

Murray City Municipal Council Chambers Murray City, Utah

The Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah, met on Tuesday, the 16TH day of March, 2010 at 6:30 p.m., for a meeting held in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Roll Call consisted of the following:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Jeff Dredge, | Council Chair |
| Krista Dunn, | Council Member – via Teleconference |
| Darren Stam, | Council Member - Conducted |
| Jared Shaver, | Council Member |
| Jim Brass, | Council Member - Excused |

Others who attended:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Dan Snarr, | Mayor |
| Jan Wells, | Chief of Staff |
| Michael Wagstaff, | City Council Director |
| Brent Davidson, | Deputy City Recorder |
| Frank Nakamura, | City Attorney |
| Doug Hill, | Public Works Director |
| Tim Tingey, | Community & Economic Development Director |
| Gil Rodriguez, | Fire Chief |
| Pat Wilson, | Finance Director |
| Citizens | |

A. OPENING CEREMONIES

1. Pledge of Allegiance - Garen Early, Boy Scout, Troop 424
2. Mr. Stam stated that there is a tradition in Murray City to invite the Boy Scouts in attendance to stand and introduce themselves, their Troop Leaders, and which Merit Badges they are working on.

The Scouts in attendance stood and introduced themselves and their leaders.

3. Approval of Minutes of February 02 and February 16, 2010

Mr. Dredge made a motion to approve the minutes of February 02, 2010, with the correction of excluding the Gordon Property from the Mixed Use Ordinance Change. He also made the motion to have the motion to the amendment stand as approved in the meeting.

Mr. Shaver 2nd the motion to approve the minutes and that the motion to the amendment stands.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Davidson

All Ayes

Mr. Shaver made a motion to approve the minutes of February 16, 2010.
Mr. Dredge 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Davidson

All Ayes

4. Special Recognitions

None

B. CITIZEN COMMENTS (Comments are limited to 3 minutes unless otherwise approved by the Council.)

Mr. Shaver stated that if anyone in attendance is there to discuss the Lincoln Street issue, it is not on the agenda for this meeting, but they do have the right to speak to it if they would like to, but no action will be taken on it.

Russ Groves, 618 E Kirstys Lane

Mr. Groves stated that he has lived there for approximately a year now; he has lived in Murray for most of his life. He wanted to thank the Council and the Mayor for their dedication and allocating the funds for the Lincoln Street reconstruction. This is something that has been needed there. As he was driving to the meeting tonight, he noticed that there were a lot of chuck-holes, the road is very uneven, and there is a lot of gravel on the road, and he appreciates the City taking care of this road. They have a lot of supporters for this project, and he thanked the City once again.

Peter Kling, 602 Lincoln Place

Mr. Kling agreed with Mr. Groves, and he is here with about a dozen of his neighbors, along with a petition of about 20 signatures and addresses of those who support this project, and it has become a very passionate issue. They had an open-house last week, thinking that what the engineering group had recommended, in terms of two sidewalks, a full road rebuild, was the right thing to do. He understands that there were some people who had different ideas, but they wanted to exercise their rights as citizens of the neighborhood to comment on that. In addition to the signatures, they have about ten other letters with additional comments, expressing support for the road construction and to take care of the children and elderly who like the idea of having a sidewalk to walk on. They appreciate and encourage the City to continue to allocate the funds and get this road done this spring.

C. CONSENT AGENDA

None

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Staff and sponsor presentations, public comment and discussion prior to Council action on the following matter:

A. Consider an Ordinance amending the budgets of the General Fund, Library Fund, and Redevelopment Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

Staff presentation: Pat Wilson, Finance Director

Ms. Wilson explained that there are three budget revisions:
The first one basically is that the Library has found that they can receive some extra funding through some Federal Grant monies, and are asking that the Council amend their budget to allow for expenditure of this increased revenue that would come in, in the amount of \$16,237.

The second budget amendment is for the Redevelopment Agency; they are asking that there be a budget revision so that they can take some of the current, existing reserve money and apportion that so it can be spent for possible future property acquisition or clean up in the central district area. The amount that they are requesting is \$600,000, which exists in their current reserves.

The final budget revision deals with increasing expenditures in the Council budget to pay for the services of the lobbyist during the Legislative session, in the amount of \$40,000 which will be re-apportioned

from existing appropriation expenditures, which were left unspent after completion of some road funds. Some of this comes from the Silver Shadows road expenditures, and the remainder of it from the Allen Road. Basically, they are asking that \$40,000 be transferred from the existing budget line-item into a budget line-item to pay the lobbyist expense.

As the finance director, Ms. Wilson sees no real negative impacts to this.

Public Hearing opened for public comment.

None given

Public Hearing closed

Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing

Mr. Dredge made a motion to adopt the amendments to the Ordinance.
Mr. Shaver 2nd the motion.

Call vote recorded by Brent Davidson:

A Mr. Shaver
A Ms. Dunn
A Mr. Dredge
A Mr. Stam

Motion passed 4-0

B. Consider a Resolution allocating 36th Year Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds for Calendar Year 2010.

Staff presentation: Tim Tingey, Community Economic Development Director.

Mr. Tingey recognized Karen Wiley, Salt Lake County, CDBG Administrator, and thanked her for all of her support throughout the year that she provides our City on these projects; and Angela Harper, who is our coordinator for the Community Block Grant Program in the City.

Mr. Tingey explained that this program is administered through the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are a number of government organizations that receive funds; including state entities, urban counties and entitlement communities, which are communities who receive funds directly. We are not an entitlement community, we receive funds through Salt Lake County as an urban county and go through this process.

This process is a required process to make sure that we get the required public comment and public input, as well as a variety of other things through this important process. What HUD wants to see, and even going clear to Congress and the President of the United States, is to see these funds being able to be utilized and getting out and helping people as quickly as possible. An important part of that is telling our story. These are funds that are not just given to communities or counties by the Federal Government and then forgotten; there is a very strict reporting process, there is very strict in monitoring, to make sure that the funds that are spent are spent on eligible activities. So, as they go through this process, there are a number of things that they have to consider: eligibility on projects, making sure that they are meeting all of the guidelines that HUD has identified, or, there is that possibility that the funds may have to be returned to the Federal Government.

In addition to that, HUD will sometimes come and monitor communities; Mr. Tingey has been involved in some of those monitoring processes, and it is not just coming in and looking at a couple of files and writing a report, it is really looking at all of the organizations that are funded from the County, to the City, to the sub-recipient organizations that they are going to be recommending today. It is a strict process, and they want to make sure it is done right; for our credibility as a community, and also for the credibility of the County as they are reporting to HUD.

All of these issues are very important, and as they consider all of these applications, it is a very difficult process; every organization does wonderful work, and help people. The hard part is that they have a lot of money that they have to cut, because they don't have the funds to do everything. Some of the eligibility requirements that every project has to adhere to one of the following three national objectives for every dollar spent, or they are not eligible:

1. Benefitting low to moderate income persons
2. Preventing or eliminating blight
3. Urgent need issues, such as disasters, or minor issues

In this process, they had applications that were received; they had an administrative committee made up from Community and Economic Development department representatives, Mayors Office staff, and had Presentations from the hard cost applicants, and also from the soft cost applicants by telephone for each of these applications. They have looked at each one of these very closely as a committee and these recommendations are based on their evaluations on all of this.

The available funding, which has not been set in stone, as Congress has not yet allocated everything yet, is approximately \$259,000 based on last years figures. They had funding requests were \$477,000; so, you can see that they

have had to reduce \$217,000, which is not an easy process. Soft cost requests can only be funded at 15% of the funding allocation, per HUD requirements. The soft cost applications were \$79,000 and so the City cannot exceed \$38,000 with that 15%, which means a reduction of \$40,000. The hard cost requests had to be cut by \$176,000 from the total request of \$220,000. They looked at a variety of different things, including the need, the number of Murray residents served, overall benefit to the community, ability to leverage funds from other sources, which is a very important part of this process in leveraging, and low to moderate income families served.

They also looked at level funding, especially on the soft-cost applicants, to see if they had received funding at a level last year, it was likely that it would not increase, even if they were requesting that. This was some of the criteria that they evaluated these applicants with.

Mr. Tingey went over the soft cost applications:

Big Brothers, Big Sisters: there was a reduction based on the number of Murray residents served, and the reduction reflects some of the other similar programs; they had other programs requesting the same type of funding, and they looked at some reductions based on that.

There was level funding recommended on some of the other applications, due to the increase of applications, and there were also reductions based on some of the requests. The Legal Aid Society, for example, the reduction was based upon proportion of Murray residents served

Level funding was recommended on all of these, the CAP funding was recommended because they had three different program requests, and to accommodate the needs of all three programs, they recommended funding for the three, but there were reductions based on that.

Mr. Tingey explained that the next ones were reduced based on the increase in number of applicants. On the YMCA Parkside, there was a reduction based on a new service, and concerns related to quantifying LMI individuals, and a possible duplication of service issues. The Boy Scouts of America were a new applicant, the committee had concerns over this being a new service; there was some duplication with some of the schools, where other services were being provided right now through some of these applications, and they also had some concerns about quantifying LMI applicants and their track record in doing that, so there was a recommendation of not funding that.

Some of the other reductions were based on the increase in the number of applicants.

Mr. Tingey moved on to the hard-cost applicants, which make up the majority of the funding that we give. All of these programs and entities that applied are wonderful, important projects, but once again, there were a lot of questions related to eligibility issues on the hard costs.

The Road Home was recommended for full funding based on the critical need of that project and the renovation of their facility, and the number of Murray residents that they serve. Columbus Community Center was recommended a slight reduction in their project, but there is some funding from this year's project that they are proposing that the Council roll over into this to help get this project completed. Assist Inc., there is a possibility of other programs to utilize funds; Family Support Center, they recommended full funding based on the fact that they serve a high number of Murray residents. The Boys and Girls Club has the opportunity of rolling over funds to meet the needs of their organization; Murray City Public Services architectural drawings for their park facility: they talked to Public Services staff about this, as well as Ms. Wiley, and as they looked at this area, it is located in a low to moderate income area, but it is very difficult to quantify how many low to moderate income people are being served, and so they felt there are eligibility issues with that. Because of that, they are recommending no funding for that project.

The Murray City Heritage Center has been an on-going applicant over the years, and they have recommended partial funding of their project, up to \$50,000, but Mr. Tingey wanted to emphasize some of the issues relating to this: the work that they do is valuable, there is no doubt about that, but they are concerned about the cost of this project; they calculated it at being about \$238.00 per square foot, and there is a concern that the proposed project will not completely resolve the life, health and safety issues related to what was put in their application. The center needs to look at other sources of funding, that the committee wanted to recommend as part of this, and that road vacation variance will need to occur to make this project work. There is no guarantee that there will be funding for this project next year, and emphasized that this is a HUD requirement. There may be funding this year if it is approved, but he cannot guarantee through the public processes that there will be any funding for this project next year, and he wants to make sure that is clear in this project recommendation.

Mr. Tingey continued: with the Segoe Lilly School, they are excited to have this facility; it is going to be a new facility located here in Murray, and they have been working with them through the Planning Review process for quite some time. They are recommending no funding with this project; they feel that it is a good project for this community, but they look at track record, and there are two Murray residents right now being served by this organization. As they expand into Murray, they have said that there will be that opportunity for more Murray residents; but as they have been trying to put together a report for HUD, their track record is two Murray residents being served, and we cannot look at the hope of getting additional Murray residents based on the facility being located here, so they really feel that it is an eligibility issue and something that they cannot justify to HUD based upon what the intent of what they think may happen. They are recommending \$0 for the funding of that project.

The Odyssey House is doing some rehabilitation for a project here in Murray; they are recommending funding for the project based upon the proportional number of residents being served.

These are their recommendations; there are also on-going administrative expenses with this program, our Housing Rehabilitation Development Program; they want to have at least \$18,000 in that for capital needs for future housing rehab programs. For the First Time Down Payment and Closing Costs Assistance program, last year was the first year that the program was funded; they funded \$25,000 and in the first four months of the project, they were out of money. There is a huge demand and huge need for that, and are recommending an increase for that program.

The Community Economic Development Department and this committee are recommending approval of the funding requests as seen, including the additional elements relating to if there is a reduction in funding or an increase in funding that they have put in the staff report to the Council.

Mr. Shaver asked, since they have so many groups that provide similar services, why not focus it on a singular group as opposed to spreading it out over so many different groups? One of the groups will not be receiving any money, and another will be given a little; why not say "we want this group, and we would like you to become part of that group", such as the YMCA and the Boys and Girls Club? It seems that if Parkside has that, and they are so close, why not just put all of the money into one group.

Mr. Tingey stated that the challenge with that is, which one do you fund it to? Which organization should get the full funding? Especially with the two- there were three, with a question of duplication of services, but the two have a fairly on-going track record of doing these programs and assisting the people through that, so they felt that recommending funding for the two, where they have done these projects before, is something that will work. The third one didn't have a track record, had never quantified low to moderate income residents, and those were issues of concern and that is why they recommended the two being funded.

Mr. Shaver said that he was thinking of the Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Boys and Girls, and YMCA. Not even looking at the others, just thinking of funding all three of those.

Mr. Tingey said that those three are not serving the same school. They are serving the community in different areas.

Mr. Shaver asked if this was part of the criteria, being able to say that this one is closer, this one is going into this school, this one is serving other areas?

Mr. Tingey answered: it is basically feeling comfortable that they are meeting needs and not duplicating to the point where it is a full duplication of the same services of the same needs. They feel that they can fund all three of those, they will all serve different residents and they were comfortable with that.

Mr. Shaver said that with the Heritage Center, it isn't that they are uncomfortable with what they are spending the money on, and the fact that they are going to be relying on spending so much and getting funding the next year, why not help them a little bit and put some of that and put it into that first time. In other words, do \$20,000 into the Heritage Center, and yes, we are a bit uncomfortable with the cost of \$239 per square foot, and we are not sure that it is meeting this criteria you've established and refund that. Based on what we just heard, wouldn't that be part of that partnership, wouldn't it be better served in this First Time Down Payment Program?

Mr. Tingey said that it is really a judgment call on this. He feels that this project, the way it was presented to them, is something that will enhance the safety of seniors in our community, and we cannot ignore that, it is an important thing to think about. There are concerns with the project, and what he feels they are saying, as a committee, is that if they don't have a certain amount of funding, it is going to hard for them to fund-raise for the additional amount. For example, if we didn't fund them at all, it would be difficult for them to raise the funds for the full amount of the project. We are recommending approval for some of the funding, but they need to go out and fund-raise, and address these issues over time for the cost, and looking at possibly scaling back that project.

Could the money go towards the Down Payment Closing Cost Program, and the needs be addressed there? Sure it could, but we feel that it is important to address the needs of the seniors as well, related to this issue. Susan Gregory has spoken about this in the presentations; her concern with the safety of the residents going in, with the location of the entrance where it is, is an issue that needs to be considered.

Mr. Shaver noted that comment #4 is: "the center should look at other, more cost effective alternatives as they proceed with the project" and "the committee does not value the work of the Heritage Center and safety as an important issue."

Mr. Tingey said that, no, the committee *does* value the work of the Heritage Center, and the safety is an important issue.

Mr. Shaver corrected himself and said that it is comment #3: "there is a concern that the proposed project will not completely solve the overall issue." It would seem to him that it would be more advisable to say to them 'let's resolve these particular issues, then let's look at the funding. He is not trying to short senior citizens, not at all, but, it seems that if there are questions about what they are doing, providing the funding for them at this point, may be premature.

Mr. Tingey stated that he does understand what Mr. Shaver is saying.

Ms. Dunn disclosed that one of the applicant agencies, the Boys and Girls Club, her husband is the director there. All of the things that applied for are repairs on the building, so nothing will go to any of the people there. The second thing is, in the past, they have had everyone get up and speak. She feels that it would be better if those that have something to add to what they had written in their applications, it may save time over those people going over everything that was in their application.

The other Council members agreed with Ms. Dunn. Mr. Stam asked that the soft costs are addressed first, the followed by the hard costs in a separate motion.

Ms. Dunn said that in the past, the time limit for these discussions was limited to one minute, instead of the normal three due to time constraints, and asked that this be the case tonight as well.

Public hearing opened for public comment.

Karen Wiley, Community Development Coordinator, Salt Lake County

Ms. Wiley stated that she manages the CDBG funding that the City is working with now; she has the arduous task of making the decisions and final cuts, so it is not an enviable job. Mayor Snarr is always very wanting in having to have more of the funding be able to go to the soft cost portion. She addresses this each time she goes to D.C., and gets shot down every time. She wanted to let the City know that she does let them know that the Mayor of Murray would like to have..... As far as the public portion of this goes, you may take a middle stance and allow the agencies a couple of minutes so that they are either able to thank you for the recommendation or explain their program a little further if there was not funding recommendations, which was stated in our citizen participation plan. We really do need to follow that.

Julie Adams-Chatterley , grant writer for Utah Food Bank

The Utah Food Bank put in a soft cost request for the 211 Information Referral Program; Murray is the largest place that they calls from in the County. They received over 6000 calls last year, and this program is a starting point for anyone who is in a crisis who is able to call a simple number and get connected to all of the community resources that they may not know even exist.

Ms. Adams-Chatterley also noted that she has had a wonderful time working with the Community Economic Development here in Murray, and they do an excellent job.

Heather Stringfellow, Director, Rape Recovery Center

Ms. Stringfellow passed out a handout outlining some brief facts about the sexual violence in our community and the services they provide Murray residents. She thanked the City for their past support and their recommendations.

Two things that the City helps their program with are: the hospital response team, where they come to the hospital along with the Murray Police Department, to assist victims of sexual violence as they go through the criminal justice system. The second thing is therapy; they have four licensed therapists that provide therapy to low and moderate income people who cannot afford therapy on their own.

Kai Wilson, Legal Aid Society

Mr. Wilson stated that they have requested funding to help victims of domestic violence obtain protective orders; they do this at a cost of just \$210 per person, which ends up being less than a typical police call of two police officers going out on a

domestic call. They appreciate all the funding that the City has given them over the years, and the recommendation this year.

Diane Spencer, The Family Support Center

Ms. Spencer thanked the City for the recommendations that have been made, they are very grateful to have those. They have both soft cost and hard cost requests this year. She explained that they are a child abuse prevention and treatment agency, and the only provider's of crisis nursery care in the Salt Lake Valley; they have crisis nurseries in West Valley City, Midvale and Sugarhouse, and that is where children can be brought who are at risk for abuse or neglect, or there is some kind of other emergency in the family and there is no other childcare available. It is free of charge for a couple of hours, or 72 hours, including overnight stays. They also provide counseling; these are the two programs that they have requested help with.

With the \$3,000 that they have been recommended for in their soft cost requests, and the 85 residents that they treated last year, that would only be a cost of about \$35.00 per Murray resident to the City, but all of the residents come multiple times.

She is very happy about the recommendation for funding for the remodel of the bathroom at the Midvale facility; the committee saw pictures of the run down, decrepit bathroom – it is in a single family dwelling that was built in the 1940's, and considering the number of staff and children that they have there year around, it's probably being used around 8,000 times a year, which is a pretty big drain on a single family dwelling bathroom. Just Sunday night, they had two little girls that were brought in to stay overnight; one of the staff was giving the girls a bath and the faucet completely blew off the bathtub, shooting water out into the hall, knocking one of the little girls over. She was quite traumatized by this, and so they can't get going on this soon enough. Ms. Spencer thanked the Council once again for their support.

Sam Stephens, Vice President, Volunteers of America of Utah

Mr. Stephens thanked the Mayor and Council for their thoughtful recommendations and their support for the agency throughout the years. VOA is a large human service organization here in Utah, serving 11,000 people a year throughout seven counties, with 150 staff members and over 11,000 volunteers. Here in Murray, they are happy to operate their center for women and children, which, ten years ago, was one of the first facilities in the nation to provide residential substance abuse, detox and treatment to homeless women abusing substances, who had dependent children. That facility has been operating for ten years now, serving 500 people a year; the mothers can stay, detox, in a safe environment and get back on the path of self-sufficiency. The children can stay with them in a safe and supportive environment and get the mom on the path to self-sufficiency as well. They appreciate the support of the City Council and look forward to working with them long into the future.

Georgia Smith, The Learning For Life Program

Ms. Smith stated that they were not approved for funding, but wanted to take a

moment to introduce their program, as they feel like they ‘missed the boat.’ They do a lot with Parkside and Longview elementary schools. Parkside is a Title I school, and they cover the experiential gap. If she could leave the Council with anything, it would be to let them know ‘when the seam tore, the note went sour.’ For those children who don’t know what a bagpipe sounds like, they obviously still won’t have any idea what that means. This program offers a lot of opportunity to close that gap for children in this community; the biggest thing that they do is take the children up Millcreek Canyon, where they have access to Camp Tracy facilities. Many of these children have never even been in the canyons, and when they read in a book about hiking, crossing streams and fishing, or riding in a row boat, they have no idea what that is. She would like to leave the council, for consideration next year, that they do provide a very relevant service to this community. They really enjoy being part of this community, and hope that they can be considered another time.

Celeste Eggert, Development Director, The Road Home

Ms. Eggert thanked the Mayor and Council for their past support for The Road Home and to thank them for their recommendations this year.

Joseph Carbone, President and Founder, Eye care for Kids Foundation

Mr. Carbone stated that their clinic is at 6911 South State; if you have the time, they have found from other entitlement communities that have come out and done a tour of their site, they would love to have everyone come out while they have 50 kids there, getting their eyes checked and getting them glasses; it’s a hoot and you’d love to do it. He thanked the City for their time and all the good that they do.

Pam Sanders, Executive Director, Big Brothers, Big Sisters of Utah

Ms. Sanders stated that as a state-wide organization, they identify children who need mentors in their lives, and try to find adults who will work with them. They are located here in Murray, their state offices are here, and she is also a resident. They serve approximately 144 kids here in Murray, and their funding request is for the school based program, but they serve kids in their community based program as well.

They certainly appreciate the support they have received from Murray in the past, and thank you for the recommendations for next year.

Kali Monet, representative, Odyssey House of Utah

Ms. Monet extended their extreme gratitude for the recommendation that was given to them for funding; they are very excited: they have just purchased two buildings in the Murray community and are thrilled to be a part of Murray, and look forward to working with the City in the future. The addresses of the buildings are at 218 E & 174 E 4500 S., and as they are in poor shape, they are working very hard to give them a face-lift and do some beautification to the properties.

Phil Weimer, grant writer for Community Health Center

Mr. Weimer said that right now, their center is taking any pregnant women or that think they are pregnant and they receive a free pregnancy test and initial consultation, regardless of no money or no insurance. They currently have four locations within Salt Lake County.

Jamie Gregersen, Salt Lake Donated Dental Services

Ms. Gregersen said that they provide free comprehensive dental care to the homeless and low income; they have requested \$1,000 from Murray City to enable their volunteer dental professionals to provide quality preventative and restorative dental care to 60 Murray City residents, and also to relieve the pain and suffering caused by oral health problems for 30 Murray residents. This year, 18 children, seven homeless and 65 of Murray's working poor could have a brighter future, thanks to the City.

Christine Hill, Assistant Director, Midvale Health Clinic

Ms. Hill explained that they are a small clinic, running on a shoestring budget, but they reach very many people; they served over 3,000 patients last year, with nearly 500 of those being Murray City residents. They do this with one provider, multiple volunteer providers, they get their equipment off of Ebay, through Globus Medical Services, and save every dime that they can, so that they can put it towards patient care. They are very thankful for the money that the City has allotted them, and look forward to working with the City.

Marsha Prantel, Senior Director of Youth and Family, YMCA

Ms. Prantel stated that the YMCA now serves over 3,000 youth in the Wasatch Front; this is the first time that they have been able to look at working in Murray, and are very excited about it. Last September, Parkside administration came to them, to ask if they could help with an after school program; they had lost some funding, and the YMCA was able to partner with them. They had an Americorps-Vista volunteer and with that staffing and being able to build capacity, they were able to start this program. We have served 60 students already this year, and are hoping to serve around 100. As you know, Parkside is a Title I school; 40% are free and reduced lunch, they provide 78% financial assistance to run this program, and would like to thank the City for their recommendation.

This is honorable of you, and she wanted to address Mr. Shaver's comment about the YMCA and duplication of service: Ms. Prantel has been in after school programming for 20 years, and this question comes up constantly. She wants people to understand that parents need choices, sometimes parents want their children to stay at school, sometimes they want them to be in a facility after school. As you can see with the enrollment that they have at Parkside, there is a need out there for these services. Sometimes, because they do the same services, they are providing different services.

Mr. Dredge asked, as this is based out of a school, why is the school district not funding it, or are they?

Ms. Prantel said that her history with the Murray School District is that at one time, there was quite a bit of funding through the government, through 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and they chose not to rewrite some of those funding sources; so, they discontinued some of those programs that were already operating in those schools.

Mr. Dredge asked if it was their intent to stay only to at Parkside, or to move into some of the other schools.

Ms. Prantel stated that where there is a need, they are there. One thing about the YMCA is that if there is a need in the community, and a service in the community that needs to be met, that is what the YMCA does.

Mr. Shaver stated for the record that his son attends Parkside.

Public comment closed.

Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing (soft costs).

Mr. Dredge expressed his appreciation to all the applicants, stating that they are attempting to fill the gaps that are out there. This is one of the most agonizing meetings that he has to attend to, not being able to magically fill all of the coffers with funds; at the same time, one of his concerns has been where there is duplications. If there are similar entities that provide similar things, you have to buy photocopiers, and paper for each of those entities. As he has looked at these, it has been a huge concern for him, and one of the problems or questions he has on the application, is with Parkside. Not to say anything negative about the YMCA, but simply, if a program is at the school, he wonders why the school is not funding, and although it is nice for the parents to have a program right there at the school, it is so close to the Boys and Girls Club, is that a fairly significant duplication and as the program grows to other schools, are we going to be asked to further dilute the available CDBG funds in these other school programs. He would like to see, if we are to go that route, more of a partnership with the school district, seeing more support from them.

Mr. Shaver asked if that means having the schools work more to provide this service>

Mr. Dredge said that he would like to see the school district seeding this a little more themselves, rather than relying on someone else just to do it.

Mr. Shaver said that although his son did not participate in the after school program, he does know that there was someone that was at the school doing it, and the school district, or Federal money, where that actually came from he is unsure, they cut the funding and that is why there was such a challenge, as many of those students had no place else to go.

Mr. Dredge said that when they ran out of funds, they came to the City asking for CDBG funds and they were denied.

Mr. Stam added that the Boys and Girls Club does provide busing to all of the schools, so it isn't that there is no place for these students go.

Mr. Shaver asked where would the funding go, since Mr. Dredge's proposal is to move that money elsewhere? Have it go to the Big Brothers, Big Sisters, or to the Boys and Girls Club?

Mr. Dredge stated that his question would be whether there is agreement with the position he is taking, if there is not, then he would not waste the Council's time with re-allocating the money.

Mr. Tingey said that as far as the school districts involvement, he thinks that there is that involvement, facilities are being utilized for that program, and feels that there is some partnership. This is \$3,000 related to this program and additional monies are looked at; they can address that, but there is participation and honestly feels that there isn't duplication at this point. If it would make them feel comfortable, staff could sit down with these organizations and insure that duplication is not an issue. In the past he has looked at Interlocal agreements related to that, but he understands the concerns with duplication, but they can take steps to insure that it does not happen through these programs.

Mr. Dredge stated that a further issue that he struggles with, is at what level do we fund after school programs in general. Are we, in doing this, taking the place of baby-sitting in place of parents who are working? He is not trying to attack the program, it is a genuine question; are we funding a baby-sitting program so that parents can go to work when we do something like this?

Mr. Tingey said that a portion of that is true; but the mentoring that they provide, provides a lot more than just watching the children. It provides a service that assists those children in learning in a variety of other areas.

Mr. Shaver noted that based on what the YMCA provided in their grant request, it says that they are focused on homework, creativity and other activities rather than just sitting in with children. He does not remember all of the statistics, but remembers that portion of it; he agrees with Mr. Dredge in that if the Boys and Girls Clubs are providing the same services, homework and creativity rather than just watching children, and there is bus service, then why are we not just busing them, as close as they are. His concerns goes to what was addressed earlier, and that is, if we do it at Parkside, are we also going to do it at other schools. Where does it stop, where does it go, how far do we take that? Diluting the funds with each step.

Mr. Shaver does not want to misunderstand the questioning, especially Mr. Tingey- he would not want to, in any way, denigrate what you and your staff have done in those groups, he knows that their tasks are much harder than the Councils since they have to actually read the grants and make those assessments, and he knows that it is not an easy process.

Mr. Shaver made a motion to adopt the Resolution on soft costs, with one change, moving the funding from the YMCA Parkside after school program to the Boys and

Girls Clubs.

Ms. Dunn asked if the motion was to move those soft costs into the hard costs area.

Mr. Tingey said that with the Boys and Girls Clubs, it is not an application on the soft cost money, so there is not an application for that, so they cannot fund it to go towards that project or program. If there were an application in for the soft costs, it would be different.

Ms. Dunn asked if the soft cost amount was a maximum. Mr. Tingey said that is correct, it is 15%.

Ms. Dunn asked if we wanted to move it to a hard cost, we could? Mr. Tingey said yes. If you do not want to consider the soft cost right now, you want to hear the hard costs first and then consider it all at once, it would probably be more appropriate to do that.

Mr. Shaver removed and killed his original motion

Public Hearing opened for Hard Costs

Jennifer Schwartz, Founder, Segó Lilly School

Ms. Schwartz thanked the City for all of their help with the application, and is here to ask the Council to reconsider the decision not to fund their program. There were four things that were listed as reasons that they were not chosen for funding: They currently only have two students from Murray City. As they are just moving into Murray, it is hard to say how many students from Murray they will have in the future; however, they are also building their building to emergency shelter specifications. This means that anyone in the area, should an emergency occur, will have access to the building as an emergency shelter. It is earthquake proof, and she has been told that it may actually be nuclear bomb proof, and they do have their own power sources on site as well. It will be a very functional shelter in an emergency.

The second thing that was mentioned was that it would be difficult to track how many low and very low income students they have; they actually keep track of all of that. All of their students who are in the low and very low income categories have applied for their sliding scale tuition, so they actually do have records for all of their students of their exact family income level, so it is something that they can provide for HUD or for Murray City if needed.

The third thing that was listed was it was thought that the funding that they were requesting could be absorbed by other funding sources, such as their loan and other grants. They have actually found that because they are building a very unique building, a very green and sustainable building, it costs more to build than a conventional building and because they are building to emergency shelter specifications, it costs more to build. They actually have a funding deficit right now of \$900,000 and really think that they do not have the rest of the funding, and would request Murray City support with that.

The last item mentioned was that there simply was not enough money to go around- she does understand that. Looking at the final spreadsheet, she has a lot of sympathy for the City for the work they have to do on this, and the narrowing down, but would like to request that the Council reconsider their request, at least partial funding.

Michael Cox, Unit Director, Boys and Girls Club of Murray

Mr. Cox asked a couple of the club members to come join him: Tiffany Bible, and Anthony Bible; on behalf of the 700 club members that they had in 2009 from the Murray area, plus the 100's of community members who utilize their facility after hours, they would like to thank the Mayor, and the Community Economic Development Department for their recommendation for the CDBG money this year.

He added that he would appreciate the roll-over from last year's money, but also, safety has been the bulk of focus of their application, and the additional \$5,613 would allow them to complete all of their safety projects listed in their proposal. This would allow them long-term, durable safety for their facility; they give their thanks, and ask for consideration in rolling over the money from last year, in addition to the \$19,613 for this year.

Dave Woodman, Emergency Home Repair Coordinator, Assist, Inc.

Mr. Woodman stated that Emergency Home Repair is part of the safety net that tries to help Murray City's lowest income residents with immediate life, health, or safety problems with their homes. They do not do any maintenance, remodeling, or cosmetic work; all work is done through licensed and insured contractors, they try to solve problems by directing families to the appropriate agency or service. They communicate daily with the Community Action Program, maintenance groups and governmental entities. The potential for the creation of a rehabilitation organization program here in Murray is just wonderful, as part of the continuum of services, that would be a terrific partner for them. The City's support of this and other worthy programs, helps families not only to survive, but to continue to live in their homes with dignity and security.

Leda Wright, Murray Heritage Center

Ms. Wright said that the Heritage Center is thankful for the City's support in the past, and their support and encouragement is very beneficial. There is a contingent here tonight from the center.

People who come to Murray, stay in Murray; they raise their families, and grow old here. That is what happens to a lot of their participants. They know that they provide service, currently, to approximately 170 people a day, and over 5,000 people in the past year; it is a sizable number of people that they reach. There are a few things that you may not know about the center: there are seven or more ongoing exercise programs, varying in activity from line dancing to yoga; they have a very well equipped exercise room, treadmills, Weight Watchers program, they have a summer

golf program with over 100 participants, they have Bridge, Pinochle, pool tables, shuffleboard and bingo. They have a Monday movie, a Thursday night dance, they reach a very wide spectrum of people in this community; they take annual over-night trips, day trips, they provide many services to the seniors. They have a computer center where they provide computer lessons, which costs between \$5 - \$15 for four to eight lessons, so they try to keep costs affordable for low income people. They regularly schedule a podiatrist, a dermatologist, toe nail clipping; they provide information about social security, Medicare, they prepare income taxes; weekly, they have hair-cuts, testing for blood pressure and glucose. These are all things that seniors need and sometimes can't get other places.

You have seen their proposal, and she would like to address some of the questions: One was that it didn't fully solve the problem with safety; a lot of their participants have been dropped off at the front door, and the entrance is not a safe entrance. The reason it is not completely solving the problem is they also have a very large parking lot, and there is nothing that they can do about that. The City is very good about getting there and plowing it early in the morning. They have currently raised over \$12,000 towards this project; they have started a program that they call " \$30 for 30 years" celebrating their 30 year anniversary, and hope to raise \$10,000 from that project. Their goal is to raise \$30,000 by this time next year.

Stephanie Mackay, Development Director, Columbus Community Center

Ms. Mackay thanked the Council and Mayor for the recommendation for the funding to do some remodeling in their group home, which is located on Jones Ct. For many years, they have been serving five individuals with developmental disabilities who live there, providing their residential support; this year, in particular, the grant money would be used to remodel a bathroom to make it handicapped accessible. It is going to allow them to add one or two more residents to the home, so for the first time in the years that she has been working on this, she gets to add some numbers to her reports, and add a few individuals. With the aging population, and the need for residential programming in the community, they are really pleased that they will be able to expand their program.

Mr. Stam asked the Legal Aid Society if, when they have someone they are going to represent, do they do any kind of background or check to see if the people that come to them, are really in need?

Mr. Wilson stated that everyone is asked to provide their income; over 80% of the people coming to them for protective orders live under 200% of poverty.

Mr. Stam asked if they verify that person is really in need of a protective order, as he has experience with a case where someone who had a history of things, and Legal Aid represented them, and they did not do any background check on it.

Mr. Wilson answered yes, Legal Aid requires some sort of substantiation for a protective order, that is legal code, so they cannot get one without it, so typically, Legal Aid will not accept a case unless there is some sort of police report or information that substantiates the abuse.

Public Hearing Closed

Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing (hard costs).

Mr. Dredge asked Mr. Tingey: It seems like the Heritage Center is really up in the air, as to what the final product might be; his question is, on the proposed solution, how does this solve the current problem? Does it extend the covered walkway closer to the drop off point?

Mr. Tingey said that yes, it extends the area right out to where the parking area is. The reason that it is not addressing all of the concerns is because if you are parking cars, you still have the concern of getting from the parking lot to the entrance, but if there is drop-off, this is extending out to the curb, alleviating some of the concern for safety.

Mr. Stam asked that the Boys and Girls Club be taken on a separate vote, due to the fact that Ms. Dunn's husband works there.

Mr. Dredge made a motion to adopt the Resolution on the costs for the Boys and Girls Club, with the change in the cost to the percentage commensurate from the YMCA. He added that it is no secret that the Boys and Girls Club has a long history with Murray City, that the City started the club and they've done a great job, and he sees this as too close to an already existing program with the potential of further diluting already limited funds in the future should this go to other schools.

Mr. Shaver second the motion.

Call vote recorded by Brent Davidson:

 A Mr. Shaver
 X Ms. Dunn - Abstained
 A Mr. Dredge
 A Mr. Stam

Motion passed 3-0

Mr. Shaver made a motion to adopt the Resolution on both hard and soft costs as amended.

Mr. Dredge second the motion.

Call vote recorded by Brent Davidson:

 A Mr. Shaver
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge
 A Mr. Stam

Motion passed 4-0

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

F. NEW BUSINESS

None

G. MAYOR'S REPORT

None

H. QUESTIONS OF THE MAYOR

None

ADJOURNMENT

Draft Pending Formal Approval