

# MINUTES

## CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

*January 21, 2026, | Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 South State Street, North Building, Rm N3-600  
Jordan River 1:00 – 3:00 pm*

*| Meeting called to order by Dan Tisdale*

---

### In Attendance

---

**Committee Members:** Pat Holmes, Audrey Evans, J. Todd Richards, Candy Tippetts, Antonio Valbuena

**Online Committee Members:** Rex Marler, Tom Christiansen, Lisa Nguyen, Mike Anderson

**Excused:** Jacob Lawson, Turner Bitton

**Staff:** Dan Tisdale, Tallie Viteri, Jennifer Jimenez, Derick Davis, Smita Patel

**Guests:**

---

### 1. Call Meeting to Order and Review Staff Items of Business - Dan Tisdale

---

- Dan welcomed everyone and started the meeting at 1:06. Dan introduced Lisa Nguyen as a new committee member. Dan noted that Mike would be recusing himself from speaking on the UCA applications due to a conflict of interest.

---

### 2. Approve meeting minutes from 1/14 and the 2/27, 2025, meeting – Chair

---

- Candy asked for a motion to approve the minutes from 1/14/2026 and from the 2/27/2025 meeting from last year's funding cycle. Todd motioned to approve the minutes for both meetings. Pat seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

---

### 3. Application Review – Chair

---

- **UCA – Early Childhood Services**
  - \$150,000.00
  - Pat said the narrative did not address what the program does. Very general and non-descript. Limited by the number of people it assists.
  - Tom said the program innovation was limited. The funding innovation was good and would receive high marks.
  - Todd said the leverage was good. The request is for \$150k with a total project cost of \$480K. The leverage sources were not listed. If the funding were less, they would help fewer students.
  - Candy said they have a good background and experience. They did list the federal funding and have roughly 5 years of experience with that type of funding.

- Rex said the coordination with the con-plan is a stretch.
- The committee said it meets the income and population targeting criteria.
  
- **UCA – ESG**
  - \$198,683.00
  - Pat said the narrative was good. It shows good partnerships and progression of the program.
  - Antonio said he thought the innovation was good. Tom said he would give high marks on the program innovation, but average marks on the funding innovation.
  - Todd liked that most of the funding was going to direct assistance. The funding leverage is good.
  - Candy said they have been in operation for 10 years. They do receive a grant along with the federal funding, and they have experience with federal funding. Also, an annual audit.
  - Rex gave them a high score to improve housing stability and good coordination.
  - The committee said it does cover the population target.
  
- **UCA – TBRA**
  - \$230,056.00
  - Pat said the narrative was the same as the previous UCA application.
  - Antonio said he likes the program, but he said it is similar to the previous application. Tom said his views are the same as the previous grant.
  - Todd said the leverage is good. The request is \$230k of the \$3.7 mil total project cost. 91% of the ask is going to TBRA. The leverage amounts are broken down.
  - Candy said they have been providing rental assistance for over 35 years, and 25 of those have been funded by SLCo. They do have a good background with grants and federal funding.
  - The income and population were basically the same as in the previous application.
  
- **Odyssey House**
  - \$150,000.00
  - Pat said the narrative is good. It addresses each objective with good collaboration.
  - Antonio said it has good innovation with the population that it serves. Tom said their funding model is interesting, and he gives high marks to the program and funding.
  - Todd said their request of \$150k is the total for the program. No leverage.
  - Candy said that Odyssey House has been around for several years. They have good partnerships. Assist clients in several ways.

- Mike would like to have seen a better explanation and more information on the coordination. Rex liked that the funds would go to rental assistance and gave it a high score.
  - They fit the population-served criteria. The clients they serve are low and extremely low-income.
- **Guadalupe Center**
    - \$162,500.00
    - Pat said it has a good narrative. They are trying to break the cycle of poverty and have good partnerships.
    - Antonio said the innovation is good and they are doing good work. Tom liked the innovation as it pertained to a volunteer-based model to help stretch the funding. On the funding side, they use multiple grant sources.
    - Todd said the leverage is good. The request is \$162,500.00 with a total of \$850K for the program. They did not provide the sources of funding for the leverage.
    - Candy said they have a good track record, having been around for about 60 years. They do have a good history with federal funding going back about 60 years. They have been funded in the past. They have a lot of outside funding.
    - Mike gave them a high score for the ESL focus and good coordination and said it was a good bang for the buck. Rex agreed with Mike.
    - The income population and targeting were not detailed.
- **Wasatch Community Gardens**
    - \$104,000.00
    - Pat said the narrative was good. The program is exclusive to helping women with stability.
    - Tom said he was not a fan of the program. Good job on innovation. The funding model seeks funding from different sources and generates revenue from seed sales. Antonio loved the program; coming from a farming background, he gave it a high score.
    - Todd said the request is \$104K with a total budget of \$421K, and the leverage is good.
    - Candy said their partnerships are good with several groups. They do have experience with federal block grants and CDBG money.
    - Rex gave it a good score for the coordination with the con-plan. Housing stability and economic mobility. Mike agreed with Rex. Maybe a little more detail.
    - It definitely fits the housing and stability criteria.
- **The INN Between**
    - \$150,000.00

- Pat said the narrative is great and very detailed, addressing a need in the community. Giving people death with dignity. Audrey agreed with Pat's comments.
  - Antonio said he likes what they do to help a unique population. Tom said it is a very innovative program. It is a program that is doing something that no one else is doing.
  - Todd said the request is \$150K with a total project cost of \$2.6 mil that gives it good leverage. They are looking for a rezone. Currently, they have 50 beds and are looking to increase to 70 or 80 beds.
  - Candy said they have been around since 2015. It is a nationally unique program, and innovation is very high. They do receive federal funding and have experience with grant cycles.
  - Rex said it has good coordination with the con-plan, even though it wasn't directly related to housing.
  - The committee said it was lacking a little in the population served. It fits the niche, but it lacks detail.
- **Community Building Services**
    - \$169,949.00
    - Pat said the narrative was general and vague about the population they are trying to serve. Audrey agreed with Pat and asked if there could be clarifying questions for more detail.
    - Antonio would like more clarification on the program.
    - Todd said the budget is broken down well. The request is \$169,949 with a project total of \$228K.
    - Candy said she didn't score them high on their background. No federal funding.
    - Rex said they do well with computer classes and ESL. They do meet the coordination with the con-plan.
    - The income and population served is lacking and vague.

---

#### 4. Next Meeting Details – Dan Tisdale

---

- Lisa will be partnering with Candy on the Background/Experience/Federal Funding category.
- The next meeting will be on January 28<sup>th</sup> from 1-3 pm. N3-600 Jordan River.

---

#### 5. Adjourn – Committee

---

- The meeting was adjourned at 2:56.

#### **Committee member breakdown for application review:**

- Project Narrative – Pat and Audrey

- Innovation – Tom and Antonio
- Leverage/Budget/Contingencies – Todd
- Background/Experience/Federal Funding – Candy and Lisa
- Coordination with Consolidated Plan – Mike and Rex
- Income and Population Targeting/Project Size – Turner and Jacob