



**MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL**  
**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

---

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

**Members in Attendance:**

Brett Hales	Council Chair
D. Blair Camp	Council Member
Jim Brass	Council Member
Diane Turner	Council Member
Dave Nicponski	Council Member- Excused

**Others in Attendance:**

Ted Eyre	Mayor	Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrator	Jan Wells	Chief Administrative Officer
George E. Hamer Jr.	Fleet	Chad Wilkinson	CED
Jennifer Kennedy	Recorder	Janet Towers	Exec. Asst. to Mayor
Justin Zollinger	Finance	Tim Tingey	ADS Director
Jennifer Brass	Resident	Kellie Challburg	Council Office
Scott Stallings	Resident	Jessica Stallings	Resident

Chairman Hales called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

**Approval of Minutes**

Chairman Hales asked for approval or corrections on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meetings on February 4, 2014, and February 18, 2014, and also the Public Open House on March 19, 2014. Mr. Brass moved approval for the Committee of the Whole minutes, and Ms. Turner seconded. The minutes were approved 4-0. Mr. Brass moved approval of the Open House minutes, and Mr. Camp seconded. All were in favor.

**Business Item #2**

**Alternative Fuel Vehicle Replacement Report-  
George E. Hamer, Jr.**

Mr. Hamer said he was asked by Ms. Turner to evaluate and research different options for hybrids or alternative fuel vehicles. He discovered that most manufacturers are not putting out CNG (compressed natural gas) vehicles from the factory, but instead focusing on hybrids. The CNG vehicles are diminishing because there are many cheaper conversions available. About four years ago, a conversion cost about \$12,000 to \$15,000; the current cost today is approximately \$5,200 to \$5,400.

Mr. Hamer mentioned HB 61, which allocated approximately \$200,000 available to government entities to offset some of the conversion costs at a rate of 50%. Ms. Turner asked if any conversions had been done in Murray. Mr. Hamer replied that they had not. He mentioned that the return on the investment at the higher cost would have been about eight to ten years and would not have been worth it. The current return on investment would be a much shorter time, possibly three to four years, and much less if the amount is subsidized by HB 61. He stated that Murray typically keeps its vehicles from about eight to ten years.

Natural gas costs about \$1.60 for a gallon equivalent, compared to about \$2.65 for a gallon of gasoline. The savings would be about \$1.00 a gallon. If the City was able to receive some funds from HB 61, then it would be a big return on the investment. If not, then the conversion would cost about \$5,200 per vehicle, and would still be a cost benefit, as long as the City keeps the cars for eight to ten years.

Mr. Brass asked which vehicles he would recommend doing a conversion on, considering the loss of power when changing to CNG. Mr. Hamer replied that it actually shows an increase in horsepower, from about 70 to 100 with a diesel vehicle. The vehicle still uses diesel, at about a 60/40 rate. In that situation, if a diesel converted truck idles frequently, then it wouldn't be effective, since CNG kicks out in the idle phase. He believes it would be most effective on the vehicles that are taken home for after-hours service calls.

Ms. Turner commented that the City has some hybrid vehicles. Mr. Hamer replied that was correct; three in the Power Department, and one in the Fire Department.

Ms. Turner asked details about the conversion process, such as who performs the conversion, and costs. Mr. Hamer replied that there is a company that is certified to do the conversion. After the conversion is done, City employees would be trained on how to maintain them, and inspect for leaks, etc.

Mr. Camp asked if there was a difference in cost between converting a new vehicle and an older one. Mr. Hamer said there wasn't a difference, but you would want to make sure the older vehicle is worth converting. The fuel tank is the biggest expense on the conversions but the tank is good for twenty years and can be moved to another vehicle, he stated.

Mayor Eyre asked if it was true that CNG engine burns cleaner, and the oil lasts longer, causing a much cleaner result with less maintenance, and if a CNG vehicle gets about the same gas mileage as other vehicles. He also asked if HB 61 covers any hybrid vehicles or just conversions. Mr. Hamer added that HB 61 offers a credit for hybrid vehicles also; the State would reimburse the difference between a regular vehicle cost and a hybrid vehicle cost, up to 50% of the difference.

Mayor Eyre asked if the torque decreases on a converted diesel vehicle when the horsepower increases. Mr. Hamer said that they claim that the horsepower and the torque both increase. Mr. Hamer mentioned that he spoke with employees at Centerville City and they are very happy with their diesel conversions.

Ms. Turner noted that she would like to pursue this option, and research it further to evaluate costs and determine if the City could receive funds from HB 61. Mr. Camp stated that the clean air issue is enough to continue pursuing this option. Ms. Turner added that clean air is her biggest concern and money saved would be an added benefit.

Mr. Hamer stated that he would continue the research and get back to the Council.

**Business Item #2**

**Presentation National League of Cities Conference-  
Jim Brass and Diane Turner**

Ms. Turner stated that she recently attended the National League of Cities Conference with Mr. Brass in Washington D.C. She enjoyed it and believes she learned a lot from it. The biggest positive aspect was the networking, but learned from the seminars also.

Ms. Turner and Mr. Brass attended an Economic Development seminar that discussed tax increment financing and bonds. The speaker simplified the concept down to the basic tax increment financing model. She had the literature from the seminar and invited anyone to review the material, if they wished.

Ms. Turner mentioned that she met a representative from Arizona that had similar issues with a UTOPIA style business and eventually took it to a utility model that was run by the City. It was helpful to talk to people from other cities and discuss similar issues. Chairman Hales agreed with the value of networking that is found at the conferences.

Ms. Turner noted that there are different Councils and Associations, such as the Western Municipal Association, that one can join. That Western Municipal Association had an interesting topic of intergovernmental challenges arising from marijuana legalization for medicinal or recreational use in the Western United States. That discussion came from the recent legalization in Colorado and Washington State. Chairman Hales noted that the Utah Legislature approved a type of marijuana product as a seizure medication. Mr. Brass commented that with neighboring Colorado, there will be issues of driving under the influence of marijuana. It isn't a simple Breathalyzer test, the Police troopers would need to be phlebotomists and have the ability to draw blood for a marijuana test. The other issue is crimes of opportunity because the retail marijuana locations are making large amounts of money, and the banks are not allowing it to be deposited, because the Federal Government isn't clear on whether it is drug proceeds or not. Mr. Brass commented that it was interesting to see the different views between the conservatives and liberals from Colorado.

Ms. Turner stated that they also attended a seminar on downtown redevelopment that was very interesting. The seminar was presented by the Planning Director from San Diego, whom was also the former Mayor of Ventura, California. He gave some strategies

for a vibrant downtown, such as public markets, playgrounds, two way streets, and open satellite campuses from the University.

Ms. Turner believes it would be beneficial to have a Council Member attend every year and become members of the different Associations.

Mr. Brass commented that it was interesting talking to recently elected officials, and those that have been in office for some time. Those that have been in office for a longer period of time believed that the conference was a little lacking in substance. He stated that it makes sense for two designated officials to attend every year, as Ms. Turner had previously stated. The networking and involvement in different committees is where the best benefits come from.

Mr. Brass believes that the ULCT (Utah League of Cities & Towns) provides every bit as good of training, if not better. The ULCT training comes twice a year, and is a lot less money. This trip was \$6,000 for two to attend. He asked what the cost to attend the upcoming ULCT training in St. George was. Ms. Lopez replied that it was approximately \$1,000 a person. He stated that he believes that the City should commit to the same two representatives attending NLCT every year and work the system or possibly think about doing something else.

Mr. Brass added that another benefit is meeting with the Federal legislators. The fact that Murray City is getting in front of the Federal legislators is a good thing. He mentioned that they met with Orrin Hatch's staff and also Jim Matheson. Chairman Hales noted that Congressman Matheson seems to make himself available for meetings. Mr. Brass agreed that Congressman Matheson was very gracious and it was a good meeting. The National League had six points that they would like the legislators lobbied. He noted that some of the sessions were mainly how to lobby, instead of learning facts about the issues. He believes for the dollars spent, the Utah League is a better resource. He would like to hear the opinion of Ms. Turner after she attends the Utah League convention.

Ms. Turner added that she met some representatives from Colorado and mentioned that she as interested in TOD (Transit Oriented Development.) The Colorado representatives had ideas on that and quickly sent her emails with information. Mr. Brass agreed that they had some good ideas on TOD and pointed out not to get caught up on the area around the stations, but tie it together with bike paths, etc. He gave an example about paid parking meters, and said that every session had some good points, but it still was a large expense.

Chairman Hales commented that there is so much information out there to take in.

Ms. Turner mentioned the materials would be in the office for anyone to review. She thought it was very helpful for her, and appreciates going.

**Business Item #3**

**2014-2015 Community Development Block  
Grant (CDBG) Funding- Mayor Eyre and Chad  
Wilkinson**

Mr. Wilkinson mentioned that CDBG is a Federally Administered program through the

Department of Housing and Urban Development. The specific function is to serve low to moderate income individuals and households within cities.

Murray City participates in the Urban County Program, and the funds are administered through Salt Lake County. The amount allocated is based on a formula that takes into consideration population and low to moderate income within the City. The amount changes each year, and there had been an 11% reduction this year, as well as, previous years. There were \$387,000 in requests, and the anticipated allocation is \$131,000. Last year, with the re-allocations, the amount was \$148,000.

Mr. Wilkinson mentioned that the non-profit groups would be making presentations to the Council shortly and wanted to point out some acronyms. LMI (low to moderate income), and AMI (area median income). LMI is defined as an individual or household earning less than 80% of the AMI. This year, 80% of the AMI amount is \$38,500 for an individual and \$54,950 for a household of four. It is dependent on the size of the household.

Each of the projects that apply for funding have to demonstrate that they serve 51% or more of LMI individuals or households. The County determines eligibility for the projects. The recipients keep track of that information, verifying that they serve that percentage of LMI individuals.

Mr. Wilkinson handed out materials showing all the applicants.

The biggest difference in the process from 2013 is that the County received all the applications this year and then gave them back to Murray City. This was a significant change because it allowed the sub-recipients to apply to multiple agencies for funding, on one application. It did lead to some confusion, but streamlined the process for applicants.

Murray City still has the decision making authority on how the funds are allocated. As in prior years, there was a committee made up of Mayor's staff and CED (Community & Economic Development) staff that met with the applicants. There were 19 applicants that met in separate interviews. Those applications were reviewed to determine if they met any of the goals in the County consolidated plan. They are all valuable programs that provide great service, noted Mr. Wilkinson.

The factors taken into consideration were: first, whether the project met the goals in the County consolidated plan, the number of Murray residents served, if the project is located in Murray, and the project itself. Staff made recommendations, as shown on the handout.

Chairman Hales asked how many employees were on the committee. Mr. Wilkinson replied there were three. Chairman Hales asked if two Council Members could sit on the committee next time. Mr. Wilkinson said he is hesitant because the Council Members are the decision makers and possibly should not make the recommendation also. Chairman Hales said he was asked if the Council could be part of the committee also. Mayor Eyre commented that it might be good to have a separation there. Mr. Brass said that in the past, the Council made the recommendations and the decisions. He commented that it was a consuming process, and the longest meeting of the year. He said that a separation may not be necessary because the Council is the deciding body and the funding body, but it does simplify the process. Mr. Tingey said that was correct

that the Council is the funding body, but it complicates things when the recommendations come from the same body. He believes it is more advantageous to have recommendations brought to the Council. Mr. Camp said he concurs with that decision, and it eliminates a single Council Member speaking for the Council. Chairman Hales said that occasionally happens, for example, in budget meetings. Mr. Wilkinson restated that the Council can decide to go against the recommendations.

Mr. Camp asked if the \$131,900 included the re-allocations also. Mr. Wilkinson said that it did include approximately \$5,000 in re-allocated funds. The re-allocation amount was a little lower this year than previous years. He mentioned that the exact amounts would be in the materials sent out.

Ms. Turner asked if the recommended funding was for Murray City to fund. Mr. Wilkinson said that was correct. He commented that some of the applicants have requested money from other cities also, and that would be listed on the application.

Mr. Wilkinson noted that the County removed the social services, or soft part of the grant from the participating cities and gave it directly by the County.

Mr. Brass asked about Odyssey House, as an example. They have requested \$8,000 for replacing their boiler system, and the recommendation is to give them \$5,000. He asked if that was enough money. He noted that it is important to give enough to adequately fund the project. Mr. Wilkinson said this is a good example, because the Odyssey House requested funds from multiple jurisdictions. Staff researched all sources of funding that the applicant had requested. Mayor Eyre said that question was directly asked to the applicants, if they could complete the project with fewer dollars than requested. Mayor Eyre said the applicants were asked to prioritize the projects with less money awarded.

Mr. Brass asked what the extra amount requested from the Boys & Girls Club of South Valley was to be used for. Mr. Wilkinson said the amount requested was much higher, and the amount recommended would cover a portion of the energy efficient lighting. Mr. Wilkinson said the Boys & Girls Club prioritized their projects. Most important was the insulation, that was fully funded, and some money was given towards other projects.

Mayor Eyre commented that it was interesting to be on this side of the table because he had previously twice requested CDBG funds. The committee met and discussed the applications, then later reconvened and individually compared the lists, and they were almost exactly the same.

Chairman Hales confirmed that the Council was in agreement with the format for recommending CDBG funds.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that the Public Hearing would be held on April 15<sup>th</sup>, and the applicants had all received copies of the recommendations.

Chairman Hales adjourned the meeting.

Council Administrator II  
Kellie Challburg