

CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

February 6, 2025, | Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 South State Street, South Building, Rm S3-070

| Meeting called to order by Dan Tisdale

In Attendance

Committee Members: Robert Brough, Pat Holmes, Jacob Lawson, J. Todd Richards, Catherine Taylor

Online Committee Members: Rex Marler

Excused: Turner Bitton, Candy Tippetts, Mike Anderson, Antonio Valbuena

Staff: Dan Tisdale, Amanda Cordova, Russell Goodman, Caitlin Lea, Derick Davis

1. Call Meeting to Order -Jacob Lawson

- Chair – Jacob welcomed and called the meeting to order at 9:41.

2. Review and Approve Minutes – Jacob Lawson

- Catherine motioned to approve the minutes of the meeting with comments on what she had said. Robert seconded the motion. All in favor of the comments made, none opposed. Motion passed.

3. Application Review – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- #20 – University of Utah (Community Capacity and Wellbeing)
 - \$138-665.60
 - Not funded previously
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative is unclear on their request.
 - Robert – Robert said it's not clear what they are doing
 - Todd – Todd was wondering if this program is for the students or the community.
 - Rex – Rex said the details on their line items are good. Shows how each dollar is being spent. The leverage is poor on this application.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background reads like a course outline. Where does the match come from? Poor clarity.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the application is unclear on how it coordinates with the consolidated plan.
- #21 – No App.
 - Application was withdrawn

- #22 – Shelter the Homeless (PARC Transit)
 - \$110,000.00
 - Not previously funded
 - Pat – Pat would like to see a better description in the narrative with fewer acronyms. It's unclear what they are doing.
 - Robert – Robert said the application was vague and had no innovation to speak of.
 - Todd – Todd asked in the budget who is making up the difference in funding.
 - Rex – Rex said the leverage is good. There was not a lot of detail in the program.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background was not well described. She would like to see a brief statement about who they coordinate with.
 - Jacob – Jacob said they somewhat identified with the consolidated plan. I would like to see details on the numbers.

- #23 – Ruff Haven (Street Outreach)
 - \$162,631.65
 - Not previously funded
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was good. It had specific details and spelled out the results. She also mentioned the need is great for pets owned by the population served. This fills a gap in helping the homeless and elderly population.
 - Robert – Robert said it is a unique program and an innovative program. I would like to see more detail.
 - Todd – Todd said there is a good breakdown of numbers on the budget. No leverage.
 - Rex – Rex agreed with Todd on the leverage. I would like to see more funding from outside sources.
 - Catherine – Catherine said this was the only program of its kind. They listed partnerships and qualifications, but there are a lot of assumptions.
 - Jacob – Jacob said it was a stretch to comply with the consolidated plan. They don't have any experience with federal funding, just grant funding.

- #24 – South Valley Services (Clinic)
 - \$103,094,.05
 - Not previously funded
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was great with a good explanation.
 - Robert – Robert said it is the only confidentially located center in the valley. The program is very innovative and also serves the male population.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget is clear, but the leverage is poor.
 - Todd – Todd said the leverage is good. The county funding is only 25% and 75% comes from other sources.
 - Catherine – Catherine said they have unique qualifications. A good community resource center and good partners.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the coordination was laid out well with the consolidated plan. The federal funding needs a better number breakdown.

- #25 – South Valley Services (Rental)
 - \$210,000.00
 - Not previously funded
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was great. It made a good case of what the program does with an emphasis on the needs of this population.
 - Robert – Robert said the innovation was ok. It is a good program for removing barriers to get people housed.
 - Todd – Todd said the breakdown of the budget was poor. It has good leverage for the total cost.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget is good. He would like to know how many people they help.
 - Catherine – Catherine said they cut and pasted the background from the previous application. The background description was poor.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the consolidated plan was the same as the previous application from SVS. The federal was also a cut-and-paste. It needed better description and numbers.

- #26 – First Step House (Housing Case Management)
 - \$162,212.00
 - Currently being funded
 - Pat- Pat said it had a good narrative, and it spelled out the goals of the program.
 - Robert – Robert said he was glad to see the goals added, but was wondering how many people will be housed. They are specific about the help they have available to the population they serve. Such as physical and mental health help. Also, they have good partnerships with other agencies.
 - Rex – Rex said the leverage was good, but the budget was a little vague.
 - Todd – Todd said the leverage was decent. I would like to see a better description of the budget.
 - Catherine – Catherine said in the background they talk about their years of experience, comprehensive experience, and robust portfolio. She would like to see the portfolio.
 - Jacob – Jacob said there was not enough information to meet with the consolidated plan.

- #27 – Guadalupe Center (Adult Education)
 - \$150,000.00
 - Currently being funded
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was good and was specific and detailed in the breakdown.
 - Robert – Robert said it was well-written with student-specific lessons and working with families.
 - Todd – Todd was glad to see the lived experience examples. The leverage is good for the program.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget looks good.

- Catherine – Catherine said they have 50 years of experience, and the background was well-written and supported. Directly relevant to the program.
- Jacob – Jacob said the description was comprehensive and meets the consolidated plan. The federal funding is good.
- #28 – First Step House (TBRA)
 - \$162,212.00
 - Not previously funded
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was very specific on how they will use the funds.
 - Robert – Robert said the innovation had a good description and was specific to the program. They also added case management.
 - Todd – Todd said the budget description is good and very specific.
 - Rex – Rex said they have good numbers, but the budget does not match. The leverage is good with 50% of committed funds.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background was ok. The background was a cut-and-paste from the previous application.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the coordination could be more comprehensive. They do identify TBRA. The federal funding was good but would like to see more numbers.
- #29 – Catholic Community Services (Weigand)
 - \$141,260.00
 - Not previously funded
 - Pat – Pat liked the narrative and that they have an employment specialist position in the agency.
 - Robert – Robert said it was well written and explained the services well. They have also added mental health services to the program.
 - Rex – Rex said the project cost was left blank. There was a breakdown on the development team, but the leverage was not clear.
 - Todd –
 - Catherine – Catherine said they have a strong evolution of the program with proven experience.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the federal funding is good.
- #30 – First Step House (Employment)
 - \$125,274.00
 - Previously funded
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was good and was specific about their goals. It mentioned the agency's history and spoke on how to attain the outcomes they have set out.

- Robert – Robert said the innovation. They have a unique clientele, and they are specific about the services that they provide.
 - Rex – Rex said the leverage looks ok but was wondering if it was mislabeled.
 - Todd- Todd said the budget numbers don't match. They are looking for the county to make up the shortfall in funding.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background was good based on their evolution from doing substance abuse treatment and getting into the employment preparation field.
 - Jacob- Jacob said they did identify part of the consolidated plan. I would have liked more detail. The federal funding was the same as the other applications but was decent.
- #31 – Neighborhood House (SPARK)
 - Will be reviewed 2/13
 - #32 – Housing Connect (HARP)
 - Will be reviewed 2/13
 - #33 – Utah Legal Services (Housing Stability)
 - Will be reviewed 2/13
 - #34 – Community Development Corporation of Utah (Rental)
 - Will be reviewed 2/13
 - #35 – English Skills Learning Center (Upward Mobility of Employment)
 - Will be reviewed 2/13

4. Adjourn – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- The committee discussed adding a meeting on February 27. Splitting the last 16 applications, 8 on the 13th and 8 on the 20th of February. Robert motioned adding an extra week to the schedule to finalize applications. Pat seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.
- The meeting was adjourned at 11:30.

Next Meeting: Thursday, February 13, 2025.

Committee member breakdown for application review:

- Narrative – Pat and Jacob
 - Innovation – Candy and Robert
 - Leverage/Budget – Todd and Rex
 - Background – Catherine and Antonio
 - Coordination/Federal Funding – Mike and Turner
- With Mike and Turner out for this meeting Jacob took the Coordination and Federal Funding role.