

**-MINUTES
FROM THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
BOARD MEETING (CDCIP)
Monday, February 3rd, 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
Sarah Neilson
Alexandra Hall

2. Terms

HOPWA — Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids
HOME — Home and Investment Partnerships
ESG — Emergency Solutions Grant
CDBG PS — Community Development Block Grant Public Service
TBRA — Tenant Based Rental Assistance
STH — Shelter the Homeless
VoA — Volunteers of America
UCA — Utah Community Action
IRC — International Rescue Committee

3. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Thomas begins the board meeting at 5:11 P.M.

4. Final Funding Allocations

Ms. Schaefer motions for the order of funding to be HOPWA, HOME, ESG, CDBG, and CDBG PS. Motion passes unanimously.

i. HOPWA

Utah Community Action and Housing Connect are the two HOPWA applicants. Mr. Christensen motions to fully fund them both. Ms. Schaefer seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Ms. Thomas mentions that there are leftover funds for the HOPWA program for additional funding for the two projects.

Mr. Christensen mentions that last year the council wanted rounded numbers. Ms. Thomas answers that it is correct and they try to because including cents overcomplicates the process.

Mr. Christensen suggests to approve UCA at their request rounded up to the nearest \$1,000, then allocate the extra funding.

Mr. Christensen and Ms. Schaefer suggest to allocate 25% of the extra, available funds to UCA and 75% to Housing Connect to the nearest thousand, with necessary adjustments. The board produces a draft final recommendation to be voted on later.

Mr. Jones asks what happens to any funding not allocated by the board, council, and/or city. Mr. Murphy says it goes back to the Federal Government. Mr. Jones also asks whether they can allocate funding via percentage, since the city doesn't know yet what the total funding for each program will be. Ms. Thomas answers that is what the contingency plans are for.

ii. **HOME**

Mr. Christensen asks about the qualifications of a CHDO (Community Housing Development Organization). Ms. Thomas answers that they are specific organizations with specific board make up. However, none of the applications this year are CHDO eligible.

Mr. Skog asks if the min operating need is taken from previous years' data. Ms. Thomas answers that it is a new question as of this year to prevent awarding funding under the program's operating needs.

The board discusses striking Housing Connect from the funding because of the high amount required to operate and low score. Mr. Murphy mentions that the organization is trying to recover their losses, and any amount of funding they receive will likely go toward that.

The board discusses the Funding Options column on the pre-prepared spread sheet. Mr. Murphy comments that he is in favor of column K. Ms. Schaefer comments that it does not meet Housing Connects minimum operating need. Mr. Skog suggests to reallocate the Housing Connects portion of column K. Mr. Christensen says that some money may be useful even if it is under the stated minimum operating cost.

Ms. Thomas mentions in the last few years the board hasn't funded down payment assistance but that they could if they wished.

Mr. Skog, Ms. Schaefer, and Ms. Schechinger are in favor of column J, with some adjustments. Mr. Murphy points out that the suggested adjustments are similar to column H. In column H, more than half the applicants are fully funded. Then he adds that he is in favor of column I.

Ms. Schaefer asks why, in column I, Housing Connect isn't funded at their minimum operating need. Ms. Nielson answers that they allocated what was left after allocating the others above them their minimum operating need. Ms. Schaefer suggests, if going with

column I, reallocating the leftover funds from Housing Connect to the other projects.

Mr. Christensen points out that the board, overall, scored TBRA highly, and some funding, if not all, may still be beneficial.

Mr. Murphy asks what the average for column J is. Ms. Thomas answers that it is the board's averaged recommended amount, but only half of the board filled it out.

Ms. Schaefer and Ms. Schechinger express their favor for column J. The board discusses adjustments to that column and produces a draft final recommendation to be voted on later.

iii. **ESG (Part 1)**

Ms. Thomas introduces the data city staff have collected for ESG parts 1 and 2.

Mr. Murphy comments on STH's application, saying he feels they may take the funding for granted, and asks the board how they feel about not funding STH. Mr. Skog agrees.

Ms. Schechinger asks the board about Ruff Haven. She adds, with a personal anecdote, that a state senator in California supported building shelters that would allow homeless individuals to bring in their pets. She comments that, to the homeless individual, their pet is their best friend, family, and the only thing they have. It is a big deal to them. Ms. Schaefer agrees; however, they did not score well and, whatever the reason, the board should respect the scoring system, despite personal sentiments.

Ms. Schaefer also pushes back on Mr. Murphy and Mr. Skog's point about STH, saying that it's possible they are not taking the funding for granted, but rather they don't rely as heavily on the funding as some other applicants. However, she agrees with not funding STH.

On the topic of Ruff Haven, Mr. Skog says that he wasn't convinced with their shift from pet-focused to people-focused, and that they have a lot of funding from the State Opioid Settlement. Ms. Steed comments that she likes Ruff Haven's application and finds them an intriguing and unique organization. However, during NANO sessions, she sensed that the applicant was confident they could find the funding to continue operations as they have been in past years even without their ESG application because the animal component of their organization is well funded.

Mr. Murphy says he's in favor of column H or I (they are the same).

Ms. Thomas mentions that Ruff Haven's application was deemed ineligible last year.

Mr. Murphy mentions that VOA and YWCA only have a one-point difference in the board's average score column, and that he would rather fund the YWCA because they also service children.

Mr. Jones asks what city staff look at when conducting their assessments. Ms. Thomas says it is a combination of qualitative and quantitative data including past performance, whether the project is new, etc.

The discussion is temporarily tabled. The board moves on to ESG part 2

iv. **ESG (Part 2)**

Ms. Thomas notes that it is unlikely the board will be able to fund UCA at their full ask given that the max amount of funding available is less than their request.

Mr. Christensen notes that all the applications are some form of rental assistance. Ms. Schaefer comments that the board scored them all similarly, and that she is in favor of funding the top two applicants. Ms. Thomas comments that the board could either fund UCA or Housing Authority of Salt Lake at their minimum operating cost, but not both due to the expected total funding amount. Mr. Murphy suggests not funding the Housing Authority of Salt Lake due to the high minimum operating costs. Ms. Schaefer agrees.

Ms. Thomas says that the reason for a minimum operating cost question is explained in the application. Mr. Skog asks the board whether they put the rest of the funding into UCA or the other two applicants. The board discusses funding UCA at above their minimum and TRH at their minimum. They include this in their final board recommendation to be voted on later.

The Board returns to ESG part 1.

v. **ESG (Part 1 Continued)**

Mr. Murphy says he is for column I. Mr. Skog agrees. The board decide to use that column as their draft final recommendation to be voted on later.

vi. **CDBG**

The board discusses column J. Mr. Murphy comments that most are funded below their minimum operating costs. He suggests mixing some suggestions from columns H and I and the spreadsheet to create a more ideal breakdown that takes into account the board's recommendations and the program's minimum operating costs.

Mr. Christensen mentions that with this breakdown, the city would have to take less than their operating costs; however, they did score lower overall.

Ms. Andrea asks the board if they should fund Habitat for Humanity at full when, according to their application, their minimum operating cost is the same as their request. Ms. Thomas mentions that Habitat for Humanity has, generally, a lower risk assessment. Ms. Schaefer says that she would like to know why they've answered that way and suggests to take that into account for future years, but Mr. Murphy says he would be skeptical of how their answer would factor into the quantitative scoring.

Mr. Skog says he is in favor with the column J. The board use column J, with some adjustments, for their draft final recommendation to be voted on later.

vii. **CDBG PS**

Ms. Neilson mentions that the scores for these applications were weighted in a way that wasn't made clear to City Staff, despite trying to replicate the weight. Ms. Schaefer says

that, as a board member, she's upset that they don't know how those scores came to be and asks if Ms. Nielson can gather the city staff scores.

Mr. Murphy calls for a 5 minute recess while city staff gather the data. During this recess, city staff receive a message that the weighted score consists of 70% board scores and 30% city admin scores and risk assessments.

The meeting reconvenes at 6:48 P.M.

Mr. Skog asks the board if they looked at the suggested contingencies. Mr. Christensen says he would defer to the recommended contingencies. Mr. Christensen asks if the board needs to officially adopt the contingencies. Ms. Thomas answers they will and do so when they vote for the funding at the end. Mr. Christensen asks if the decrease in funding puts their funding lower than their minimum operating cost, they will the organizations still have the opportunity to accept the reward. Ms. Thomas says city staff will contact them and ask on a case-by-case basis.

With the new data, the board discuss CDBG PS funding. Mr. Christensen recommends using the average recommended amount to fund more programs, if even at the minimum operating cost. The board discusses application 30074 which is for bus passes. Ms. Steed mentions that any funding may be helpful, even if it is below the listed minimum operating need because they stated in the past they don't necessarily have a minimum as long as they can buy bus passes, and Mr. Skog says he is more comfortable flexing funding if that's the case. Ms. Schaefer states that it would be best to take the minimum operating need at face value.

They discuss meeting the IRC's, 30074, and Community Dental to their minimum by flexing some funding from the average recommended amount for another applicant. Mr. Murphy comments that the board's recommendations have not been taken into account the city's score. Ms. Schaefer asks what the city council asks for in regard to scores. Ms. Thomas answers that she believes they give council both scores. Mr. Murphy and Ms. Schaefer suggest to look for outliers in the city's score to consider, particularly keeping an eye out for more risky projects. Ms. Schaefer asks city staff to implement an independent city staff score for future years. Mr. Christensen comments that he doesn't see a significant decrease that would make him particularly concerned. Mr. Skog agrees.

Taking that into account, the board makes some adjustments to their recommended amounts.

Mr. Murphy motions to accept the board recommendations in the file as of 7:20 M.S.T. 2/3/25. Ms. Steed seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

5. Vote on Contingencies

Mr. Christensen motions to approve the contingencies as outlined in the suggested document. Ms. Schaefer seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

6. Other Business

Ms. Schaefer also suggests that both the city staff and board scores, weighted with consistent metrics, are presented to city council.

Ms. Thomas mentions that she doesn't know if city staff can produce that calculation. Ms. Steed believes that the intention is for city council and the mayor to understand the full context of the board's recommendations. Ms. Schaefer says it's more about making constituent voices along with the risk assessment clear and for the weighted system to be consistent.

Mr. Murphy asks what format city staff will present to the mayor. Ms. Nielson answers that they have presented, in the past, the combined score. Ms. Steed asks if the mayor's office could ask for more in depth information upon request. Ms. Thomas says that is correct. Ms. Nielson shows the board the previous years' data as an example.

Mr. Jones comments that adding a wealth of additional information may complicate the process for the city council, and that it is the board's job to filter than information for their recommendations. Ms. Schaefer says it's important for the mayor and city council to be aware that the scores are weighted together and suggests to include a footnote of how the scores are decided.

Mr. Skog asks if that is different from the city staff's process. Ms. Thomas answers that she believes the data the board wants to get to the mayor's office will be available to her and the city board, but that she would have to defer to Tyler Durfee for more precise information.

Mr. Murphy suggests that if the board would like the staff to present certain information to the mayor's office, they can email Tyler Durfee on Neighborly.

1. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Steed motions to approve the minutes from 1.27.25. The motion passes unanimously.

2. Adjourn

Mr. Murphy expresses his gratitude to city staff for their work on the fiscal year. Ms. Thomas also expresses her gratitude to the board. The meeting is adjourned at 7.38 P.M.

X 

Jake Skog (Feb 20, 2025 11:17 MST)

CDCIP Board Chair

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the CDCIP Board meeting held February 3rd, 2025.

CDCIP 24-25 Board Meeting 2.03 Minutes

Final Audit Report

2025-02-20

Created:	2025-02-20
By:	Rachel Molinari (Rachel.Molinari@slc.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAUXsNzjvgPieq28So9eKiNfoovuDmGAeK

"CDCIP 24-25 Board Meeting 2.03 Minutes" History

 Document created by Rachel Molinari (Rachel.Molinari@slc.gov)

2025-02-20 - 4:54:31 PM GMT

 Document emailed to Jake Skog (jakeskog@gmail.com) for signature

2025-02-20 - 4:55:09 PM GMT

 Email viewed by Jake Skog (jakeskog@gmail.com)

2025-02-20 - 6:17:06 PM GMT

 Document e-signed by Jake Skog (jakeskog@gmail.com)

Signature Date: 2025-02-20 - 6:17:35 PM GMT - Time Source: server

 Agreement completed.

2025-02-20 - 6:17:35 PM GMT



Powered by
Adobe
Acrobat Sign