

-MINUTES
FROM THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
BOARD MEETING (CDCIP)
Monday, October 6th, 2025
5:00pm

1. **Board Members**

Brad Christensen
Joseph Murphy (Jurphy)
Devon Schechinger
Jenny Bonk
Dallin Jones

Board Members Not Present

Staff Present

Kerry Thomas
Dennis Rutledge
Sarah Nielsen
Alexandra Hall
Jack Markman
Amanda Best
Kate Warrett (Online)
Tyler Durfee (Online)
Tony Milner (Online)
Sara Montoya
Heather Royall

Also Present

Sean Weeks
Cooper Fankhauser
Parviz Faiz (Online)

2. **Terms**

CDBG PS - Community Development Block Grant: Public Services
CDBG NHI – Community Development Block Grant: Neighborhood Housing and Improvements
ESG – Emergency Solutions Grant
HOPWA – Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS
OPMA – Open and Public Meetings Act
Quorum – minimum number of members present to make the proceedings of the meeting valid
GRAMA – Government Records and Management Act

3. **Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Thomas begins the board meeting at 5:04 P.M. Ms. Thomas and Mr. Rutledge kick off introductions. The board introduces themselves. Remaining introductions are given. Ms. Thomas

goes over the agenda.

4. Overview of the CDCIP Board, Process, and Federal Grants

Ms. Thomas goes over the CDCIP Board PowerPoint, including the changes for the 26-27 funding year. Reiterates that these meetings will be the only chance to ask applicants questions since the dissolution of the NANO sessions and reminds the board that all comments are GRAMA-able. The board will decide what to do if an applicant cannot make it to their timeslot, the two options are 1) give them until the following Wednesday to respond to questions via email to staff and 2) let them know that if they cannot make it to their timeslot, the Board will have to take their application at face value.

She introduces the new rubric and scoring for applications. She asks the board not to enter a number other than what is on the software (most often 1, 3, and 5) for scoring. She will be adding admin scores, and spend-down plans to each week's worksheet for the board's convenience. She then introduces the board schedule, highlighting that final funding night will be broken into several funding nights.

She overviews the 2025 Consolidated Plan Goals and Public Outreach Outcomes, including staff's survey and results, and mentions that the minimum ask for this year has been raised to \$50,000. She then explains the four main grants (CDBG PS and NIH, ESG, HOPWA and HOME) and states she will send the slide deck to the board for reference.

Mr. Markman explains the Funding Our Future program. It is for funding housing services relating to non-profits such as rental assistance, etc. There are two service areas 1) tenant-based assistance, and 2) equity and home ownership assistance.

5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Ms. Thomas introduces the leadership election for board chair and vice chair. Mr. Murphy motions for Mr. Christensen to be chair and for Ms. Schechinger to be Vice Chair, Mr. Jones seconds the motion. Ms. Thomas mentions that, if possible, the Chair or Vice Chair would speak on behalf of the Board at City Council Meetings. Mr. Rutledge expands that last year the city council had questions about why one project was funded over another and that staff cannot speak for the board.

Mr. Murphy reasons that Mr. Christensen was Vice Chair last year and has the most familiarity with HUD vernacular, Mr. Jones agrees. The board votes Mr. Christensen in as board Chair unanimously. Ms. Schechinger becomes Vice Chair.

Ms. Best introduces herself and mentions that she is looking for another CDCIP board member to be on the Internal Loan Committee that meets once a month and to email her or any member of staff if interested.

6. Utah Open and Public Meetings Training

Ms. Montoya introduces herself and the Open and Public Meetings Act which states that meetings of a public body are open to the public, unless an exception is available that allows the meeting to be closed. A public body is supported by tax revenue and vested with the authority to make

decisions. A meeting is defined as a gathering of a public body with a quorum present. She emphasizes that social gatherings of members of a public body cannot drift into business territory or else it is a violation of OPMA.

According to Ms. Montoya, to properly hold a meeting, the board must give 24-hour public notice and agenda (date, time, meeting place, and reasonable specificity). She then explains the rules for emergency and electronic meetings. For electronic meetings, anchor locations are necessary unless there is a public safety or health risk. She emphasizes that electronic messages (emails, texts, etc.) where there is a quorum discussing business would be a violation of the act and that these forms of communication are GRAMA-able. She goes over the rules for closing the meeting to the public. Then she emphasizes that the minutes would be the official record of a public meeting, so they are important to review, and explains the process for posting the minutes. Violation of OPMA is a Class B misdemeanor.

Mr. Murphy clarifies about the last meeting minutes earlier in the year and whether October is considered a 'reasonable' time. She answers it is, and Ms. Thomas mentions that the pending minutes have likely been posted in the meantime.

Mr. Weeks asks if Ms. Thomas can send the bylaws. She agrees, and Mr. Murphy mentions that the link sends the user to the city ordinance.

Mr. Rutledge tells the board that their private notes pertaining to applicants are also GRAMA-able, so if they are not writing notes in the software, they should keep a physical/digital copy of the notes. Ms. Schechinger asks if it is all their private notes that are GRAMA-able, Mr. Rutledge says yes, as long as it is about the applications. He also adds that, for the sake of simplicity he would advise to keep the notes in Neighborly and that they will be GRAMA-able for up to 7 years. Ms. Montoya mentions that there may be an exception for work product, but she would have to check.

Mr. Christensen asks for clarification about what would count as business. Ms. Montoya says that deliberating or discussing opinions to persuade another board member may be examples of business-like conduct. Or anything that goes against the purpose of OPMA where a decision has been made that the public was not privy of.

7. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Christensen opens the floor for discussion of the minutes. Mr. Murphy motions to approve the minutes as written, Mr. Jones seconds it. The minutes pass unanimously.

8. Other Business

Ms. Thomas opens the floor for discussion of what should be done with applicants that can't make it to the CDCIP board meetings. Mr. Christensen begins by suggesting allowing them to submit documents to review and leave it to the individual board members to look at the documents on their own time, rather as a group. Mr. Jones clarifies if the board has questions for these applicants if the answers would be emailed to the board. Ms. Thomas says they would send an email with the question to the applicant and request a response by the following Wednesday (24-hour turn around), and any response would be sent to the board.

Ms. Schechinger says that while she would like to have the 24-hour leeway, since some applicants have significant requests, the applicants should treat their opportunity to speak to the board as a priority.

Mr. Murphy, referring to Mr. Christensen's comment, responds that questions are better discussed as a quorum in case a board member doesn't understand the response. Mr. Christensen replies that a compromise might be not to deny anyone the chance to respond to the questions, but ultimately the questions have already been discussed amongst the board members and further discussion may cause a delay in the applicant review process. Ms. Thomas adds that they've broken up final funding night in order to alleviate some of the time pressure, but Mr. Rutledge adds that it's best to keep in mind that the schedule is tight.

Ms. Bonk asks to clarify that the board's questions would be sent to the applicant in the event that the applicant does not attend the meeting, and the answers will be sent to the board by email, but the board would not discuss those answers. Mr. Christensen agrees that is what he meant. Ms. Bonk and Mr. Weeks agree with the idea.

Ms. Thomas asks the board to submit their scores to the Sunday before the final funding night. Mr. Christensen asks how many CDBG applications there are. Ms. Thomas answers 27 and 10 respectively. Ms. Bonk applauds whoever came up with the idea of breaking up the final funding night sessions. Mr. Jones asks if the final funding night mini-sessions take away time from applicants. Mr. Rutledge says that there is a little bit of a trade-off, but all applicants will have their time to speak with the board and that with the removal of the NANO sessions, breaking up final funding night was a logical alternative.

Mr. Murphy asks about field trips to visit the applicant's projects. Ms. Thomas responds that there isn't time, and Mr. Rutledge adds that an individual board member does have the ability to contact some of the applicants. Mr. Murphy asks for contacts. Ms. Royall interjects that doing field trips would require the city to invite the public and may conflict with non-profits that maintain client confidentiality, but there may be a way to build it in the schedule for next year, or, since contacting several applicants separately may burden the applicants, choosing a handful to visit individually may be more beneficial. Ms. Thomas clarifies that a quorum will be 5 once all council members are sworn in.

Mr. Christensen motions for the proposal that any applicant that cannot make it to their time slot for the CDCIP board meeting will be contacted with the board's questions electronically and given a 24-hour period to respond, but the applicants' answers will not be discussed in the following meeting in order to save time. Mr. Murphy seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Rutledge mentions that he added all the board members to the reviews on Neighborly. He also mentions that Funding Our Future will run differently than the other programs since there are only a couple weeks to go over the programs and there are 25 – 40 applications. There isn't enough time to host all Funding Our Future applicants on Zoom, but there will be time for the board to review the applications individually. Mr. Markman adds to expect some ambiguity in the review process this year. Ms. Schechinger confirms that the rubric will be the same for Funding Our Future as the other programs. Mr. Rutledge says it will be mostly similar.

Mr. Murphy asks if a review of the Neighborly software is possible. Mr. Weeks concurs that this

would be helpful to help integrate the new board members. Mr. Rutledge runs down the basics of the software and scoring with the board and Mr. Durfee explains some of the additions from the previous year. Mr. Jones suggests that a notification for adding notes might be beneficial and to consider deleting any mention of 2 or 4 points on the rubric since the board isn't using them.

Ms. Thomas mentions that the new board members will be required to make a Neighborly account, and if something goes wrong to let staff know as soon as possible. Mr. Rutledge adds for the members to check to make sure they can see the applicants within the next couple days.

Ms. Bonk advises the new board members that 1) staff do the eligibility review, 2) be consistent with their own scoring, and 3) do background research on the organizations and ask questions. Ms. Thomas says staff will do their best to explain the HUD vernacular. Mr. Rutledge explains why the scoring consistency is important for city council.

Mr. Murphy asks about the board split. Ms. Thomas says it will likely happen after this year. Mr. Rutledge says they will be in contact as soon as staff have more information.

9. Adjourn

Meeting is adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

X 

CDCIP Board Chair

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the CDCIP Board meeting held October 6th, 2025.