

-MINUTES
FROM THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
BOARD MEETING (CDCIP)
Monday, January 29th, 2025
7:30pm

1. Board Members

Heidi Steed
Brad Christensen
Joseph Murphy (Jurphy)
Jake Skog
Andrea Schaefer
Devon Schechinger
Dallin Jones

Board Members Not Present

Jenny Bonk

Staff Present

Kerry Thomas
Dennis Rutledge
Sarah Neilsen
Alexandra Hall
Amanda Best
Tyler Durfee
Tony Milner

2. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Thomas begins the board meeting at 7:28 P.M.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Murphy motions to approve the minutes. The motion passes unanimously.

4. NANO Session Debrief

Mr. Jones, Ms. Schaefer, and Ms. Steed all agree that the NANO sessions went more smoothly this year. Mr. Skog mentions that it is difficult for the applicants to answer the questions within the time limit (2 minutes) especially if the applicant has multiple applications; however, he does like the face-to-face connection with both the applicants and fellow board members. Mr. Christensen agrees and believes that it is easier to understand the projects when talking in-person with someone connected to the work.

Ms. Schaefer comments that the rapid-fire design of the NANO sessions allows for more impact on repetitive topics since they are hearing these issues from various angles back-to-back.

Ms. Steed talks about the highlights of her question #2 "What is your strategy to diversify the funding sources for this project over the long-term?" She says that many organizations mentioned

that because of the difficulty of finding federal funding they are diversifying their funding sources, particularly looking into private funding.

Ms. Schaefer comments on her question #3 "How is your project adjusting to Salt Lake City's growing population?" She says these organizations will inevitably feel pressure to expand due to population growth, but with this question she had a sense of how hard many organizations are trying to stay afloat due to the rapid expansion of SLC. Mr. Skog agrees and says some organizations seem to be at the point of simply maintaining their mission, and unable to investigate long-term solutions. He also comments that he is impressed with the preparation of some of these organizations in data gathering and action planning with growth in mind.

Ms. Bonk shares her experience with question #1 "Tell me a success story from your organization for this project." She says that some stories were very difficult to hear, but thanks to the organization their clients were able to not only survive but also thrive. Mr. Christensen says that it becomes apparent that all the applicants are worthy, but he also senses that the organizations have little institutional impact. Even so, they are important.

Mr. Murphy speaks on his question #4 "What is unique about your project's approach?" He says that when there was overlap in services provided, such as services that provide home repair, the question allowed them to approach their pitch from a new angle. He uses examples such as ASSIST which is the only non-profit architectural firm, the VOA youth shelter assists a younger demographic, and the Utah Film Center is trying to build community in a cultured industry, which he considered timely due to the approach of the Sundance Film Festival. Mr. Murphy also mentions that Salt Lake Donated Dental Services answered that many other organizations use the more cost-effective option of pulling the teeth, but they focus on doing restorative work.

Mr. Murphy asks the board about their thoughts on Salt Lake American. Mr. Christensen responds that refugees essentially receive peer support services through the organization and that there is value in the organization despite not having the foundation of older organizations. Ms. Bonk adds that they offer 24/7 support. Mr. Murphy comments that it stands out how well they understand their focus group. Ms. Schaefer comments that to do anything refugees must learn some English, and this organization opens the door to that.

Mr. Skog asks the board if the focus on a particular ethnic demographic produces a risk of discrimination. Mr. Christensen points out that Salt Lake American is not refusing services to anyone. Mr. Skog agrees. Ms. Steed comments that they had recently received two other small grants.

5. NANO Session Vote

Mr. Christensen opens the conversation, saying that the time dedicated to face-to-face interaction with these organizations is valuable. Mr. Murphy says he enjoys being able to listen and respond to the applicants while listening to their mission and values. Mr. Skog says he thinks it would be a better use of time to replace the NANO session for the board to discuss the applications as a group. Mr. Jones mentions that he noticed the applicants talking amongst themselves and that it was interesting to see them networking as a result.

Mr. Murphy and Mr. Skog ask about the City Staff perspective on the NANO Sessions. Ms.

Thomas answers that the Staff's job is to prep for the board, and any alternative process would have some administrative preparation. Mr. Rutledge mentions that removing the NANO sessions just means that they would include something similar into an agenda item on the regular meetings.

Mr. Murphy motions to remove the NANO sessions and include as part of the standing agenda time for the applicant to come present their case for the 2025-2026 session. Ms. Schaefer adds to the motion to strongly encourage in-person attendance. Mr. Murphy accepts the amendment. Ms. Bonk seconds the motion. Ms. Steed abstains due to her future absence. The motion passes by majority vote.

Mr. Skog motions to turn the NANO session night into a board discussion night for the applicants. Mr. Jones seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

6. Other Business

Mr. Murphy mentions that it would be valuable to visit some of the organizations. City staff agree to take it into consideration for the coming year. Mr. Christensen adds that having a contact from the applicant organization in case they would like additional information might be helpful.

Ms. Thomas reminds the board of a document shared and asks the board to fill out the sheet in preparation for the final funding night.

City staff remind the board to submit the final recommendations by Sunday night so that they could have the data ready.

Mr. Murphy asks the board their thoughts on the bonus points. Ms. Schaefer comments that, for her, the bonus points are for organizations that are doing something different and special. Mr. Christensen says that he will use the points when the ranking averages out different than how he intended.

Ms. Thomas tells the board that she will be sending out recommendations for contingency plans to vote on for the final funding night.

The board's notes are collected by Mr. Rutledge for recordkeeping.

The board confirms that Ms. Bonk will not be attending the final funding night.

7. Adjourn

Meeting is adjourned at 8.15 P.M.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large 'X' on the left and a stylized, cursive line on the right, all resting on a horizontal line.