



MURRAY CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, April 3, 2012, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray Utah.

Members in Attendance:

Dave Nicponski	Council Member
Darren V. Stam	Council Member
Jared A. Shaver	Council Vice Chair
Brett A. Hales	Council Member

Members Absent:

Jim Brass	Council Chair
-----------	---------------

Others in Attendance:

Angela Price	CDBG Coordinator	Dan Snarr	Mayor
Janet M. Lopez	Council Office	Jan Wells	Mayor's COS
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney	George Katz	Citizen
Tim Tingey	ADS Director	Sally Hoffelmeyer Katz	Citizen
Louis Fazio	Citizen	Justin Zollinger	Finance Director
Peri Kinder	Valley Journals	Alison Smith	NeighborWorks

Vice Chair Shaver called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. He mentioned that a quorum was present; although, Mr. Brass was excused and Mr. Nicponski would arrive shortly.

Minutes

Mr. Shaver asked for corrections or action on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meeting held on February 21, 2012. Mr. Hales moved approval as written. Mr. Stam seconded the motion, which was approved 3-0.

Mr. Shaver asked for action on the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meeting on March 6, 2012. Mr. Stam moved approval and Mr. Hales seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-0.

Business Item #1:

**2012-2013 Community Development Block Grant
Recommendations – Tim Tingey and Angela Price**

Mr. Tingey explained that the process for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds had been partially completed. A committee was created to go through the applications and form recommendations. This meeting would present those recommendations prior to the Public Hearing that was scheduled to be held on April 17, 2012. At that meeting the Council would make a decision whether to accept the recommendations or modify them. Ms. Price would outline the recommendations and justification behind them.

Mr. Shaver mentioned the reduction in funding that the City has experienced over the past three years. He confirmed that the process remains the same in that the federal government appropriates the funding, the county makes recommendations on where that goes and the City takes their portion. Mr. Tingey concurred stating that Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allocates so much funding for this program, the county and the state receives funding in various entitlement communities. The county allocates a portion for cities and Murray goes through the public process required by HUD.

Mr. Shaver noted that there is a lot of reporting for that, as well. Mr. Tingey confirmed a significant amount of reporting is required. Fortunately, the county does much of the reporting for Murray City; however, there is still a lot of work at the city level.

Ms. Price reviewed the City process and gave the Council an opportunity to see the numbers before the public hearing. She proceeded to provide some background for the applications that the Council Members would read prior to the public hearing.

She thanked the Mayor and Ms. Wells for devoting six hours of their time to help with the interviews of all the applicants along with Chad Wilkinson and herself. The funding recommendations actually come from that committee, called the CDBG Advisory Committee.

The substantial funding reductions that Murray experienced were acknowledged by Ms. Price. Requested funding was over \$405,000 and about \$230,000 in reductions were taken. There was \$19,500 in funds that could be reallocated. Total current funding available was \$156,000. Part of that, \$18,100, was additional funding the county gave Murray due to the large reduction in money. Gross funds for Murray to allocate were \$175,600. Ms. Price reviewed the recommendations for each agency.

NeighborWorks – The recommendation was \$43,000 for property acquisition. That will go toward acquisition, rehabilitation, loans and program delivery.

Mr. Shaver asked for an explanation of the reallocated funds. Ms. Price explained that those are funds from housing rehab money that expired from a previous program year. Part of it went to the Community Development Corporation and NeighborWorks in previous City ordinances in November and February. This is the remainder of that money. Mr. Tingey added that there is a two year contract period and if funds have not been spent during that time, they must be reallocated. Ms. Price emphasized that because of the huge reduction from HUD she was looking for any money that could be allocated to the various agencies. She remarked that part of those funds were administration dollars from previous years that were unused. It was a cushion in her salary because there was a delay when she was hired versus the funding that was budgeted. Normally, she explained, if money was left over from a particular agency, then she would attempt to grant it back to them; however, these dollars were collected randomly.

Community Development Corporation of Utah - \$34,500 was awarded to the CDC for the down payment assistance program. They have done amazing work in Murray and the staff is excited to continue that program. The CDC also applied for money for a new program called the

“Green and Healthy Homes Initiative.” This is a partnership with the county. The committee chose not to fund this because NeighborWorks also participates in this certification program and that would be a duplication of services.

Habitat for Humanity – This is the first year that they have requested funding from the City and the committee wanted to give them a little to see what they could do here in Murray. The funding is for a new program they are starting, not the program most people are familiar with where they buy land and have volunteers build a house. This is a neighborhood revitalization initiative that will help the lowest of low income individuals. Habitat is able to stretch their dollars because of their “re-store” where they can get windows, kitchen cabinets and different items for free. This is a test to see how they do in Murray.

Mr. Shaver asked if this is for homeowners and Ms. Price confirmed that it is for owner occupied properties.

ASSIST & Valley Services – ASSIST has been funded at \$18,000 and Ms. Price mentioned that Valley Services has been given \$9,000. ASSIST has been funded for many years and they do emergency home repair. Valley Services is a new program in partnership with the county. They offer emergency home repair for elderly individuals, as well. One must be 65 or older and the repairs are provided on a grant basis, not a loan. They will take care of minor leaky faucets, electrical or plumbing issues. ASSIST does more large scale projects, such as ramps. The money has been stretched between the two services to see what they can do in Murray. Some projects have already been done under the county contract, however, that will be expiring.

Mr. Shaver asked if this money would be dedicated specifically in Murray, even though both agencies work outside of Murray, as well. Ms. Price confirmed that it would.

Columbus Community Center - This is the property on Jones Court and they do amazing work in Murray providing those residents with work in the City.

Boys and Girls Club – The money provided will fund the playground upgrade and American Disability Act (ADA) upgrades including automatic door openers for three doors and a chair lift. This will help provide as much access to the facility as possible; they do have a staff person in a wheelchair that will be able to access the upstairs offices.

House of Hope – The committee did not recommend funding for this agency this year, due to budget cuts and the number of Murray residents served. They are not located in Murray and did not meet City priorities.

Mr. Hales asked if everyone else with recommended funding is located in Murray. Ms. Price stated that they are either located in Murray or serve a lot of Murray residents.

Volunteers of America – This was a difficult decision because the committee would have liked to participate in the expansion of the adult detox center, however, it is not located in Murray and cuts had to be made. Unfortunately, this was one program that suffered.

Dave Nicponski joined the meeting in progress at 6:12 p.m.

The Road Home – The bathrooms in this facility are absolutely in shambles, Ms. Price noted. They staff several Murray residents and have a substantial amount of individuals who call Murray home or list it as their last address.

Murray Program Delivery – This money goes toward Ms. Price’s salary, training and program administration.

Mr. Tingey added that regarding the two agencies not being funded, the evaluation criteria were not met even though Murray people may utilize these programs. When looking at this amount of dollars it is necessary to prioritize. The priorities, as outlined previously, relate to housing, location in Murray and filling immediate critical need. All the programs are very important, although they did not meet the threshold of main concern.

Mr. Hales asked if these were the only applications received, because he was under the impression that many were received in the past. Ms. Price pointed out that these are only hard costs and the soft costs requests go to the county. These are about standard for the hard costs. There is a Murray representative that sits on the county selection committee, not a staff member, but a Murray resident. Soft costs go toward services and personnel. Hard costs are brick and mortar projects.

Ms Price explained that the hard cost (roof or bathroom projects) applications come directly to her. Housing applications go to the county and then are forwarded on to the municipalities. When you review the applications you will see the Murray one and also the county one.

Mr. Nicponski stated that this is very impressive. He observed that 105 Murray residents use the services of Volunteers of America. Ms. Price said that typically Murray funds that organization and they have a women and children’s facility in Murray that is usually funded. This year the committee had to focus on the housing and critical needs. Cuts had to be made.

Mr. Shaver pointed out that Murray residents are still served there by services that are soft costs and this is the hard costs choice. The county will still give them help for services.

Ms. Price said that when the committee meets with the organizations they asked what the priorities are for the agency to remain up and running. The Volunteers of America are also funding to foundations and every city and county along the Wasatch Front. Their facility will continue to operate and serve Murray residents even though the City is not able to fund this project. She added that this particular project was not funded in the previous year either. Parts of their needs were funded such as the heat tape.

Mr. Shaver asked Ms. Price to address what information the Council would receive from her. Ms. Price said there would be an Excel sheet and because many of them are using iPads, it has been a challenge to put the materials together in a format they could preview. She created an Adobe package, which has a file for each application and then one for supplemental information. That will have the Excel sheet with three tabs at the bottom for history; it has the summary; and the Council letter with the resolutions for allocations, reallocations and the public hearing notice.

Mr. Shaver inquired about the reminder of the process after this meeting. Ms. Price responded that on April 17 the public hearing will take place. She will not go over these numbers again; however, each applicant will have the recommendation letter and an opportunity to speak during the hearing. Then the resolutions will be voted upon, first the reallocations, followed by the current year allocations.

Mr. Shaver acknowledged that each person who was not recommended and those that were recommended for funding would have a chance to stand up, as well as, others who would like to make a comment on what the Council is doing may speak.

Mr. Hales asked if the three not funded would have major questions or would others come too. Ms. Price said that usually everyone will come forward to speak and usually every year there are reductions and projects that do not get funded. It is a grueling process for the committee to decide who to fund. They are all really great projects so it is difficult to spread the funding. The priorities set with the Council are the basis for decisions made.

Mayor Snarr said there is nothing for the Heritage Center. Ms. Price reported that they did not request funds this year because they have received \$90,000 over the past two years.

Mr. Shaver said that he feels some people may come and comment even though they were not funded this year because they may want the Council to keep them in mind for the following year due to the two-year cycle. He noted that it has never been bitter or disagreeable. The public hearing gives the Council a chance to see who the agencies are and listen to them talk about their organization and the things they are doing; he said he really looks forward to this public hearing each year.

Ms. Price added that Volunteers of America and House of Hope were both funded in the past couple of years. Each year the committee tries to make it as fair as possible.

Mr. Nicponski noticed that some of the organizations are involved with multiple cities. He asked if Ms. Price works with her counterparts at the other cities at all. She said it depends on the programs and pointed out that Murray is unique and NeighborWorks, specifically, is exclusive to Murray. The down payment assistance program is specific to Murray. Other cities have down payment programs. ASSIST applies to the county and other cities. Some money goes to CDBG designated areas, of which Murray has none.

Mr. Tingey pointed out that the application asks what other cities they are requesting funds from. Ms. Price said the Council will be able to see this question and also how many Murray residents are served. It is interesting to see who they serve. The Family Support Center serves a high number of Murray residents.

Mr. Stam stated that he appreciates the efforts Ms. Price has made over the past couple of years in refining the process and making it easier for the Council members.

Mr. Shaver declared that there were no announcements.

Mr. Nicponski mentioned a couple of things. Mr. Shaver asked if they were on the agenda. Mr. Nicponski wants them on the next agenda. Mr. Shaver said that because they were not on this agenda, they need to be handled differently. He needs to talk with Mr. Wagstaff about them to get them on an agenda, but because they are not here they cannot be discussed at this time.

Mr. Shaver adjourned the meeting at 6:27 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Council Office Administrator

