

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

1. **Board Members**

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

Board Members Not Present

Staff Present

Dennis Rutledge
Jack Markman
Alexandra Hall
Tony Milner
Tyler Durfee

Also Present

2. **Terms**

FOF – Funding Our Future

3. **Welcome and Introductions**

Mr. Rutledge begins the board meeting at 5:02 P.M.

4. **Approval of Minutes**

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

5. **Vote for Vice Chair**

Ms. Bonk nominates Mr. Jones for Vice Chair and makes a motion for it. Mr. Fankhouser seconds. The motion passes.

6. **Application Review: Funding Our Future**

Mr. Markman begins the application review process for Funding Our Future.

i. **The INN Between – Medical Supportive Housing for the Homeless**

Mr. Markman introduces the INN Between's program

Q. Mr. Christensen asks what the difference was between their previous years' application and this year.

A. Mr. Markman answers that the applications were approximately the same.

Q. Mr. Weeks asks if the program is exclusively for those with medical conditions.

A. Mr. Markman answers that the primary service for the program is hospice or end of life care for homeless individuals, though they may house individuals with chronic conditions that aren't terminal they focus on those with terminal diagnoses.

ii. The Road Home (TRH) – House 20

Mr. Markman introduces TRH's House 20 program. He mentions that House 20 was historically an FOF category which TRH used to apply for almost exclusively. It is more competitive this year due to category changes.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks if it's reasonable to have 20 beneficiaries for this program.

A. Mr. Markman answers that they generally have a rotating pool of 20 individuals they are working with. Mr. Christensen adds that the program would likely look for other funding sources for rent assistance while this funding stream would likely cover case management for the 20 beneficiaries.

Q. Mr. Weeks asks about the intensity of the case management.

A. Mr. Markman answers that he believes it is wrap-around, intensive case management, but he will reach out to the organization for clarification.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks what Mr. Weeks considers a full workload for case manager.

A. Mr. Weeks answers that for health providers, 20 people is considered a single full-time case manager which is why he was wondering why TRH is funding two for the program. Mr. Christensen adds that the case management for this program is likely more outreach oriented than is standard for case managers.

iii. The Road Home (TRH) – Landlord Assurance

Mr. Markman introduces TRH's Landlord Assurance program.

Q. Mr. Jones asks about clients served.

A. Mr. Markman answers that the number of clients served for the program will likely be close to the TRH's projection of 50.

Q. Mr. Weeks asks for clarification on what barrier elimination and landlord incentive means in their application.

A. Mr. Markman answers that some examples may include services such as damage repair resulting in impending eviction, higher downpayment for entry associated with at risk home seekers, etc. Landlord incentives may include fees associated with business licenses and other fee removals.

iv. The Road Home (TRH) – Shared Housing

Mr. Markman introduces TRH's Shared Housing program. He adds that this was also a FOF program that has become more competitive in recent years.

Q. Mr. Jones asks if the funding covers the roommate and what the vetting process may look like.

A. Mr. Markman answers the funding would cover both individuals. He also describes the vetting process for the program and clarifies that the HUD definitions of homelessness are strict enough that shared housing doesn't qualify individuals as homeless, so the enrollment of this program focuses on those currently homeless.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks what the city's rationale for getting rid of the shared housing category.

A. Mr. Markman answers that some categories were getting very few applicants and other categories provided similar but different programs, so to pool funding towards the greatest need, the categories were lumped together to benefit more applicants, though it made the funding more competitive. Overall, 8 categories were consolidated into 2 categories where most provided tenant-based housing assistance.

Q. Mr. Christense asks if the program is time-limited or if clients can have access to assistance for as long as they meet the qualifications.

A. Mr. Markman will ask what the timeline for clients served in this program is.

v. **The Road Home (TRH) – Supportive Housing Case Management**

Mr. Markman introduces TRH's Supportive Housing Case Management program.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks about Magnolia House.

A. Mr. Markman believes it is TRH's property but will ask for clarification. Mr. Christensen adds that his understanding is that Magnolia House is owned by TRH and operates as permanent supportive housing for those with chronic illnesses.

vi. **Utah Community Action (UCA) – Landlord Tenant Mediation**

Mr. Markman introduces UCA's Landlord Tenant Mediation program.

Q. Mr. Christensen asks if the funding would supplement short-term rental assistance for rentals beneficiaries already have or if it's similar to Rapid Re-housing programs.

A. Mr. Markman answers that the rental assistance will be paired with tenant-landlord mediation for clients at risk of eviction, whereas, rapid re-housing, beneficiaries generally have been homeless before applying or have no disputes with their landlord.

vii. **Utah Housing Coalition (UHC) – Renter, Tenant, and Landlord Education**

Mr. Markman introduces UHC's Renter, Tenant, and Landlord Education program. He adds that their estimate of beneficiaries likely includes how far the educational impact extends.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks if the UHC is separated from the city/state.

A. Mr. Rutledge answers that he believes they are a separate entity and are a non-profit. Mr. Milner adds that they address homelessness throughout the state but are not connected to the government.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks if there is a minimum amount of funding that can be awarded to FOF applicants.

A. Mr. Markman answers that the lower bound cap for FOF has been historically \$30,000.

viii. Volunteers of America (VOA) – House 20

Mr. Markman introduces the VOA's House 20 program.

Q. Mr. Christensen asks, regarding both House 20 programs, what criteria is considered for vetting beneficiaries.

A. Mr. Markman agrees to get that information to the board.

ix. Wasatch Community Gardens (WCG) – Green Team Case Management

Mr. Markman introduces the WCG's Green Team Case Management program. He specifies that this program will fund housing related needs for participants of their Job Training program.

Q. Mr. Murphy asks for clarification on whether the funding is going to be used for housing case management or rental assistance.

A. Mr. Markman answers that he believes the funding will be used for both, but he will reach out for clarification. Mr. Christensen adds that he saw money allocated for housing assistance in their application and that the program pays wages to their participants.

Q. Mr. Christensen asks how many FOF applications are the same as HUD applications.

A. Mr. Rutledge answers that just from this meeting, two applications were carry-over applications. Mr. Christensen asks the board to consider whether they would want to fund these programs with FOF funding if they had decided not to fund those same applications through HUD programs. Mr. Markman adds that some applicants will overlap with HUD even if their programs don't. Mr. Rutledge offers to send the board a list of the applicants that have sent the same application for both HUD applications and FOF.

x. Women of the World (WoW) – Assistance for Refugee, Immigrant, and Asylum-Seeking Women

Mr. Markman introduces WoW's program.

Q. Mr. Christensen asks how program income works for FOF programs.

A. Mr. Markman answers that the city's policy is that program income funds are

recaptured by the city. Generally, the returned funds are clearly generated by the program.

xi. **YWCA Utah – Residential Self-Sufficiency Pilot Survivor Driven Housing, and KRH Incentivized Rent Assistance**

Mr. Markman introduces the YWCA's program.

There are no questions.

7. **Other Business**

Mr. Christensen asks whether FOF has historically covers programs that HUD does not. Mr. Markman answers that is part of how FOF has been marketed to applicants, but there has always been a mix of applicants that apply with programs that could be fulfilled with HUD funding.

Mr. Jones asks when the board scores are due. Mr. Markman answers the 11th would be ideal. Mr. Rutledge adds that the goal for the next meeting is to do the FOF final funding and review the HUD funding in the same night. Mr. Markman reminds the board that their scores are necessary to get both done on the same night. Mr. Rutledge also reminds the board to look at their funding decisions ahead of time in preparation for the meeting. He also describes what meeting with the council might look for the board members.

The board requests staff to send the contingencies from the previous year. Staff agree.

8. **Adjourn**

Meeting is adjourned at 6:19 P.M.

X

CDCIP Board Chair

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the CDCIP Board meeting held January 5th, 2026.