

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

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, August 26, 2008, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

**Members in Attendance:**

Krista Dunn	Council Chairman
Jeff Dredge	Council Member
Robert D. Robertson	Council Member
Jim Brass	Council Member
Patricia W. Griffiths	Council Member

**Others in Attendance:**

Daniel Snarr	Mayor
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Janet M. Lopez	Council Administrative Secretary
Jan Wells	Mayor's Chief of Staff
Tim Tingey	Community & Economic Development Director
Karen Wiley	Salt Lake County
Erin McShay	Valley Journals

Chairman Dunn called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Brass moved that the approval of minutes be postponed until the next Committee of the Whole meeting. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

**Business Item**

**Presentation and discussion of Community  
Development Block Grant reallocation by Tim  
Tingey**

Ms. Dunn welcomed Karen Wiley from Salt Lake County and invited Tim Tingey to begin the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) presentation.

Mr. Tingey recognized Ms. Wiley for all that she does at the County in operation of the CDBG program and he stated his appreciation for her partnership and the several meetings that he has had with her since he started this position with Murray City.

Ms. Dunn confirmed the experience and background of Karen Wiley, as she has known her for many years in Salt Lake City, and agreed with her excellence in the execution of the CDBG program.

Mr. Tingey expressed his passion for the CDBG program and in his past work life he was a program manager for an entitlement community for CDBG, therefore, he recognizes the importance of this program and the benefits to the community and individuals, especially those that are low to moderate income.

Mr. Tingey's presentation is a preface to a formal proposal that he will bring to the City Council as an amendment next month. There are funds available which have been awarded in past contract years and those contracts have expired, therefore the funds need to be reallocated. His proposal will be focused toward where the Community and Economic Development Department wants to head in the next few months and years. He will take that focus and move into discussion of the specific amendment. There is a lot of information that will be very appropriate in addressing the topic and he appreciates being able to make this presentation to the Council.

The CDBG presentation began with a review of the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) objectives in the program, which are to:

- Ensure decent affordable housing,
- Provide a suitable living environment,
- Expand economic opportunities for low and moderate income persons.

Under the CDBG National guidelines, every project must meet the following objectives:

- Benefit low and moderate income persons,
- Prevent or eliminate slums or blight,
- Address community development needs having a particular urgency due to an immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.

An example of how that has been used in the past was for Hurricane Katrina and 911 emergency community needs.

He continued by stating that every project must meet these guidelines in some form or another, which has occurred in the past.

As the Murray Community and Economic Development Department has evaluated the CDBG program, the focus will be in four areas.

- *Planning and Projects:* Facilitate planning efforts to understand needs in the community and to develop strategies and project proposals to address these needs. This is both short-term and long-term and the department wants to embark upon planning efforts to meet those areas of need.
- *Marketing and Housing Programs:* Increase marketing efforts for housing assistance programs to address housing and property enhancement needs for low to moderate income families in our community. This will include structures themselves for housing rehabilitation programs and also property maintenance issues for people who may need assistance. He stated his desire to increase efforts to make sure programs are being publicized. He added that in eight years, nine rehabilitation projects have been completed. That is good, however, he feels his department can be doing more. It is all based upon marketing the availability of funds for this purpose. He would like to see two to four projects per year, to begin.
- *Administrative Oversight:* Work more closely with public service agencies to ensure that funds are being spent in a timely manner so residents receive maximum benefit. He feels the sub-recipients are doing a good job, however, he feels the oversight needs to be increased. It is important to make sure their needs are being met with the programs, helping them understand the HUD policies and directives.
- *Reporting:* Report often to the Mayor and City Council on the results of the CDBG program. This is to create an understanding of how people are being helped and show slide presentations of housing rehabilitation projects to enhance the community.

The four objectives lead in the direction of the department and toward the amendment request that Mr. Tingey will explain momentarily.

### **Planning and Projects**

The County has requested each city to conduct a study to determine the housing needs in the community. He stated his desire for Murray to be a leader in developing this housing study. It is important to understand the needs in Murray and then address those needs with funding programs.

Mr. Tingey expressed his hope to have a future request for proposals for an organization to come in and assist the City in a housing market analysis and needs assessment. He explained that the staff could probably do that assessment, although, ordinarily with an outside organization

there is not the bias of the staff that lives and works here in the community. He feels an objective organization is very helpful.

This planning effort will include:

- Housing market analysis,
- Housing needs assessment,
- Strategies and goals to address needs of the community.

### **Marketing Housing Programs**

Currently, there are three groups who help with housing rehabilitation programs. They are:

- Assist Emergency Home Repair (Minor home repair),
- Housing Services of Utah (Major home repair),
- Utah Food Bank Services for Seniors (Minor home repair).

This may include repairs related to a variety of things for seniors, as well as, those who may need accessibility and structural changes to the home. Murray has allocated these funds for housing services:

• Assist Emergency Home Repair	\$55,000
• Utah Food Bank Senior Services	\$25,000
• Housing Services of Utah	\$60,000
• Housing Rehab Loan Program	\$93,876
• Other Murray Housing Funding	\$50,000
Total	\$283,876

These are all capital dollars, and what is available under the marketing housing programs.

### **Administrative Oversight**

\_\_\_\_\_ Mr. Tingey would like to devote more of his staff time to oversight of the CDBG program which would include:

- Increased follow up on Murray sub-recipient agencies to ensure contract objectives are being completed.
- Monitoring programs regularly at the Murray City level, with accurate documentation being provided and ensuring that the money is going to low to moderate income families.

- Flexibility in carry over funding and line item modifications, which is part of the amendment request. For example, over the past couple of months sub-recipient agencies have come to Mr. Tingey with projects that have been completed and excess funds remaining. They have reported another similar project coming in the following year and he has been asked if the funds could be carried over to the next project. He feels that there is a possibility of doing that, however, he would like Council direction for authorization of staff flexibility or a process in place to bring this sort of request to the Council for approval. This request would include line item modifications that occur during the project.

These are the basic components of the administrative oversight.

### **Reporting**

At a minimum, Mr. Tingey will plan to bring a year end report to the Council and a slide presentation showing the projects that have occurred and how many people have been helped so that there is an understanding of the good being done with the funds. This is not something new. At the national level, President Bush wanted to terminate the program and Mr. Tingey feels this may be due to the fact that the story of the project results has not been told. He wants to focus year end on this and possibly quarterly reports as well.

Eventually, Mr. Tingey would like to look at recommendations on future funding allocation processes that go along with reporting. The CDBG funding seems to be going down every year, due to budget constraints at the congressional level. Eventually that will create more competitiveness in the programs. Determining who to assist may include an advisory committee or implementing a scoring process that is fair and adequate, looking at the benefit per proposal for low to moderate income people. These issues will be discussed in the future.

### **2008 CDBG Proposed Amendment**

All this background leads into the recommendations for the upcoming amendment request that will come before the Council next month. Please keep in mind that there is a 15% cap on public service organizations. We are right at that cap now. To reallocate these funds into public service organization projects is not possible. A different direction will need to take place with these excess funds. Following are the funds available, primarily due to expired contracts and project completion:

- Year 31 (2005-2006)
  - Operation Stand-down, \$500
  - Utah health Care, \$15,000
- Year 30 (2004-2005)

- Senior Citizen Center Equipment, \$144.10
- Year 29 (2003-2004)
  - Murray Cap Head Start, \$15,555.19
  - Affordable Housing Alliance, \$5,000
  - Citizen Committee on Human Rights, \$1,500
  - Youth Training Center, \$1,500
- Year 28 (2002-2003)
  - Microenterprise Loan Fund, \$13,815

The total funds available are \$53,014.29. The Murray Cap Head Start had a large amount left, so Mr. Tingey called to talk with them and they thought this was a program funded several years ago for the school district to complete some improvements or rehabilitation for an old fire station. That project is finished and the total funding was never spent. The other funds involve expired contracts and can be spent by the City.

Mr. Tingey would like to discuss any concerns today, and get input from the Council, so that when his proposal is presented at Council meeting a modified version is prepared, if necessary. The proposal for reallocation is all focused on the four areas presented earlier and contains the following elements.

- City CDBG Administrative Fund - \$30,868.50
- Housing Market Study and Plan, \$20,000. This is to fund the affordable housing study that the County has requested. Mr. Tingey has been involved in similar studies in the past and to get a really good plan with a lot of information the cost will be between \$15,000 and \$20,000. He has contacted some consulting groups and these are the rough figures he has been quoted based on the elements of the study, which are to:
  - Assist in understanding housing needs and gaps in Murray.
  - Define goals and strategies to address those needs.
  - Help staff in preparation of future housing proposals for low to moderate income households.
- Staff Administrative Costs - \$10,868.50 Mr. Tingey feels that if the staff is utilizing its time to facilitate and follow up on CDBG funding then administrative costs should go toward that.
  - Approximately seven hours per week average staff time will be devoted to CDBG.

- Staff will be proactive in marketing the CDBG housing rehabilitation programs, including neighborhood windshield surveys. By doing this drive-by survey a list will be made to show where rehabilitation needs to be done, maybe deteriorating paint, roof shingles needed or other housing repairs. Every few months designated areas will be surveyed and letters will be sent out to owners to let them know that funding programs are available for these types of improvements. The work will be referred to various programs and the agencies do the verification of income.
  - Sub-recipient follow up will take place to ensure that the agencies are using their funding in a timely manner and preparing their reports.
  - Staff time will also go toward facilitating planning efforts.
  - The reporting of the CDBG programs will also be enhanced.
- Housing Rehabilitation - \$22,145.79
    - As marketing efforts are successful, there will be a greater demand for housing rehabilitation assistance so these additional dollars will be spent on capital improvements.

This is the proposal. He is not proposing any new staff, this will save funding from the general fund, utilizing the time available now with the new community development planner and other staff members.

Finally, as part of the proposed amendment, the Utah Alcoholism Foundation has requested that \$1,826 from the 2007-2008 program be reallocated to its 2008-2009 project. This is one instance where the carry over and line item reallocation would apply. If the Council would like all these come to them, that is fine, or if some discretion can be given to staff that is great, either way.

Ms. Dunn commented that the Council has been through this many times and everyone realizes how competitive the program is already. There is less money every year and the program side receives only about one tenth of what is requested from the City. Ms. Dunn also mentioned that a top priority is service in Murray and if the agency cannot show that it provides service in Murray then it is removed from the list. Secondly, the Council looks at how much service is provided to Murray. She likes the idea that Mr. Tingey has presented for keeping some of the money inside Murray City. When preparing the RDA budget, she proposed that part of the money be set aside for low or no interest loans for residents to repair their properties. She feels this is a great partner, since what is done with low interest housing in the RDA budget does not have to be used in the RDA area. By combining programs, not commingling funds, they could enhance each other. The Council knows how much is available from the RDA and some really nice things could be done in the City. She thinks it is a great idea and something the City should

look at. The County is great to let Murray know if the funds are being utilized and if the CDBG objectives are being met, however, they do not have time to monitor what is being done in Murray. She has no problem with the proposal.

Mayor Snarr asked about the windshield analysis and if that information could be used by the RDA when funds are available.

Mr. Tingey said he would love to see that money spent down in improving homes in our community by gearing up the marketing efforts. He commented that the Murray housing stock is not the newest and there is quite a bit of need there.

Ms. Griffiths added that the population is getting up in age, too.

Ms. Dunn said that with the proposals from various agencies, they have to be taken at their word. There is no way to monitor if they have really serviced the number of Murray residents that is reported. Having staff look at that information and following up will be really helpful.

Mayor Snarr stated that when the money goes to the Senior Citizens Center and the Boys and Girls Club, he sees the results of those well spent dollars, however, some of these other organizations must be taken at their word.

Mr. Tingey suggested that when the applications come in questions can be asked to determine how the funds were spent and as staff puts in more time on the projects they will be familiar with them. One thing he mentioned, as discussed with Ms. Wiley, was the possible duplication of services. At this point he is not aware if that is occurring. At the staff level these questions will be asked before the application is formally processed.

Mayor Snarr asked about abuse of the system. He has seen individuals in very nice vehicles waiting to get food assistance. He pointed out that some people do not have a financial need, but just know how to work the system.

Ms. Griffiths commented that many people with a real need are too proud to seek the available assistance.

Mr. Brass inquired if the money is easy to access for those who really need it. He knows of some people who need ramps built and locating the information is not easy for them. For the elderly the steps to go through are difficult. Part of the research should include how people find out about the resources available.

Mr. Dredge asked if the rehabilitation is done project by project or if he would look at an area that needs work. Murray has some neighborhoods that are in decline and he wondered if that



can be changed by investing in particular neighborhoods.

Mr. Tingey said that he has done this for the past ten years and it is best to focus on the neighborhoods that are really in need. Those will be the first to have the windshield surveys. Then, letters are sent out to the owners to make them aware of the programs and try to get them involved. Some of the homes will be rental properties that will not utilize this program. Others might be over income and not qualify, however, if three to eight properties out of 100 access the program then we will have better housing stock by using these resources.

Mr. Brass has observed that if one to two homes on a block are rehabilitated then others see that and decide to purchase a home with the idea that they can rehabilitate theirs too. This does turn a neighborhood around. He saw this with his first home and it occurred after one house was rehabilitated on an alley.

Ms. Wiley mentioned that there are other programs that will compliment that one. The County has the Lead Based Paint program for homes built before 1940. This is a grant program. There is a new program that the County is partnering with Questar and Rocky Mountain Power for tax credits. Questar will go into a home and increase the insulation and people have saved as much as 50% on fuel bills. Educational classes are just beginning on that to get the program started. There are other resources that can make this more attractive to residents.

Mr. Brass stated that if first time home buyers thought they could get help to repair homes, they might be more inclined to purchase. Right now it is tough for first time home buyers to buy a home in this town, let alone fix it up.

Mr. Tingey said that in the future incremental steps will be taken. The department will move forward on the four goals, future goals will be developed and he is very interested in partnering with the RDA on projects. His past involvement in RDA and CDBG confirm that there are opportunities to partner on projects. It may be issues related to slum and blight or a facade improvement program for businesses. There are a variety of things that can be looked at. As more staff time is devoted to this, he feels there will be some good results.

Mr. Tingey commented that he would like to look at the application process, as well. There are a number of communities that have application processes based on a scoring criteria. "Best practices" is a term used by HUD and maybe Murray can look toward best practices in application scoring. There are many great programs out there. Every sub-recipient has a great program so how to prioritize them becomes the issue. Maybe some of that is looking at the maximum benefit per low income person by a scoring criteria. He said that in the future he may bring a proposal on that to the Council.

Mr. Brass pointed out that as funds are reallocated, if a record of that could be kept, then when new allocations are being awarded, those new funds could go to agencies where no left

over money was being utilized.

Ms. Dunn added that one year is a short turn around for many projects and she can easily see where some could run over.

Ms. Wiley remarked that the County awards building projects over two years. Many times if an agency is completing more than one project then one might be over budget and another under budget, or it might occur that once a wall is removed they discover something else that also needs to be done. A little bit of leeway is needed for issues such as this.

Ms. Griffiths explained that the Utah Alcoholism Foundation request was only partially funded. She added that the woman who was the force behind the project became ill and that could be why the funds need to be carried over.

Ms. Dunn agreed that since it was only a year ago, the City should not try to take back the funding.

Ms. Dunn stated her appreciation for Mr. Tingey's experience and expertise on this topic and she confirmed her excitement about going in that direction for rehabilitation of Murray properties.

Mr. Robertson confirmed his agreement in Mr. Tingey having some flexibility in decision making as long as the Council is kept informed about what is happening and when.

Mr. Brass stated that CDBG allocations are the toughest decisions the Council must make and anything to make that easier would be very appreciated.

Ms. Wiley stated that with the new application process the Council will be getting better numbers and information that is Murray City specific. All of the non-profits are very excited about this and pleased with the new recording system and how it is working. She added that the Council's work has been very beneficial and Mr. Tingey is a huge asset, with amazing ideas and great to work with.

Ms. Dunn observed that working with Ms. Wiley on CDBG has been very nice because they can get answers from her freely.

**Staff Report**

**Michael D. Wagstaff**

Mr. Wagstaff mentioned that on Friday, August 29, Congressman Matheson will be speaking at "Eggs and Issues."

He distributed a new calendar of events and announced that the Murray City Employees Association has a golf tournament scheduled, 18 holes, and anyone interested should contact Ms.

Lopez or himself.

Mr. Wagstaff has copies of the resident survey that the administration is conducting. He would like everyone to look over it and contact Ms. Wells if there are comments or questions.

There being no further business Ms. Dunn adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez  
Administrative Secretary