MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
COUNCIL MEETING
Minutes of Tuesday, June 2, 2026
Murray City Hall, 10 East 4800 South, Council Chambers, Murray, Utah 84107

Attendance:

Council Members:

Paul Pickett	District #1
Pam Cotter	District #2
Clark Bullen	District #3
Diane Turner	District #4 – Vice Chair
Adam Hock	District #5 – Council Chair

Others:

Kim Sorensen	Mayor Pro Tem	Jennifer Kennedy	City Council Executive Director
Mark Christensen	Deputy Attorney	Pattie Johnson	Council Administration
Joey Mittelman	Fire Chief	Brooke Smith	City Recorder
Craig Burnett	Police Chief	Chad Wilkinson	Community & Economic Dev. Director
Brenda Moore	Finance Director	Erica Brown	Chief Communications Officer
Emily Barton	Finance Controller	Isaac Zenger	IT Support
Ryan Madsen	IT Director	Citizens and Guests	

Call to Order: 6:30 p.m. – Council Member Bullen

Approval of Minutes: Council Meeting May 5, 2026.
MOTION: Mr. Pickett moved to approve. Ms. Turner seconded the motion. All in favor 5-0.

Citizen Comments:

Rosane Coleman – Murray Resident

Senior Center Advisory Board Member Ms. Coleman spoke about attendance growing at an incredible rate, the need to expand programing, limited space available and how the Murray Center remains vital to the lives of the aging population.

Special Recognition:

1. **Introduction of Miss Murray 2026, Sarah Christenson.** Mr. Sorensen introduced Ms. Christenson and Ellerie Larson, recently crowned as the new Miss Murray and Little Miss Murray. Ms. Christenson shared her experience in the pageant and the journey that led to her being crowned Miss Murray. She noted her love of hiking, dogs, and playing the violin, and highlighted some of the ways she has served the community.

Public Hearings:

1. **Consider an ordinance amending Sections 16.04.020 and 16.04.040 of the Murray City Municipal Code regarding the definition of a Boundary Line Adjustment and the Designation of Land Use Authority for specific subdivision application reviews, approvals, and appeals**. CED (Community and Economic Development) Director Chad Wilkinson explained that a new land use authority diagram/table would be added to the Code due to updated State legislation. He reviewed the drafted text amendment and the proposed diagram/table, which assigns application types to the appropriate reviewing, approving, and appeals authorities. Responsibilities were now outlined for Full Boundary Adjustment and Simple Boundary Adjustment processes, and members were also identified within the Development Staff, Land Use Authority, and Planning Commission entities. Mr. Wilkinson noted that Simple Boundary Adjustment applications would be handled administratively by the CED Director rather than the Planning Commission; Findings were presented to confirm why the Planning Commission and CED staff recommended that the City Council adopt the ordinance.

The public hearing was open for public comments. No comments were given, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the ordinance Ms. Cotter SECONDED the motion.

Council Roll Call Vote

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Aye
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	5-0

2. **Consider an ordinance amending the City's FY (Fiscal Year) 2025-2026 Budget.** Finance Director Brenda Moore discussed a few of the final adjustments to the current year budget, highlighting that various grant funds would be allocated appropriately; the Water Fund would use $850,000 in reserves for the new Winchester Well; and the Golf Fund would increase Green Fees revenue by $51,000, allocating funds to Professional Services for reservation software and Credit Card Fee expenses.

   Ms. Moore stated that the budget opening also included language authorizing her to make year-end adjustments related to the GF (General Fund) transfer to the CIP (Capital Improvement Program) Fund, the CIP Fund transfer from the GF, and any Transportation Tax Revenue adjustments. She also noted that she could transfer funds to the CIP Fund as necessary to maintain GF reserves between 25% and 26%.

   The public hearing was open for public comments. No comments were given, and the public hearing was closed.

   MOTION: Ms. Cotter moved to adopt the ordinance Mr. Hock SECONDED the motion.

   Council Roll Call Vote

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Aye
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	5-0

3. **Consider an ordinance adopting the transfer of monies from enterprise funds to other city funds**. Ms. Moore stated that she was required by State Law to explain Enterprise Funds transfers, and Administrative/Overhead Cost transfers. A thorough presentation outlined the difference between the two.

   For Transfers-Out, she reviewed the definition, purpose and methodology of the Transfers Out to the GF and detailed how the calculations were determined. Ms. Moore confirmed that $865,920 would transfer from the Waster Fund; $770,560 would transfer from the Wastewater Fund; and $3,819,600 from the Power Fund, with a total allocation of $5,456,080 going to the GF.

   Ms. Moore displayed a graph illustrating all GF revenue sources, highlighting Transfers-In totaling $5,456,080, which accounted for 8% of the total $69 million GF budget.

   For the Administrative Services allocations Ms. Moore explained the breakdown of how money in the Enterprise Funds was used to cover administrative and overhead costs in the Council, Mayor, Finance, Utility Billing, Human Resources, City Attorney, City Treasurer, Recorder’s Office, IT and GIS departments. The

Facilities Department was added after a cost study and was allocated based on the number of facilities that the Facilities Department helps oversee. A chart was displayed outlining the total cost for each department totally $11.8 million as well as, the percentage that each Enterprise Fund would receive totaling $11.8 million. Ms. Moore noted the GF would keep 54% of the amount; and out of all seven Enterprise Funds, the Power Fund would receive the most at 18.81% comparatively.

The public hearing was open for public comments.

David Child – Murray Resident
Mr. Child felt the City was not managing its finances responsibly and that the Enterprise Fund transfers did not represent a true return on investment, noting that revenue intended for the Water Fund was ultimately transferred to the GF to support other City operations. He said the 17% water rate increase last year and this year was already a challenge for taxpayers on fixed incomes, questioned why all City employees would receive cost-of-living and merit increases, and wondered whether the Transfers-Out were necessary.

The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Moore explained why the Enterprise Fund transfers were necessary, stating that approximately one-third of the property within Murray City was exempt from property taxes. Because several large non-profit entities located in the City do not pay property taxes but still utilize Murray City water, power, sewer, and wastewater treatment services, the transfers help offset the cost of providing those services to non-taxable entities. Without the transfers, Murray residents and for-profit businesses would face an estimated 40% property tax increase to cover those costs to serve the non-profit agencies.

MOTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the ordinance Ms. Cotter SECONDED the motion.

Council Roll Call Vote

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Aye
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	5-0

4. **Consider an ordinance approving and adopting compensation increases for the Executive Municipal Officers of the city for FY 2026-2027.** Ms. Moore stated that she was required by State Law to publicly discuss any pay increases for executive municipal officers in a public hearing. Pay increases have always been discussed as part of the budget process and existing public hearing, which includes employees, department heads, and their assistants and superintendents. Ms. Moore reviewed the City's employee step plan, which applied to all City employees except the mayor, city council, city judge, and chief administrative officer. She explained how merit increases, wage and range adjustments, market comparisons, and the COLA (Cost of Living Adjustments) were incorporated into the plan, noted that employee pay rates are available on the City's website, and outlined the advantages of the step plan as presented in the budget.

   Ms. Moore said all City employees would receive a 2% COLA including all Council Members and Mayor Hales; all employees would receive the appropriated step increase on their next step date, and some employees would receive a market adjustment. The compensation increase chart was displayed for FY 2026-2027; Ms. Moore stated that the goal of a market adjustment was to keep civil service employees within 5% of the market and that proposed increases were comparable to those cities similar in size to Murray.

The public hearing was open for public comments.

<u>David Child – Murray Resident</u>
Mr. Child thought a pay increase of 7% for a City employee of five years was too aggressive, noting that it would include a step increase and a COLA increase. He also felt that comparing city to city increases provided a way for cities to give high increases, questioned increases just for working a certain number of years and wondered if the pay increases could be reconsidered due to the proposed property tax increase.

<u>DeLynn Barney – Murray Resident</u>
Mr. Barney commended the City for implementing pay increases in the step process and stated that as a retired federal employee it was not uncommon to get a step, COLA, and merit increase in the same year.

The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Moore confirmed that merit raises were not automatic increases and explained that employees must complete a required evaluation to be eligible for the 2.5% merit increase. She said the step plan had helped address retention and pay compression issues and allowed the City to hire employees at competitive rates. While she was uncertain whether the step plan was sustainable long-term, she noted that, given the current frequency of employee retirements, it appeared to be sustainable so far.

MOTION: Mr. Hock moved to adopt the ordinance Ms. Turner SECONDED the motion.

<u>Council Roll Call Vote</u>

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Nay
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	4-1

5. **Murray City intends to make the following statement containing each of the following elements (a) through (d), as required by state law:**
   a. that Murray City is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds Murray City's certified tax rate ("tax rate increase");
   b. the approximate dollar amount of and purpose for additional ad valorem tax revenue that would be generated by the proposed tax rate increase;
   c. the approximate percentage increase in ad valorem tax revenue for Murray City based on the proposed tax rate increase; and
   d. that if Murray City proceeds with the proposed tax rate increase, Murray City will provide notice of and conduct a public hearing, as required by state law (Utah Code 59-2-919(4)(c)), at which members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the proposed tax rate increase.

Brenda Moore stated that the Murray City Council's tentative budget which is scheduled for a public hearing during this meeting contains a property tax levy increase above the certified tax rate, which will be released in June. The City needs more revenue than what is anticipated to be collected by other revenue sources and the current property tax levy with anticipated growth. The proposed budget requires $863,709 of new property tax revenue including growth. The proposed amount is a 6.92% increase in the Cities certified tax levy from calendar 2025. This is just an increase of the City's portion of the property tax paid, not the entire amount paid. It is anticipated that the amount of revenue required will change after the property tax growth figure is received from the County auditor. The Certified tax rate for the Murray city Library will remain the same as the County Auditor will provide in June. The revenue increase would be used for an additional police officer, additional overtime for police and fire department, pay range increases for the City's police officers and firefighters, and additional vehicle/fire truck maintenance in the fire department. If the City proceeds with the Tax rate increase the City will provide notice of and conduct a public hearing on August 11, as required by state law (Utah Code 59-2-919(4)c)) at which members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the proposed tax rate increase and may also comment tonight.

6. **Presentation of the property tax impact schedule.** Ms. Moore reviewed the Property tax Increase Impact Schedule, stating that under State Code as amended in the 2026 Legislative Session, the Impact Statement was required as a design to make the public aware that the City was proposing a Tax Levy Increase. The schedule must show details about the increase, and what the effect would be, if a property tax increase was not passed.

   Based on 2025 numbers, the current property tax rate was 0.001403. The current property tax revenue is approximately $12.4 million; the City needs approximately $13.3 million so the estimated amount generated from the increase was $863,709.

   The estimated increase to Murray City's property tax rate would be 6.92%. This meant that a combined rate for those living in the Murray School District would be a 1.21% change, and for those in the Granite District a .97% change.

   The estimated increase to primary residence valued at $602,900 would be $32.19 per year, or $2.68 per month; the estimated increase to a business valued at approximately $602,900 would be $58.53 per year or $4.88 per month.

   The Police Department would receive $429,882 to hire a new police officer, make market adjustments to police officer salaries and increase overtime to allow more time to be spent on major incidents. The Fire Department would receive $433,827 to make market adjustments to firefighter salaries, increase overtime and the Vehicle and Fire Truck Maintenance budget.

7. **Public Hearing for the proposed FY 2026-2027 Budget.** Ms. Moore reviewed highlights of the final budget, including the Special Revenue Funds, Internal Service Funds and Enterprise Funds. She noted that the GF budget was projected to end the fiscal year at approximately the same level at which it began, with sales tax revenue estimated at FY 2026 collection levels. Personnel costs would increase by 3%, while operating costs were projected to decrease by 2%. She explained that the Murray Theater's operating costs would be funded through the 0.2% Optional Sales Tax revenue rather than property tax revenue and noted that $3.3 million was budgeted for Class C Road projects. Ms. Moore noted revenue sources, expenditures by category and function, and confirmed that the CIP Fund would provide $11.1 million for capital projects. She also reviewed the remaining budget schedule stating that the City Council would adopt the Interim Budget on June 16, 2026, and a Truth In Taxation hearing would be held on August 11, 2026.

   The public hearing was open for public comments.

   <u>David Christensen – Murray Resident</u>
   Mr. Christensen expressed appreciation for the way Murray ensured that City police officers and fire fighters were paid appropriately, however he wondered why fire fighters were often asking for money to fill a boot and how those donations were allocated.

David Black – Murray Resident
Mr. Black expressed surprise about the proposed 10% property tax increase but after hearing the budget presentation and learning how the revenue would be used, he believed that the City's finances were well managed and he appreciated the transparency provided. He was not opposed to an annual increase of $32, but questioned the need for Enterprise Fund transfers, stating that utility payments should be used only for utility-related services rather than GF expenditures.

David Child – Murray Resident
Mr. Child was surprised that the City could not work with the school district to retain the Murray Library property. He stated that he was less impressed with the Murray Library because it did not meet his interests, so he attended county libraries. He was not enthused that the City hoped to get a new library building, felt the existing library could be improved, and encouraged the City to talk to library users about how to make it more interesting instead of spending money on a new one.

Colby Oliverson – Murray Resident
Mr. Oliverson felt the Enterprise Fund transfers were not a standard budgeting practice and created an incentive to make money from utilities to pay for GF costs not associated with the Enterprise Funds. He thought blending enterprise revenues with GF costs created a lack of transparency. He also expressed concern with implementing a COLA in the budget and questioned the use of property tax revenue while the City was still receiving the 0.2% Optional Sales Tax revenue.

Rebecca Sanborn – Murray Resident
Ms. Sanborn, a former Murray City employee, stated that residents should be treated with respect and valued because they pay for City employee wages. She expressed concern with government expansion, believing Murray was becoming more like Salt Lake City, and pointed to high expenditures, personnel costs, and COLA and step plan increases. She urged the Council to reevaluate how to avoid passing additional costs on to citizens through a property tax increase, stating that the spending was becoming oppressive for residents.

The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Moore clarified that Murray firefighters were not begging for money for themselves; the Fill the Boot program is a fundraiser for the Muscular Dystrophy Association. She stated that the City has no control over large nonprofit private businesses locating in Murray which affected the City’s property tax revenue. She confirmed that the original proposed increase of 9.8% was reduced to 6.92% after many budget decreases, which would be equivalent to $2.68 per month per home. She also confirmed that the 0.2% tax revenue would not be used for the City’s ongoing GF expenses, which would help reduce the impact of losing that revenue after 2030.

Mr. Bullen stated this was the first public hearing to receive public comments on the proposed FY 2026-2027 budget, the vote to adopt the interim budget would happen on June 16, 2026 during a second public hearing and public comments would be welcome again.

Business Items:

8. **Consider a resolution authorizing an increase of Murray City pick up of Public Safety and Firefighter employee retirement contributions**. Ms. Moore stated that as part of the Tier 2 Firefighter System and the Tier 2 Public Safety System, the City has chosen to cover retirement contributions for all firefighters and police officers on staff. She pointed out that every other city in the surrounding area with public safety and

firefighter employee retirement contribution options has also chosen to do so, which often helps with retention. The contribution rate for the retirement plan was 5.89%, and the total cost allocated in the 2027 budget was $398,616.

MOTION: Mr. Hock moved to adopt the resolution. Ms. Cotter SECONDED the motion.

Council Roll Call Vote

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Aye
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	5-0

9. **Consider an ordinance enacting Section 2.24.080 of the Murray City Municipal Code related to establishing a Theater Division of the Parks and Recreation Department.** Parks Director Jeff Martin explained that the reason for the proposed ordinance was that the Theater Division was established last year under the Parks Department but was never officially codified.

MOTION: Mr. Pickett moved to adopt the ordinance Ms. Turner SECONDED the motion.

Council Roll Call Vote

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Aye
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	5-0

10. **Consider a resolution approving a Cooperation Agreement between Murray City and the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands for a cost-reimbursement grant for a trail lighting project adjacent to the Jordan River.** Mr. Martin requested that the Council approve the resolution allowing the City to accept grant funding in the amount of $40,000, which would be used toward the cost of installing solar lighting along the Jordan Parkway.

MOTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the resolution. Mr. Pickett SECONDED the motion.

Council Roll Call Vote

Ms. Turner	Aye
Mr. Hock	Aye
Mr. Pickett	Aye
Ms. Cotter	Aye
Mr. Bullen	Aye
Motion passed:	5-0

Mayor's Report and Questions: None

Adjournment: 8:29 p.m.

Pattie Johnson
Council Office Administrator III