

CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

*February 18, 2026, | Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 South State Street, North Building,
Room N3-600 Jordan River 1:00 – 3:00 pm*

| Meeting called to order by Dan Tisdale

In Attendance

Committee Members: J. Todd Richards, Candy Tippetts, Antonio Valbuena

Online Committee Members: Rex Marler, Tom Christiansen, Lisa Nguyen, Audrey Evans, Jacob Lawson, Pat Holmes

Excused: Mike Anderson, Turner Bitton

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

Guests:

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

- Dan welcomed everyone, verified a quorum, and started the meeting at 1:10. Dan spoke to the committee about application 36 not meeting eligibility. Stating that it had been removed from the process.

2. Approve meeting minutes from the 2/11 meeting – Chair

- Candy asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the 2/11 meeting. Todd motioned to approve the minutes. Pat seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

3. Application Review – Chair

- **Habitat for Humanity**
 - \$650,000.00
 - Pat said the narrative was good. They work with city housing offices and list their partners. Audrey had nothing more to add.
 - Todd said the budget was not included in the application. Not a lot of leverage. \$572K of the ask will go to project costs. 27 households at about \$21K per. Tallie said the staff reached out for the budget but got no response.
 - Rex said it does meet coordination with the con-plan with home rehab/housing stability.
 - Lisa said they have 40 years of well-established experience. They have experience with federal funding, with program examples listed.
 - Jacob said they did a good job of explaining who they serve.
 - Antonio said it's a good program, specifically helping low-income and the elderly. Tom said the program and funding are both innovative.

- **ASSIST – Emergency Home Repair**

- \$500,000.00
- Pat said the narrative is ok. They will focus on approximately 140 repairs, 60 design proposals, and 4 community projects. No partners listed. Wondering how they get their clients.
- Todd said the leverage was good. The ask is \$500K with a project cost of \$2.6 million. The average household project would be around \$3K.
- Rex said it does meet the coordination with the con-plan. They are doing smaller home repairs.
- Candy said they have good experience in existence since 1969. They administer CDBG and HOME funds. Federal funding of 50 years. Lisa had nothing more to add.
- Jacob said they did not have a lot of information on the population served.
- Tom said it's innovative with its uniqueness. No funding innovation. Antonio said there was not a lot of innovation. Average.

- **ASSIST – Aging in Place**

- \$250,000.00
- Pat said they are focusing on clients with disabilities to give better accessibility. Larger-scale projects than the previous application. No partners listed. She wonders how they do their outreach.
- Todd said the ask is \$250K out of the \$2.2 million project cost. They do have quite a bit of leverage, and they show where that comes from.
- Rex said it meets the coordination with homeowner rehab and thriving communities.
- Lisa said it's similar to the previous application. Copy and paste.
- Jacob said it was short and concise, but would like to see more detail on the population they are serving.
- Antonio said he likes the program and that it helps disabled people have a good life. Tom said the innovation was explained in the narrative. The funding is not very innovative.

- **Odyssey House – Anchor Point**

- \$275,000.00
- Pat said the narrative was good, short, and sweet. They did open a new facility in August 2025.
- Todd said the ask is the same as the total project cost. They do not have any committed funds. \$250K is for the project, and \$25K is for admin costs.
- Rex said since it was a public improvement, it does coordinate with the con-plan for thriving communities. Would like to see more information and detail.
- Lisa said they receive CDBG funds from SLC and SLCo. They do have federal funding, but they were not specific on the timeframe. They did list some partners. The background portion was short.
- Jacob said the income and population portion was short. They do define the population served. He would like to see more evidence on the clients served.
- Tom said he gave a low score. Not innovative. Antonio agreed with Tom.

- **Shelter the Homeless**

- \$166,750.00
- Pat said the narrative was good. They own and operate three centers. Good description of the project.
- Todd said the ask is the full project amount. No leverage.
- Rex said it meets the coordination with the infrastructure improvements.
- Candy said this is for 4 homeless resource centers and 2 non-congregate. They are a key partner with SLCo. Listed services. They manage several government grants. Lisa had nothing more to add.
- Jacob said they define who they will serve, and why they are high need. He would like to see more detail.
- Antonio said there is not a lot of innovation. Tom said there is not much innovation.

- **YWCA Utah**

- \$300,000.00
- Pat said the narrative is very good. Taking existing units and converting them to studio apartments. Helping transitioning clients.
- Todd said the \$300k will cover 12 units. They have a grant from SLC for an additional \$300K and 12 more units.
- Lisa said they have more than 40 years of experience. Federal funding is good with past and current projects, and they listed the agencies they work with.
- Jacob said it clearly defined the connection with the group being targeted.
- Tom said it's a strong program with good innovation. Antonio said it's a good program helping domestic violence survivors.
- Rex said they hit all three coordination categories. Housing stability, economic development, and thriving communities.

- **The INN Between - Flooring**

- \$138,000.00
- Pat said the narrative was good. Short and sweet. Specific to the project. Has had previous funding.
- Todd said there is \$100K to go with the \$2 million total project cost. The leverage looks good, but he has questions on the budget itself. They do have a savings account that they could use if they weren't fully funded.
- Rex would like to see better detail in the budget. Too many discrepancies. Infrastructure improvements meet the coordination with the con-plan.
- Candy said they have been around since 2015. It's one of a few facilities that do this. They do have some experience with federal funding. The last four year grant cycles.
- Jacob said he would have liked to see more in this section. He would like to see more definition on the population served.

- Antonio said he didn't have a lot to say and gave it an average score. Tom said there was no innovation on the program side. It was innovative with the adaptive reuse of the building.
- **Utah Arts Alliance**
 - \$150,000.00
 - Pat said the narrative was good. Previously funded. Good explanation of the project.
 - Todd said the full \$150K will go to the project. \$100K to the restrooms, \$35K to the accessibility ramps, and \$15K to design and contingencies.
 - Rex said it has infrastructure improvements. Something that is needed. They did speak on their prior funding.
 - Lisa said they have 20 years of experience. They manage several venues. They do have decades of federal funding with details.
 - Jacob said there was nothing listed about the targeted population.
 - Antonio said it is an important project. Gave it a good score. Tom said he gave an above-average score.

4. Next Meeting Details – Dan Tisdale

- Tallie gave a presentation on the scoring and how it is weighted. Each application has the possibility of 100 points, plus a 5-point bonus. Tallie also asked the committee to pay attention to the way the applicant coordinates with the con-plan. Dan explained that application 36 was not eligible, and the applications for the February 25th meeting will be 37-39 and 43-49. He spoke on the meeting process for the March 4th final review, and the March 11th adopt final funding. Tallie said the public hearing is planned for early April.

5. Adjourn – Committee

- The meeting was adjourned at 3:00.

Committee member breakdown for application review:

- Project Narrative – Pat and Audrey
- 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
- Innovation – Tom and Antonio