



**MURRAY**  
CITY COUNCIL

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

---

**T**he Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, March 15, 2011, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

### **Members in Attendance:**

Jim Brass	Council Chair
Jeff Dredge	Council Vice Chair
Darren V. Stam	Council Member
Jared A. Shaver	Council Member
Krista K. Dunn	Council Member

### **Others in Attendance:**

Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Dan Snarr	Mayor
Jan Wells	Mayor's Chief of Staff
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Janet M. Lopez	Council Office
Peri Kinder	Valley Journals
Angela Price	Comm & Econ Dev
Doug Hill	Public Service Director
John Matern	Lochner Engineering
Caren Lopez	Utility Customer Services
Pat Wilson	Finance Director
Layne Jones	Lochner Engineering
Trae Stokes	Murray Engineering
Scott Stanger	Murray Engineering
Chad Wilkinson	Comm & Econ Dev
Jennifer Brass	Citizen
Bill Finch	Citizen
Susan Dewey	Comm & Econ Dev
Tim Tingey	Comm & Econ Dev Director
Jeff Evans	Planning Commission
Jim Harland	Planning Commission
Tim Taylor	Planning Commission

Chairman Brass called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

## **Minutes**

Mr. Brass asked for corrections or action on the minutes from the Budget and Finance Committee Meeting held on February 1, 2011. Ms. Dunn moved approval; Mr. Shaver seconded and the motion, which carried 4-0.

Mr. Brass addressed the minutes of the Committee of the Whole meeting held on February 1, 2011, and the Council Initiative workshop held on February 15, 2011. Mr. Shaver moved approval as written. Mr. Stam seconded, and the motion was approved 4-0.

Mr. Dredge joined the meeting in progress.

### **Business Item #1: Utility Billing Changes - Pat Wilson, Finance Director and Caren Lopez, Customer Services Supervisor**

Ms. Wilson explained that the department is proposing to make some changes to the way some of the financial processes are handled in the customer service area. There are three items to address: the utility deposits, reconnect fees, and the deferred payment agreements.

Ms. Lopez explained that due to the economic times there might be some deficiencies in these fees and rates. The security deposits for renters have been an issue for some time. The way the refundable security deposit is currently assessed is by billing. The deposit is based on a two month average utility bill for the location, and is then billed over the first two months of use. The problem is that, if they do not pay the bill, by the time the City shuts off, there is already three months due. If at that time, they have vacated, or are evicted, they have the deposit and three months billing due, and the city has collected nothing. The change that is being proposed is a deposit based on three months billing, with half collected up front. She realizes this is going to be very difficult for people, especially if they are unemployed. Murray has taken a loss more and more.

Ms. Lopez commented that a study was done comparing utility connection fees with other cities in the valley. Murray is at the low end with a \$25 reconnect charge during business hours for shut off due to non payment. This includes the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. After hours and weekends the reconnect fee for service is \$50. Our cost for one reconnect after hours is about \$60. We are asking to raise the business hours fee to \$30, and after hours to \$65.

A special circumstance that happens rarely is a shut off when the power meter is inside the home. In this case, the line will have to be cut at the pole. This involves a power line crew and a bucket truck. Ms. Lopez is proposing that charge be raised to \$250.

Mayor Snarr asked how we can charge someone \$250 when they have not been paying their bill. Ms. Lopez stated that to have the power reinstated, and then the resident must pay the past due power bill, and the reconnect fee. If a shut off is for nonpayment, then the City always requires the past due bill and reconnect fee.

Ms. Dunn asked about the charges to a new resident under those circumstances. If it is new service and they want same day service, then they are charged the same fees. Next day service has no charge.

Mr. Shaver asked if the charge is different for a residence with inside service. Ms. Lopez said that the City does not charge owners' deposits, unless it is a business. For a business, owners and renters are charged a deposit and must pay it up front. If the business owner is going to be a landlord, then the renters will be charged the deposit.

The final item the department is concerned with is the deferred payment agreement. A deferred payment option has been offered to people who cannot pay their utility bill. Depending on the amount owned, they will be given either a six month or twelve month plan. There are no rules or regulations to this plan. It is open to anyone at any time, and the department does not feel good about that. These plans have increased over the last several years. In the past there may have been only three to five per year, however, in 2009 there were 45. Almost half of those did default. There are also more foreclosures, people ask for the deferred payment agreement, and then soon they are gone.

Ms. Lopez stated that this is a plan that should be offered to good paying customers only. If someone has not finished paying the deposit, she will not grant the deferred payment, although it is not actually in the policy. If the plan includes only people who have a good paying history with the City, then a deposit usually would not be owed. The department allows two late payments within a twelve month period and still considers that a good pay history.

Ms. Dunn asked about someone who has lived in the City for six months and loses a job leaving them unable to pay the utilities. Ms. Lopez said that she would have to look at that closely, because they would not have the long term history with Murray. They would not be allowed to set up a deferred payment plan. She added that there are a lot of federal programs providing funds for low income families, such as, the Heat Program, Community Action Program, and Catholic Community Services. Murray does receive funds from these plans for people who are having trouble paying their bills. Mr. Shaver asked if she makes recommendations on these programs. She responded that she does so frequently.

Ms. Lopez indicated that because some of these policies are not in writing she must accommodate people should they ask. And she remarked that the goal is to cover the City's costs and protect Murray's interests.

Ms. Dunn asked about the Murray heat assistance program and if it is used and how much. Ms. Lopez said that about \$17,000 has been budgeted and it does all get used every year. Ms. Dunn wondered if it is used up more quickly now than in the past. Ms. Lopez said that the scale is adjusted from time to time, and the City does not know until after the fact how much the federal benefit is going to be. It is necessary to guess. The City decided about three years prior that in order to help more people it would be wise to lower the benefit per person. People are getting help from the federal program and Murray. The federal funds are much greater than what Murray has available for this purpose.

Ms. Wilson informed that Council that the documents would be on the next Council meeting.

**Business Item #2**

**Cottonwood Street Environment Assessment Update –**  
**Doug Hill, Public Service Director**

Mr. Hill introduced the presenters, Laynee Jones and John Matern, from Lochner Engineering.

Ms. Jones reviewed the project objectives, which are to improve access to the Murray City Center District, and improve connectivity throughout Murray. The way these objectives are measured is in increased commercial frontage in the district, and improved access to landlocked parcels.

On connectivity, Ms. Jones pointed out that Main Street ends and Cottonwood Street ends leaving a gap and limited connectivity in the area. Connectivity is important for the major destinations of the transit stations there, the new Murray City Center District (MCCD), the hospital, and Fireclay.

Initially, seven different alternatives were considered. Some have been eliminated. They are as follows:

- Alternative #1 – Box Elder: This one has been formally eliminated, and the public has been informed. It did not achieve the goals by just skirting the edge of the MCCD, and having very high impact.
- Alternative #2 – Hanauer: This performs better by bisecting the MCCD, giving good commercial frontage on both sides, although it also has very high impact. It leaves residential properties on the east side that are not very well connected to the rest of the neighborhood. The project team has recommended elimination, and it has been preliminarily approved, however, the decision has not become public. A little more documentation must be done with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to formalize eliminating that option, and then the public will be notified.
- Alternatives #4 and #7 - Between Hanauer and Box Elder: Alternative # 4 has been retained, and #7 has been eliminated, which is farther to the west. Alternative #4 performs very well through the MCCD, the residents support this alternative, because it would not be directly in front of anyone's home. It does have a higher cost.

Ms. Dunn asked for more explanation of Alternative #7, and a comparison of the costs. Ms. Jones said that #4 takes the east row of apartments, and #7 takes the west row. Mr. Matern pointed out #4 and #7 on the map, and indicated that the cost of #4 is slightly more expensive. Number 7 goes through a detail shop, so a hybrid of that will straighten out the street alignment and produce some cost savings. Alternative #7 does have a curve through the MCCD that does not conform to objectives.

- Alternatives #5 and #6 – West: These really do not meet the project objectives; therefore, they have been eliminated. Reducing travel distance between Fireclay and the MCCD is one of the objectives and these alternatives actually increase the distance.
- Alternative #3 – Couplet: This alternative goes northbound on Hanauer and southbound on Box Elder. These are one way streets, with good support, perform well, and have low impact.

Ms. Jones described the Stakeholder Working Group, which is comprised of 22 members. All of these people live in the project area. They were asked to state their personal preference, and also vote on what the city of Murray should do. There were some slight differences between the two votes; however, there was broad support for Alternatives #3, #4, and #7. Those are the choices that have been retained by the consulting company.

The general public open house attracted 45 attendees. Additionally, ten people participated on line. The results were similar with support for Alternatives #2, #3, #4, and #7.

Ms. Jones showed a drawing of the couplet option in detail. On the northern end near Tim Dahle properties, there may be some revisions to improve access to some business parcels.

Alternative #4 was shown in detail, with two design options. There is a 4a drawing that would take out the ABRA business building. Option 4b would avoid it.

Historic properties are addressed as 4(f) resources that have additional protection under the FHWA's transportation laws. To impact a 4(f) historic property the study must show that there is no other feasible or prudent alternative. She feels that has been done. There were two alternatives that avoided all 4(f) properties; however, they did not meet the objectives of the project. The two remaining alternatives do have impact to 4(f) properties, and an analysis will have to be completed to determine the overall harm analysis as the project moves forward.

The next step is to draft the environmental assessment document, and a final preferred alternative will need to be selected. This should be done within the next month. In about two weeks another Stakeholder committee meeting will be held to obtain more feedback. She is hopeful that with that input and the City Council's comments a final decision will be made. She is planning to publish the Environmental Assessment in July.

Mr. Brass asked what the street widths and profile will be, especially going through the City center. He wondered if it meets the proposed design standards for the MCCD. Mr. Wilkinson stated that it does meet the MCCD design standards. It is touted for being a walk able transit oriented community, and Mr. Brass wanted to make sure that this does not work against that ideal. Ms. Jones commented that in creating the alternatives the ordinance was studied and it was written in a statement that the chosen alternative must meet the ordinance in order to meet the purpose of the project. This was to alert FHWA and other decision makers that these standards have to be considered. A fifteen foot sidewalk and landscaping in the downtown area was included to meet this ordinance. Residential areas have ten foot sidewalks.

Mr. Brass said that #4 is clearly a popular alternative with residents and the public. He feels the couplet is attractive because it would cut traffic flow down in either direction. Ms. Dunn added that it takes people down two parts of the downtown area, seeing more of the business district as they travel this way daily. Mr. Shaver agreed.

Ms. Dunn asked how the costs compare between these two options. Ms. Jones responded that the cost of Alternative #3 is less than Alternative #4. Mr. Shaver commented that the lanes can be broader with one way direction of traffic. The feel is more pedestrian, Ms. Dunn said. Ms. Jones expressed that the cost of Alternative #3, the couplet, is \$16 to \$18 million, and Alternative #4 would be \$20 to \$22 million. Mr. Matern corrected that due to right-of-way purchases, the latest estimate on Alternative #4 comes in at \$24 to \$25 million.

Mr. Dredge asked Mr. Hill and Mr. Tingey for their preferences and comments between options #3 and #4 based on maintenance and other issues brought forward.

Mr. Hill asked the Lochner team if cost becomes a factor in selecting the final alternative. Ms. Jones stated that it does factor in; although it is difficult to use it in the 4(f) impact argument. She does not feel that the assessment is in that position because the two options have similar impact. Mr. Matern said Alternative #3 has four historic properties and #4 has five. Ms. Jones confirmed that it would be easier to select Alternative #3 because it does have fewer 4(f) impact; although, it would not be impossible to pick Alternative #4. Overall, Alternative #3 is cheaper and has less historic impact.

Mr. Tingey said he likes both options, and from an economic development perspective to have the #4 option right through the middle of the downtown has some advantages. The one way streets are a little more challenging, but he feels both are acceptable. Mr. Brass commented that vehicular traffic is not being encouraged in this area, and when a car is put in a parking structure that access may not have an effect, however, he is asking if it will be an issue. Mr. Tingey said that he does not feel that it is a huge issue at all. He feels there are advantages and disadvantages to both options. Mr. Wilkinson said that there are some important east west connections that help commercial developers. Mr. Stanger said that on option #3 bicycle traffic might be a little confusing. Mr. Matern said that the drawing shows a pedestrian trail, and bike lanes could be included on the path too.

Mr. Evans asked about the traffic signals, and if they will mirror those on State Street. He looks at this as a mini version of the Legacy Highway, not to encourage traffic, but to slow speed, give a nicer look, and discourage big trucks. He pointed out that if there is a traffic jam on State Street then many people will use this connection to avoid that, and may use the new street for less traffic to and from work. Ms. Jones agreed that it certainly might be the case if there is an accident on State Street, but because the speed limit will be 25 miles per hour the traffic modeling is not showing high traffic volume that will be used regularly for a long trip. Mr. Brass added that with cars parked on both sides it tends to create a traffic calming device. He said it might be like the difference between traffic on 700 East and 500 East. It is slower. Mr. Stanger pointed out that with landscaping and trees traffic tends to slow, as well.

Mr. Hill asked for an explanation of the transition on to Vine Street. Mr. Matern said there would be signals on the couplet on the eastern intersection at Cottonwood Street and Vine Street. Stop signs will be used on the other direction. They are trying to limit signals. Signals will probably be where the new street intersects with 4800 South and Main Street. There will be some free flowing intersections with extra lanes to merge.

Mr. Hill asked if the Planning Commission members would like to make any comments. Mr. Taylor asked if the frontage road would be kept open near the north end at 4500 South. Ms. Jones said that it will be kept open, but it is a problem spot with many trucks that utilize it. He asked if there would be a median where the couplet comes together. Ms. Jones said that median decisions are made later when more traffic analysis is done and the design is finalized. Some brainstorming is still being done to improve the performance on that spot. She said that Tim Dahle has asked that the segment that cuts through his property be two way, so that is being evaluated.

**Business Item #3**

**Community Development Block Grants – Tim Tingey,  
Community and Economic Development Director, and  
Angela Price, CDBG Coordinator**

Mr. Tingey explained that Angela Price would present the CDBG recommendations. The Advisory Committee was formed to hear the applicant's presentations. He was not involved in that process because he is a Board member of one of the applying agencies. The Committee consisted of Ms. Price, Mr. Wilkinson, Mayor Snarr, and Ms. Wells.

Ms. Price addressed the reallocations that are being proposed for this year. These are funds that agencies received in the past, but either completed their projects under budget or contracts expired and the funding needs to be reallocated.

- Heritage Center \$24 – This is proposed to be moved into housing rehabilitation.
- Program income from housing \$82,000 – Allocated to NeighborWorks. This offsets the \$1,000 from this year's CDBG program making their total about \$83,000.
- Housing Rehabilitation \$46,000 – These funds are in a contract that will soon expire and will go to the Murray City Housing Rehabilitation program.
- The Road Home \$10,000 – This is from the Road Home HVAC project last year, and it is proposed to reallocate it to them.
- Volunteers of America \$1,246 – This is money from a project that came under budget, and by reallocating this back to them with new 37<sup>th</sup> year funds they will receive a total of \$5,000 for heat tape installation.

On the new year funding, the City received applications and completed soft cost interviews over the telephone. Hard cost interviews were done by the Advisory Committee in person. She expressed that the City is in a unique position this year, as the House of Representative budget passed with a 66% cut to CDBG funding. The Senate has not acted on it yet. The Committee has optimistically assumed level funding and these recommendations are based on that.

Murray received almost \$770,000 in requests this year. Two years ago \$900 in cuts were made, and currently, \$510,000 in cuts have been made. The requests have increased tremendously. There were 41 applicants.

The selection criteria were based on the guidance and priorities from the City Council last summer. Some of the criteria included the number of Murray residents served, and overall benefit to the community. The City focused on programs and facilities located in Murray. For soft cost requests, the committee looked at basic life necessities: medical care, housing, food, and location. They talked about funding fewer organizations at a higher level, and looked at duplication of services. Some agencies were cut that had received funds for several years, and that was hard. They looked at consolidated plans, the number of low to moderate income folks served, and the ability to leverage funds from other sources.

Ms. Price detailed the amount of funds recommended for each organization and program. (A copy of this detail is attached to the minutes.)

The soft cost dollar recommendations are as follows:

- Community Action Food Centers - \$5,000
- Community Health Centers - \$1,885 This overlaps with Eye Care for Kids and Donated Dental. Community Health Center gives the most for the money.

- House of Hope - \$840
- Midvale Family Health Clinic - \$1,730
- Neighborhood House - \$5,000 This is a new request and provides day care services for aging seniors and children on a sliding scale. It allows Murray residents to stay employed and not have to stay home with parents or children.
- Odyssey House of Utah - \$5,000
- Rape Recovery Center - \$2,500
- South Valley Sanctuary - \$4,000
- Family Support Center - \$2,000
- The Road Home Community Shelter - \$1,000
- The Road Home Winter Shelter - \$1,000
- Utah Food Bank Senior Food Box - \$5,000
- YWCA Women in Jeopardy - \$4,000

These programs amount to the 15% cap for the soft cost funding.

The hard cost recommendations are as follows:

- ASSIST - \$35,000
- Community Development Corporation - \$11,500 That is enough for two down payment loans and administrative expenses. \$49,000 still exists in the program funding this year, therefore, the lower recommendation.
- NeighborWorks - \$1,016 reallocation. The situation here is the same as above; therefore the lower recommendation.
- Boys and Girls Club - \$55,862 For roof, playground, and ADA projects.
- Columbus Community Center - \$10,500 Central air system and electrical upgrades.
- Family Support Center - \$1,225 Playground and carpet
- Heritage Center - \$50,000 Covered vestibule. With the money allocated last year, the money raised from donations, and this funding there should be enough for the project.
- House of Hope - \$5,325 Re-roof the play area.
- Murray Green House - \$7,500 Roofing project.
- Murray Program Delivery - \$22,500 This covers the staff salaries, landlord tenant trainings, and office supplies.
- Council of Government (COG) - \$4,063 Yearly fees.
- South Valley Sanctuary - \$3,000 Window replacement.
- The Road Home – Reallocation
- Valley Mental Health - \$9,500 Playground
- Volunteers of America - \$3,754 and the reallocation funds making a total of \$5,000.

These allocations are all based on level funding from the HUD program. If there is a decrease in budgets, then the City will propose across the board cuts to all of the applicants. Some of the agencies have several projects funded; therefore, the City will work with each one on where they can best take the cuts, if necessary. If an agency opts out, due to lack of enough funding to complete any project, then those available funds would be reallocated to housing rehabilitation programs.

Mr. Dredge thanked Ms. Price for doing the interviews and recommendations.

Mr. Brass asked about the allocation for COG annual fees. Ms. Price said that they forgot to submit an application, so CDBG is funding the membership fee.

Ms. Price explained that the committee used the 2011-2012 CDBG funding priority criteria to strictly judge the requested projects. She feels bad that some agencies that have had yearly funding were passed over this time; however, the selection recommendations fill the criteria outlined earlier by the Council and City.

Mr. Tingey mentioned that the City had been monitored by HUD earlier that day. One of the things discussed was the process used, and the fact that letters would be sent to all applicants following the funding recommendations. They did applaud the City for this transparency and he complimented Ms. Price on her handling of the program.

Mayor Snarr related that the Heritage Center has come in several times for funding, and he would like them to finish the project at hand, then it would be somebody else's turn next time. There are many needs out there. He complimented Ms. Gregory on raising a lot of money to go along with the CDBG funds.

Mr. Dredge conveyed his appreciation for the recommendation process and the work that goes into the selections. The Council members are all happy to have the Community and Economic Development Department apply the standards consistently to all applicants, making a better program overall.

Ms. Price would like to come back to the Council next summer to fine tune the criteria again. She remarked that HUD and the County would really like these funds to be used on housing projects. The City is committed to the ASSIST, NeighborWorks and CDC projects, and next time they may focus more attention in these areas.

**Announcements**

**Mike Wagstaff, Council Executive Director**

Mr. Wagstaff asked if anyone objected to Mr. Shaver's suggestion for rescheduling one event to April 5, as indicated in a recent email. Everyone agreed that it works better.

Mr. Brass adjourned the meeting at 6:25 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez  
Council Office Administrator



MURRAY CITY CORPORATION  
COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

B. Tim Tingey, Director  
801-270-2420 FAX 801-270-2414

TO: Murray City Council  
FROM: *AP* Angela Price, CDBG Coordinator  
DATE: March 16, 2011  
RE: CDBG Funding Reallocations

I am writing to propose modifications to our CDBG annual budget for the 2011-2012 program year. There are several agencies that have received funding in the past that have either completed their projects/programs under budget or contracts have expired and the funding needs to be reallocated. We also have program income that was generated through housing programs that needs to be re-distributed. The following outlines the proposed reallocations:

**Proposed Program/ Project Reallocations (\$139,919)**

- **Murray City Heritage Center (\$24)**--Additional funds are available from the 35<sup>th</sup> program year, recommend reallocating funding to housing rehabilitation;
- **Murray City Housing Program Income (\$82,399)**--Program income generated from housing programs, recommend reallocating funds to NeighborWorks Salt Lake. Total funding for 37<sup>th</sup> program year would be \$83,415 (includes \$1,016 in new funding allocations);
- **Murray City Housing Rehabilitation (\$46,250)**--Housing rehabilitation funds from 35<sup>th</sup> program year that expire on June 30, 2011. Propose reallocating these funds to Murray City Housing Rehabilitation for a total of \$46,274 (includes \$24 from Heritage Center);
- **The Road Home (\$10,000)**--Due to further evaluation of the original HVAC project it has been determined that this project is ineligible for CDBG funding. The proposal is to reallocate \$10,000 from the 36<sup>th</sup> program year to The Road Home for the shelter door project, total funding for the 37<sup>th</sup> program year would be \$10,000.
- **Volunteers of America (\$1,246)**--Volunteers of America came under budget on their 35<sup>th</sup> year project, propose reallocating \$1,246 to Volunteers of America for the heat tape installation project at the Women and Children's Detox Center. The proposal to reallocate the \$1,246 will be included in the funding for the 37<sup>th</sup> year which provides \$5,000 for this project.

**Community and Economic Development staff recommends approval of the attached resolution outlining the proposed funding reallocations.**

Based on our analysis of the applications, the following outlines our proposed recommendations:

### Soft Cost Applicant Summary

Organization	Description	Requested Amount	Recommended Funding	Reason for Recommendation
Alliance House	Computer and software purchase	\$3,794	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
Big Brothers Big Sisters	Mentoring program for 10 Murray youth	\$7,500	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
Community Action Partnership: Housing Outreach Rental Program	Housing supportive services	\$3,000	\$0	Reduction proposed due to an attempt to fund multiple programs from the same organization.
Community Action Partnership: Comprehensive Housing Financial Counseling	Housing and financial counseling services	\$3,000	\$0	Reduction proposed due to an attempt to fund multiple programs from the same organization.
Community Action Partnership: Neighborhood Food Center	Neighborhood food center	\$10,000	\$5,000	Reduction proposed due to high number of applicants.
Community Health Centers	Primary healthcare and dental services for LMI individuals	\$1,885	\$1,885	Full funding recommended.
English Skills Learning Center	Provide English instruction to immigrant and refugee families	\$2,500	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
Eye Care 4 Kids	Eye care for LMI individuals	\$15,000	\$0	Funded other broad medical programs that also provided eye care.
House of Hope	New phone system	\$1,859	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
House of Hope	Salary and benefits for a community case-worker	\$840	\$840	Full funding recommended.
Kostopoulos Dream Foundation	Camp scholarships	\$500	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
Learning for Life	Life skills mentoring program	\$6,010	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
Legal Aid Society	Legal services for LMI individuals	\$5,000	\$0	Program did not meet City funding priorities of providing housing, food or medical services.
Midvale Family Health Clinic	Medical care for LMI residents at the Midvale Clinic	\$3,826	\$1,730	Reduction proposed due to high number of applicants.
Neighborhood House	Child and adult day care services	\$5,000	\$5,000	Full funding recommended.
Odyssey House of Utah	Treatment, counseling and housing services	\$8,350	\$5,000	Reduction proposed due to increase in number of applicants.
Rape Recovery Center	Rape recovery services and shelter	\$2,500	\$2,500	Full funding recommended.
Salt Lake Donated Dental Services	Free dental care to LMI individuals	\$2,000	\$0	Funded other broad medical programs that also provided dental care.

Murray Heritage Center	Vestibule project	\$70,000	\$50,000	Funds will be used to build a covered vestibule on the entrance of the Murray Heritage Center. Previous year funds are still available and will be used to cover a portion of the costs for this project.
House of Hope	Re-roof the play area	\$5,325	\$5,325	Full funding recommended to replace the leaking roof over the children's play center.
Murray Greenhouse Foundation	Roof replacement	\$7,500	\$7,500	Full funding recommended to replace the leaking roof.
Murray Program Delivery	Program delivery expenses for the Murray CDBG program	\$22,500	\$22,500	Full funding recommended to cover staff salaries, landlord and tenant trainings, staff trainings, and office supplies.
Council of Governments	COG yearly fees	\$4,063	\$4,063	Full funding recommended to cover yearly COG membership fees.
Murray Public Services	Road re-surface on Fayelle Ave	\$85,000	\$0	Funding was not recommended due to a high number of applicants.
South Valley Sanctuary	Window replacement project	\$3,000	\$3,000	Full funding is recommended to replace 30 windows.
The Road Home	Replace doors for the family rooms	\$10,000	\$0*	Recommend reallocating funds from the 36 <sup>th</sup> program year to fund the installation of 10 doors for a total of \$10,000.
Valley Mental Health	Playground installation	\$11,018	\$9,500	Partial funding is recommended to cover the installation of a playground.
Volunteers of America		\$15,000	\$3,754*	Partial funding is recommended to install heat tape on the roof of the Center for Women and Children. Additional funds will be reallocated to cover the entire cost of the project (\$3,745.45 from 37 <sup>th</sup> program year and \$1,246 reallocated from 35 <sup>th</sup> program year for a total of \$5,000). Funding is not recommended to add additional building space to the Adult Detoxification Center.
<b>HARD COST TOTAL</b>		<b>\$650,147</b>	<b>\$220,745</b>	

\*Annotates organizations that are recommended for funding reallocations. These reallocations will be outlined in a separate memo.

Based on these findings, the advisory committee is recommending approval of these allocations with the following conditions:

- Funding recommendations are based on level funding which is \$259,700;
- Budget cuts from Congress will result in across the board reductions to all agencies;
- We will work closely with agency representatives to determine how budget reductions will be executed;
- If an agency opts out of accepting CDBG funds those funds will be reallocated towards the housing rehabilitation program.

There will be a public hearing on **Tuesday March 29, 2011 at 6:35** in which we will present these recommendations and allow the public an opportunity to comment. In addition, the public will have an opportunity to comment on the proposed funding reallocations from the 35<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> program years and the reallocation of program income (funding reallocation recommendations will be presented in a separate memo). If you have any questions about these recommendations please feel free to contact me directly at 801-270-2419.

Murray Heritage Center	Vestibule project	\$70,000	\$50,000	Funds will be used to build a covered vestibule on the entrance of the Murray Heritage Center. Previous year funds are still available and will be used to cover a portion of the costs for this project.
House of Hope	Re-roof the play area	\$5,325	\$5,325	Full funding recommended to replace the leaking roof over the children's play center.
Murray Greenhouse Foundation	Roof replacement	\$7,500	\$7,500	Full funding recommended to replace the leaking roof.
Murray Program Delivery	Program delivery expenses for the Murray CDBG program	\$22,500	\$22,500	Full funding recommended to cover staff salaries, landlord and tenant trainings, staff trainings, and office supplies.
Council of Governments	COG yearly fees	\$4,063	\$4,063	Full funding recommended to cover yearly COG membership fees.
Murray Public Services	Road re-surface on Fayelle Ave	\$85,000	\$0	Funding was not recommended due to a high number of applicants.
South Valley Sanctuary	Window replacement project	\$3,000	\$3,000	Full funding is recommended to replace 30 windows.
The Road Home	Replace doors for the family rooms	\$10,000	\$0*	Recommend reallocating funds from the 36 <sup>th</sup> program year to fund the installation of 10 doors for a total of \$10,000.
Valley Mental Health	Playground installation	\$11,018	\$9,500	Partial funding is recommended to cover the installation of a playground.
Volunteers of America		\$15,000	\$3,754*	Partial funding is recommended to install heat tape on the roof of the Center for Women and Children. Additional funds will be reallocated to cover the entire cost of the project (\$3,745.45 from 37 <sup>th</sup> program year and \$1,246 reallocated from 35 <sup>th</sup> program year for a total of \$5,000). Funding is not recommended to add additional building space to the Adult Detoxification Center.
<b>HARD COST TOTAL</b>		<b>\$650,147</b>	<b>\$220,745</b>	

\*Annotates organizations that are recommended for funding reallocations. These reallocations will be outlined in a separate memo.

Based on these findings, the advisory committee is recommending approval of these allocations with the following conditions:

- Funding recommendations are based on level funding which is \$259,700;
- Budget cuts from Congress will result in across the board reductions to all agencies;
- We will work closely with agency representatives to determine how budget reductions will be executed;
- If an agency opts out of accepting CDBG funds those funds will be reallocated towards the housing rehabilitation program.

There will be a public hearing on **Tuesday March 29, 2011 at 6:35** in which we will present these recommendations and allow the public an opportunity to comment. In addition, the public will have an opportunity to comment on the proposed funding reallocations from the 35<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> program years and the reallocation of program income (funding reallocation recommendations will be presented in a separate memo). If you have any questions about these recommendations please feel free to contact me directly at 801-270-2419.