



# COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL of SALT LAKE CITY

**TO:** City Council Members

**FROM:** Ben Luedtke and Sylvia Richards  
Budget and Policy Analysts

**DATE:** January 5, 2021

**RE:** **Budget Amendment Number Six FY2021**

## Project Timeline:

Set Date: December 8, 2020  
1<sup>st</sup> Public Hearing: January 5, 2021  
1<sup>st</sup> Briefing: January 5, 2021  
2<sup>nd</sup> Briefing: January 12, 2021 (if needed)  
2<sup>nd</sup> Public Hearing: January 19, 2021  
Potential Action: TBD

Budget Amendment Number Six includes requested changes to four funds. Total expenditures are \$1,810,804 including \$63,673 from Fund Balance. There are a total of seven items, five of which are new items in Section A. The sixth is a Housekeeping item in Section D. The seventh is a Council-added item in Section I. Additionally, this budget amendment includes the transfer of six employees from the General Fund to the IMS fund and the creation of one additional position within the IMS Fund. The Administration is requesting a straw poll on the Housing-related Funding Our Future Applications. (See Item I-1 Council-Added Item.) **The Administration indicates that all seven of these budget items are time-sensitive.**

## General Budget Updates

The Administration anticipates updated sales tax revenues for October and Comprehensive Annual Finance Report (CAFR) confirmed Fund Balance numbers will be available to share with the Council at the January 5 briefing.

The City received \$150,000 from the County for a third round of CARES Act funding. The Administration plans to include in an upcoming budget amendment the \$150,000 and a reconciliation of the second round of CARES Act funding.

The President has not decided whether to declare a disaster for the September windstorm. The March earthquake did not qualify for FEMA reimbursements to the City. However, individual and household assistance is available up to \$938,506. 279 applications have been submitted at the time of publishing this report. FEMA's website for the earthquake disaster is available here: <https://www.fema.gov/disaster/4548>

The Administration provided the following status update on insurance claims and payments for earthquake damage to City buildings: "The City received a \$2,000,000 advance payment from the property insurance carrier for earthquake damages. Once the City's expenditures for repairs exceed \$2,100,000 (\$100,000 deductible + claim advance), we can submit those expenses for reimbursement."



## Revenue Update

	<b>FY20-21</b>		<b>Variance</b>
	<b>Annual</b>	<b>Revised</b>	<b>Favorable</b>
<b>Revenue</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>(Unfavorable)</b>
Property Taxes	111,418,455	111,418,455	-
Sales and Use Tax	67,999,593	67,999,593	-
Franchise Tax	26,812,125	26,812,125	-
PILOT Taxes	1,508,894	1,508,894	-
<b>TOTAL TAXES</b>	<b>207,739,067</b>	<b>207,739,067</b>	-
License and Permits	28,601,482	28,225,928	<b>(375,554)</b>
Intergovernmental	4,444,400	4,444,400	-
Interest Income	1,900,682	1,900,682	-
Fines & Forfeiture	3,938,848	3,202,960	<b>(735,888)</b>
Parking Meter Collection	3,347,986	2,848,523	<b>(499,463)</b>
Charges and Services	4,428,069	4,083,647	<b>(344,422)</b>
Miscellaneous Revenue	4,014,037	3,435,330	<b>(578,707)</b>
Interfund Reimbursement	20,281,706	20,281,706	-
Transfers	9,750,600	9,750,600	-
<b>TOTAL W/OUT SPECIAL TAX</b>	<b>288,446,877</b>	<b>285,912,843</b>	<b>(2,534,034)</b>
Sales and Use Tax - 1/2 cent	32,797,506	32,797,506	-
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>321,244,383</b>	<b>318,710,349</b>	<b>(2,534,034)</b>

The Administration indicates that they are seeing a decrease in revenue budget due to trends for apartment units, new business license and business license renewals. Due to the administrative order for COVID, parking ticket revenue shows a decrease of nearly \$500k due to only 51,000 pay station transactions through the end of August (normally well over 200k). This decrease is also having an effect on citations written. Additionally, Justice Court fines are down \$37,000, while moving violations are down \$151,000. In Charges and Services, field reservation fees are down \$273,000 while auto parking fees are also under budget. Miscellaneous revenues are also down due to a decrease in special events and the elimination of take-home vehicle fees during the current pandemic.

**Fund Balance Update:**

This fund balance projection includes a line item adding in funding budgeted for use for expenses associated with COVID-19 in the fiscal year 2020 that was not spent.

<b>Salt Lake City</b>							
<b>General Fund</b>							
<b>TOTAL</b>							
<b>Fund Balance Projections</b>							
		<b>2020 Projection</b>			<b>2021 Projection</b>		
	<b>2019 Actual</b>	<b>FOF</b>	<b>GF Only</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>FOF</b>	<b>GF Only</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Beginning Fund Balance	56,104,269	10,372,054	69,441,955	79,814,009	6,625,050	36,900,813	43,525,863
Budgeted Use of Fund Balance	(380,025)	-	(1,510,094)	(1,510,094)	-	(4,885,620)	(4,885,620)
Prior Year Encumbrances	(8,731,774)	(3,105,004)	(6,566,830)	(9,671,834)	-	-	-
Estimated Beginning Fund Balance	46,992,470	7,267,050	61,365,031	68,632,081	6,625,050	32,015,193	38,640,243
<i>Beginning Fund Balance Percent</i>	14.57%	18.52%	21.06%	20.76%	20.20%	11.38%	12.30%
Year End CAFR Adjustments							
Revenue Changes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expense Changes (Prepays, Receivable, Etc.)	(3,701,982)	-	(4,127,838)	(4,127,838)	-	-	-
Fund Balance w/ CAFR Changes	43,290,488	7,267,050	57,237,193	64,504,243	6,625,050	25,390,143	38,640,243
<i>Final Fund Balance Percent</i>	13.42%	18.52%	19.65%	19.51%	20.20%	9.03%	12.30%
Budget Amendment Use of Fund Balance	(1,858,647)						
BA#1 Revenue Adjustment		-	-	-	-	-	-
BA#1 Expense Adjustment		-	(410,173)	(410,173)	-	-	-
BA#2 Revenue Adjustment		-	135,628	135,628	-	-	-
BA#2 Expense Adjustment		-	(745,025)	(745,025)	-	(288,488)	(288,488)
BA#3 Revenue Adjustment		-	-	-	-	-	-
BA#3 Expense Adjustment		-	(50,000)	(50,000)	-	(6,239,940)	(6,239,940)
BA#4 Expense Adjustment		(2,300,000)	(10,987,506)	(13,287,506)	-	-	-
BA#5 Revenue Adjustment		-	-	-	-	(242,788)	(242,788)
BA#5 Expense Adjustment		-	(1,350,000)	(1,350,000)	-	(2,783,685)	(2,783,685)
BA#6 Revenue Adjustment		-	438,980	438,980	-	-	-
BA#6 Expense Adjustment		-	(3,071,042)	(3,071,042)	-	(63,673)	(63,673)
FOF Revenues	3,149,980	-	-	-	-	-	-
Projected Revenue Shortfall		758,000	(4,297,242)	(3,539,242)	-	(2,534,035)	(2,534,035)
Fund Balance Budgeted Increase	2,500,000	900,000	-	900,000	-	-	-
Unspent COVID Funds		-	-	-	-	5,900,000	5,900,000
HAND Rent Assistance Reimbursement		-	-	-	-	1,100,000	1,100,000
Adjusted Fund Balance	47,081,821	6,625,050	36,900,813	43,525,863	6,625,050	20,237,534	33,487,634
<i>Adjusted Fund Balance Percent</i>	14.60%	16.88%	12.67%	13.17%	20.20%	7.19%	10.66%
<b>Projected Revenue</b>	<b>322,562,293</b>	<b>39,242,000</b>	<b>291,317,665</b>	<b>330,559,665</b>	<b>32,797,506</b>	<b>281,282,923</b>	<b>314,080,429</b>

## Impact Fees Update

The Administration provided a summary of impact fee tracking, details on refunding amounts and dates and lists of unfinished projects with impact fee funding. The information is current as of December 1, 2020. \$88,479 of police impact fees are scheduled to expire by the end of this fiscal year. The Administration reports the impact fee consultant is finalizing the police section update and transmittal to the Council Office is anticipated in early 2021.

Type	Unallocated Cash “Available to Spend”	Next Refund Trigger Date	Amount of Expiring Impact Fees
Fire	\$732,533	More than a year away	-
Parks	\$6,404,154	More than a year away	-
Police	\$318,626	December 2020	\$9,155
Transportation	\$3,623,027	More than a year away	-

*Note: Encumbrances are an administrative function when impact fees are held under a contract*

---

## Section A: New Items (note: to expedite the processing of this staff report, staff has included the Administration’s descriptions from the transmittal for some of these items)

### A-1: Fisher Carriage House Exploration Center Construction Overage (\$540,732 – CIP Impact Fees)

*See Attachment 1 for renderings of the Fisher Mansion Carriage House redevelopment project*

In FY20 CIP, the Council approved \$1,098,764 of parks impact fees for this project which is in addition to \$280,000 from the Chevron donation (2010 oil spill in Red Butte Creek). The total approved budget for the project was \$1,378,764. The new funding request represents a 58% increase for a new total project budget of \$2,172,496. If approved, then the available to spend balance of parks impact fees would be \$5,610,422.

Council staff asked the Administration if the impact fee consultant had confirmed using \$253,000 of parks impact fees to purchase indoor furnishings and equipment. It was determined these expenses are for items with a useful life less than 10 years and ineligible for parks impact fees. As a result, this request was reduced from \$793,732 to \$540,732. It’s unclear how the \$253,000 will be funded or if scope reductions can deliver the project within the approved budget.

The Administration’s transmittal indicates the following: “As design development nears completion, SLC Engineering and the consulting architect, CRSA, have updated budget projections for the project. Unfortunately, those cost projections have increased significantly from the original budget estimate created in 2018 based on a preliminary conceptual design. This budget amendment requests the additional funding necessary to implement the project, which (if funded) would go to bid in December 2020 and be constructed in 2021. Increased costs for the project are associated with all project elements, but particularly relate to the preservation of historic windows and doors, interior finishes, necessary plumbing and electrical upgrades, unforeseen utility upgrades and increased cost for proposed furnishings associated with the public exhibit space”.

This project is eligible for up to \$100,000 from the CIP Cost Overrun Account. In previous discussions the Council expressed a preference to spend impact fees before General Fund dollars because impact fees must be spent within six years or refunded to the developer with interest.

According to the Administration, “The project scope includes construction of an exploration center at the historic Fisher Carriage House that provides standing exhibits on the natural and cultural history of the Jordan River and surrounding area, and which showcases a beautiful restored historical structure. The exploration center will provide space for activities and education programs, places for visitors to engage with city staff and partners and get information about the Jordan River Parkway Trail and water trail. The center will also provide a home-base for outreach & education staff with the SLC Trails & Natural Lands Division, from which they can conduct programming up and down the Jordan River. Additionally, the project will compliment an adjacent boat ramp (construction planned for winter 2020) and create a recreational jumping-off point for the future Folsom Trail, the Jordan River Parkway Trail, and the Jordan River ‘Paddle Trail”.

The Administration would also like to let the Council know about future costs associated with the project. The two new employee positions and the ongoing costs listed below are anticipated to be needed for the FY23 annual budget based on the current project timeline.

### Future Ongoing Costs

FTE Site Manager & Part-time Assistant \$ 90,000.00  
Supplies and Materials \$ 20,000.00

Kayak Rental Fleet (One-Time)	\$ 10,000.00
Facility Maintenance Costs	\$ 18,238.00
Grounds Maintenance Costs	\$ - *
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 138,238.00</b>

\* In Trails Natural Lands budget

*Policy Questions:*

- **\$253,000 Indoor Furnishings Unfunded** – The Council may wish to ask the Administration for funding recommendations and/or scope reductions to address the \$253,000 of indoor furnishings that are ineligible for parks impact fees.
- **Fisher Mansion Redevelopment** – The Council may wish to discuss with the Administration if redevelopment of the Fisher Mansion should be prioritized instead of the Carriage House given the project cost increases. During FY20 CIP, the Administration had a general cost estimate of \$3.7 million to redevelop the Fisher Mansion. Note this cost may have increased due to damage from the March earthquakes. The Administration anticipates detailed Fisher Mansion redevelopment scenarios to be available mid-2021 such as public-private partnerships, nongovernmental organization operated facility models and City-operated models. The scenarios could inform a new Request for Information (RFI) for the mansion.

**A-2: Glendale Water Park Redevelopment Plan (\$225,000 – CIP Impact Fees)**

The Administration’s transmittal indicates the following: “Public Lands is requesting a budget amendment for \$225,000 in parks impact fees to hire a consultant to create a Development Plan for Glendale Water Park, a Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) site. A recent community survey found slightly more than half of the 3,700 respondents supported new uses on the site. The Development Plan would articulate a long-term community supported vision for the site with phased implementation.” Full restoration of the water park may be cost prohibitive at over \$20 million but reuse of some components may be feasible.

According to the Administration, the first phase, (to be determined with the input of public feedback) would implement active recreation on site within the three-year LWCF requirement. The clock begins once the State LWCF official inspects the site which is currently on hold due to the pandemic. The City will receive a letter confirming the three-year deadline to restore public access to the site. A violation of the conservation easement could result in denial of future federal funding grants to the City and/or a court action by the National Parks Service to require active outdoor recreation access.

The resulting redevelopment plan will be considered a small area plan. A draft will be presented to and reviewed by the Planning Commission in an open and public meeting. Then the Council will be briefed, review and have the opportunity to adopt, modify and adopt or decline the plan.

As indicated by the Administration in their transmittal,

“The 17-acre water park site located along the Jordan River is adjacent to two park sites, a golf course, the surplus canal and natural areas along the Jordan River... The benefits or goals of the project would include the following: Creating a plan that unifies these public amenities through connecting trails, unifying landscape character and the development of complementary recreation uses into a regional asset. Developing the water park site within the context of the more than 210 acres of public lands would foster positive activation and creating a dynamic community asset. Because this site was private for so long, the development will essentially create a new park, added to the City’s park inventory, with new service to residents and is impact fee eligible. In the time of a pandemic and political divisions, it is more important than ever to invest in dynamic public spaces that connect people and break down demographic and economic divides. The Glendale property is a unique opportunity to create a very special place the supports economic development, public health, a sense of community, and environmental sustainability as well as increase confidence in city government’s use of public funds.”

Project Tasks may include but not limited to:

- Analyze the site and surrounding context: opportunities and constraints
- Facilitate community and stakeholder engagement: community support
- Define the Park Vision: Community vision and goals
- Develop conceptual site plan alternatives: Explore development alternatives and cost estimates. Include analysis of alternative plan operations and maintenance requirements and cost estimates
- Develop Final Site Development Plan
- Develop an implementation plan that includes plan phasing and funding strategies
- Facilitate adoption by City Council.

The Administration shared the following general timeline for project based on annual quarter (for example “Q1” is first quarter from January 1 – March 31):

- Q1 Engage a consultant
- Q2 Engagement Window #1: Foundation of Understanding
  - Share background on the project site and City goals
  - Gather information from the community about what kinds of activities they would like to see and priorities
  - Understand how they see the park playing a role in their neighborhood, community, city and region
  - Present engagement results to Council
- Q3 Engagement Window #2: Visioning Glendale
  - Present preliminary site improvement vision for feedback
  - Targeted engagement and city department collaboration
  - Initial strategy recommendations development
  - Present engagement results to Council
- Q4 Final Community Engagement Window #3
  - Sharing of the draft plan
  - Focus on next steps of implementation
  - Planning Commission Review
  - Council hearings
- Q5 Plan adoption by Council

*Policy Question:*

- **Small Area Plan Early Council Input** – The Council may wish to ask the Administration when the Council will be able to provide early policy input on the small area plan similar to the master plan process.

**A-3: Trailhead Property Acquisition (\$275,000 – CIP Impact Fees)**

The Administration is requesting \$275,000 of Impact Fees to purchase land for a trailhead. The Administration is prepared to provide additional details of the property in a closed session.

**A-4: City Innovations Team (\$63,673 - General Fund/\$453,399 – IMS Fund)**

*See Attachment 2 for the Chief Innovation Officer job description*

The Administration’s transmittal indicates the following: “Salt Lake City Administration is looking to take transformational steps with regards to enterprise technologies and improved business practices. To do this the development of a team is required, this team will be known as the City Innovations Team. The team initially will be built upon existing resources from the Mayor’s Office, Public Services, IMS, and Community and Neighborhoods. This team will take on larger enterprise projects like the new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) effort.”

The Administration states the team’s services will be available to all General Fund departments with a goal to increase service levels over time. The team will be located on the fifth floor of Plaza 349. No additional costs are needed to make that office space ready. One new FTE position, a second strategy & special projects manager, is requested for a total of seven FTEs on the team. The total annual cost for the new FTE is \$106,348 but this request is for \$63,673 or seven months of funding. One of the Public Services Department deputy director positions will be removed from the staffing document. Public Services will have two deputy director positions after this change. A new title and FTE, Chief Innovations Officer, will be created on the staffing document for IMS. The total annual cost for the Chief Innovations Officer is \$220,500. See Attachment 2 for the job description.

The team will also improve coordination and resources between the Civic Engagement Team and IMS Media Services. A further step to improve engagement is to combine SLC Media Services and the Civic Engagement Team into a city-wide communications/engagement team in the Information Management Services (IMS) which is an internal service department. As indicated in the transmittal, “Currently, departments work with both teams separately to develop engagement and communications strategies for projects. Both teams also co-manage SLCgov social media accounts. By combining the groups, the City can create a one stop shop for engagement & communications efforts.” The proposal also includes operational costs associated with the team. The positions include:

**Public Services:**

- Chief Innovations Officer – Nole Walkingshaw transfer FTE Deputy Director position
- Strategy & Special Projects Manager – Alyssa Johnson transfer FTE Strategy & Special Projects Manager

**From Community and Neighborhoods:**

- Civic Engagement Team – Four FTE’s transferred from Community and Neighborhoods

- Elizabeth Buhler, Civic Engagement Manager
- Kyle Strayer, Civic Engagement Program Specialist
- Christianna Johnson, Civic Engagement Program Specialist
- Ronnie Buttons, Special Projects Assistant

New Position:

- Strategy & Special Projects Manager

*Policy Questions:*

- In addition to the ERP effort, will there be other projects this group tackles in its first year?
- From a longer-term perspective, will this team be similar to an internal service for all City departments? Or will that be project or service dependent?
- Back when the Civic Engagement Team was initially created, it was anticipated that they would provide support and engagement work for both branches of government. As the group launched and the Council Office’s communications work evolved, there has been a different but successful way that the groups coordinate. Will the future Innovations Team, and specifically engagement staff, continue to be available to extend and collaborate on the Council engagement efforts?

**A-5: Police Department Hiring Class (\$ -0- General Fund)**

*See Attachment 3 for the Administration's memo about this request.*

The transmittal indicates the following: “The Administration and the Police Department are seeking Council support for the hiring of a police recruit class in January or February of 2021. The Police Department is not seeking additional funding but will use current budget for fully funded positions and attrition savings from the first six months of the year”.

**Section B: Grants for Existing Staff Resources Section**

(None)

**Section C: Grants for New Staff Resources Section**

(None)

**Section D: Housekeeping**

**D-1: Airport Interim Financing (\$ -0- Airport Fund)**

The Administration’s transmittal indicates the following: “Salt Lake City Department of Airports (SLCDA) plans to issue interim financing up to \$300 million in the form of either Commercial Paper backed by a Letter of Credit or a revolving Line of Credit directly with a bank. We are currently in procurement and are negotiating the terms of the agreement which we deem to be favorable especially considering the low interest rate environment. These funds will ultimately be refunded with long term debt, but we will maintain the facility for upwards of three years to help with financial flexibility on the Airport Redevelopment Project. These funds can be used for operating and maintenance expenses or to fund construction costs as determined by the Airport Finance division”.

If the Council approves this request, then the Administration will transmit a resolution authorizing the issuance and sale of bonds not to exceed \$300 million. A public hearing must be held after the resolution is approved and following public notice of the bonds issuance per state law. Council staff is working with the Administration to understand the time sensitivity of the resolution in January.

**Section E: Grants Requiring No New Staff Resources**

(None)

**Section F: Donations**

(None)

**Section G: Council Consent Agenda – Grant Awards**

(None)

**Section I: Council Added Items**

**I-1: Housing-related Funding Our Future Applications (time-sensitive) Straw Poll Request**

The Administration has indicated that two categories of applications received fewer funding requests than what the Council approved in the FY21 annual budget, and two categories received more funding requests. The Administration is requesting a straw poll from the Council to approve a shift of the unallocated \$797,000 to unmet Incentivized Rent and

Vulnerable Populations needs.

CATEGORY	TOTAL BUDGET	TOTAL FUNDING REQUESTED IN APPLICATIONS
Community Land Trust	\$500,000	\$0
Landlord Assurance Program	\$350,000	\$53,000
Incentivized Rent Assistance	\$900,000	\$2,323,512
Service Models for the Most Vulnerable (children experiencing homelessness and individuals with mental illness)	\$200,000	\$725,380

The \$900 billion pandemic relief bill approved by Congress (pending presidential action at the time of writing this staff report) includes an extension of the national eviction moratorium through January 31, 2021 and \$25 billion in rental assistance, however, it's unclear how those funds will be distributed / accessed by landlords and renters. Utah is estimated to receive \$214 million.

The public facing website [www.fundingourfutureslc.com](http://www.fundingourfutureslc.com) provides the following program descriptions:

- Community Land Trust (CLT): make homes perpetually affordable. There are currently 9 properties in the CLT. The program reduces the cost of home ownership significantly, decreasing the purchase price of a home by removing the land cost from the total mortgage price.
- Landlord Assurance Program: works to mitigate perceived risks related to renting to low-income clients. Agency will recruit eligible landlords, provide tenant financial assistance, landlord financial assistance, and provide tenant education.
- Incentivized Rent Assistance: continue to fund an assistance program to stabilize low-income renters using best practices and an outcome-based approach, to help prevent homelessness.
- Service Models for the Most Vulnerable: support housing programs for individuals with mental illness and children experiencing homelessness.

*Policy questions:*

- Outreach to Applicants – The Council may wish to ask the Administration how would potential applicants have learned about the Funding Our Future housing programs and how to apply? The Council may also wish to ask if how many applications were received in prior fiscal years for these programs.
- Status of Community Land Trust – The Council may wish to ask the Administration for a status update on the City's Community Land Trust and how the model compares to others around the nation.
- Balance of Other Housing Budgets – The Council may wish to ask the Administration if the other Funding Our Future budgets for FY21 have been spent or if funds remain that could be recaptured for urgent housing assistance.
- Connecting Applicants with Other Funding Sources – The Council may wish to ask the Administration how applicants are connected with other funding sources from the City, County, State, Federal (such as HUD Grants) when Funding Our Future budgets are less than applicant's requests.

**I-2: HUD-CV Emergency Services Grant for the Temporary Winter Shelter (\$750,000 – ESG-CV Grant)**

A request was made through the City's modified mid-year HUD Cares Act funding cycle for \$750,000 to fund the operating costs at the temporary winter shelter. The shelter, which is located on North Temple, will be operated by Switchpoint.

The Council may recall that in a previous budget amendment, the City received a round of Cares Act funding (\$7.1 million) that would be set aside for a modified mid-year CDBG-type process. The Council appropriated the money, but it has been held while the Administration publicized the funding availability and received applications from community organizations for the grant funds for COVID-related services.

The Administration has transmitted the funding log with recommendations from the Mayor and Community Development and Capital Improvement Program (CDCIP) Board. However, we are requesting that the item for Switchpoint be pulled out and considered separately in order to ensure the operating costs for the temporary shelter are in place as quickly as possible.

**Funding:** Some questions may arise related to the funding partners for the temporary winter shelters. In addition to this funding request for \$750,000, the Administration has shared this public funding breakdown:

- State ESG-CV funding, \$525,000, operations, Millcreek and SLC Airport Inn.
- County ESG-CV funding, \$234,320, operations, just Millcreek.

There is also a private contribution related to security expenses at the Millcreek and Salt Lake City locations.

**Overall ESG Projects:** The Council may also have questions about the remainder of the ESG funding availability. The log for those items is included in Attachment 4 and will be scheduled for a full briefing as soon as possible. The full briefing would include the remainder of the ESG funding requests, plus the other CDBG funding requests. As a note, based on this \$750,000 request and the other applications that were received, there would be \$460,828 in funding remaining for future discussion.

*Policy Questions:*

- The Council may wish to ask whether additional funds will be requested for the temporary shelter.
- The Council may wish to ask whether there have been any conversations about the County providing funding for the Salt Lake City side operations.
- The Council may wish to ask about the other support costs related to shelter-resistant camping locations in the City, and whether adequate budget remains for the waste disposal and temporary restroom facilities.

---

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Fisher Carriage House Redevelopment Renderings
2. Chief Innovation Officer Job Description
3. Administration's Memo about Request for Hiring Police Officers in Budget Amendment #6
4. ESG Funding log

**ACRONYMS**

CAFR – Comprehensive Annual Financial Report  
CARES Act – Federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act  
CIP – Capital Improvement Program  
CLT – Community Land Trust  
COPS - Community Oriented Policing Services  
DAQ – Utah Division of Air Quality  
ERP – Enterprise Resource Planning  
FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency  
FTE – Full time employee  
FY – Fiscal Year  
HUD – United States Housing and Urban Development Department  
IMS – Department of Information Management Services  
LWCF - Land and Water Conservation Fund site  
RFI – Request for Information  
SLCDA – Salt Lake City Department of Airports