

CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

February 13, 2025, | Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 South State Street, South Building, Rm S2-950

12:00 – 2:00 pm

| Meeting called to order by Dan Tisdale

In Attendance

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

Online Committee Members: Rex Marler, Candy Tippetts, Turner Bitton, Mike Anderson

Excused: Amanda Cordova

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

Guests: Steven Van Maren, Isaac Higham (online)

1. Call Meeting to Order - Jacob Lawson

- Chair – Jacob welcomed everyone and verified a quorum at 12:04.
- There was a question on the previous week's CCS application. Dan reached out and they said that the total cost section was left blank in error and the ask was \$141,260.00 with \$188,346.00 for the staff and the total project cost was \$1,769,800.00.

2. Review and Approve Minutes – Jacob Lawson

- Robert motioned to approve the February 6 minutes. Todd seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

3. Application Review – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- #31 – Neighborhood House (SPARK)
 - \$130,000.00
 - Not currently funding.
 - Pat – Good Narrative, they know what they want. It explained the full program.
 - Jacob – Well written, not very specific.
 - Candy – Very well written, self-explanatory. 200 units of affordable housing.
 - Robert – Good program, helping with early childhood education. Thinking ahead to the future.
 - Rex – Pretty good budget, no line items. Good leverage.
 - Todd – Good detail in the budget, 15-year lease.
 - Antonio – Good solid program, 130 years in business, 60 years doing this program.

- Catherine – Agreed with Antonio's take on the program.
 - Turner – Very good coordination with the consolidated plan. Childcare and education, sliding scale for the childcare cost based on income. They have a lot of experience with federal funding. They have received CDBG funding in the past and comply with Davis-Bacon.
- #32 – Housing Connect (HARP)
 - \$187,440.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Short and sweet narrative, to the point.
 - Pat – Good narrative, self-sufficient, a little unclear.
 - Robert – Good with self-sufficiency, they know what they are doing.
 - Candy – Agreed with Robert, Pat, and Jacob on innovation and narrative.
 - Todd – Very good budget and leverage.
 - Rex – Fourteen households are being helped. Clear on explanation, expensive but a good investment.
 - Catherine – They have good experience with being around for 50 years.
 - Antonio – They know what they are doing with this program.
 - Mike – Liked the coordination with the consolidated plan, specific with what they are doing for the community. Impressive with federal funding with over 50 years of experience.
 - Turner – Agreed with Mike and what he had to say.
- #33 – Utah Legal Aid Services (Housing Stability)
 - \$100,000.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Good narrative, a crucial program for the community.
 - Pat – Great narrative until the end. Retaining employees as opposed to expanding.
 - Candy – Interesting innovation. Appreciated the three-step program.
 - Robert – Liked the innovation with a three-step process. How much funding is SLCo specific?
 - Rex – Good budget, but they hurt themselves with the explanation. Leverage is vague.
 - Todd – It looks like they have a shortfall in funding and their looking to fund an attorney.
 - Antonio – Good team of attorneys. 40 years of experience.
 - Catherine – The background was the stronger of the sections of the application.
 - Turner – Consolidated plan has good coordination, 2 of 3 priorities met. Good outreach. Good experience with federal funding. Would like to see more funding sources.
 - Mike – Recused himself from this application.
- #34 – Community Development Corporation of Utah (Rental)

- \$225,110.00
 - Not currently funding.
 - Pat – Good narrative, specific, presented their case well.
 - Jacob – Solid narrative. Excellent community partners.
 - Robert – The application fell apart as it went on.
 - Candy – Appreciated the fact that they are the bridge and help with navigating the population they serve.
 - Todd – The ask is a lot. Not a lot of the budget is going to rental assistance. The leverage is unclear.
 - Rex – Agreed with what Todd said. Glad to see \$5000.00 per household. Good leverage, a lot in the pipeline. Average budget.
 - Antonio – Good background and partnerships.
 - Catherine – They have recent developments. The application started high but diminished as it went on.
 - Mike – Good coordination with the consolidated plan. Would like to see more detail. Impressed with the federal funding.
 - Turner – Agreed with what Mike said.
- #35 – English Skills Learning Center (Upward Mobility of Employment)
 - \$113,744.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Well-written narrative and informative.
 - Pat – Very detailed narrative. Maybe too much detail.
 - Candy – A lot of information, but not specific. Details got lost.
 - Robert – Great innovation. Good program offerings for the community.
 - Rex – Good leverage with partnerships and what they have in the pipeline. The budget is not well correlated. Not detailed.
 - Todd – The budget is detailed, and they have good leverage.
 - Catherine – Very qualified and they have a 50% proficiency rate.
 - Antonio – Great results dating back to 1988.
 - Turner – Good detail and met the consolidated plan. Good federal funding with specific sources. The response was thorough.
 - Mike – Agreed with Turner. He would like to see more specifics on the grants.
- #101 – Utah Arts Alliance (Art Castle)
 - \$150,000.00
 - Start date 11/1/2025
 - Jacob – Good narrative, structured and specific.
 - Pat – Good narrative with a specific focus on the ADA.
 - Candy – Preserving an old chapel and creating a need in the community.
 - Robert – Agreed with what Candy had to say.
 - Todd – Doesn't show the amount on the budget. Decent leverage with some in-kind donations.
 - Rex – Good budget. Different format for Hard Costs. Good leverage with the ability to scale back if not fully funded.

- Catherine – They talked about themselves as an organization and how they operate and maintain their facilities. So, they did have words that addressed the background.
 - Antonio – Agreed with what Catherine had to say.
 - Turner – Met 2 of 3 priorities on the consolidated plan. Good federal funding with specifics listed. "Great project"
 - Mike- Recused himself from this application. (Mike is on the UAA Board.)
- #102 – The INN Between (Sewer Line)
 - \$117,500.00
 - Start date 3/30/2026
 - Jacob – Short and sweet narrative.
 - Pat – Good narrative, succinct and to the point.
 - Robert – The innovation was the same as the Soft Cost application.
 - Candy – The innovation is self-explanatory.
 - Rex – The budget is very vanilla, nothing out of place. Leverage is poor asking for the full amount.
 - Todd – They seem to ask for building improvements every year. The budget is straightforward. Asking for the full amount, not a lot of leverage. They do have a savings account if there are cost increases.
 - Catherine – They are the only one that does what they do. They have got contracts for certain types of services before and they're looking at getting things generated.
 - Antonio – Agreed with what Catherine had to say.
 - Mike – Disappointed in responses. Good experience with federal funding.
 - Turner – Coordination and federal funding are the same. Would like to see more detail.
- #103 – Shelter the Homeless (PARC Laundry)
 - \$112,090.00
 - Stat date 1/3/2026
 - Jacob – Short and sweet narrative direct with their needs.
 - Pat – Agreed with what Jacob had said.
 - Robert – These are not just laundry rooms. A place for community connection and dignity.
 - Candy – Three different locations to serve the population. No cost, and stability for the people served. Plays a significant role in the community.
 - Todd – The budget description is good. Would like a better breakdown of units per location.
 - Rex – Agreed with Todd. Indirect admin costs seem high.
 - Antonio – Good partnerships, but not a lot of other information.
 - Catherine – The background was cut and paste.
 - Turner – Good coordination with the consolidated plan. Federal funding does not answer the questions fully. Good experience.
 - Mike – The coordination section shied away from making their argument for funding.

- #104 South Salt Lake (Homeownership)
 - The committee will review 2/20
- #105 – South Valley Sanctuary (Shelter Upgrades)
 - The committee will review 2/20
- #106 – Assist (Emergency Home Repairs)
 - The committee will review 2/20
- #107 – First Step House (REACH)
 - The committee will review 2/20

4. Adjourn – Jacob Lawson/Staff

The committee will review the final eight applications on February 20. The tentative deadline for scoring submissions will be Friday the 21st. February 24 – 26 the staff will put together scenarios and present at the 27 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned 2:01.

Next Meeting: Thursday, February 20, 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