SALT LAKE COUNTY
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MINUTES

CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

March 11, 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, Pat Holmes, Turner Bitton, Tom Christiansen

Online Committee Members: Rex Marler, Audrey Evans, Jacob Lawson, Mike Anderson

Excused: Lisa Nguyen

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

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 1:11.

2. Approve meeting minutes from the 2/25 meeting – Chair

- Candy asked for a motion to approve the minutes from 2/25. Turner motioned to approve. Pat seconded the motion. All in favor. None opposed, motion passed.

3. Review Funding Scenarios – Staff

- **Review and discuss the results of scored applications.**
    - Dan presented the final scoring to the committee. He gave a breakdown on the rankings. The staff put together two funding scenarios for the committee to decide on. The first scenario is funding 100% down the list until the funding runs out. Dan said at this point, it's just preliminary numbers, and they could change. Scenario two is a tiered percentage. The agencies that scored 90% or above would receive 90% of the ask, 80% score would receive 80% of the ask. Two agencies would also be funded with the remaining amount, less than an 80% score. Dan spoke on funding fewer agencies with larger amounts to maximize impact. Candy asked if the agencies had a contingency plan if they received a reduced amount. Dan said that was asked of them in the application. There was an RFA training in late 2025, so the agencies knew what the total allocation would be. Pat asked the question about changing the funding amounts to help more agencies. Jennifer explained the role of the HOME Consortium to the committee and how they would have the final say on funding amounts.

- **Review contingency scenarios for potential reduction or increase in funding.**
    - Turner brought up that there is no funding being allocated to rental assistance. Dan said that it is a possible concern that the HOME Consortium could bring up in their final decision. Antonio brought up a possible tiered program for awards for the next year. Jennifer said that the HOME Consortium has a large interest in rental assistance. Mike said he was not in favor of this funding scenario. He would like to see the committee redistribute some of the funds to make it fairer. Turner asked Mike what logic the committee would use to redistribute the funds. Mike explained what he thought should change to justify the funding change. Dan explained that this is only the second year that the HOME funding has been included in the process. Making the scoring look different than before. Dan said the staff could reach out to the Consortium with any concerns that the committee had regarding the funding. Dan talked about how close the scoring was across the agencies. Tom brought up having a ceiling that wouldn't be exceeded with the award. Tallie said that could be an option in next year's RFA. Dan said that the more information from the needs assessment will help inform the committee's decisions. Jennifer said that this is the first year in a while that there is a new development project. It has typically been TBRA in the past. The committee discussed the different scenarios with Dan showing the breakdown by percentage, and Talli explained to the committee the Urban County and how they affect the funding. Mike and Audrey made comments about the scoring not being fair. Dan spoke on the HOME funding, and that $236,486.00 is part of the CHDO, and that CDCU is the only eligible CHDO project. Mike commented on lowering the award to CDCU by $100K to fund IRC. With the logic of rental assistance being a priority in the con-plan. Dan said that it was possible with ample justification for the change. Dan read what CDCU and IRC wrote in their applications if they were awarded less than their requests. The committee and staff discussed the justification for the funding change. Dan said the cost per service is higher with IRC as compared to CDCU.

4. Vote for Final Recommendations – Chair

- **Adopt final funding recommendations to forward to the mayor.**
    - Dan said for the record, the modified scenario two would be awarding 90% of the ask to those that scored 90% or above. 80% of the ask to those who scored 80% to 89% for everything outside of HOME dollars. For the HOME dollars, we would allocate a lump sum to CDCU to allocate as they see fit to their top four ranked projects, as long as $236,486.00 is met outside of the rental assistance to meet the CHDO requirements. With $100K being awarded to the IRC rental assistance application, based on their rank and the efficiency of their program to meet the needs of the community. Mike made the motion to approve as described by Dan. Todd seconded the motion. All in favor with staff discretion to modify. All in favor. None opposed, motion passed.

- **Adopt contingency scenario for potential reduction or increase in funding.**
  - The committee agreed to let the staff modify and make any necessary changes to the final funding amounts.

  - *Dan thanked all the committee members for their time and effort in this process. Candy said she likes the suggestions for modifying the scoring and possibly capping the amounts for next year. Having more weight based on the Con-Plan.*

5. Final Business – Staff

- **Discuss public hearing format.**
  - The Public Hearing will be on April 2nd from 4-6 pm. Midvale City Hall. Dan explained the public comment period and how the mayor will decide on the final funding.

- **Discuss content for applicant debriefings.**
  - Dan explained how the debriefing process works. Reaching out to the agencies and letting them know the outcomes and what they could work on for the next application review. Those usually go out after the mayor has made her decision.

- **Discuss process for next year.**
  - Dan said there have been a lot of changes with this new committee in the last two years. He spoke on the term limits being three years for members, and he welcomed them to continue if they are interested.

6. Adjourn – Committee

- The meeting was adjourned at 2:59.