www.SLC.gov
www.SLCMayor.com

451 S State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

SLC FOOD MICROGRANT SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 14th, 2026

The following members of the SLC Food Microgrant Selection Committee were present:

In-Person

Maria Schwarz, *Chair*
Monica O'Malley, *Interim Secretary*
Maria Romero
Josh Rebollo

Electronic

James Hunter
Marifer Rivera

The following members were absent:

Leesie Clegg, *Vice Chair & Secretary*
Karina Villalba

Minutes by:
Monica O'Malley, Salt Lake City Sustainability Department

Meeting Start Time: 2:35 p.m. | Time Adjourned: 3:19 p.m.

1. **Welcome & Roll Call**
   Chair Schwarz welcomed everyone and called role.

2. **Approve Meeting Minutes**
   Chair Schwarz shared a draft of meeting minutes from April 7, 2026, and called for any adjustments, questions or concerns. Committee Member Romero made a motion to approve and Committee Member Rebollo seconded with a unanimous approval by the committee.

3. **Review Community Food Grant Application Scores/Questions**
   Chair Schwarz reminded the committee that they will not be making funding decisions today and will instead discuss discrepancies in scores and give committee members the opportunity to adjust their scores if they choose to. She reminded the group that there's about $28,800 available to distribute to Community Grant applicants. She indicated that applicant scores are not necessarily a reflection of

the value of applicants, but rather a way to help the committee decide the best use for the limited amount of funding available. She ran through the review process as a reminder.

For each of the following Community Grant applications reviewed, Chair Schwarz shared the amount of funding requested and gave a brief overview of the applicant's proposal. She also read comments left by absent committee members where applicable. Funding requests, proposal summaries, and committee member comments and scores can be found in the selection committee review excel spreadsheet provided.

Community Grant Applications:

Solstice Malt Committee Member Rivera changed her score from a 3 to a 1 because she felt that, while it is a great project, it does not align with the scope of the grant compared to other applications.

Somali Community Self-Management Agency This being a past awardee, Committee Member Rebollo asked what they received funding for in the past. Chair Schwarz replied that they previously received food microgrant funding to support the community garden built at the Hartland Community Center. Committee Member Rebollo elaborated that he gave a relatively lower score of 3 because he was not sure what the proposal was for, whether it be to expand something they already had or create something new. While he feels the project is great, he is still not clear on all the details and decided to keep his score of 3.

StrEATS Committee Member Romero asked why lower scoring committee members scored the way they did. Chair Schwarz replied that, while she appreciates their intent to support small food vendors, she feels this project does not have an immediate impact on food access compared to other applicants and wasn't clear on what the inclusive outreach portion of the application entailed. Committee Members Romero and Rivera both changed their sores to a 2 from a 5 and 4, respectively.

The Center Contemplative Chair Schwarz shared that Vice Chair Clegg changed her score to a 3 before the meeting, mainly due to the lack of specificity included in the application. Committee Member Romero noted that she gave this application a score of 2 because, while the mission was really strong, the application did not include enough details on how the organization would execute their vision. Agreeing with the points made, Committee Member Rivera changed her score from a 5 to a 3, and she provided feedback that it would be helpful to know if and how participants would be active throughout the project. Chair Schwarz also suggested that this group engage with other existing services.

The Village Chair Schwarz shared that Vice Chair Clegg changed her score to a 3 before the meeting. Committee Members Rivera and Hunter both lowered their scores to a 3 from a 4 and 5, respectively. Both Rivera and Hunter agreed that, while the proposal is great, they'd like to prioritize other stronger projects, given the limited amount of funding available.

www.SLC.gov
www.SLCMayor.com

451 S State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

University of Utah Center for Community Nutrition: Food, Movement, and You Chair Schwarz noted that this organization is a previous awardee, and about half of the funding requested would be used to purchase produce from a local farm that also applied for a Community Grant.

Committee Member Rivera suggested the committee could connect applicants with similar proposals for potential collaboration.

University of Utah Farmers Market There were no comments, questions, or score changes discussed.

Utah Animal Rights Coalition Chair Schwarz shared that Committee Member Villalba indicated an overall recommendation score of 3, and Vice Chair Clegg changed her score to a 4 before the meeting. Chair Schwarz noted she gave this organization's proposal a score of 3 because of the consideration of direct costs versus more durable investments, recognizing that they are being resourceful in allocating money well.

Utah Pacific Islander Health Coalition There were no comments, questions, or score changes discussed.

Wasteless Solutions Committee Member Rebollo noted he gave this application an overall score of 3 because the organization is located outside of Salt Lake City, so he was not sure if they would serve Salt Lake City residents. Chair Schwarz replied that while they do provide services across multiple Counties, she has the impression that the mobile market included in their proposal would be based in the west side of Salt Lake City, as the partners listed are west side based organizations. Committee Member Rivera confirmed that Wasteless Solutions will go where their partner organizations are located. Committee Member Rebollo changed his score from a 3 to a 4.

Chair Schwarz noted that she will connect with Committee Member Villalba after the meeting to see if she wants to update any of her overall scores on the applications discussed today.

4. Next Steps

Chair Schwarz communicated that she will send the Committee an updated spreadsheet with changed scores from today, asking that committee members conduct a final review to make final changes to their scores and/or note any additional questions or comments they have about the Community Grant applications.

Once each application has their final scores, Chair Schwarz explained that the Committee will examine how the applications rank according to their weighted scores which depends on their raw score in each category and the relative weight of each category.

Chair Schwarz reviewed the different scoring categories and asked the Committee if they would like to change the relative weight of any. Committee Member Romero clarified that a scoring category with a relative weight of 3 will have higher impact on the overall score than a scoring category with a relative weight of 1.

Committee Member Rebollo suggested that the Mission and Leadership categories should both retain a weight of 1. He also suggested the Budget and Timeline categories should have a higher weight, as these two categories have been crucial to the Community Grant discussion this year. Committee Member Rivera agreed and suggested increasing the weighted score of Budget to a 3 and Timeline to a 2.

Chair Schwarz suggested keeping the Sustainability category at a 1, as it seems baked into all the projects. Committee Member Rivera suggested keeping the Evaluation category at a 1, as a lot of the applicants were newer organizations and may not be established yet.

Committee Member Rebollo suggested changing the Success category weight from a 2 to a 1 because, like the Evaluation category, newer organizations may not have established success yet. Committee Member Rebollo also suggested keeping the Populations Served, Project Proposal, and Project Impact category weights at 3. Chair Schwarz recommended keeping the Overall Recommendation to Fund category weight at a 3, as this has been the Committee's gut check and allows them to look wholistically at the proposal. Committee Member Rebollo suggested keeping the Partnerships category at a 2.

The present Committee agreed that the proposed weights reflected the values they discussed during their Community Grant meetings this year. Chair Schwarz motioned to adopt the scoring process and category weights as proposed, as long as Committee Members Clegg and Vialba agree. Committee Member Romero seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to adopt the scoring process and category weights as proposed.

Chair Schwarz said the next meeting will likely be the last meeting where the Committee will use the ranking of the weighted scores to decide which applications to fund.

5. Adjourn

Committee Member Romero made a motion to adjourn, and Committee Member Rebollo seconded, all unanimously voted in approval.

APPROVED: Maria Schwarz (Apr 22, 2026 13:08:10 MDT) DATE: 04/22/2026