

MINUTES
FROM THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
BOARD MEETING (CDCIP)
Monday, January 12th, 2026
5:00pm

1. **Board Members**

Brad Christensen
Joseph Murphy (Jurphy)
Dallin Jones
Sean Weeks
Jenny Bonk

Board Members Not Present

Cooper Fankhauser

Staff Present

Kerry Thomas
Dennis Rutledge
Jack Markman
Alexandra Hall
Heather Royall
Tyler Durfee

Also Present

2. **Terms**

FOF – Funding Our Future
HOPWA – Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids
ESG – Emergency Services Grant
CDBG NHI – Community Development Block Grant Neighborhood Housing and Infrastructure
CDBG PS – Community Development Block Grant Public Services
CDCU – Community Development Corporation of Utah
UCA – Utah Community Action
TRH – The Road Home

3. **Welcome and Introductions**

Mr. Markman and Ms. Thomas begin the board meeting at 5:05 P.M.

4. **Approval of Minutes**

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

5. **Final Funding Night**

Mr. Rutledge gives the board a document listing what organizations were funded with what funds across programs.

i. FOF – Equity and Home Ownership (EHO)

Mr. Markman introduces the board’s scores and funding projections for Funding Our Future EHO.

Mr. Christensen says he leans towards column J. Ms. Bonk suggests to the board that they do not fund the last applicant for this category because they can’t fund them at their minimum funding ask and instead overfunding the higher placed applicants. Mr. Markman explains the spreadsheet in more detail.

Mr. Jones asks if staff has an estimate of the dollar amount spent per beneficiary served for these programs. Mr. Markman answers that they do not have that calculation on hand, but reminds the board that the applicants are ordered on the sheet in order of risk from lowest to highest and those with significantly large funding asks are ranked to be a little riskier.

Mr. Murphy asks if the funding can be given to another category or if they can choose not to spend the full amount. Mr. Markman answers that the former is not possible, but the latter can be done if the board decides. Mr. Weeks asks if they can offer funding the lowest scored applicant under their minimum and leave it up to the applicant to decide whether they can accept the funding. Mr. Markman answers that is possible and can be included in the contingencies the board will vote on.

Mr. Jones asks what the minimum funding amount for FOF is. Mr. Markman answers that it has historically been \$30,000 but many applicants are applying for \$50,000 minimum because they also applied for HUD funding, of which the minimum funding is \$50,000.

Mr. Weeks and Mr. Murphy point out the number of estimated beneficiaries for the applicants. Mr. Murphy also adds that the City Council may choose to fund some programs even if the board chooses not to.

Mr. Markman estimates the funding allocation based on the board’s discussion and shows it to the board. Mr. Christensen says he liked the original J column. Mr. Weeks agrees with the new J Column. The board agrees to revisit at the end.

ii. FOF - Tenant-Based Housing Assistance (TBHA)

Mr. Markman introduces the scoring and funding calculations for FOF TBHA programs. He points out the applications that have the same board scores.

Mr. Murphy asks city staff how the cost of oversight relates to the number of grant recipients awarded. Mr. Markman answers that for FOF generally funds anywhere between 12 – 20 applicants, and that there isn’t usually a large change in workload for the staff. Ms. Thomas adds for federal funding, managing more programs versus managing different beneficiaries each comes with its unique challenges.

Mr. Murphy points out that the board should consider how to fund programs that ranked with the same score. Ms. Bonk advocates for column J. Mr. Christiansen says that he feels funding column J would punish programs who asked for a smaller amount of funding. Mr. Weeks agrees and adds that he is in favor of spreading the funding more as well as funding the higher scored applicants more. Mr. Jones agrees.

Mr. Murphy asks the board what their methods for recommended funding. Mr. Jones says he never puts a zero and recommends at least minimum funding for most applicants and full funding for those he scored highly. Other members of the board say they fund a few programs at full amount until the funding runs out and then don't recommend funding for the lower scored programs.

Ms. Bonk speaks against column L because it doesn't treat fairly the applicants that asked for more. Mr. Markman suggests creating another funding calculation based on the board's discussion. Ms. Bonk suggests taking a percentage off some applicants who are overfunded to fund a few more highly scored applicants. Mr. Christensen suggests funding the applicants by their percentage score. The board also discusses how to fund applicants with the same percentage scoring. They decide to split the remaining funding equally across the programs.

The board discusses whether they want to fund every program using a similar method.

Mr. Murphy motions to approve column N for both FOF programs. Ms. Bonk seconds. The motion passes. Ms. Nielsen mentions that the board left \$100 unfunded. Mr. Weeks motions for the extra money to be given to the INN Between. Mr. Jones seconds. The motion passes.

iii. **HOPWA**

Ms. Thomas introduces the new scoring for HOPWA since excluding the scores of the members who left the board. Mr. Markman reminds the board that leftover funds will be returned to the federal government. Mr. Murphy suggests taking off the change and rounding the funds awarded to the nearest dollar. The board agrees.

iv. **HOME & HOME CHDO**

Ms. Thomas introduces the new scoring for the HOME programs. The board discusses fully funding CDCU's CHDO application. Mr. Rutledge adds that any unfunded CHDO dollars will remain unused until next year. The board agrees to fund the CHDO application with the available CHDO dollars.

v. **ESG Part 1 and ESG Part 2**

Ms. Thomas introduces the new scoring for the ESG programs and reminds the board of the funding limitations. She says with the change in board, the UCA ESG Part 2 application gained a higher score than TRH. The board discusses whether to fund TRH or UCA or to give that funding to another, higher scored program.

Mr. Weeks suggests funding according to the change in score. Mr. Murphy suggests the board fund TRH. Mr. Murphy says he is in favor of column N as written, funds the UCA instead of TRH. Mr. Weeks and Mr. Christensen agree. The rest of the board agrees.

vi. **CDBG NHI**

Ms. Thomas introduces the new scoring for the CDBG NHI programs. The board agrees to keep it as it's written.

vii. **CDBG PS**

Ms. Thomas introduces the new scoring for CDBG PS and points out that the board previously chose to fund one applicant with a third of the program's funding. Mr. Weeks says he agrees with the funding due to the extensive service the program provides. Mr. Rutledge adds that council may move the funding. Mr. Jones asks if staff can give the board's reasoning to the council. Mr. Rutledge agrees.

Mr. Christensen mentions that, even if the board only funded the highest scored programs at minimum request to try and fund more applicants, they would only spread the funding to one or two more programs.

The board decides to leave the funding as previously decided.

6. **Vote on Contingencies**

Ms. Thomas introduces the previous year's contingency plans. Mr. Weeks asks staff what happens to programs funded at the minimum if a contingency is invoked. Ms. Thomas answers that they would not be funded and the funding would be reallocated to highest scored up to their ask.

Mr. Murphy asks staff what the likelihood is of these programs receiving more funding instead of less. Mr. Durfee explains the current political situation of federal funding. Mr. Christensen asks if the language on the contingencies as written allow for enough flexibility in the event of budget cuts. Mr. Rutledge answers that it does and adds that the contingencies are worded to try not to take funding away from the highest scored programs. Mr. Christensen and Mr. Murphy propose a change to the wording to allow overfunding for the highest scored programs if needed to all programs.

The board agrees on the contingencies.

Mr. Markman explains the contingencies for FOF. The board agrees with the contingencies. Mr. Murphy asks about the part of the contingency concerning rounding the dollar amounts. Mr. Markman explains that it is to capture as much funding as possible while keeping the reallocation clean.

Mr. Weeks motions to approve the contingency plans. Mr. Jones seconds. The


motion passes. Mr. Weeks also makes a motion to approve all the funding at once instead of grant by grant. Mr. Jones seconds. The motion passes. Mr. Weeks motions to approve the funding as written. Mr. Murphy seconds. The motion passes.

7. Other Business

Mr. Rutledge reminds the board that staff will be sending them a survey. Mr. Murphy asks staff if the board is projected to be dissolved. Mr. Durfee says the latest staff have heard is that the discussion is paused but will likely continue moving in that direction. Mr. Rutledge adds that when staff have a clear answer, they will let the board know. The board thank the staff for their hard work.

8. Adjourn

Meeting is adjourned at 7:01 P.M.

X 
Brad Christensen (Feb 19, 2026 21:08:57 MST)

CDCIP Board Chair

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the CDCIP Board meeting held January 12th, 2026.







Meeting Minutes 01.12.26

Final Audit Report

2026-02-20

Created:	2026-02-19
By:	Rachel Molinari (Rachel.Molinari@slc.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAxd-9L1iY2iN87-YHGE5Px87GISzKkSFF

"Meeting Minutes 01.12.26" History

-  Document created by Rachel Molinari (Rachel.Molinari@slc.gov)
2026-02-19 - 6:21:20 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to brad.r.christensen@gmail.com for signature
2026-02-19 - 6:22:27 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by brad.r.christensen@gmail.com
2026-02-19 - 8:27:05 PM GMT
-  Signer brad.r.christensen@gmail.com entered name at signing as Brad Christensen
2026-02-20 - 4:08:55 AM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Brad Christensen (brad.r.christensen@gmail.com)
Signature Date: 2026-02-20 - 4:08:57 AM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.
2026-02-20 - 4:08:57 AM GMT

