

**SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT**  
**BUDGET AMENDMENT #5 – FISCAL YEAR 2005-06**

**DATE:** June 2, 2006  
**SUBJECT:** Budget Amendment #5  
**STAFF REPORT BY:** Gary Mumford  
**CC:** Rocky Fluhart, Sam Guevara, Steve Fawcett, Gordon Hoskins,  
Luann Clark, Chief Querry, Chief Burbank, LeRoy Hooton,  
Louis Zunguze, Rick Graham, Shannon Ashby, Sherrie Collins,  
Susi Kontgis, Kay Christensen

---

A public hearing for budget amendment #5 is scheduled for June 6, 2006.

**WORK SESSION SUMMARY AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

The Council held a briefing on the proposed budget amendment on May 16, 2006. The discussion focused primarily on the following items:

**A-4: Contribution to Local First (\$20,000 from fund balance)** – Local First Utah is requesting a \$20,000 donation from the City for its campaign to emphasize the benefits of buying from locally based businesses. Local First has applied for 501c3 status and has asked for this interim funding. David Nimkin, vice chair of Local First Utah, explained that several banks are waiting for Local First's 501c3 status before contributing. Mr. Nimkin said that the banks' regulators prefer that donations go directly to Local First. Several major events and promotional activities are scheduled for Salt Lake City. The Council discussed whether this item should remain in the amendment or be moved to the regular annual budget. A majority concluded to keep it with the budget amendment.

**A-6: Street Lighting Extraordinary Maintenance (\$40,000 from fund balance)** – The City contracted for street lighting maintenance on April 1, 2006 rather than continuing to use Utah Power's maintenance services. Additional work is ready as soon as the money is available. Discussion was held on whether this item should remain in the amendment or be moved to the regular budget. The majority of the Council was in favor of leaving the issue in the budget amendment.

**A-8: Bonding – The Leonardo at Library Square (\$10,200,000 from bond proceeds)** – The proposed budget amendment establishes a budget to receive bond proceeds and use the proceeds for retrofitting the old main library building. In November 2003, Salt Lake City voters passed a \$10.2 million general obligation bond (Proposition 2) to help transform the old main library into The Leonardo. The Council's resolution (September 2003), which provided for the holding of a bond election, specified that the bonds "shall only be issued if money or pledges satisfactory to the City have been received for the facilities described in City Proposition Number 2 in aggregate amount at least equal to the principal amount of such bonds to be issued." The City's finance director certified sufficient donations and pledges to issue the bonds. In April, the Council took the first step to issue the bond by adopting the bond parameters resolution.

According to Mary Tull, Leonardo's Development Director, the Leonardo has applied for grants and is seeking contributions for naming rights of the north annex. She said that if neither a major naming rights contribution nor the City's contribution is assured by the end of June, the Board will move forward to the design phase with an alternative seismic solution.

Councilmember Buhler asked Council staff to follow-up on how the funding match would impact the issuance of the bonds. Since some of the pledges are restricted for exhibits and programming, the pledges are scheduled to be received over the next two or three years. Those donations or pledges that are not specified for a specific exhibit or programming purpose can be used to offset the increased construction costs that have been identified since the bond election nearly three years ago. The Leonardo believes that there are sufficient cash donations for cover the increased construction costs.

Mary Tull said that if a particular donor had a catastrophic event and were unable to fulfill a pledge, other donations would replace those funds. She said that the Leonardo has had a 92% pledge collection rate so far. Once more detail is available regarding the exhibits, the Leonardo will begin corporate sponsorship including corporate naming of the exhibits. The resolution and election documents don't specify what is to happen if the pledges don't materialize into cash. Although the Council could opt to do otherwise, the Council's resolution and other documents allow the Council to issue the bonds now that the match has been certified.

**A-9: Bonding – Open Space (\$5,400,000 from bond proceeds)** – The Administration requested this budget to recognize receipt of bond funds and appropriate these funds for expenditures. Rick Graham clarified that Council approval is required before each specific transaction. The Administration and Advisory Board will make recommendations and the Council will make the final decision of when and how much money will be spent. Councilmember Saxton asked whether \$400,000 of the \$5,400,000 was for bond issuing costs. Subsequent to the briefing, the City Treasurer explained that \$100,000 is for issuing costs and \$5,300,000 is for “acquiring and preserving open space, park and recreational lands and amenities.”

**D-2: Interest earned on Tracy Aviary/Hogle Zoo Bond Interest Earnings (\$207,199 from bond interest revenue)** – The Council asked what specifically the interest revenue can be used for and whether the original bond funds were restricted for specific projects. The language in the propositions put forth before the voters was general enough to allow for any capital improvements for the Zoo and Aviary. According to the bond documents and election language, the bond proceeds for the Hogle Zoo are to be used for “acquiring, improving and renovating facilities for Hogle Zoo.” The bond proceeds for Tracy Aviary are to be used for “improving and renovating Tracy Aviary.” Therefore, remaining construction funds and interest earnings can be used for improvements to any exhibit or part of the Zoo or Aviary.

The Council also asked whether interest earned can be used as a portion of debt service. The City Treasurer spoke with Richard Scott, bond counsel, about the use of interest earnings relative to bond proceeds in construction funds. Mr. Scott said that under state law, interest earnings can be used to pay interest on outstanding bonds during the period of construction and for 12 months beyond the end of the construction period. So the Council does have the option of either reinvesting interest earnings from construction proceeds into the projects or transferring those earnings to the debt service fund to reduce the amount that the City will request from the County to come from property tax payers.

*Additional Items that the Council May Wish to Consider:*

**G-1: Downtown Construction Mitigation/Ombudsman (\$30,000 from fund balance) –**

The proposed annual budget for fiscal year 2006-07 includes the services of a downtown renovation coordinator whose fee will be split evenly with the Salt Lake Chamber. The Council expressed unofficial support for this at a recent briefing. Approving this in the budget amendment will make the funds available right away.

**G-2: Real Estate Professionals for Economic Growth (RE-PEG) – (\$10,000 from fund balance) –**

A group of real estate professionals engaged in Utah commercial brokerage, development and related real estate activities is working in conjunction with persons in governmental or quasi-governmental functions to attract favorable industries to Utah. This group has requested funding to expand its organized economic development effort. Attached is a position paper that was prepared for Governor Huntsman and a copy of a letter to the City requesting this funding.

***POTENTIAL MOTIONS:***

The Council has several options relating to the proposed budget amendment. If the Council desires to adopt the budget as proposed, the following motion would be appropriate.

1. *["I move that the Council"]* **Adopt an ordinance amending the fiscal year 2005-06 budget as proposed by the Administration.**
2. *["I further move that the Council"]* **Include funding of \$30,000 for a downtown construction mitigation contract coordinator with the Salt Lake Chamber contributing a matching amount.**
3. *["I further move that the Council"]* **Include funding of \$10,000 for the RE-PEG group, subject to a public benefit hearing.**

---

*The information on the following pages was provided previously. It is provided again for your reference.*

---

**The Administration classified the following as:**

**New Items:**

***A-1: CIP cost overrun – Redwood Road Sidewalk Project – east side of Redwood Road between California Ave and Indiana Avenue (\$66,000 CIP Fund) source: \$16,500 CIP cost over-run account; \$49,500 UDOT***

Under a grant from the Utah Department of Transportation, sidewalk is being installed on the east side of Redwood Road from California Avenue to Indiana Avenue. The City's match is 25% of the cost. Costs have increased by \$66,000 due to additional curb and gutter to facilitate drainage, additional drive approaches, increase in asphalt thickness for pavement tie-ins, and escalation of construction costs. The City's match of \$16,500 is proposed to come from the CIP cost over run account. This will leave \$513,234 in the overrun account including funds that will be recaptured and reallocated in this budget amendment.

***A-2: CIP cost overrun – 700 South Jordan River Bridge Project (\$400,000 – CIP Fund) source: surplus in 900 South, Main St. to 900 West project***

The bids for the 700 South Jordan River Bridge Replacement project are over the original project estimates. The Administration has decided to re-bid the project in September with some minor changes in design and schedule requirements in an effort to receive better bids. The Administration is requesting that \$400,000 of Class C funds that were originally allocated to the 900 South, Main Street to 900 West project be transferred to this bridge project. The section of the 900 South project is substantially complete with minimal change orders and material quantity overruns.

***A-3: Grant – Water Efficiency Benchmarking (\$530,000 – Grant Fund)***

The Department of Public Utilities received a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for a water efficiency study to benchmark efficient water usage for single family homes. An independent consultant will collect data from ten large water utilities across the U.S. in an effort to demonstrate how the use of advanced technologies can reduce water use. Salt Lake City is the lead agency for the grant. In addition to the \$350,000 grant, each of the other nine water departments will contribute \$20,000 for the study for a total of \$530,000 for the study.

***A-4: Contribution to Local First (\$20,000 – General Fund) source: Fund Balance***

The Local First campaign emphasizes the benefits of buying from locally based businesses by educating consumers and businesses on the importance of purchasing locally. The Local First directory has over 500 participating Utah businesses. Website, brochure, window decals and media campaign have been produced. A loyalty buying card is planned to provide benefits to consumers who buy locally. Local First Utah has requested a \$20,000 donation from the City to continue the efforts. The Administration has prepared a benefit analysis study identifying some of the benefits received. A public hearing is also required under Utah Code 10-8-2. The Council may wish to consider this in context with the Mayor's annual budget, so that it can be considered with other uses of one-time funding.

**A-5: Street Lighting Electrical Power (\$182,204 – General Fund) source: \$150,000 from fund balance; \$32,204 from surplus SID funds**

The Administration is requesting an additional appropriation to fund increases to electricity for street lights. The costs for replacement of bulbs and other basic maintenance have also increased. The Administration is requesting an appropriation from fund balance of \$150,000 as well as \$32,204 that has accumulated within the special improvement districts. Another request for \$150,000 is included in the proposed annual budget for next year.

**A-6: Street Lighting Extraordinary Maintenance (\$40,000 – General Fund) source: fund balance**

Some extraordinary maintenance is required to keep lighting systems operational such as fixing damaged wiring and replacing downed street lighting poles. Costs have increased due to the raising cost of steel, overall system aging, more use of underground power service, and an increase in knockdowns. The Administration is requesting an appropriation of \$40,000 from fund balance. A request of \$28,659 for extraordinary maintenance is also included in the proposed annual budget. A contract is ready and waiting for this \$40,000 appropriation.

**A-7: CIP cost overrun – Strongs Court/Fenway Avenue SID (\$74,000 – CIP Fund) source: \$32,000 CIP fund balance; \$42,000 SID assessments**

The Engineering Division received only one bid for the Strongs Court/Fenway Avenue special improvement district. Due to increasing costs, re-bidding the project at a later date may not result in lower prices according to the Engineering Division. The additional costs for the Strongs Court project will be \$15,000 for the City and \$15,000 for property owners plus \$10,000 for the property owners for the lighting. The additional costs for the Fenway Avenue project will be \$17,000 for the City and \$17,000 for the property owners. The property owners have been informed and, accordingly, have agreed to the increased assessments including the lighting. The Administration proposes that the City's share come from CIP fund balance.

**A-8: Bonding – The Leonardo at Library Square (\$10,200,000 – CIP Fund) source: bond proceeds**

In November 2003, the voters approved bonding for the remodel of the old library building for an art, cultural and science center. The issuance of the bonds is contingent on the Leonardo Foundation raising matching funds of at least \$10,200,000. The Council may wish to confirm with the Administration that the required matching funds have been raised and that these funds have been certified. The Council may wish to clarify at what point the contributions that are in the form of certified pledges will be converted to funds directly available for the project, and whether bond funds and contributions will all be available at the same time for use of the project.

**A-9: Bonding – Open Space (\$5,400,000 – CIP Fund) source: bond proceeds**

In November 2003, the voters approved issuing bonds for acquiring and preserving open space, parks and recreation lands. The Administration is proposing issuing these bonds at the same time as the bonds for the remodel/retrofit of the old library building.

**The Administration classified the following as:  
Grants Requiring Existing Staff Resources**

***B-1: Grant – High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (\$145,800 – Grants Fund)***

The Police Department received a continuing grant from the Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Police for the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA). HIDTA is a multi-agency enforcement program that targets illegal distribution of drugs. This grant will allow the Police Department to continue to fund three officers assigned to Metro Narcotics for drug enforcement one of which is stationed at the Airport working with a drug detection dog. The grant pays for most but not all of the officers' costs. The remaining funds are budgeted within the Police Department's general fund budget.

***B-2: Grant – Emergency Management Performance (EMGP) (\$24,000 – Grant Fund)***

The Department of Management Services received a continuation grant from the Utah Division of Emergency Services and Homeland Security. The grant pays a portion of the salary of the City's emergency manager.

***B-3: Grant – Project Safe Neighborhood (\$20,000 – Grant Fund)***

The City received a continuation grant from the State of Utah as part of a pass through grant from West Valley City for deterring gun violence in the Weed and Seed area of the City. The grant will continue to fund a part-time employee in the Prosecutor's Office to help the Prosecutor's Office identify and file appropriate cases involving domestic violence, gangs and juveniles with firearms in the City's Weed and Seed targeted area.

**The Administration classified the following as:**

**Housekeeping**

***D-1: Workers Compensation and Unemployment Compensation (\$257,000 – Insurance & Risk Management Fund)***

The City is self insured for workers compensation and unemployment compensation claims. The City's Insurance & Risk Management Fund pays the claims to third party administrators and collects the actual claim amounts from the departments where the employees work or used to work. By year end, workers compensation claims are expected to be \$240,000 greater than the budget in the Insurance & Risk Management Fund and unemployment compensation claims are expected to be \$17,000 greater than the budget. The Administration is not requesting more funding to pay for the increased costs. This budget amendment will adjust the budgets in the Insurance & Risk Management Fund to reflect actual cash that goes in and out of this fund. The Administration classified this request as "housekeeping" because this represents money that during the year just moved from the departments to the Insurance & Risk Management Fund. Apparently there was sufficient funding in the departments' budgets to cover the increased costs.

***D-2: Tracy Aviary/Hogle Zoo Bond Interest Earnings (\$207,199 – CIP Fund)***

The proceeds from bonds that were sold in April 2004 were placed with a trustee who reimburses the City for construction costs. As of today, there is \$1,681,000 remaining in the Zoo construction account and \$28,000 remaining in the Aviary construction account. Interest on these funds is eligible to fund construction of the respective projects. During the past year, interest of \$195,135 for the Zoo and \$12,064 for the Aviary has been earned. This amendment is to appropriate the interest earned to be added to the funds available for construction at the Zoo and Aviary.

**D-3: Housing Loan Fund – accounting change (\$6,607,793 – Special Revenue Fund)**

Formerly some housing loan activity was accounted for in the Grants Operating Fund. Now all housing activity is accounted for in the Housing Loans Fund (a special revenue fund). The Administration is requesting this budget amendment to transfer remaining housing loan assets (loans receivable and inventory of houses held for resale) to the Housing Loans Fund.

**D-4: Recapture CIP Funds (\$75,441 – CIP Fund)**

The Administration is requesting that excess cash in the Quiet Zone CIP project of \$63,391 be transferred to the CIP cost over-run account. A budget of \$12,050 remains in the Guardsman Way project (but no cash). The Administration is requesting the this project be closed.

**D-5: Urban Search and Rescue Disaster Response Reimbursement (\$364,425 – Fire Department)**

The Fire Department sent its urban search and rescue team to help with disaster relief for Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita. The City continues to pay the team members while deployed including overtime for the extended hours worked. FEMA reimburses the City for all the costs associated with this deployment. The Department is requesting that the FEMA reimbursement be appropriated to its budget to cover its costs.

**D-6: Computer Rental Program (\$41,430 – Information Management Services Fund)  
source: IMS rental revenue**

The Information Management Services (IMS) Fund has provided a computer rental program to City departments since 2000. This program has been successful in bringing about standardization of operating systems and equipment, which has helped IMS to control costs. IMS estimated that 304 units would be handled in fiscal year 2005-06 but actually placed 346 units. Rental revenue was \$43,430 more than originally estimated. The Administration is requesting that the budget for IMS be increased by this amount to allow for the increased cost of providing the computers. This is not a request for new funding, but a request to allow excess lease money already paid by the departments to be spent by IMS for the computer rental program.

**D-7: Police overtime reimbursement (\$32,500 – Police Department)**

The Police Department provides police officers to some taskforces and events on a reimbursement basis. The officers are paid overtime for the extra time to which the taskforce or events reimburses the Police Department. The Department is requesting that the reimbursements be appropriated where actuals exceeded original estimated budgets.

**D-8: Grant – Protective/Restraining Order Management Information System (\$36,000 – Information Management Services Fund)**

In 2003, the Police Department received \$500,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice for the purpose of encouraging enforcement of protection orders. A portion of the grant was made available to the City's Information Management Services (IMS) Fund to develop a web service that linked Salt Lake City's protective orders to the State of Utah's data systems and other non-profit agencies for the purpose of tracking protection orders and violations of protection orders. The first grant extension was from September 2005 to December 2005. A second extension from January 2006 to July 2006 reallocated \$58,000 to IMS to extend the capacities of the domestic violence case filing system. The goal is to have fewer instances of where cases are delayed due to the defense not having the

discoverable documents. This will also reduce the time required for the prosecutor to create the discoverable document packet. The Administration requests that the \$36,000 allocation be appropriated to the IMS Fund.

***D-9: Accounting Change for CDBG CIP projects (\$761,219 – CIP and Special Revenue Funds)***

Construction projects of nonprofit groups are accounted for in the CDBG operating fund rather than in the Capital Projects Fund. In budget amendment #4 (March 2006), the Administration requested that CDBG construction projects for non-profit organizations also be accounting for in the CIP fund. It has since been determined that this created an accounting problem for tracking and reporting project costs to HUD. The Administration is now requesting that the March amendment for this item be reversed.

**The Administration classified the following as:  
Grants Requiring No New Staff Resources**

***E-1: Grant – Utah, Division of State History to prepare a National Register nomination of the Yalecrest neighborhood (\$10,000 – Grant Fund)***

The Planning Division received this grant to complete an intensive-level survey of 10 properties in the Yalecrest neighborhood to assist in preparing a national register nomination of the Yalecrest neighborhood. Funding will be used to hire a professional consultant. The 100% match will be met with the in-kind salary of the Division's historic planner position.

***E-2: Grant – FEMA to replace obsolete personal protective equipment for firefighters (\$108,719 – Grant Fund)***

Each year the Fire Department receives an Assistance to Firefighters Grant from FEMA. The funds were awarded to replace old personal protective equipment for firefighters. The grant requires a 20% match of \$27,180, which is budgeted within the Fire Department's budget.

**The Administration classified the following as:  
Donations**

***F-1: Library Paver replacement project (\$173,200 – Donation Fund)***

Funds of \$1,173,200 have been received for replacing the Library's pavers. The Council previously adopted a \$1,000,000 budget. The Administration is requesting that the additional \$173,200 be budgeted in the donation fund for this project.

***F-2 Contribuiton – Underage Drinking Prevention Campaign (\$1,000 – Donation Fund)***

CRP Inc., a management consulting firm located in Washington DC, contributed \$1,000 to the Mayor's Coalition on Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs to host town hall and school meetings on prevention of underage drinking. The drug free coordinator is working with the Mayor's Coalition to determine dates and times of town hall meetings and school presentations.



**RE-PEG OFFICERS**

President  
**Bill Martin**  
 Commerce CRG

Vice-President  
**Randy Abood**  
 The Ninigret Group

Treasurer  
**Greg Pavich**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

Secretary  
**John Gurr**  
 InterNet Properties

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**Randy Abood**  
 The Ninigret Group

**Randy Alkin**  
 CBRE

**Wesley T. Comelison**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Nancy Edwards**  
 Commerce CRG

**Craig Kaminski**  
 CBRE

**Chris Kirk**  
 Commerce CRG

**Bill Martin**  
 Commerce CRG

**Jim Sheldon**  
 NAI Utah

**MEMBERS**

**Melissa Adamson**  
 CBRE

**Jim Berry**  
 Ninigret Realty

**Richard Dye**  
 CBRE

**Mike Farmer**  
 Commerce CRG

**Brandon Fugal**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Peggy Garcia**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Jeff Gochnour**  
 The Boyer Company

**Gloria Gustin**  
 Ninigret Realty

**Richard Nordlund**  
 Commerce CRG

**PROJECT SUPPORTERS**

**Doug Clark**  
 Governor's Office of  
 Economic Development

**Dale Carpenter**  
 Salt Lake County  
 Department of Economic  
 Development

**Jeff Edwards**  
 Economic Development  
 Corporation of Utah

**L. Robert Fox, PhD**  
 Real Estate Division  
 Church of Jesus Christ of  
 Latter-Day Saints



Real Estate Professionals  
 for Economic Growth

May 19, 2006

To: Mr. David Buhler, Chairman, and  
 members of the Salt Lake City Council

From: Mr. William K. Martin, President  
 Mr. Randolph G. Abood, Vice President

We appreciate the opportunity to introduce RE-PEG (Real Estate Professionals for Economic Growth), an organization formed for the purpose of supporting Governor Huntsman's economic initiatives. RE-PEG has grown during this past year to represent not only the major commercial real estate brokerages but also Salt Lake County, the LDS Church, EDCU and of course the State of Utah.

The first year 2005 met with considerable success with a survey undertaken to assess why companies have and have not considered Utah as a location for its business and related topics. The most important initiative for 2006 is to update the Survey that was conducted by Todd Wolfenbarger, Partner, The Summit Group Communication. The EDCU's charter does not include providing surveys of this type, but they do provide names of companies to be contacted by The Summit Group. RE-PEG is currently setting forth its primary goals and initiatives for 2006.

The attachments provide a broader view of RE-PEG's purpose, financial standing and related information.

We are in the process of going back to our members for additional funding. We invite Salt Lake City to become a 2006 member. The city's proportionate share this year would be \$10,000. Your participation and support is important and we look forward to welcoming Salt Lake City to RE-PEG.

TODD WOLFENBARGER PARTNER/EVP • P 801.595.1155 | F 801.606.7485 | M 801.244.9600 WWW.SUMMITGROUPSLC.COM

**RE-PEG OFFICERS**

President  
**Bill Martin**  
 Commerce CRG

Vice-President  
**Randy Abood**  
 The Ninigret Group

Treasurer  
**Greg Pavich**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

Secretary  
**John Gurr**  
 InterNet Properties

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**Randy Abood**  
 The Ninigret Group

**Randy Atkin**  
 CBRE

**Wesley T. Cornelson**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Nancy Edwards**  
 Commerce CRG

**Craig Kaminski**  
 CBRE

**Chris Kirk**  
 Commerce CRG

**Bill Martin**  
 Commerce CRG

**Jim Sheldon**  
 NAI Utah

**MEMBERS**

**Melissa Adamson**  
 CBRE

**Jim Berry**  
 Ninigret Realty

**Richard Dye**  
 CBRE

**Mike Farmer**  
 Commerce CRG

**Brandon Fugal**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Peggy Garcia**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Jeff Gochnour**  
 The Boyer Company

**Gloria Gustin**  
 Ninigret Realty

**Richard Nordlund**  
 Commerce CRG

**PROJECT SUPPORTERS**

**Doug Clark**  
 Governor's Office of  
 Economic Development

**Dale Carpenter**  
 Salt Lake County  
 Department of Economic  
 Development

**Jeff Edwards**  
 Economic Development  
 Corporation of Utah

**L. Robert Fox, PhD**  
 Real Estate Division  
 Church of Jesus Christ of  
 Latter-Day Saints



Real Estate Professionals  
 for Economic Growth

## 2006 Budget/Contribution Levels

### Contributions: Re Peg Members

Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED)	\$10,000
Salt Lake County	10,000
Salt Lake City	10,000
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints	10,000
EDCUtah	5,000
Coldwell Banker Commercial	3,000
Commerce CRG	3,000
CB Richard Ellis	3,000
NAI UTAH	3,000
InterNet Properties, Inc.	3,000
Ninigret Group	<u>3,000</u>
	<b>\$63,000</b>



May 18, 2006

Alison McFarlane/Salt Lake City Council  
c/o Gloria Gustin  
Ninigret Properties  
4850 West 2100 South, #150  
Salt Lake City, UT 84120

Ms. McFarlane,

Thank you for your continued efforts and financial support. See the below accomplishments since inception.

- Founded a trade association (no small task) that effectively reflects 95 percent of all commercial real estate transactions in the state of Utah.
- Received more than 300 hours (very conservative estimate) of volunteer time from Utah's top commercial real estate professionals toward advancing the economic development prospects for the State of Utah.
- Have presented Re Peg perspective and point of view to a number of key economic development entities within Utah including:
  - Utah Governor Jon Huntsman, Jr.
  - Governor's Office of Economic Development
  - EDCUtah Staff
  - EDCUtah Board of Directors
  - Salt Lake Chamber Board of Governors
  - University of Utah
  - Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
  - Salt Lake County Department of Economic Development
  - Regional Conference of Economic Developers
- Completed and published study of why businesses choose or do not choose Utah. Participants included more than 25 business and site selectors representing more than 100 different transactions/decisions made in the past two years.
- Discussed the study and received media coverage with the following:
  - Deseret Morning News
  - Salt Lake Tribune
  - The Enterprise
  - Utah Business Magazine
  - NPR Radio
  - KSL Radio, Doug Wright Show

**RE-PEG OFFICERS**

President  
**Bill Martin**  
 Commerce CRG

Vice-President  
**Randy Abood**  
 The Ninigret Group

Treasurer  
**Greg Pavich**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

Secretary  
**John Gurr**  
 InterNet Properties

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**Randy Abood**  
 The Ninigret Group

**Randy Atkin**  
 CBRE

**Wesley T. Cornellson**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Nancy Edwards**  
 Commerce CRG

**Craig Kaminski**  
 CBRE

**Chris Kirk**  
 Commerce CRG

**Bill Martin**  
 Commerce CRG

**Jim Sheldon**  
 NAI Utah

**MEMBERS**

**Melissa Adamson**  
 CBRE

**Jim Berry**  
 Ninigret Realty

**Richard Dye**  
 CBRE

**Mike Farmer**  
 Commerce CRG

**Brandon Fugal**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Peggy Garcia**  
 Coldwell Banker  
 Commercial

**Jeff Gochnour**  
 The Boyer Company

**Gloria Gustin**  
 Ninigret Realty

**Richard Nordlund**  
 Commerce CRG

**PROJECT SUPPORTERS**

**Doug Clark**  
 Governor's Office of  
 Economic Development

**Dale Carpenter**  
 Salt Lake County  
 Department of Economic  
 Development

**Jeff Edwards**  
 Economic Development  
 Corporation of Utah

**L. Robert Fox, PhD**  
 Real Estate Division  
 Church of Jesus Christ of  
 Latter-Day Saints



Real Estate Professionals  
 for Economic Growth

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** All Members

**FROM:** Bill Martin/Randy Abood

**DATE:** May 18, 2006

**SUBJECT:** Status Report

**Re Peg Meetings – Completed**

February 24, 2005 Re Peg proposal delivered to Chris Roybal for Governor Huntsman's review

March 21, 2005 Bill Martin and Randy Abood met with Chris Roybal from the Governor's Office and Martin Frey from the Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED)

March 29, 2005 Martin Frey and Doug Clark of GOED met with the Re Peg group

April 12, 2005 Salt Lake County Mayor, Peter Corroon and County Economic Development Director, Dale Carpenter met with the Re Peg group

April 28, 2005 EDCUtah President, Jeff Edwards and Stephanie Frohman have been invited to meet with the Re Peg group

May 1, 2005 Re Peg Request for Proposal (RFP) completed

May 17, 2005 Open – call for money  
 Start selection process for survey

June 14, 2005 Interview process completed, firms responding
 

- The Summit Group
- Harris Interactive (Wirthlin Group)
- Bonneville Research
- Dan Jones and Associates

June 14, 2005	Selected the finalist and discussed fund raising issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selected survey firm "The Summit Group"</li> </ul>
July 19, 2005	Developed agenda/talking points for Governor Huntsman
August 9, 2005	Received update from Governor Huntsman's meeting
September 29, 2005	The Summit Group presented a PowerPoint presentation to EDCUtah and Governor Huntsman
October 27, 2005	Todd presented the communications plan and the complete survey summary
November 8, 2005	Discussed recruiting efforts by state, what area to focus on Discussed "what if ideas"
January 25, 2006	Revised 2005 accomplishments and developed 2006 goals
February 2, 2006	Requested new proposal from The Summit Group, received update on site selection event hosted by EDCUtah in Deer Valley
March 1, 2006	Welcomed Bob Lox from the LDS Church to our group Todd presented a revised format for goals and initiatives
March 28, 2006	Developed initial catalyst idea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception of Utah, Peggy and Greg</li> <li>General marketing for Utah, Bill and Todd</li> <li>Marketing campaign, Chris</li> <li>Economic clusters, Randy and Craig</li> <li>Tools, Randy and Bill</li> </ul>
April 25, 2006	Ongoing catalyst committees and team leaders to meet and develop the catalyst concept Received The Summit Group's proposal for the next survey
May 16, 2006	Refined catalyst ideas further Approved The Summit Groups proposal for 2006 survey
<b>June 20, 2006</b>	<b>NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING</b>

**PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR RE-PEG****PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

---

To: The RE-PEG Board of Directors, care of Bill Martin

**PROPOSED APPROACH**

---

Stage 1 / Discovery

Setting up the proper interview sample and framework to generate useful and actionable information

Stage 2 / Field Research

Conducting interviews and providing early stage adjustment mechanisms and results window.

Stage 3 / Reporting

Analysis and generation of report.

Step 4 / Extending the Value of the Report

Creating public opportunities and audience to present the report.

**DETAILED APPROACH**

---

**Stage 1 / Discovery**

Objective: Create the necessary foundational steps to ensure that qualitative interviews deliver relevant and actionable information.

- Create an interview pool broad enough to deliver necessary participation.
- Utilize EDCU Site Selector focus groups to create easier interview opportunities.
- Create a discussion guide that ensures proper information is gathered.
- Create an invitation for participation communications piece from GOED and Re-Peg to ensure sample size is met.
- Create a "check-in" evaluation mechanism that will allow modification/enhancement of the discussion guide following the first 20% of the interviews.

- Creation of detailed project plan and timeline.



## **Stage 2 / Field Research**

Objective: Conduct interviews that will deliver relevant and actionable information.

- 6-8 site selectors
- 8-12 businesses already in Utah who have expanded or are considering expansion
- 10-15 businesses who have chosen or not chosen Utah
- Transcribe all interviews.
- Create a competitive market media analysis (Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico) of economic development activities for the past six months.
- Create a mid-project report/presentations to assess what we are "hearing" (samples of Salt Lake County presentation attached)

## **Stage 3 / Reporting**

Objective: Create a detailed report and analysis for the benefit of those commissioning the research.

- Prepare a formal report with analysis on our findings for private and/or public use.
- Prepare a summary report for distribution.
- Prepare a RE-PEG PowerPoint presentation of the findings.

## **Stage 4 / Extending the Value of the Report**

Objective: Create opportunities for RE-PEG teams to extend the message of the report to broader economic development groups and key Utah influentials.

- Prepare a traveling PowerPoint support package.
- Identify presentation opportunities

## **TIMELINE**

---

- TSG proposes to begin immediately.
- TSG proposes to have initial field contacts with potential interviewees through mid-March.
- TSG proposes to complete all interviews by mid-May.
- TSG proposes to have a updated report by the end of June.

---

**POSITION PAPER  
OF THE  
REAL ESTATE PROFESSIONALS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH (“RE-PEG”)**

**PREPARED FOR**

**GOVERNOR JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.**

**IN CONNECTION WITH AN EXAMINATION OF THE  
GOVERNOR’S INITIATIVE TO INCREASE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**DATED**

**FEBRUARY 24, 2005**

---



## INTRODUCTION

On January 3, 2005, Governor Jon M. Huntsman, Jr. took the oath of office of the Governor of Utah, having campaigned primarily on the basis of increasing Utah's economic growth. Similarly, in an informal poll conducted by KSL radio, economic development topped the list of items that should be prioritized by the Governor. Our group, Real Estate Professionals for Economic Growth ("RE-PEG"), is a group of real estate professionals engaged in Utah commercial brokerage, development and related real estate activities, who support the Governor's economic initiatives by offering a series of thoughts and recommendations as set forth in this Position Paper.

By way of further background, the RE-PEG group is represented, among other bodies, by Utah's major commercial brokerage firms, many of whom have an alliance, or is part of, a much larger national and international commercial brokerage. Additionally, local members of the three most prestigious North American business trade groups of commercial real estate professionals are also represented: Certified Commercial-Industrial Members (CCIM), National Association of Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP) and Society of Industrial and Office Realtors<sup>®</sup> (SIOR). We not only are exposed to commercial real estate on a national level but are exposed on a day to day basis with those outsiders who are considering Utah for the conduct, or expansion, of its business. More importantly, we have made a huge investment in Utah for many reasons, the most salient being our love of Utah, the lifestyle it affords us and the many opportunities here for ourselves, our children and other family members. Utah is our precious gem, which we look to enhance, not destroy. We fully support the Governor in his efforts to strengthen Utah through economic growth.

## ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

We believe that the Governor should focus on six salient points for consideration as part of his initiative to increase economic growth in Utah:

1. A **survey** of companies that have considered locating in Utah should be undertaken to assess in a detailed and professional manner why companies have and have not considered Utah for its business situs.
2. A systematic series of **benchmarking** should be undertaken to compare truly what Utah has to offer, as compared to many other states.
3. A broad and objective assessment of **outsiders' perceptions** of Utah and its unique culture should be undertaken to identify specific strengths and weaknesses.
4. A very focused analysis of the **industries targeted** for growth should be made and then

used as the springboard for a vigorous marketing and promotional campaign.

5. Local and state-wide **incentive programs** that build on and involve each other are necessary in order to attract favorable industries that provide job growth and other important social functions.
6. As an integral part of the Utah marketing program, outsiders should be given the **opportunity to meet directly** with the various professionals in Utah, including those in the real estate industry, in addition to, and in conjunction with, persons in governmental or quasi-governmental functions.

## I. SURVEY

We believe that a closer look at the reasons why companies have and have not considered Utah for its business situs will give the Governor a much clearer perspective of how to attract and retain business in Utah. This research should also include a review of businesses currently considering a location, or companies that have been in an expansion mode over the past several years.

Since specific location criteria change at an enormously fast rate throughout the United States largely by company and industry sector, it is important to be cognizant of those trends when considering firms that may or may not have located in years past. For example, union enrichment and real estate costs were two of the top ten location criteria years ago; neither appears to be on the top ten now.

In addition, it would be extremely important to include site consultants within the survey participants. Site consultants are the eyes and ears of these companies, and they impact what the businesses believe about Utah and other states. Any company's image and decision to enter a market are driven by the information provided by the consultants. We would estimate that up to eighty percent (80%) of all significant locations in the inter-mountain west have involved, in whole or in part, a site location "expert".

## II. BENCHMARKING

Too often in the past, Utah has examined its neighboring states, particularly Nevada, Arizona, Colorado and Idaho, in determining how it fares with the competition. In RE-PEG's opinion, this is too small a universe to assess adequately how growth will come to Utah. It would be better to look at the universe, including important regional cities and regions such as Indianapolis, northern Virginia, Seattle and Columbus, to assess properly how Utah stacks up.

As part of this benchmarking, a close examination of why a company is headquartered in one region and not another is a very critical point for Utah. During the last recession, our euphemism for a company that was consolidating was that it was leaving Utah. In the future, consolidation should mean returning to Utah.

We believe that one of the common threads we will find with other successful communities is a mutual cooperation among the public sector, the private sectors and the educational bodies. One of the systemic problems that we believe exists in Salt Lake County is the number of Cities in the Valley all competing against each other for the same businesses. As noted in today's Wall Street Journal, for example, other areas of the country are merging into each other in order to obtain needed economies of scale, to cut bureaucratic costs and to market jointly. If growth is to succeed in Utah, collaboration must be the *sine qua non*.

There is another sense of benchmarking that needs to be put in place, which is a continuous monitoring of the accomplishments reached as part of this mission. For example, the Governor's staff should keep track of, and announce publicly, the number of companies that have moved to Utah, the number of company headquarters that have settled in Utah, the number of Industrial Assistance Funds (IAF) granted, the number of new conferences, conventions, junkets in Utah (by categories, such as technology transfer, venture capitalists, CFO's, accountants, etc.), etc. Each of these categories should have set goals for the year and should be measured each year against actual results.

### **III. CULTURE ASSESSMENT**

We believe that one of the major limiting factors of companies considering a move to Utah is the lack of understanding of our culture. This is not casting an aspersion; it simply reflects our experience in the real estate industry of companies' comments about what they might expect in a move to Utah. In so assessing the Utah culture and social mores, its many strengths need to be extolled and, where appropriate, changes of outdated and unnecessary laws need to be vigorously pursued. It gets back to perception: while liquor restrictions, for instance, may seem somewhat innocuous, they reinforce to those outside the community the perception of a state placing unreasonable restrictions upon businesses and its citizens and therefore an intolerance to disparate ideas or minority positions. Utah citizens need to be made aware of the benefits of business expansion as it relates to them: increased tax base for education and capital improvements, more quality jobs for their children, etc. RE-PEG believes that, if Utah is to successfully attract new business and an expanded economy, a big "welcome" sign must be posted on our citizens and community. We need an internal education and promotional program (e.g., "I love New York", "Virginia is for lovers").

We understand that approximately ten years ago the Economic Development Corporation of Utah (“EDCU”) questioned and surveyed 250 key corporate executives, as well as 500 major media contacts around the country, as part of a contract between EDCU and DCI. This was done in an effort to track image and to assess how that image transitioned over time. This type of assessment needs to be reinstated and conclusions prioritized for solution. This has been done in several other cities and states, in many cases as part of a branding initiative. In some small sense, Utah brands itself as the best skiing in the country, which is fine for winter tourism but may not be the brand necessary to attract business for long term economic growth.

#### **IV. TARGETED INDUSTRIES**

RE-PEG believes that, before embarking on a growth program, it is important to undertake a critical analysis of the industries to be targeted, both within and outside the State of Utah. For instance, the prior administration’s focus on technology may have been misplaced. Utah would not have been able to assemble a critical mass in the technology arena to compete successfully against other regions with the same mission. This type of research is being done throughout the United States, and while it has previously been done in Utah, it needs to be updated and kept up to date. In undertaking the analyses, which usually consists of a gap strategy, one should examine peripheral industries to the industry being considered. For example, a recruitment of a wood products business would naturally spill out into a fiber board business from their waste products. At the end of the day, most companies in Utah are here because they want to be here, not because they absolutely have to be here. We need to expand the number of companies who want to be here.

#### **V. INCENTIVES**

Philosophically, we adhere to the notion that long term corporate welfare is not a desired goal. At the same time, we believe that incentives for businesses to commit long term to a region have several mutual advantages to the public and private sectors. Incentives for property development or long term leases that have a positive affect on job creation or other valuable social impacts could include tax abatements or credits, job training assistance, loan packages, etc. Such incentives should be transparent and based on clearly defined, objective criteria and not *ad hoc*.

As a state, Utah should also give greater consideration to local option incentives. A key success example of this would be the local option sales tax initiatives for economic development in Texas. Over 200 communities have substantial funds that they can utilize in ways specific to their goals and needs.

It is important to recognize that, despite efforts to attract from outside, in most cases expansion emanates from growing local businesses. Therefore, for the local, smaller businesses,

lower hurdle rates should exist for efforts such as the Industrial Assistance Fund. Accounting should be relatively simple, and the availability of funding, and its terms, should be well publicized.

Initiatives with University business ventures should also be reviewed and expanded, and co-sponsorships of, or assistance in, University reunions of graduated professionals should be considered.

Finally, a look at a very bold step should be considered immediately, such as the elimination of the corporate income tax. This would be a clear statement that Utah is attracting business and wants to go toe to toe with states such as Nevada that is growing in leaps and bounds. While this requires a careful look at the cost to the State from the loss of the income tax, the benefits could be legion.

#### **VI. TARGETED FACE TO FACE PROGRAMS**

We believe that a concerted effort should be made to match up potential business persons considering Utah with various Utah professionals in the private sector. Through direct interaction and socializing, we believe that an outsider will get a much better feel as to what to expect after a move to Utah.

We strongly believe that an initiative to promote commerce in Utah, whether through the site selection process or otherwise, has little chance of succeeding without the input and efforts of the private sector. Similarly, and again a major challenge for this state, is that we have never fully cohesively integrated all related economic development programs. The most successful regions of the country, in terms of growth, be it Silicon Valley, the Princeton, New Jersey corridor, the northern Virginia corridor leading to the airport, or the Boston/Cambridge area, have all recognized the strength derived from a coalition of government, the private sector and educational institutions. The Enterprise Florida initiatives, where the State's research efforts (i.e., the Universities), job training efforts, business recruitment and business expansion efforts were all tied to the same goals, and were separately held accountable. We recommend similar initiatives for Utah.

As a beginning example, similar to what was organized by some during the Olympics, we envision an informal "Ambassador" program in which many individuals from the private sector are called from time to time to visit with other private sector individuals who are considering a move to Utah. These events should be formal and informal; if the individuals play golf or ski, the Ambassadors would take them to play golf or ski. If a spouse needs to know more about the education system, spouses in the know would meet with them. Business roundtables could also be created for a series of discussions on issues of concern. While the Ambassadors would be better served by entertaining the target business people in Utah, the alternative should also exist to meet the prospects in their respective home states.

Other ideas for promoting Utah can be organized in a cohesive manner. Seminar sponsorships of venture capital and related firms would be one example. Testimonials and other positive press from industry leaders, such as Warren Buffet in his capacity as owner of R.C. Willey, would be extremely helpful. A coordinated effort to attract a group of persons, such as Chief Financial Officers of a particular industry or set of industries, to attend two or three sessions with private and public representatives in Utah would, in our opinion, prove fruitful over a prolonged period of time. Finally, there should be a greater effort to coordinate the various state initiatives to foster growth.

## **VII. RECOMMENDATIONS**

We believe the Governor should undertake to do the following:

- 1. Undertake a survey to assess the reasons that industries have and have not come to Utah.**
- 2. Benchmark Utah against several other critical cities and states.**
- 3. Assess the cultural strengths and weaknesses of Utah.**
- 4. Target specific industries for both internal growth and for importation to Utah.**
- 5. Consider important and critical incentives.**
- 6. Undertake a series of face to face programs with various members of the Utah private sector as well as the public sector.**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with this Position Paper. We believe that we are representative of a broad number of real estate professionals who over the years have had many opportunities to work with businesses from the outside in choosing whether or not to locate in Utah. We are here because of our love for Utah, but in advocating your position of economic growth believe your program requires specific focus and execution. We cannot overemphasize, however, that we are not seeking unmitigated growth; rather we are for intelligent growth resulting in maintaining the high quality of life that we all enjoy and ensuring the same for our children and future generations.

Finally, we wish to reiterate our support for you, for your new Administration and for the initiatives that you have embarked upon. We believe it has the greatest chance of success and only wish to help you in its application. We are ready to serve you in any capacity we can. We look

forward to working with you to expand the base of private enterprise in an effort to share and support your vision.

Most importantly, we implore you to be bold. Raise the bar. Tread where others have failed. Don't be afraid to expose the components of the Emperor's wardrobe. While your mission to expand the Utah economy is prescient, it requires major initiatives to succeed. We are fully confident in your ability to succeed.

**COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL**

**TO:** Dave Buhler, Chair  
Salt Lake City Council

**FROM:** Rocky J. Fluhart, Chief Administrative Officer

**DATE:** April 25, 2006

**SUBJECT:** Budget Amendment No. 5

*Rocky*

**Recommendation:** We recommend that on May 16, 2006, the City Council set a date to hold a public hearing on June 6, 2006 to discuss Budget Amendment No. 5.

**Discussion and Background:** The attached amendment packet is transmitted to the City Council Office for the briefing on May 16, 2006.

**Legislative Action:** The attached ordinance to amend this budget has been approved by the City Attorney.

cc: Dan Mulé, City Treasurer  
Shannon Ashby



SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE  
No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 2006  
(Amending the Final Budget of Salt Lake City,  
including the employment staffing document,  
for Fiscal Year 2005-2006)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE NO. 26 OF  
2005 WHICH ADOPTED THE FINAL BUDGET OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, AND  
ORDINANCE NO. 48 OF 2005 WHICH RATIFIED AND RE-ADOPTED THE FINAL  
BUDGET THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 2005 AND ENDING JUNE 30,  
2006.

PREAMBLE

On June 21, 2005, the Salt Lake City Council adopted the final budget of Salt Lake City, Utah, including the employment staffing document, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2005 and ending June 30, 2006, in accordance with the requirements of Section 118, Chapter 6, Title 10 of the Utah Code Annotated, and said budget, including the employment staffing document, was approved by the Mayor of Salt Lake City, Utah. On August 23, 2005, the City Council ratified and re-adopted the final budget.

The City's Policy and Budget Director, acting as the City's Budget Officer, prepared and filed with the City Recorder proposed amendments to said duly adopted budget, including the amendments to the employment staffing document, copies of which are attached hereto, for consideration by the City Council and inspection by the public.

All conditions precedent to amend said budget, including the employment staffing document, have been accomplished.

Be it ordained by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

SECTION 1. Purpose. The purpose of this Ordinance is to amend the final budget of Salt Lake City, including the employment staffing document, as approved, ratified and finalized by Salt Lake City Ordinance No. 26 of 2005 and Ordinance No. 48 of 2005.

SECTION 2. Adoption of Amendments. The budget amendments, including amendments to the employment staffing document, attached hereto and made a part of this Ordinance shall be, and the same hereby are adopted and incorporated into the budget of Salt Lake City, Utah, including the employment staffing document, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2005 and ending June 30, 2006, in accordance with the requirements of Section 128, Chapter 6, Title 10, of the Utah Code Annotated.

SECTION 3. Certification to Utah State Auditor. The City's Policy and Budget Director, acting as the City's Budget Officer, is authorized and directed to certify and file a copy of said budget amendments, including amendments to the employment staffing document, with the Utah State Auditor.

SECTION 4. Filing of copies of the Budget Amendments. The said Budget Officer is authorized and directed to certify and file a copy of said budget amendments, including amendments to the employment staffing document, in the office of said Budget Officer and in the office of the City Recorder which amendments shall be available for public inspection.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect on its first publication.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHIEF DEPUTY CITY RECORDER

Transmitted to the Mayor on \_\_\_\_\_

Mayor's Action: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Vetoed

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHIEF DEPUTY CITY RECORDER

APPROVED AS TO FORM  
Salt Lake City Attorney's Office  
Date 4-25-06  
By [Signature]

(SEAL)

Bill No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 2006.  
Published: \_\_\_\_\_.

RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_ OF 2006  
(ACCEPTING THE STUDY PERFORMED  
IN COMPLIANCE WITH *UTAH CODE* SECTION 10-8-2  
AND AUTHORIZING A \$20,000.00 CONTRIBUTION  
TO LOCAL FIRST, A 501(C) (3) ORGANIZATION , WITH THE GOAL  
OF PROMOTING LOCAL BUYING

WHEREAS, the City Administration has recommended a contribution of \$20,000.00 from the City's Non-Departmental Budget to Local First, a 501(c) (3) organization, with the goal of promoting local buying; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has received and reviewed a Study regarding said proposed contribution prepared by the City's Department of Management Services in compliance with the requirements of *Utah Code* Section 10-8-2, and public notice has been given at least 14 days prior hereto in a newspaper of general circulation within the City; and

WHEREAS, the Council has reviewed the Study, and has fully considered the analysis and conclusions set forth therein, and all comments made during the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

1. The City Council hereby adopts the conclusions set forth in the Study, and hereby finds and determines that, for all the reasons set forth in the Study, the net value to be received by the City by making this grant will constitute adequate consideration, or equivalent value, both tangible and intangible, for the benefit being provided by the proposed contribution;

2. In the judgment of the City Council, this appropriation will provide for the safety, health, prosperity, moral well-being, peace, order, comfort, or convenience of the inhabitants of Salt Lake City;

3. That \$20,000.00 be and is hereby appropriated from the City's Non-Departmental Budget to Local First, a 501(c) (3) organization, with the goal of promoting local buying as described in the aforementioned Study.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2006.

SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL

By \_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHIEF DEPUTY CITY RECORDER

APPROVED AS TO FORM  
Salt Lake City Attorney's Office  
Date 4/21/2006  
By T. S. Spaulding

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Steve Fawcett

FROM: Kay Christensen

DATE: April 20, 2006

SUBJECT: Non-Departmental Budget –Contribution to Local First:  
Study to Comply with Utah Code Annotated Section 10-8-2

---

It is recommended that Salt Lake City contribute \$20,000 to Local First, a 501(c) (3) organization with the goal of promoting local buying.

To ensure that a contribution by the City to Local First would be in compliance with UCA 10-8-2, the following study has been performed. UCA 10-8-2 states the purposes for which a municipal body may appropriate funds and the factors that must be considered in determining the propriety of such an appropriation. This study will consider the following factors:

- (1) The specific benefits to be received by the City;
- (2) The City's purpose in making the appropriation, including an analysis of how the safety, health, prosperity, moral well-being, peace, order, comfort or convenience of the residents of Salt Lake City will be enhanced; and
- (3) Whether the appropriation is "necessary and appropriate" to accomplish the City's goals.

*Benefits and Costs to Salt Lake City:* Last year Salt Lake City Corporation contributed \$20,000 to the Vest Pocket Business Coalition as seed money to organize the Local First 501(c)(3) organization. Those funds were used to research and prepare a long-term strategy for the organization, to prepare public education and promotional literature and materials, and to build a state-wide local business registration base. The organization also

implemented Local First Utah week and promoted it with press conferences, TV coverage, and radio interviews.

Local First is now a separate 501(c)(3) organization with a governing board and campaign committee. The budget for the year has been set at \$60,000. This budget will allow Local First to hire an executive director with duties shared between Local First (campaign, promotions and resource development) and the Vest Pocket Business Coalition (primarily networking, advocacy and member benefits). The organization would also like to hire a community organizer with a special grant to increase Local First business registrations and establish a series of Local First networks throughout the state.

In July, Local First is planning what they intend to be an annual "Independents" Week. They also plan to implement a "loyalty buying card" that will provide benefits to consumers who buy locally and will build brand awareness of Local First Utah.

*Meeting Salt Lake City's Purposes and Enhancing the Quality of Life for Residents:* Salt Lake City Corporation has adopted a performance measurement tool called the Balanced Scorecard to assist the City in articulating strategic goals, measures and targets for all departments and divisions within the City. The Balanced Scorecard is divided into eight focus areas, including Community Building/Diversity, and Revitalization of Downtown/Neighborhoods and Economic Development. The accompanying goals include strengthening neighborhoods by investing in quality of life initiatives, revitalizing downtown by improving the City's economic base, and increasing the number of people living and working in the City, downtown and otherwise. Support of local business will likely increase the number of neighborhood businesses, improve the City's economic base and increase the number of people who desire to live and work in the City.

Therefore, at least three of the City's eight identified focus areas would be positively impacted by the work of Local First.

*Accomplishing Salt Lake City's Goals:* The proposed contribution is necessary and appropriate to accomplish Salt Lake City's goals. Benefits from the \$20,000 contribution to Local First will be realized as small local

businesses thrive and revitalize neighborhoods, and improve the City's economic base.

***FY 2006 Initiatives in Budget Amendment #5 – June***

Initiative Name	Initiative Amount	FY 2006		FY 2006
		Gen. Fund Impact	FTE	Gen. Fund Fund Balance Impact
<b>Section A</b>		<b>New Items</b>		
1. CIP - Redwood Road Sidewalk - Calif. Ave	\$66,000.00			
2. CIP - 700 S Jordan River Bridge Replacement	\$400,000.00			
3. EPA Water Efficiency Benchmarking	\$530,000.00			
4. Local First Campaign	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00		\$20,000.00
5. Street Light Operation and Maintenance	\$182,203.79	\$150,000.00		\$150,000.00
6. Street Light Extraordinary Maintenance	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00		\$40,000.00
7. Strong/Fenway SID Construction	\$42,000.00 \$32,000.00			
8. Leonardo At Library Square Bonding	\$10,200,000.00			
9. Open Space, Parks and Recreational Lands Bonding	\$5,400,000.00			
<b>Section B</b>		<b>Grants For Existing Staff Resources</b>		
1. Police Dept Metro Narcotics/Drug Enforcement Grant	\$145,800.00			
2. State of Utah Emergency Management Grant	\$24,000.00			
3. WVC Pass Through Project Safe Neighborhood Grant	\$20,000.00			
<b>Section C</b>		<b>Grants For New Staff Resources</b>		
<b>Section D</b>		<b>Housekeeping</b>		
1. Risk Fund Workers Comp and Unemployment	\$257,000.00			
2. Bond Construction Interest	\$207,199.00			
3. Housing Loans Program Income	\$6,607,793.03			
4. CIP Fund Recapture	\$75,440.51			



***FY 2006 Initiatives in Budget Amendment #5 – June***

Initiative Name	Initiative Amount	FY 2006		FY 2006
		Gen. Fund Impact	FTE	Gen. Fund Fund Balance Impact
5. FEMA Disaster Response Reimbursement	\$364,425.00			
6. IMS Computer Rental Income	\$41,430.00			
7. Police Services Overtime Reimbursement	\$32,500.00			
8. IMS PROMIS Grant	\$36,000.00			
9. Move CDBG From 83 Fund CIP to 71 CDBG Fund	\$761,219.41			
<b>Section E</b>		<b>Grants Requiring No New Staff Resources</b>		
1. State of Utah Survey Grant for Yalecrest Neighborhood	\$10,000.00			
2. FEMA Grant for Fire Dept Personal Protective Equipment	\$108,719			
<b>Section F</b>		<b>Donations</b>		
1. Library Square Pavers	\$173,200.00			
2. Prevent Underage Drinking Scholarship	\$1,000.00			

**Initiative Name:**

Redwood Road Sidewalk - Job 102132

**Initiative Number:**

BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #A-1

**Initiative Type:**

New

**Initiative Discussion:**

In Budget Amendment #1 of this fiscal year, the Engineering Division requested a \$25,000 match to a Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) grant of \$75,000 which was brought into Budget Amendment #1 also. This project consists of the installation of sidewalk on the east side of Redwood Road, from California Ave. to Indiana Ave.

The current estimated cost of construction for the Redwood Road safer sidewalk UDOT grant is \$166,000. This \$66,000 increase is due to additional curb and gutter needed to facilitate drainage; additional drive approaches; increases in asphalt thickness for pavement tie-ins; and the recent escalation of construction costs.

This request is to increase the CIP budget/match by \$16,500 and reduce the CIP cost over-run account by the same amount, and increase the UDOT grant budget by \$49,500. This action will leave a balance of \$238,654 in the Fiscal Year 03-04 CIP cost over run account. UDOT has agreed to cover it's portion of the increased costs.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget adjustment to facilitate this project.

**Redwood Road Sidewalk - Job**

**0102132**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-1**

Initiative Number

**Community Development - HAND**

Department

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**New**

Type of Initiative

**535-6136/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

83-06050 UDOT Grant

\$

49,500.00

Total

\$

49,500.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0.00

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	NA
<b>Revenue</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
83-06050	1370	\$ 49,500.00	
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
83-06049	2700	16,500.00	
83-06050	2700	49,500.00	
83-04099	2700	(16,500.00)	
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?		NA	
Is there a potential for grant to continue?		NA	
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?		NA	
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?		NA	
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?		NA	
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?		NA	

**Initiative Name:**

700 South Jordan River Bridge Replacement - Job 107088

**Initiative Number:**

BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #A-2

**Initiative Type:**

New

**Initiative Discussion:**

The 700 South Jordan River Bridge replacement was awarded \$900,000 of Federal Highway funding during FY03-04. The required Match of \$200,000 was also awarded during the FY03-04 CIP Process from the Class "C" fund.

This project was recently bid and the Engineering Division received two (2) bids. The low bid came in \$360,000 over the Engineers estimate. The escalating construction costs currently being experienced is even greater for bridge construction projects. The City attempted to secure additional federal funds for the increase, but recent reallocation of federal bridge replacement funds has resulted in a significant dollar decrease to the program and funds were denied. Although the revised cost to replace this bridge is approaching the point of being cost prohibitive, Engineering recommends approval of the cost increase as it will allow the City to utilize the \$900,000 of federal funds already approved for this project. The project will be re-bid in September, with some minor changes in design and schedule requirements in an effort to receive better bids.

This request is to move \$400,000 of Class "C" funds allocated from the 900 South, Main Street to 900 West project to the 700 So. Jordan River Bridge project. The 900 So. project is substantially complete. Excess project funds are available in the 900 So. project due to good bids received and an excellent design resulting in minimal change orders and material quantity overruns.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget adjustment to facilitate this project.

**700 South Jordan River Bridge  
Replacement - Job 107008**

Initiative Name

**BA#5FY2006 Initiative #A-2**

Initiative Number

**Community Development - HAND**

Department

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**New**

Type of Initiative

**535-6136/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0.00

0

**Description**



**Initiative Name:**

**United States Environmental Protection Agency Water Efficiency Benchmarking**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-3**

**Initiative Type:**

**New**

**Initiative Discussion:**

The Public Utilities Department applied for and received this US Environmental Protection Agency grant in the amount of \$350,000 to participate in a water efficiency benchmarking of single family homes.

In addition, Salt Lake City Public Utilities will partner with nine (9) other nationwide water departments who will provide \$20,000 each (\$180,000) to Salt Lake City, to participate in the water efficiency benchmarking study. Other water departments include Roseville CA., Las Vegas NV., Clearwater FL., Phoenix AZ., Aurora CO., Eugene OR., Daytona Beach FL., Denver Co., and Cary NC.

Acting as the lead agency, Salt Lake City will contract with Aqua craft Inc, to serve as the principal investigator and to provide the data collection and analysis for the research study. The intent of the project is to collect data from several large water utilities across the US that will provide information and answers pertaining to water usage in new and existing homes, in an effort to demonstrate how the use of advanced technologies can reduce water use. Fund will be used for payment to consultant and grant monitor for grant oversight and management.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary Resolution authorizing the Mayor to accept and sign the grant agreement and to appropriate the necessary budget to facilitate this grant.



**US EPA - Water Efficiency  
Benchmarking**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-3**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Public Utilities**

**New**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Stephanie Duer/Sherrie Collins**

**483-6860/535-6150**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund (Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

72 Fund Fed EPA Grant

\$ 350,000.00

72 Fund Other Cities

\$ 180,000.00

Total

\$ 530,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

Grant Monitoring

\$ 12,375.00

Benefits

\$ 4,409.00

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	
<b>Revenue:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number		Amount
72- New Cost Center	1370	\$	350,000.00
72- New Cost Center	1890	\$	180,000.00
		\$	530,000.00
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number		Amount
72- New Cost Center	2590	\$	530,000.00
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?			
Is there a potential for grant to continue?			No
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?			NA
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?			Yes
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?			No
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?			No

**Initiative Name:**

**Local First Campaign**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-4**

**Initiative Type:**

**New**

Salt Lake City granted \$20,000 seed money in 2004 to the Vest Pocket Business Coalition to initiate a Local First Campaign. The Local First directory now has over 500 participating businesses. Website, brochure, window decals and media campaign have been produced for the Local First. The campaign is a grass roots support of local businesses to encourage consumers to Buy Local First since local businesses help to create a sense of place in our community, contribute economic vitality, and bolster the local economy by dollars spent in the community being distributed to other local businesses in support services such as advertising, accounting, and local service vendors. The Local First Campaign's request for 501(c) 6 status has been delayed, and in order to keep the campaign momentum, has requested an additional \$20,000 from Salt Lake City Corporation to continue the campaign efforts and momentum.

**Local First Campaign**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-4**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Mayor's Office**

**New**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Alison McFarlane**

**535-7704**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance)**

**(\$20,000)**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**



**Initiative Name:**

**Street Lighting Operation and Maintenance**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-5**

**Initiative Type:**

**New**

**Initiative Discussion:**

There has been an increase in the costs for operation and maintenance of City street lights. The operation and maintenance costs include costs for supplying electricity to the street lights as well as the basic maintenance services such as replacement of bulbs and other basic fixture components. The budget does not include services for non-basic repairs such as pole knock-downs and deteriorating infrastructure (poles, wiring, etc.). The increase in costs is due to increasing power rates (electricity), increasing maintenance costs (materials, fuel and labor) and an increase in the number of lights operated by the City. The City operates and maintains over 14,000 street lights. The operation and maintenance of street lights is essential to the safety and security of the public right-of-way. A private contractor is scheduled to begin providing maintenance service April 1st at less cost than UP&L, but the savings will not offset the other cost increases. UP&L has announced another significant power rate increase proposal. This will be taken into account in the budget proposal for next fiscal year.

This request is asking for \$150,000 from the General Fund Fund Balance. In addition in the SID maintenance account there is a surplus of \$32,203.79. This account contains funds collected for street lighting power and maintenance, but were not used in a previous fiscal years.

**Street Lighting Operation and  
Maintenance**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-5**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Comm Dev - Transportation**

**New**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Michael Barry**

**535-7147**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund (Fund Balance)**

**(\$150,000)**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Non Dept Transfer from SID

\$ 32,203.79

Total

\$ 32,203.79

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

**Accounting Detail**Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable: **Revenue:**

Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount
09-00800	1974-06	\$ 32,203.79

**Expenditure:**

Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount
09-00800	2331	\$ 182,203.79
30-02331	2910-08	\$ 32,203.79

**Additional Accounting Details:****Grant Information:**

Grant funds employee positions?	N/A
Is there a potential for grant to continue?	N/A
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?	N/A
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?	N/A
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?	N/A
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?	N/A



<b>Initiative Name:</b>
<b>Street Light Extraordinary Maintenance</b>
<b>Initiative Number:</b>
<b>BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-6</b>
<b>Initiative Type:</b>
<b>New</b>
<b>Initiative Discussion:</b> There has been a trend of increasing expenditures to the street lighting extraordinary maintenance. This maintenance covers fees for repairs to the street lighting system to keep it operational. Typical repairs include fixing damaged wiring systems (both above and below ground), replacing downed street lighting poles, and making safe (for the public) the locations where damage has occurred. There are many factors that have increased the costs for this maintenance with the foremost being increases to fuel costs and the cost of steel products. Other factors are the continual aging of our overall system, more use of underground power service, and an increase in knockdowns of decorative style poles. Without this increase it will not be possible to do the needed repairs. The areas with non-functioning lights will remain dark at night.

**Street Light Extraordinary  
Maintenance**

Name of Initiative

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-6**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Com Dev - Transportation**

**New**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Michael Barry**

**535-7147**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund (Fund Balance)**

**(\$40,000)**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

	Total	\$0	\$0
<b>Internal Service Fund</b>			
	Total	\$0	\$0
<b>Enterprise Fund</b>			
	Total	\$0	\$0
<b>Other Fund</b>			
	Total	0	\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

<b>New</b>	<b>Number of FTE's</b>	0	0
<b>Existing</b>	<b>Number of FTE's</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>		0	0
<b>Description</b>			



<b>Initiative Name:</b>	<b>Strong/Fenway SID Construction</b>
<b>Initiative Number:</b>	<b>BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #A-7</b>
<b>Initiative Type:</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>Initiative Discussion:</b>	
<p>The Strong Court/Fenway Avenue SID projects were awarded CDBG funds in the 04-05 CDBG process for design, and CIP funds in 05-06 for the City's portion of the SID for construction.</p> <p>These projects were recently bid and the Engineering Division received one (1) bid which exceeded the engineer's estimate. The bid is higher due to the increased costs for street lighting, concrete pavement, excavation and road base. Due to increasing costs, re-bidding the project at a later date may not result in lower bid prices.</p> <p>Discussions are currently underway with the Strong Court and Fenway Avenue property owners to receive their input on a proposed SID assessment increase. Further discussions are being held with the property owners on Strong Court to determine if they want to include the construction of the street lights or proceed without the lights.</p> <p>This request would increase the City's portion of the SID for Strong Court by \$15,000 and Fenway Avenue for \$17,000. This request is to reduce the 04-05 CIP fund balance by \$32,000 and increase the budgets in the Strong Court and Fenway Avenue projects.</p> <p>In addition, this request proposes the increase of the property owners SID budgets. The budget increase for Strong Court including the lights would be \$25,000 and for Fenway Avenue \$17,000. This request assumes property owners are in agreement with proceeding based on higher assessments.</p> <p>It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget adjustments to facilitate this project.</p>	

**Strong/Fenway SID Construction**

Initiative Name

**BA#5FY2006 Initiative #A-7**

Initiative Number

**Community Development - HAND**

Department

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**New**

Type of Initiative

**535-6136/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

CIP 83 Fund SID

\$

42,000.00

Total

\$

42,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0.00

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:		NA	
<b>Revenue:</b>					
Cost Center Number		Object Code Number		Amount	
83-06071		1890		\$ 25,000.00	
83-06072		1890		\$ 17,000.00	
<b>Expenditure:</b>					
Cost Center Number		Object Code Number		Amount	
83-05023		2700		\$ 32,000.00	
83-04099		2700		\$ (32,000.00)	
83-06071		2700		\$ 25,000.00	
83-06072		2700		\$ 17,000.00	
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>					
<b>Grant Information:</b>					
Grant funds employee positions?				N/A	
Is there a potential for grant to continue?				N/A	
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?				N/A	
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?				N/A	
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?				N/A	
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?				N/A	

**Initiative Name:****The Leonardo at Library Square Building Remodel****Initiative Number:****BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #A-8****Initiative Type:****New Item****Initiative Discussion:**

In 2003 the public approved the issuance by the City of general obligation bonds to finance the retrofitting and renovation of the Main Salt Lake City Library located at 200 East 500 South into an art, cultural and science center. The issuance of the bonds is contingent on the Leonardo Foundation raising a matching \$10,200,000. The Leonardo Foundation has matching funds in the amount of \$10,213,000 but the City has not certified those funds yet. The matching funds the City has certified are as follows:

Cash received	\$ 2,065,935
Pledges	5,646,967
Stocks	1,496,597
In-Kind Donations	838,057
	-----
Total match	\$10,047,556

The additional \$150,000 that needs to be certified will be done before the amendment is passed. The \$10 million will be used to retrofit and renovate the existing building. The extent of the renovation will depend upon the value the \$10 million will purchase with today's construction costs. Those dollars will be approximately \$8 million when the construction begin later this year. The funding is being requested at this time to fund the design work.

Retrofitting for earthquake will be the first priority of the renovation.

Any additional construction cost above the \$10 million will be funded by additional donation, contributions or grants the foundation might obtain.

The Engineering Division of the Public Service Department will be responsible for the construction and renovation of the building.

The foundation will be responsible for all of the interior design and remodeling.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this project.

**The Leonardo at Library Square  
Building Remodel**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-8**

Initiative Number

**Community Development**

Department

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**New Item**

Type of Initiative

**535-6136/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund (Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

83 CIP Bond Proceeds

\$ 10,200,000.00

Total

\$ 10,200,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0.00

0

**Description**





**Initiative Name:**

**Open Space, Park and Recreational Lands**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #A-9**

**Initiative Type:**

**New Item**

**Initiative Discussion:**

On November 4, 2003, Salt Lake City residents voted to approve the allocation of \$5.4 million in bonds funds for the purpose of acquiring and preserving open space, parks, and recreation lands and amenities within Salt Lake City or its environs. In November, 2004 the Salt Lake City Council created a Salt Lake City ordinance enacting Chapter 2.88 of the Salt lake City Code creating the Salt lake City Open Space Lands Program, and the Salt Lake City Open Space Lands Fund. The purpose of the Program is to provide an administrative structure for the protection, acquisition management and compatible of open space lands in Salt Lake City, and to implement the bond measure passed on November 4, 2003.

The Fund is created as a designated account within the accounting fund structure of the City that shall be used exclusively to acquire, preserve, protect and maintain open space lands.

No expenditure can be made from the Fund without prior approval of the City Council

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this project.

**Open Space, Parks and Recreational  
Lands**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #A-9**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Community Development**

**New Item**

Department

Type of Initiative

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

**535-6136/535-6150**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

83 CIP Bond Proceeds

\$ 5,400,000.00

Total

\$ 5,400,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0.00

0

**Description**

<b>Accounting Detail</b>		<b>Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Revenue:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>		<b>Amount</b>
83- New Cost Center	1980	\$	5,400,000.00
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>		<b>Amount</b>
83- New Cost Center	2700	\$	5,400,000.00
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
<b>Grant funds employee positions?</b>			<b>N/A</b>
<b>Is there a potential for grant to continue?</b>			<b>N/A</b>
<b>If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?</b>			<b>N/A</b>
<b>Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?</b>			<b>N/A</b>
<b>Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?</b>			<b>N/A</b>
<b>Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?</b>			<b>N/A</b>

**Initiative Name:**

Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control - Rocky Mountain  
HIDTA Grant

**Initiative Number:**

BA#5FY 2006 Initiative #B-1

**Initiative Type:**

Grants for Existing Staff Resources

**Initiative Discussion:**

The Police Department applied for and has received confirmation that the City will be receiving a grant in the amount of \$145,800 from the Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control. The grant will continue to fund three (3) Officers assigned to the Metro Narcotics/Drug Enforcement, of which one (1) Officer is assigned to the Airport working with a drug detection dog.

Although the grant caps benefits at 35% of base salary, the remaining funds needed are budgeted for within the Police Department's general fund budget.

There is no required match.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant. A Resolution was previously passed authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any additional grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.

**Executive Office of the President,  
Office of National Drug Control -  
Rocky Mountain HIDTA Grant**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #B-1**

Initiative Number

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Police Department**

Department

**Grants for Existing  
Staff Resources**

Type of Initiative

**Krista Dunn/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**799-3265/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

72 Fund Fed Grant

\$ 145,800.00

Total

\$ 145,800.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

3

0

**Total**

3

0

**Description**



**Initiative Name:**

State of Utah, Department of Public Safety, Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG)

**Initiative Number:**

BA#5FY 2006 Initiative #B-2

**Initiative Type:**

Grant for Existing Staff Resources

**Initiative Discussion:**

Management Services receives this grant annually from the State of Utah, Division of Emergency Services and Homeland Security. It is awarded to Salt Lake City to defray some of the costs associated with the Emergency Managers salary and benefits.

The \$24,000 awarded will be used to defray salary expenses of the Emergency Managers Position. This position is responsible to design, implement and apply the Emergency Operating Procedure manual and to educate Salt Lake City Corporation, community groups and local businesses of emergency procedures and policies in the event of a natural disaster, or terrorist attack.

The grant requires a 100% or \$24,000 match which is met within Management Services general fund budget.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant. A Resolution was previously passed authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any additional grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.



**State of Utah, Department Of Public  
Safety, Emergency Management  
Performance Grant (EMPG)**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #B-2**

Initiative Number

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Management Services**

Department

**Grant for Existing Staff  
Resources**

Type of Initiative

**Mike Stever/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**535-6030/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

72 Fund- State of Utah Grant

\$ 24,000.00

Total

\$ 24,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

1

0

**Total**

1

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	97.042 EMPG-2006-DHLS-CTY17
Revenue:			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
72- New Cost Center	1370	\$	24,000.00
Expenditure:			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
72- New Cost Center	2590	\$	24,000.00
Additional Accounting Details:			
Grant Information:			
Grant funds employee positions?			Yes
Is there a potential for grant to continue?			Yes
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?			NA
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?			Yes
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?			No
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?			No

**Initiative Name:**

**State of Utah West Valley City Pass Through - Project Safe Neighborhood**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5FY 2006 Initiative #B-3**

**Initiative Type:**

**Grant for Existing Staff Resources**

**Initiative Discussion:**

Housing and Neighborhood Development applied for and received this \$20,000 pass through funding from West Valley City. It is a State pass through grant to West Valley with SLC being a Sub recipient of West Valley. This is the third year that the City has received these funds. This grant is awarded to deter gun violence in the Weed and Seed area through the adult and juvenile violent offender re-entry pilot program, gun violence prevention education for at-risk youths and integrating new crime -mapping software to facility cross -jurisdictional data sharing.

These funds will be used to continue to support an hourly Paralegal/Executive Assistant to work with the Salt Lake City Prosecutors Division in identifying and filing appropriate cases involving domestic violence, gang and juvenile incidences with firearms that are coming from the City's Weed and Seed targeted area. This is an hourly position being paid approximately \$16.00 per hour for providing approximately 624 hours of service.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant. A Resolution was previously passed authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any additional grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.

**West Valley City Pass Through-  
Project Safe Neighborhood**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #B-3**

Initiative Number

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Community Development**

Department

**Grant for Existing Staff  
Resources**

Type of Initiative

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**535-6136/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

72 Fund State of Utah Grant

\$ 20,000.00

Total

\$ 20,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

1 PTE Hrly Position

**Accounting Detail**

**Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:**

**Revenue**

<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
72- New Cost Center	1890	\$ 20,000.00

**Expenditure:**

<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
72- New Cost Center	2590	\$ 20,000.00

**Additional Accounting Details:**

**Grant Information:**

<b>Grant funds employee positions?</b>	Yes
<b>Is there a potential for grant to continue?</b>	Yes
<b>If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?</b>	Yes
<b>Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?</b>	Yes
<b>Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?</b>	No
<b>Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?</b>	No

<b>Initiative Name:</b>
<b>Risk Fund Workers Comp &amp; Unemployment</b>
<b>Initiative Number:</b>
<b>BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-1</b>
<b>Initiative Type:</b>
<b>Housekeeping</b>
<b>Initiative Discussion:</b> The Risk Fund collects the workers compensation and unemployment premiums from the various City departments. The Risk Fund then makes the payments to the third party vendors.  This request will increase the Risk Fund revenue and expenditure budgets for higher than expected Workers Compensation and Unemployment activity during the current fiscal year.

**Risk Fund Workers Comp & Unemployment**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 Initiative #D-1**

Initiative Number

**Mgmt Serv - Finance**

Department

**Jeffrey Hill**

Prepared By

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Housekeeping**

Type of Initiative

**535-6478**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year**  
**FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year**  
**FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Risk Fund

\$

257,000.00

Total

\$

257,000.00

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	
Revenue:			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
87-40080	1860-60	\$	6,000.00
87-40120	1860-60	\$	6,000.00
87-40150	1860-60	\$	5,000.00
87-30030	1860	\$	3,000.00
87-30030	1860-65	\$	68,000.00
87-30540	1860	\$	4,000.00
87-30540	1860-65	\$	138,000.00
87-30190	1860	\$	1,000.00
87-30190	1860-65	\$	17,000.00
87-30120	1860	\$	5,000.00
87-30120	1860-65	\$	4,000.00
		\$	257,000.00
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
87-40080	2196	\$	6,000.00
87-40120	2196	\$	6,000.00
87-40150	2196	\$	5,000.00
87-30030	2197-02	\$	71,000.00
87-30190	2565	\$	1,000.00
87-30190	2197-02	\$	17,000.00
87-30540	2197-01	\$	12,000.00
87-30540	2197-02	\$	94,000.00
87-30540	2197-03	\$	21,000.00
87-30540	2565	\$	15,000.00
87-30120	2197-02	\$	9,000.00
		\$	257,000.00
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?		N/A	
Is there a potential for grant to continue?		N/A	
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?		N/A	
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?		N/A	
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?		N/A	
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?		N/A	



**Initiative Name:**

**Bond Construction Funds Interest**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-2**

**Initiative Type: Housekeeping**

**Housekeeping**

**Initiative Discussion:**

In April of 2004, General Obligation Bond Series 2004, was issued to fund the construction of new facilities at the Tracy Aviary and the Hogle Zoo. At the time the bonds were issued the proceeds were deposited with the Trustee contracted for the issue. Since then the proceeds have been earning interest. In June of 2005 an amendment was passed to appropriate the interest earned from the time the series of bonds was issued until the end of the 3rd quarter, or the end of March, 2005. This amendment is to appropriate the interest earned during the last quarter of FY 2005 and the first three quarters of FY 2006.

A total of \$12,064 for the Aviary and \$195,135 for the Zoo has accumulated in each respective fund since the last budget amendment was passed for this purpose. These amounts reflect interest earned during the last quarter of fiscal year 2005 and the first three quarters of fiscal year 2006.

**Bond Construction Funds Interest**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #D-2**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Mgmt Serv - Treasurer**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Dan Mulé / Randy Hillier**

**535-6411 / 535-6641**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

CIP 83-04073 Tracy Aviary Const Fund

\$

12,064.00

CIP 83-04073 Hogle Zoo Const Fund

\$

195,135.00

Total

\$

207,199.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CEDA # If Applicable:	
<b>Revenue:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
83-04073	1830	\$	12,064.00
83-04074	1830	\$	195,135.00
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number	Amount	
83-04073	2700	\$	12,064.00
83-04074	2700	\$	195,135.00
<b>Additional Description:</b>			
The 83-04073 CC is the Tracy Aviary Construction Fund			
The 83-04074 CC is the Hogle Zoo Construction Fund			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?			NA
Is there a potential for grant to continue?			NA
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?			NA
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?			NA
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?			NA
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?			NA

**Initiative Name:**

**Housing Loans Program Income**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative # D-3**

**Initiative Type:**

**Housekeeping**

**Initiative Discussion:**

Earlier this fiscal year, the Council approved a transfer of cash from the Grants Operating Fund to the Housing Loans Fund so that all housing activities could be better accounted for in one fund, the Housing Loans Fund. This request is to transfer the loans receivable and the inventory of houses held for resale to the Housing Loans Fund.

It is recommended that the Council appropriate the necessary adjustments to these budgets to complete the needed transfer of all assets to the Housing Loans Fund.

**Housing Loans Program Income**

Initiative Name

**BA# X FY2006 Initiative # D-3**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Magmt Serv - Finance**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Elwin Heilmann**

**535-6424**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Other Fund**

72 Fund fund balance

\$ 6,607,793.03

Total

\$ 6,607,793.03

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	NA
<b>Revenue</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number		Amount
78-78903	1974-72	\$	3,080,888.06
78-78905	1974-72	\$	2,597,330.94
78-78906	1974-72	\$	929,574.03
			6,607,793.03
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number		Amount
72-17004	2910-15	\$	3,080,888.06
72-60011	2910-15		2,597,330.94
72-72906	2910-15		929,574.03
			6,607,793.03
<b>Additional Description:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?			NA
Is there a potential for grant to continue?			NA
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?			NA
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?			NA
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?			NA
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?			NA

**Initiative Name:**

**Recapture CIP Funds - Completed Projects**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #D-4**

**Initiative Type:**

**Housekeeping**

**Initiative Discussion:**

This request decreases the remaining cash and budget in one (1) completed, closed CIP project and increases the cash and budget of the FY05 cost over-run account. In addition, this request decreases the remaining budget in one (1) project.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget adjustment to facilitate this project.

**Recapture CIP Funds - Completed  
Projects**

Initiative Name

**BA#5FY2006 Initiative #D-4**

Initiative Number

**Community Development - HAND**

Department

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Housekeeping**

Type of Initiative

**535-6136/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund (Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0.00

0

**Description**



<b>Accounting Detail</b>		<b>Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Revenue</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
83-05099 GF Cost over-run	2700	\$	63,391.00
83-04019 Quiet Zone	2700	\$	(63,391.00)
83-02048 Guardsman Way (Reduce Budget Only)	2700	\$	(12,049.51)
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
<b>Grant funds employee positions?</b>		<b>NA</b>	
<b>Is there a potential for grant to continue?</b>		<b>NA</b>	
<b>If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?</b>		<b>NA</b>	
<b>Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?</b>		<b>NA</b>	
<b>Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?</b>		<b>NA</b>	
<b>Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?</b>		<b>NA</b>	

**Initiative Name:**

**Fire Department / Urban Search and Rescue (USAR) Disaster Response  
Reimbursement**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY 2006 Initiative #D-5**

**Initiative Type:**

**Grants Requiring No New Staff Resources**

**Initiative Discussion:**

As a participating member of the national Urban Search and Rescue program the Fire Department sent some of its members to help with disaster relief for Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita.

As per the policies set forth by FEMA for all USAR Teams the Fire Department paid those individuals for the time spent assisting in the disaster recovery. FEMA will then reimburse the Fire Department for all costs associated with the deployment.

The Fire Department has received a portion of the reimbursement and is doing all it can to insure it receives the full reimbursement prior to the end of the fiscal year.

The Fire Department does expect to receive full reimbursement from FEMA.

**Fire Department / Urban Search and  
Rescue (USAR) Disaster Response  
Reimbursement**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-5**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Fire Department**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**John Vuyk**

**799-4210**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

12-00005 FEMA Reimbursement

\$ 41,825.00

12-00120 FEMA Reimbursement

\$ 311,000.00

12-01160 FEMA Reimbursement

\$ 11,600.00

Total

\$ 364,425.00

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

<b>Accounting Detail</b>		<b>Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:</b>	<b>EMW-2005-FG-16772</b>
<b>Revenue:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
12-00005	1956	\$ 41,825.00	
12-00120	1956	\$ 311,000.00	
12-01160	1956	\$ 11,600.00	
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
12-00005	2199	\$ 41,825.00	
12-00120	2199	\$ 311,000.00	
12-01160	2199	\$ 11,600.00	
<b>Additional Accounting Details:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
<b>Grant funds employee positions?</b>			N/A
<b>Is there a potential for grant to continue?</b>			N/A
<b>If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?</b>			N/A
<b>Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?</b>			N/A
<b>Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?</b>			N/A
<b>Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?</b>			N/A

<b>Initiative Name:</b>
<b>IMS Computer Rental Income</b>
<b>Initiative Number:</b>
<b>BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-6</b>
<b>Initiative Type:</b>
<b>Housekeeping</b>
<b>Initiative Discussion:</b>
<p>1) The IMS rental program was created in 2000, and has been very successful in helping city departments control their desktop computers and monitor their costs. The program has helped to bring about standardization of operating systems and equipment, which assists IMS in reducing costs and maintaining a stable citywide network.</p>
<p>2) The IMS rental program has experienced additional growth during FY06 than anticipated. IMS estimated 304 units, but actually handled 346 units, which is 42 new computers being installed.</p>
<p>3) The IMS rental revenue budget for FY06 is \$423,179; actual IMS rental revenue as of 02/28/06 is \$466,400. This reflects the increase in rental units.</p>
<p>IMS is requesting a budget opening to increase rental revenues and expenses by \$41,430. This increase will allow IMS to recover the increased costs of these rentals.</p>

**IMS Computer Rental Income**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-6**

Initiative Number

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Management Services / IMS**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Daye Abbott**

**535-6343**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

65 Fund IMS Rental Income

\$

41,430.00

Total

\$

41,430.00

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**



**Initiative Name:**

**Police Department Service Overtime Reimbursement**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-7**

**Initiative Type:**

**Housekeeping**

**Initiative Discussion:**

The Police Department provides services to a variety of law enforcement taskforces and off duty events on an overtime basis. These expenses are processed thru the department's payroll system. Those reimbursements have been larger than what is budgeted for fiscal year 2006 by \$32,500. This request is to recognize those reimbursements by increasing the overtime budget in both the department expense and the general fund revenue by \$32,500.



**Police Department Service Overtime  
Reimbursement**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-7**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Police**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Jerry Burton**

**799-3824**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Off Duty Overtime Reimbursement

\$ 32,500.00

Total

\$ 32,500.00

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

*None*

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	
Revenue			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>		<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
02- Police Department		1446	\$ 32,500.00
Expenditure:			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>		<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
02- Police Department		2133	\$ 32,500.00
Additional Accounting Details:			
Grant Information:		No grant funds	
Grant funds employee positions?			N/A
Is there a potential for grant to continue?			N/A
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?			N/A
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?			N/A
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?			N/A
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?			N/A

<b>Initiative Name:</b>	<b>PROMIS Grant Amendment</b>
<b>Initiative Number:</b>	<b>BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-8</b>
<b>Initiative Type:</b>	<b>Housekeeping</b>
<b>Initiative Discussion:</b>	<p>The purpose of the grant is to create the Protective / Restraining Order Management Information System (PROMIS). This is a secure, web-based inter-agency information sharing network for criminal and civil domestic violence case data to identify and track protection orders and violations of protection orders. The grant was originally funded on 09/01/03 for \$500,000, of which the IMS portion of the funding for programming was \$75,000 for programming services and \$10,000 for capital expenditure. The funding was from 09/01/03 to 08/31/05.</p> <p>The first extension to the grant was to extend the time frame only from 09/01/05 to 12/31/05.</p> <p>The second extension is to extend the time frame from 01/01/06 to 07/31/06. The total grant will remain at the funded \$500,000; however, the categories for funding have been modified resulting in \$58,000 of additional monies awarded to IMS for completion of the programming.</p> <p>The PROMIS grant modification has been awarded to Salt Lake City for the completion of the project. The approved grant fund modifications is for specific programming that will need to be completed within the time restraints of the grant terms and conditions. This modification will specifically extend the capacities of the Domestic Violence case filing system. Enhancements will be made that will make delivering the discoverable documents for the defense attorney quicker and recording these results. The system will provide these case filings by either of three methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prosecutors printing a packet of discoverable documents that can be delivered to the defense</li> <li>2. Prosecutors e-mail a secured packet of discoverable documents to the defense</li> <li>3. Prosecutors providing a secured web based system for the defense to retrieve the discoverable documents</li> </ol> <p>The system will record each of these steps so there is an audit of when the documents were delivered. Thereby speeding up the deliverable process of these documents. This will assist in fewer instances of where cases are delayed due to the defense not having these documents. This will result in a speedier process for the injured parties with fewer courts visits. In addition this will greatly reduce the time required for the prosecutor to create the discoverable document packet.</p> <p>The grant summary identified the criteria for the project. IMS will follow these requirements. The software engineering design and development will be coordinated and monitored by IMS personnel and performed by qualified IMS / contract labor.</p> <p>The IMS portion of the grant modifications total \$58,000 as awarded to Salt Lake City for the PROMIS project requiring software programming and computer support through IMS. Measurability of this project is the actual tracking of identified expenses and the completion of the project.</p>

**PROMIS Grant Amendment**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-8**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Management Services / IMS**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Daye Abbott**

**535-6343**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

1st Year  
FY 2005-06

2nd Year  
FY 2006-07

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

65 Fund IMS PROMIS Grant amendment and extension for FY06 and FY07

\$ 36,000.00

\$ 22,000.00

Total

\$ 36,000.00

\$ 22,000.00

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

<b>Accounting Detail</b>		<b>Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:</b>	
<b>Revenue:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
65-03200	1954-02	\$ 36,000.00	
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
65-03200	2163	\$ 36,000.00	
<b>Additional Description:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?		Contract Labor	
Is there a potential for grant to continue?		Until 07/31/06	
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?		N/A	
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?		Yes	
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?		Yes	
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?		No	

**Initiative Name:**

**Move CDBG CIP from 83 to 71 Fund**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #D-9**

**Initiative Type:**

**Housekeeping**

**Initiative Discussion:**

In Budget Amendment #4, the CDBG CIP Building Improvement projects were moved from the 71 fund to the 83 fund which includes all capital improvement projects. This was done in an effort to coordinate the cost over-run budgets established for CDBG and to enable HAND to better monitor and track CIP CDBG projects.

It has since been determined that this action creates an accounting problem for the Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) project tracking system and the City's Capital Improvement reporting requirements.

This request reverses the action taken in Budget Amendment #4. HAND staff will continue to coordinate the cost over-run budgets through the Budget Opening process.

It is recommended that the Council approve the necessary adjustments to the budgets to continue facilitation of these projects.

**Move CDBG CIP From 83 to 71 Fund**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative#D-9**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Community Development**

**Housekeeping**

Department

Type of Initiative

**LuAnn Clark/Sherrie Collins**

**535/6136/535-6150**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Other Fund**

83 Fund CDBG Funding

\$ (761,219.41)

71 Fund CDBG Operating

\$ 761,219.41

Total

\$ -

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**





71-31055		2590	\$	5,500.00
71-31045		2590	\$	27,723.00
71-31054		2590	\$	3,400.00
71-31056		2590	\$	16,975.00
71-31036		2590	\$	118,000.00
71-30054		2590	\$	15,000.00
71-30055		2590	\$	7,500.00
71-30057		2590	\$	10,000.00
71-30059		2590	\$	7,975.41
71-30060		2590	\$	120,000.00
71-30063		2590	\$	18,000.00
			\$	761,219.41
83-06999		2590	\$	(761,219.41)
<b>Additional Description:</b>				
<b>Grant Information:</b>				
<b>Grant funds employee positions?</b>				N/A
<b>Is there a potential for grant to continue?</b>				N/A
<b>If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?</b>				N/A
<b>Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?</b>				N/A
<b>Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?</b>				N/A
<b>Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?</b>				N/A

**Initiative Name:**

State of Utah, Department of Community & Culture, Division of State History National YaleCrest Nomination

**Initiative Number:**

BA#5FY 2006 Initiative #E-1

**Initiative Type:**

Grants Requiring No New Staff Resources

**Initiative Discussion:**

The Salt Lake Planning Division applied for and received this \$10,000 grant from the State of Utah, Department of Community & Culture, Division of State History, to complete an intensive-level survey of ten (10) properties in the Yalecrest neighborhood. The area, which encompasses 1300 to 1900 East, and Sunnyside Avenue to 1300 South, was surveyed at the reconnaissance-level in 2004-2005. The completion of the intensive-level survey will assist a consultant in preparing a National Register nomination of the Yalecrest neighborhood.

Funding will be used hire a professional consultant to complete the survey and provide a published analysis of findings.

This grant requires a 100% or \$10,000 match which will be met with the in-kind salary of the Historic Planner Position and is budgeted for within the Planning Divisions general fund budget.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant. A Resolution was previously passed authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any additional grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.

**State of Utah, Dept of Community &  
Culture, Division of State History -  
National Yalecrest Nomination**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #E-1**

Initiative Number

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Community Development**

Department

**Grants Requiring No  
New Staff Resources**

Type of Initiative

**Elizabeth Giraud/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**535-7128/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

**72Fund State of Utah Grant**

\$ 10,000.00

Total

\$ 10,000.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**



**Initiative Name:**

**US Dept of Homeland Security, Emergency Preparedness and Response- Federal  
Emergency Management Agency - Assistance to Firefighters Grant**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5FY 2006 Initiative #E-2**

**Initiative Type:**

**Grants Requiring No New Staff Resources**

**Initiative Discussion:**

The Fire Department applied for and received \$108,719 from the Department of Homeland Security, Emergency Preparedness and Response/FEMA, under the Assistance to Firefighters Grant. They receive this grant on an annual basis.

These funds were award to the Fire Department to purchase and replace old obsolete personal protective equipment for the Firefighters. Equipment includes MSA push to connect mask mounted retrofit to a quarter turn docking system, face pieces and eight (8) chemical/biological suits.

The grant requires a 20% match or \$27,180 which is budgeted for within the Fire Departments general fund budget.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this grant. A Resolution was previously passed authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any additional grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.

**US Department of Homeland  
Security, Emergency Preparedness &  
Response- Assistance to Firefighters  
Grants**

Initiative Name

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #E-2**

Initiative Number

**2005-06**

Fiscal Year

**Fire Department**

Department

**Grants Requiring No  
New Staff Resources**

Type of Initiative

**John Vuyk/Sherrie Collins**

Prepared By

**799-4210/535-6150**

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

\$0

\$0

**Other Fund**

72 Fund Fed Grant

\$ 108,719.00

Total

\$ 108,719.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**



<b>Initiative Name:</b>
<b>Library Pavers Donations</b>
<b>Initiative Number:</b>
<b>BA #5 FY2006 Initiative # F-1</b>
<b>Initiative Type:</b>
<b>Donations</b>
<b>Initiative Discussion:</b>
<p>The Library Paver Donations fund currently has a donations budget of \$1,000,000. Actual donations received total \$1,173,200, with 164,000 from private donations and the remaining 9,200 from public donations.</p>
<p>It is recommended that the Council appropriate the additional donations to support the completion of the Library Paver replacement project.</p>



**Library Paver Donations**

Initiative Name

**BA #5 FY2006 Initiative #F-1**

**2005-06**

Initiative Number

Fiscal Year

**Mgmt Serv - Finance**

**Donations**

Department

Type of Initiative

**Elwin Heilmann**

**535-6424**

Prepared By

Telephone Contact

**General Fund ( Fund Balance) Impact**

**Revenue Impact By Fund:**

**1st Year  
FY 2005-06**

**2nd Year  
FY 2006-07**

**General Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Internal Service Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Enterprise Fund**

Total

0

\$0

**Other Fund**

77 Donations Fund

\$ 173,200.00

Total

\$ 173,200.00

\$0

**Staffing Impact:**

**New Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Existing Number of FTE's**

0

0

**Total**

0

0

**Description**

Accounting Detail		Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable:	NA
<b>Revenue:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number		Amount
77-77157	1895	\$	164,000.00
77-77157	1897	\$	9,200.00
<b>Expenditure:</b>			
Cost Center Number	Object Code Number		Amount
77-77157	2700	\$	173,200.00
<b>Additional Description:</b>			
<b>Grant Information:</b>			
Grant funds employee positions?			NA
Is there a potential for grant to continue?			NA
If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant?			NA
Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame?			NA
Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated?			NA
Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector?			NA

**Initiative Name:**

**Prevent Underage Drinking Scholarship**

**Initiative Number:**

**BA#5 FY2006 Initiative #F-2**

**Initiative Type:**

**Donation**

**Initiative Discussion:**

The SLC Mayor's Coalition on Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs received a \$1,000 scholarship from CRP Incorporated for participation in the SAMHSA's Underage Drinking Prevention Campaign.

This campaign is geared toward prevention of underage drinking by hosting town hall meetings and providing "Reach Out Now" educational information at local schools.

The Drug Free Grant Coordinator is currently working with the Mayor's Coalition to determine dates and times of town hall meetings and school presentations.

This request is to increase the current budget in the Drug Free Communities grant by \$1,000 to facilitate the check received. This is a private donation and requires no match.

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the necessary budget to facilitate this donation. A Resolution was previously passed authorizing the Mayor to sign and accept the grant and any additional grants or agreements that stem from the original grant.



**Accounting Detail**

Grant # and CFDA # If Applicable: **None - NA**

**Revenue:**

<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
72-60519	1895	\$ 1,000.00

**Expenditure:**

<b>Cost Center Number</b>	<b>Object Code Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
72-60519	2590	\$ 1,000.00

**Additional Accounting Details:**

Increase existing budget by \$1,000

**Grant Information:**

Grant funds employee positions? **NA**

Is there a potential for grant to continue? **NA**

If grant is funding a position is it expected the position will be eliminated at the end of the grant? **NA**

Will grant program be complete in grant funding time frame? **NA**

Will grant impact the community once the grant funds are eliminated? **NA**

Does grant duplicate services provided by private or Non-profit sector? **NA**