



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

The Murray City Municipal Council met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, September 21, 2010, in the Murray City Center, Conference Room #107, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Members in Attendance:

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

Others in Attendance:

Daniel Snarr	Mayor
Frank Nakamura	City Attorney
Michael D. Wagstaff	Council Executive Director
Janet M. Lopez	Council Office
Peri Kinder	Valley Journals
Angela Price	Comm & Economic Development
Tim Tingey	Comm & Econ Dev Director
Jennifer Brass	Citizen
Bill Finch	Citizen

Chairman Dredge called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance.

Mr. Dredge asked for corrections or approval of the minutes from the Committee of the Whole meetings held on August 3, 2010, and August 17, 2010, and the Council Initiative Workshop held on August 17, 2010. Mr. Stam moved approval as written. Mr. Shaver seconded the motion. The motion carried 5-0.

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) - Tim Tingey and Angela Price presented goals and objectives.

Mr. Tingey informed the Council that his department had started the CDBG process for the upcoming year. The annual action plan for the next cycle of CDBG allocations was what the department would address, and gain input on the types of projects the city should propose for funding.

Ms. Price has started a monitoring process with the sub-recipients related to the

program. Regular contract monitoring is always done, however, this year a full scale monitoring has been completed on site. This involves reviewing records, evaluating programs, and making sure compliance within the CDBG guidelines is being adhered to by each of the sub-recipients. It is an education process for the organizations. Documentation that is necessary for Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is explained, so that if the city is ever audited it will be in compliance. Accountability is the focus for the city and recipients, making sure the funds are being spent and people are getting the assistance needed with programs.

Ms. Price commented that after the previous funding year, she noticed some areas that could use improvement and other areas that were being handled very well. She would like to streamline the project, and get everything as electronic as possible. In coordinating with the county there have been discussions on ways to improve communication, and renovate issues with them. The county does a lot of administration for Murray, however, if the city becomes an entitlement community, then administration would be our responsibility.

Currently, the city distributes 15% of the funds to soft costs (overhead), and 85% to hard costs (bricks and mortar) projects. This percentage breakdown would continue, although, the direction is to fund fewer organizations at a higher funding level. Additionally, Ms. Price proposes to establish a funding criteria, and scoring system that will help determine who to fund. When the city receives 30 applications, but desires to fund 10 organizations, a system for decision making is critical.

This year the city funded 21 organizations at \$1,000 each for soft costs. For example, The Road Home has a \$5 million budget, and this \$1,000 contribution is a drop in the bucket, however, it is a lot of work to administer. If the city funded them at \$5,000 to \$10,000 then it becomes a more worthwhile and substantial contribution. This applies only to the 15% for soft costs.

Mr. Shaver asked if we use this criterion of funding at higher levels, then do we also let the organization know that they may not reapply for, say, three years. Is this something the city can do? Mr. Tingey said that each year is separate according to HUD, and they look at current needs. HUD does not allow us to discourage an organization from applying. Mr. Shaver confirmed that it is our final determination.

Ms. Price indicated that the county, and Karen Wiley, do the administrative work for Murray. Whether we award an organization \$300 or \$3,000, the same amount of work is done for them. By funding fewer organizations, part of the administrative burden is removed from the county, and if Murray reaches a population of 50,000 citizens, and becomes an entitlement community, then the administrative duties would be reduced from Murray staff.

Ms. Price explained four funding categories that the City will develop for organizing applications:

- Soft costs

- Public facilities - The Boys and Girls Club, Heritage Center, Murray homeless shelters, rehabilitation centers
- Housing programs
 - NeighborWorks
 - Housing rehabilitation
 - Property acquisition - a future goal
 - Potential affordable housing
 - Accessibility upgrades
 - Down payment assistance
 - City Programs
 - Administration
 - HEAT program
 - Infrastructure investment - removing mobility barriers in town

Ms. Price detailed the funding areas under the soft costs' categories. It could be determined in a particular year, based on applications and community needs, that only the primary needs are funded.

- Primary
 - Health
 - Safety
 - Welfare - food, clothing, shelter
- Secondary
 - Social services
 - Counseling - rape, financial, mental, substance abuse
 - Youth
 - Legal services

- Senior services
- English emersion services

Ms. Price explained that the city thinks all of these programs are worthwhile, however, some serve more Murray residents than others. Additionally, the department feels the primary needs should be funded first.

Ms. Dunn commented that some of the social programs also provide the primary services, especially in youth and senior care.

Mr. Tingey added that every single program is wonderful and important for the community, however, prioritizing is difficult. He said that they are just trying to make the Council's job easier. Looking at the primary and secondary needs is a starting place.

Ms. Dunn stated that in the past the Council had tried to go to a system of funding fewer organizations in a similar way. This way with the turnover of Council members, there is some direction to follow in the future. This will make it easier for the Council. Mr. Brass noted that CDBG is the most demanding Council meeting of the year when the funding must be determined. Turning down the organizations is very difficult.

Prioritization criteria will be completed with the applications and interviews, using the following point system:

- Need - Clearly identifying a need that is tied to the county-consolidated plan, is a priority activity for the city, demonstrates a need not being met, and doesn't duplicate service will be considered. Noted will be how many Murray residents are served, and how many low to moderate individuals' (LMI) needs are met. The Columbus Community Center is a good example. They serve five Murray residents, however, they provide the entire livelihood for those people. Mr. Tingey explained that benefit, budget, and leverage will be the most important elements.
- Budget and leverage - Extremely important items.
- Project goals and outcomes
- Capacity and sustainability
- Additional aspects to be considered: job creation, affordable housing, green projects, multi jurisdictional or regional plans, advance community livability.

Mr. Brass pointed out that some organizations serve a vast pool of individuals and may draw funding from many sources. The Columbus Community Center does not have the revenue draw that other organizations have.

Mr. Shaver asked if this is the leverage that was mentioned. Ms. Price said that is part of the application process. The organizations must state whom they receive funds from. If a group asks only Murray for something, then the city wants to know why they have not also applied elsewhere. She added that some organizations rotate the communities they apply to.

Mr. Shaver agrees that it is important to provide food to people, however, he is interested to know if they are being taught how to provide their own food. How can we help people being served move forward in their lives to become contributing members of a community? Mr. Tingey stated that the criteria of promoting self reliance could be added to the application and scoring system. Ms. Dunn mentioned that some organizations who work with the disabled and seniors may not be able to do much to build self reliance.

Ms. Price outlined some of the projects being proposed for the 2011-2012 CDBG year:

- HEAT program - Taking some of the burden off the Murray General Fund.
- Property acquisition - Through NeighborWorks rehabilitation and resale.

Mr. Brass asked if there is a benefit to purchasing a property rather than assisting an individual to purchase then helping them rehabilitate. Mr. Tingey responded that there are some distinct difficulties with HUD and people working with lead-based paint or issues similar to that. It can be structured in different ways, such as, an owner purchasing a property and the City rehabilitating it for them, or the City buy and rehabilitate, and then sell to LMI individuals. NeighborWorks does have a lead-based paint certification.

Mr. Dredge asked if the NeighborWorks program to help elderly and LMI people rehabilitate their homes is considered here. Ms. Price stated that NeighborWorks definitely does this and it is part of the vision for the city once it is operational.

Continuing the proposed projects:

- NeighborWorks
- Heritage Center
- Administration

Other items for consideration brought out by Ms. Price were:

- Electronic application - A compact disc containing the applications, accompanied by a summary, would be preferable, if there are no objections.

- Partner commitments - The staff would like to consider these groups for further funding:
 - NeighborWorks
 - Community Development Corporation of Utah - Down payment assistance program.

Some future issues include:

- Infrastructure investment - Curb and gutter improvements, neighborhood beautification.
- Public participation - It may be possible to have more public participation in the process, such as through a citizen advisory committee, surveys, or hearings.

Mr. Dredge thanked Ms. Price and Mr. Tingey for their proactive approach toward the CDBG process.

There being no further business, Mr. Dredge adjourned the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Janet M. Lopez
Council Office Administrator