

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

Work Session Minutes of Tuesday, September 16, 2025
Murray City Hall, 10 East 4800 South, Poplar Meeting Room, Murray, Utah 84107

Attendance:

Council Members:

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

Others:

Brett Hales	Mayor	Jennifer Kennedy	City Council Executive Director
Doug Hill	Chief Administrative Officer	Pattie Johnson	Council Administration
G.L. Critchfield	City Attorney	Chad Wilkinson	Community and Economic Dev. Director
Joey Mittelman	Fire Chief	Brenda Moore	Finance Director
Hal Luke	Senior Center Board	Erica Brown	Chief Communications Officer
Amanda Gardner	Boys and Girls Club	Camron Kollman	IT Support
Citizens and Guests			

Conducting: Council Chair Cotter called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Discussion Items:

- **Murray Senior Recreation Center Report.** Senior Center Board Member Hal Luke reviewed a Deseret News article related to seniors staying healthy with line dancing, shared a video of Murray seniors line dancing and displayed photos of handmade quilts donated to the City.
- **Report from the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Salt Lake.** President and Chief Executive Officer Amanda Gardner expressed gratitude for funding that supported the Murray Boys and Girls Club community programming. Ms. Gardner explained that due to federal spending cuts, two other clubs had closed and the Salt Lake City club had temporarily closed. She believed that due to Murray City's financial support they were able to maintain the same level of service to the City including transports to all Murray schools. She explained all that the Murray club offered in relationship to health, wellbeing, character building and leadership skills. Ms. Gardner described various programs, classes and opportunities for academic success, life and workforce readiness, and discussed community challenges related to the lack of after school care.
- **Update on research into private pond regulations.** CED (Community and Economic Development) Director Chad Wilkinson said his staff worked hard in researching how other cities regulate private ponds and shared comparative information. Cities like Murray without pond regulations or pond permits, only require an electrical permit for any kind of hard wired pump. Others require pond permits at a certain threshold related to size, depth, grading or excavation and many require permits for a 24-inch deep pond or a pond requiring 5,000 gallons of water. Pools of that size are handled like swimming pool permits that must follow existing zoning requirements.

Mr. Wilkinson reviewed Murray's pool standards from the current ordinance and displayed aerial maps to illustrate how a 10-foot by 15-foot private pond compared in size to many existing swimming pools in the City.

Mr. Wilkinson acknowledged recent concerns related to the request to regulate private ponds, confirming that issues like mosquitos and fish are currently regulated by the DWR (Department of Water Resources) and MAD (Mosquito Abatement District). He reported that MAD successfully resolves 99% of private pond mosquito issues and DWR gets involved only when game fish are placed in private ponds. Staff fully supports these agencies handling all related concerns.

Mr. Wilkinson said unlike a pool, ponds vary in installation and size. There was not typically a pond structure to review so it was difficult to determine submittal requirements. Even though there are similarities between pools and ponds, there are notable and complete differences related to construction, landscape, vegetation and purpose.

He emphasized how a pond ordinance would affect the entire city and if directed to draft one, staff would ensure clear differences between ponds and pools to acknowledge that ponds cannot be treated like pools.

Mr. Wilkinson confirmed that historically pond concerns were not frequent issues for the City and reiterated that due to unintended consequences, the City should exercise caution when drafting an ordinance to address one individual. He explained that because pond issues were not common, an ordinance would require a geotechnical engineer or an engineering study that would affect everyone deciding to install a small pond. He felt that such an ordinance could discourage others who want to install a small pond because now it would be more costly.

He felt if the City did not adopt specific standards for regulating ponds, civil remedies were available to resolve neighbor issues, which could be handled without the City's involvement and without the City having to implement a new ordinance for one situation. He noted that more property line dispute issues are received than pond complaints, and the City does not get involved in those disputes.

Mr. Wilkinson said the assignment to research other cities was complete, but more time was needed if the Council still wanted an ordinance drafted. After reviewing the research his personal opinion was to only move forward with a light touch ordinance, if any. His hope was that it would not hinder other residents from installing a small Koi pond if they wished.

Council Members discussed fencing, pond liners, fountains, filtration and blue stakes, they discussed commercial ponds and setbacks for residential ponds, analyzed both residential and commercial pool standards related to engineering requirements and electrical permits for pumps.

There was consensus to move forward with drafting a pond ordinance that would define proper setbacks, liners, fencing, size, depth and filtration and that staff should have discretion within the Code.

Mr. Wilkinson said setbacks and fencing regulations for ponds would be very straight forward because they would be similar to pool standards. He emphasized that the more complex part of completing an ordinance would be working with the building division and city engineers, to understand proper liners and how pond structures would be reviewed as part of a new permitting process. He believed there was no idea how citizens would be affected because only two permit requests for electrical pumps were made in the last 10 years. In addition aerial maps could not reveal where private ponds are located that could be small or hidden by trees. Staff would move forward in drafting a proposed pond ordinance, which would first be presented to the Planning Commission.

- **Partnering with Main Street USA (Murray City Downtown District).** Mr. Hock explained that the MCDD (Murray City Downtown District), a 501(c)(3) who is part of Main Street USA, and their request for \$65,000

has been discussed internally for some time. He emphasized to the Council that if the City were to enter into a partnership with Main Street USA, it would be a long-term agreement. City Attorney G.L. Critchfield clarified that originally financial assistance was requested for the MCDD during the City's budget process, by the local non-profit who had already implemented the program on their own.

Mr. Critchfield said there was more to the Main Street USA program than realized, where usually a city by itself passes a resolution to say it supports revitalization, with its own vision for a downtown area, with its own board of directors and the selection of a 501(c)(3) organization to help partner with Main Street USA.

Because the process was implemented backwards and the City was already a Tier Two Main Street USA community, the Council could approve a financial donation with no further involvement or the City must be fully committed to become a Tier Three community.

Mr. Critchfield reviewed information about Main Street USA to clarify what the program entailed. He noted that financial support for the organization comes from local entities with a stake in downtown city government, merchants, businesses, major employers and the public. It is a local initiative both organizationally and financially and offers different tiers within the whole program. A community is recognized as Tier One once a community designation application was completed and accepted.

Mr. Critchfield pointed out that this process was already completed by the MCDD who requested the financial donation from the City and that in order to become a Tier Three community, the City must commit to participating with the Main Street USA program. The City would develop communications, fund a development plan, assist the community in implementing the main street four-point approach and help host main street efforts if it is moved forward.

He emphasized that the partnership was not just a donation for the non-profit agency to spend on whatever it chooses; and explained that the City would take the initiative in deciding what it wants for its own downtown by setting the vision. He noted all Tier One community cities in Utah's rural areas and all Tier Two communities including Murray.

Mr. Critchfield reiterated that the Council could approve just a cash donation and not continue the partnership, emphasizing that there was much more to the financial request than others normally seen during the budget process. He explained that the Utah program was meant to help Utah communities revitalize their economy, appearance and image by providing framework and resources to support revitalization and required the community to also commit to the main street approach.

Mr. Critchfield said a separate department was not needed within the City to operate the program, but there would be overlap with the non-profit agency, City staff and volunteers who were involved in the initial proposal. The program would function similar to the NeighborWorks partnership agreement where financial reporting would be required to ensure that the annual \$65,000 allocation was properly managed each year.

Ms. Turner asked if the City could withdraw funding, if money was not being spent the way the City wanted. Mr. Critchfield clarified the Main Street USA program was supposed to be the City's idea, not initiated by someone else, it was not like a donation to the Boys and Girls Club that could be denied each year. The required cost was a major commitment because the City would be an equal partner, if not more than the person who implemented the partnership.

Mr. Critchfield confirmed the City could always make the decision to not participate. He said Main Street USA was primarily intended for rural communities all over the Country where many had been committed for up to 40 years, so it was a major commitment to say how the City would revitalize downtown.

Mr. Hock expressed concern with who would set the vision for the downtown, noting that Jenn Kikel-Lynn, the Mayor's administration and the City Council would be working together. He felt past discussions already proved there were different visions and each branch had set a different course for the program. Mr. Hock said a very clear vision was needed between all three branches if the program were to move forward.

Mr. Critchfield confirmed that letters of recommendation were sent to the State in support of Jenn Kikel-Lynn overseeing the program as part of her application process. He said it would have been helpful had the Council been involved prior to the application process to provide an approved resolution to go with the initial application. Despite that process, the City was already accepted so direction was needed about whether to pursue it with funding.

There was consensus that Jenn Kikel-Lynn's hard work was not undermined, the annual required cost to her would still be \$65,000, regardless of any grant funding she received and the vision needed to be approved by the City. Mr. Critchfield suggested Ms. Kikel-Lynn present her vision to the Council in a future meeting to get her input and compare whether the same vision was shared or not.

Mr. Hock thought all three visions for the downtown were not the same and ideas should be crystalized to determine the end goal. Ms. Turner agreed she was unaware of what had been accomplished so far. Mr. Pickett believed the Council was supporting the vision of the executive branch and shared their ideas. Mr. Critchfield said the Council should be very clear about the vision before supporting it financially. There was consensus that Ms. Kikel-Lynn had a strong connection with Murray businesses, but before funding was approved another work session was needed to clarify the same vision.

Mr. Critchfield stressed the proposal was not like a general plan zoning code for the Council to set the policy. The Council would approve a policy based on understanding the clear vision. Ms. Turner said years ago the hope of the Council was that the Murray Chamber of Commerce would do more with Murray businesses to revitalize the downtown area. All agreed that Ms. Kikel-Lynn was doing good work, but it would be helpful for her to understand their vision as well.

- **Adjournment:** 6:08

Pattie Johnson
Council Administrator III