

-MINUTES  
FROM THE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS  
BOARD MEETING (CDCIP)  
Monday, October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025  
5:00pm

1. **Board Members**

Brad Christensen  
Joseph Murphy (Jurphy)  
Devon Schechinger  
Dallin Jones  
Cooper Fankhauser  
(Online)  
Sean Weeks

**Board Members Not Present**

Jenny Bonk

**Staff Present**

Kerry Thomas  
Dennis Rutledge  
Sarah Neilsen  
Alexandra Hall  
Heather Royall (Online)  
Tyler Durfee (Online)

**Also Present**

Parviz Faiz

2. **Terms**

CDCU – Community Development Corporation of Utah  
UCA – Utah Community Action  
FSH – First Step House  
TRH – The Road Home

3. **Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Thomas begins the board meeting at 5:03 P.M.

4. **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Murphy motions to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Jones seconds. The minutes pass unanimously.

5. **Final Funding Night**

Ms. Thomas introduces the data for the mini-funding night. She brings attention to the unscored applications which were excluded from the data. She asks the board to score these applications by the end of the week (11.02.25) and reminds them to put their funding recommendation into Neighborly. Mr. Rutledge also touches on these points and says that Ms. Thomas will email those

who need to finish scoring their application and that the current scores may change with the additional data. Mr. Murphy clarifies if the text box is for minimum funding or recommended funding and whether it needs to be the request minimum (\$50,000). Mr. Rutledge answers it is their recommended funding, and it does not have to be at the minimum. Ms. Thomas mentions that if the board does not recommend funding for an applicant, they can put \$0 in the box.

Mr. Weeks asks if staff would prefer the funding recommendations to align with the total amount of funding. Staff say that is up to the individual board member's discretion.

Mr. Murphy asks if the board can change their scores when staff reopen the scoring for the board. Mr. Rutledge advises not to unless they feel strongly that the score should be changed. Mr. Christensen asks if staff can remove the 2024 applications from their Neighborly list. Mr. Rutledge says they will check if they can.

Ms. Thomas also mentions that staff would like the board to take into consideration a motion to limit the number of applications a single organization can submit for future years in order to spread the funds to more diverse organizations. Mr. Murphy mentions that the only entities this year that have three or more applications submitted are the CDCU and UCA, so the limitation might not change much. Mr. Faiz asks if the limitation would apply across all programs. Mr. Rutledge clarifies that the original thought was to cap awards at 3 total, with only 2 awards per program. Mr. Murphy asks if this rule would apply to Funding Our Future. Mr. Rutledge says likely not.

Mr. Christensen asks staff if the admin scores would be lower for regular applicants than for new applicants. Mr. Thomas says regular applicants tend to score higher. Mr. Christensen suggests staff can adjust administrative scoring to give newer applicants a boost to diversify funds.

Ms. Royall clarifies that everything staff puts to the board is a recommendation that would later be asked to city council and the mayor. She tells the board to consider it but not feel solely responsible for how the funding is utilized. She also clarifies that the administrative scoring is set up to be objective and supported by known facts of the applicant and the CDCIP is meant to be the subjective part of the application process.

Mr. Weeks asks for clarification on the issue. Mr. Rutledge answers that many non-profits serve a different target population, so diversifying the funds can be beneficial for the community. Mr. Weeks asks if the application can be modified to include seeking new applicants. Mr. Rutledge answers there are questions that identify whether a program is new or existing. Ms. Schechinger points out that the application favors existing programs.

Ms. Thomas mentions that staff will be taking note of the board's comments and suggestions to send to the city council.

**i. HOPWA**

Ms. Thomas introduces the HOPWA applicant scoring. Mr. Rutledge mentions that the city council had questions last year as to why some programs were funded over others.

Mr. Christensen mentions that Housing Connect shows in their application that they dedicated more funding to direct services, which was a factor in his scoring.

Mr. Murphy says he would be for fully funding the top ranked applicant and giving the rest to the latter. Mr. Jones and Ms. Schechinger agree.

Mr. Weeks mentions that diversifying the program makes more sense because he realized the applicants sound very similar, but one has asked for more money for less households and asks as to why that might be. Mr. Christensen replies that UCA's housing assistance covers less months and therefore they would assist more households while Housing Authority has ongoing assistance.

ii. **HOME**

Ms. Thomas introduces HOME and HOME-CHDO applicant scoring.

Ms. Schechinger says she would like to not fund NeighborWorks this year because she would rather the funding go to homeless services and helping individuals already on the street. Mr. Murphy replies that he sees value in addressing different ways to provide housing stability, but he acknowledges the board's opinion which shows NeighborWorks as a low funding priority. However, he would have some differing funding recommendations if he had been given the correct program funding amount. Ms. Thomas says staff will be more proactive about providing information on any changes to the board.

Mr. Jones says he understands the logic of not funding NeighborWorks but asks what would happen if they funded all applicants fully. Staff say that it would be slightly little over budget. Mr. Murphy asks Ms. Schechinger if they didn't fund NeighborWorks where the remaining funds would be allocated.

Ms. Schechinger adds that her approach doesn't compare NeighborWorks to the dollar amounts available, but rather by looking solely at their program and that she believes the money would be better spent on the higher scored programs. Mr. Weeks agrees. Mr. Murphy says he would like to see the completed data before making a final decision.

Ms. Schechinger asks what Mr. Murphy would do instead. Mr. Murphy answers that he believes the board should fund everyone at their requested amounts until the funding runs out. Mr. Fankhouser and Mr. Faiz agree.

Ms. Kerry mentions that First Step House and CDCU's Emeril Ave. Apartments were scored closely together, but FSH scored slightly higher.

Mr. Weeks says that he doesn't think NeighborWorks is a priority and that he would like to fully fund the highest ranked applicants first. Mr. Christensen replies that he leans for the lowest scored applicant to get less but still be funded. Ms. Schechinger says she could go along with funding NeighborWorks less if that is the board's decision.

Mr. Murphy mentions that he's concerned that applicants are already asking for less than they need to appeal more to city council. Mr. Rutledge mentions that the

minimum funding asks purpose is to try and address this question.

Mr. Christensen points out that for the CDCU's application, most the funding would come back to the city as program income versus down payment assistance which would not generate program income. Mr. Weeks comments that because of their creative way to addressing the housing crisis, their program is memorable to him.

Mr. Jones asks staff how subrecipients prove they've used the awarded funds. Mr. Rutledge explains the process.

iii. **ESG**

Ms. Thomas introduces the ESG applicant scoring. She also mentions that, with the floor raised to \$50,000, the board can only fully fund one ESG part 2 application; however, they are able to take any leftover funding from ESG part 1 to fund an additional ESG part 2 application. Mr. Christensen asks if Part 2 funds can be used for ESG part 1. Ms. Thomas answers that they cannot be due to a funding cap on ESG part 1.

Mr. Murphy asks what the numbers would look like if they funded the highest scored applicants first. Ms. Nielsen goes over the numbers of funding the highest first, mentioning that if the board fully funds both VOA applications, they would have to decide whether or not to fund TRH on part 2. Ms. Schechinger suggests funding them at the minimum for Part 2.

Mr. Murphy says he would like to see the YWCA funded if possible because they serve both women and children in domestic violence situations. The board discusses whether to fund the YWCA at their request or their minimum.

The board discusses how best to divvy the funding based on the current scoring.

The board come to a preliminary agreement on their funding allocations but will review their decisions before final funding night.

**6. Other Business**

Mr. Murphy confirms that there are 37 applicants before the next mini-funding night. Ms. Thomas says this is correct, but if the board needs to break the CDBG applications up there can be another mini-funding night between CDBG Public Services and CDBG Neighborhood Housing Improvements.

Ms. Schechinger confirms that staff will be opening the Neighborly scoring so the board can input their funding and change their scores. Ms. Thomas advises the board not to change their scores if they were already submitted unless they were submitted incorrectly. Mr. Murphy confirms that they do not have to mark complete until final funding night, Ms. Thomas says yes. Ms. Schechinger asks when they need to be submitted. Ms. Thomas replies Sunday (11.02.25) at 11:59.

Mr. Weeks asks why the score changes are needed. Ms. Thomas and Mr. Murphy explain that there

may be small changes to funding allocations with the inclusion of the numbers.

Ms. Thomas mentions that the contingencies from last year will likely be the same and they will be voted on final funding night.

Ms. Nielsen asks the board to make sure they can access their reopened HOPWA scoring. Ms. Thomas says that if something doesn't work right to let staff know soon so they can contact Neighborly before the scores are due.

**7. Adjourn**

Meeting is adjourned at 6:32 P.M.

X

---

CDCIP Board Chair

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the CDCIP Board meeting held October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2025.