

CEDAC Allocation Committee Meeting | MINUTES

February 18, 2020, | 11:30 AM – 2:00 PM | 2001 S State Street, S2-950, Salt Lake City UT

Meeting called by Susan Gregory

Facilitator Karen Kuipers

Note taker Erika Fihaki

Next Meeting: February 25, 2020 11:30 AM

CEDAC Committee: Susan Gregory, Shelly Batten, Leslie Jones, Jamie Peterson, Ryan Henrie, Todd Richards, Michael Anderson, Allen Litster, Becky Guertler

Excused: Kumar Shah, Camille Bowen, Tyler Money

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Sharon Pierce, Erika Fihaki, Mike Gallegos

AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic *Approval of February 11th Meeting Minutes* | **Presenter** *Susan Gregory*

There was a discussion about the minutes from the last meeting. Some modifications to the minutes were requested by committee members.

Action Items

Motion by Michael Anderson to accept minutes with modifications. Allen Litster seconded the motion. There was a unanimous vote to approve the minutes.

Agenda topic *Review of Conflicts of Interest* | **Presenter** *Susan Gregory*

Susan Gregory asked if there were any conflicts of interest for the applications which were to be reviewed today. Leslie Jones noted that she lives in South Salt Lake and works for the city as an event planner. Becky Guertler noted that she lives in Kearns, and it was noted that Allen Litster lives in Midvale. These disclosures are for the record only, as they are not financial in nature and have been deemed non-restrictive conflicts.

Agenda topic *City of South Salt Lake – Main Street TOD Lighting Application*

Exec Committee Summary –

- Project is located in an area of minimal flood hazard. HCD staff is looking into HUD requirements.
- Agency is currently being funded. On the West Temple project 2nd quarter reporting was late. 1st quarter information is on scorecard. Agency is behind on the timeframe that was identified in the Gantt chart, so the agency received a C.
- Staff would like to ensure that residents have been involved in the conversations about this lighting.
- Tab 5 Population Cert table percentages are transposed on number of persons served who are LMI.
- Other entitlement funding will come from Capital Funds
- Amanda will look at data for other lighting on West Temple.

Impact & Need – There was discussion about the scope of the project and the area it is planned in. There was discussion about how the need was great as this area is becoming more residential and less industrial.

Project Goals & Outcomes – There was discussion about the goals and outcomes being clearly stated. The housing stability portion was also stated clearly.

Agency Capacity – There have been delays in the agency’s ability to complete past projects in the timeline provided. This is cause for concern with this project.

Cooperation & Collaboration – There was discussion about the agency working closely with a wide variety of organizations. There was discussion about the scoring being based on how well the question was answered. There was discussion about whether there is collaboration or cooperation with developers for the area. It was noted that this is the second year in a row that this agency has asked for funding as a result of developers building residential projects. The suggestion was made that the cities provide conditional approval for development based on meeting certain criteria to ensure safe neighborhoods. It was clarified that often developers will put lighting in around their development and the cities are asking for funding to fill in the gaps.

Budget – The committee felt that the agency clearly stated what their budget is for this project. The agency did a good job detailing expenditures.

Leveraging – The committee was confused by their budget as some of the items were listed in the wrong columns.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
City of South Salt Lake – Main Street TOD Lighting Clarifying Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Application states that tCity of South Salt Lake partners with 100 different agencies – the committee would like to know who those agencies are. Is there a distinction between partnering and collaborating?• Are there impact fees the city is collecting from developers?• Are there collaborations with businesses to get future lighting• Are there plans for developers to share lighting costs in the future.• Please clarify your budget – committed/non-committed.• Please clarify populations served – it appears the numbers are inverted.• Please clarify tab 2 question 7 – what is the “other” as populations served.	Amanda Cordova	02/11/2020, 11:30 AM

Agenda topic *Topic Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District - 5615 South Northwest Ave to 4270 West Sidewalk Application*

Exec Committee Summary:

- Repair gutter and sidewalks in Kearns as part of neighborhood revitalization.

- Clients served are residents. This will add to the feeling of a safe and cared for neighborhood. There are trip hazards and hazards of vehicle/pedestrian accidents.
- Number of people benefitted is around 200 – residential. These areas lack accessibility to transportation, this will improve walkability to public transit and recreation.
- Staff would like information on how this was selected as a priority and if the MSD has another sidewalk program, and where funding for that comes from. Does the 50/50 program with the county still exist (county would replace sidewalks and homeowner would share 50% of the cost)? How does that play into this request?
- 59.2% Low MOD
- Budget tab was incomplete.
- Tab 2, Question 14 states that the applicant has yet to determine which sidewalks will be repaired. Staff would like clarification on if this has been determined yet.
- Staff would like clarification on whether this is curbs and sidewalks. If curbs, how does this impact state roads potentially being torn up to replace. Curbs are non-ADA compliant because they don't have curb cut.
- Need more info on which specific sidewalks would be repaired with CDBG funds.
- Salt Lake County is liable for funds, so we will perform Davis-Bacon monitoring on these projects.
- The jurisdiction has a current contract. 2nd quarter report was submitted late. Project was completed at beginning of second quarter. The MSD has spent out all but \$300. Gantt Chart score was an A. Completed project in a timely manner.

Impact & Need – The committee felt that the explanation of need was generic, non-specific. Additionally there are other areas in the neighborhood where there aren't even sidewalks, whereas the proposed area of improvement does have sidewalks. There was discussion about this not being a high priority for Kearns but was an easy project and fit within guidelines of grant.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The agency did not clearly state the goals and outcomes. The project would not appear to have any impact on housing stability.

Agency Capacity – The agency is capable of doing this project. The application did not specify their capacity to complete the project. There was no information in the application about previous projects being completed successfully.

Cooperation & Collaboration – The agency was attentive to what the public is interested in, so collaboration with the public was good; however, they don't appear to have responded well about collaboration and cooperation with other agencies.

Budget – The committee felt the ask was very large for such a small section of the road. The committee felt that there were higher priority projects to commit funding to.

Leveraging – The committee felt the application did not demonstrate sufficient leveraging. The sentiment that this was a large ask for a low priority was re-stated.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District - 5615 South Northwest Ave to 4270 West Sidewalk Clarifying Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tab 2, Question 14 states that the MSD has yet to determine which sidewalks will be repaired. Would like clarification on if this has been determined yet. 	Amanda Cordova	02/25/2020 11:30 AM

Action items

Person responsible Deadline

- Staff would like clarification on whether this is curbs and sidewalks. If curbs, how does this impact state roads potentially being torn up to replace.

Agenda topic *Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District – Magna Downtown Revitalization Application*

Exec Committee Summary:

- 77.7% Low MOD. This is an area of low opportunity. Will address ADA accessibility and trip hazards.
- Staff would like clarification on why the Engineering cost percentage is higher than the Kearns project. (33% for this project as opposed to 20% for Kearns project). Perhaps Ryan Henrie could give info about this.)
- Does the cost estimate include curbs?
- Mike would like Amanda to get clarification from Kate about cost difference between two projects.
- Identify specifically which sidewalks will be repaired.

Impact & Need – This is identified as a high priority. It provides connectivity of residential areas to main downtown. The application clearly showed the impact and need of this project. Question 6.4b references “increases in multimodal use, levels of digital infrastructure use”. It is not clear to the committee what that means.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The agency did not clearly define their measurement tools. The Agency did not clearly state how this ties in to housing stability.

Agency Capacity – The agency has the capacity to complete this type of project. The MSD have done this type of project in the past, however they did not specify staff experience.

Cooperation & Collaboration – Agency did not clearly identify who they are collaborating with. The committee is concerned that MSD is not getting adequate input from the communities involved. The committee would like to see clearer identification of their collaboration on future applications. The committee did concede that this is a new organization which is still learning the process of grant applications.

Budget – The request is for less than 600 linear feet but the sidewalk is in poor repair and non-existent in some areas. The budget is very clearly spelled out. There was concern about the source and accuracy of the number of LMI people listed. It was noted that the agency has not been audited in 3 years. Staff clarified that this is a separate legal entity now and as such are required to have an audit.

Leveraging – The leveraging was not clearly laid out in the application. The committee was interested to know whether resident fees are charged which could be utilized on this project, or is it all being done with grant funding.

Action items

Person responsible Deadline

Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District – Magna Downtown Revitalization Clarifying Questions

Amanda Cordova 02/25/2020 11:30 AM

- Please clarify what “levels of digital infrastructure use” means in Question 6.4.b
- Does the cost estimate include curbs?

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify specifically which sidewalks will be repaired. Clarification the cost difference between the Kearns and Magna projects. Please clarify why the agency did not indicate that an audit has been conducted in the past 3 years. Please verify the 48% LMI amount listed. Please clarify if there are any resident fees being collected for future projects. Clarification on why the Engineering cost percentage is higher than the Kearns project. (33% for this project as opposed to 20% for Kearns project). Perhaps Ryan Henrie could give info about this. 		

Agenda topic *Midvale City Corporation Midvale City 20/21 ADA Improvement Program Application*

Exec Committee Summary:
Impact/Need: This appears to be an ongoing project. The agency clearly demonstrated the impact on the neighborhood and the need for ADA improvements. The agency did not clearly demonstrate the need and the impact on housing stability.
Project Goals & Outcomes: The outcomes were generic and did not clearly demonstrate how it affects housing stability.
Agency Capacity: The agency has clearly demonstrated their ability to complete these projects. The staff have been with the agency for a long time and have a lot of experience with completing these projects.
Cooperation & Collaboration: The agency clearly identified the agencies and organizations they have partnered with. The project is listed as a top priority in general plan and housing plan. There was concern that the answer to question 23 did not show relevance to the project. Staff clarified that it's more difficult to answer this question with brick and mortar applications than it would be for service related applications.
Budget: The amount requested is high for the amount of ramps being completed.
Leveraging: Agency has planned for leveraging, and a backup to look for funding from other sources if project is not funded. There is not a healthy ratio of committed and non-committed funds.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
<p>Midvale City Corporation Midvale City 20/21 ADA Improvement Clarifying Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify who will benefit from the ramps – is the amount listed for the 45 ramps listed or for the total 395 ramps needed. 	Amanda Cordova	02/25/2020 11:30 AM

Agenda topic *Assignments for Next Meeting* | Presenter *Susan Gregory*

Scoring section assignments will remain the same:

Impact/Need – Leslie & Shelly

Project Goals & Outcomes – Allen & Kumar

Agency Capacity – Ryan & Susan

Cooperation & Collaboration – Michael & Becky

Budget – Tyler & Todd

Leveraging – Jamie & Camille

Staff Assignments:

Staff will send a list of eligible activities for facility improvements, as a reference to distinguish eligible activities for infrastructure projects.

Agenda topic *Other Business* | Presenter *Susan Gregory*

There was no other business.

Action Items

Motion by Leslie Jones to adjourn the meeting. Allen Litster seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 1:54 pm.