

CEDAC Allocation Committee Meeting | MINUTES

March 03, 2020, | 11:30 AM – 2:00 PM | 2001 S State Street, S2-950, Salt Lake City UT

Meeting called by Susan Gregory

Facilitator Karen Kuipers

Note taker Erika Fihaki

Next Meeting: March 10, 2020, 11:30 AM

CEDAC Committee: Susan Gregory, Shelly Batten, Kumar Shah, Todd Richards, Ryan Henrie, Leslie Jones, Allen Litster, Michael Anderson

Excused: Tyler Money, Jamie Peterson, Becky Guertler

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Teresa Young, Erika Fihaki, Mike Gallegos

AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic *Approval of February 25th Meeting Minutes* | **Presenter** *Susan Gregory*

Susan suggested that we move the approval of the minutes to next week. The committee agreed. No motion required.

Action Items

Agenda topic *Review of Conflicts of Interest* | **Presenter** *Susan Gregory*

Susan Gregory asked if there were any conflicts of interest for the applications which were to be reviewed today. There were none.

Agenda topic *Review Application Clarifications received* | **Presenter** *Amanda Cordova*

Amanda reviewed the handouts which provided the clarifications she's received from the applicant agencies so far.

Agenda topic *Odyssey House – Parents Program Fire Escape Safety & ADA Accessibility Enhancements*

Exec Committee Summary –

- The lift is fused to the fire escape so the agency will need to repair both the lift and the fire escape for it to work. This will be bid as one project and the agency is aware of Davis Bacon requirements.
- The agency has a current project which we funded. They have not billed anything yet. In the past, they have always billed out, but it's usually at the end of the grant cycle.

- If they do not receive funding, this is such an urgent project that they would pull funding from other internal sources such as the treatment program and/or staffing.
- There was a discussion with the agency that this is a high priority and needs to be addressed.
- Out of the 18 facilities they own, this is the highest priority.
- This facility has a stand-alone budget.
- The ADA is on the first floor.

Impact & Need – The committee commented that they did an average job indicating the impact and need, however they felt the application bounced around a lot. There was some confusion about the application mentioning replacement in this section as opposed to repairing it in another section. Our staff clarified that the chair lift will be repaired, while the stairwell will be replaced. The committee inquired if a chair lift was eligible for funding. Our staff clarified that because it is fire safety and/or ADA safety-related, it does qualify. The committee discussed that there is a link to housing stability, however, it’s not a big link.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The committee discussed that their goals and outcomes were not clearly stated. The committee agreed that the same was true regarding goals and outcomes for Housing Stability.

Agency Capacity – The committee discussed that there are no major concerns with the agency’s ability to complete the project.

Cooperation & Collaboration – The committee discussed that the agency adequately showed their cooperation and collaboration with other organizations – not just financially but in other areas as well. The committee discussed that they did well listing the number of agencies they work with, but did not go into further detail about how they are cooperating and collaborating.

Budget – The committee discussed the fact that a large portion of the budget for this project is not committed yet which is cause for concern. The committee discussed that the majority of their clients come from entitlement cities, however, no funds are coming from the entitlement cities.

Leveraging – The committee discussed that there was no leveraging listed. Our staff clarified that the agency will pull funding from other internal sources such as programming or treatment to get the project completed. The committee discussed that the application does state that the agency intends to request funds from other municipalities.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Odyssey House – Parent Program Fire Escape Safety & ADA Accessibility Enhancements Clarifying Questions:	Amanda Cordova	TBD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are we replacing the chair lift or repairing it? • Please clarify the discrepancy in the budget narrative. 		

Agenda topic Topic *Project Reality- New Facility*

Exec Committee Summary:

- The demolition has been prioritized. Demolition to repair/rebuild is allowable.
- Salt Lake City recently re-zoned the area, so the agency is still working through some of that.
- The agency cannot move out of the old building until the new building is completed. Once that is done, the timeline will progress quickly.
- 100% of clients are Low Mod.
- The agency staff stated the internal funding listed on the application has been released by the board incrementally for this type of project.

- There are concerns about the agency’s ability to complete the entire project in the necessary timeline. The Executive Committee discussed the possibility of the CDBG funding being used for the parking lot, rather than toward the total cost of the project.
- We could do conditional approval – providing funding only once other funding has been secured.
- This project improves the neighborhood by getting rid of old buildings and putting in a new building.
- The new building will be larger – 3 stories as opposed to 2, which will enable a larger capacity to assist clients.
- The Executive Committee would like to ask the agency what portion of their total budget will our funding goes toward.

Impact & Need – The committee discussed that the agency hopes that by improving this facility it will increase neighborhood safety and stability. The committee discussed that they are concerned that our funding wouldn’t be implemented until the end of the project and the feasibility of this. The committee discussed that there is a \$250K shortfall on their budget. Our staff clarified that we were provided with some general information about this gap, but there were no specifics provided on where the funding for the shortfall would come from. Overall the committee agreed that the impact and need are high.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The committee discussed that the application was more difficult to read, however, their goals and outcomes were good.

Agency Capacity – The committee had concerns about the lack of funding, whether they had adequate funding to complete this project. The committee was concerned that the agency will be unable to complete the project in the required time frame because they will need to finish the new building first. The committee discussed that there was no clear outline for what our funding would go toward. The committee discussed that they were impressed that the agency did not waste previous funding.

Cooperation & Collaboration – the committee discussed that they are coordinating and collaborating with numerous different agencies, including governmental and private agencies. Through this section of the application, you can see what their program does overall.

Budget – The budget seems adequate, however, the committee is concerned about the agency’s ability to complete the project in the time allowed. The committee discussed that the agency is doing a lot of work for the budget listed.

Leveraging – The committee discussed that they are adequately leveraging funding from a variety of sources, including internal funds they have set aside over the past several years.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
<p>Project Reality – New Facility Clarifying Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What portion of the agency’s total budget will our funding go toward? • The application states that they will receive funding by the end of 2019. Have they secured that funding? • Have there been any estimates given on the demolition of the building? The concern is that if there is asbestos it could increase costs. • When will construction start on the new facility? Our staff clarified that they are still working on zoning approval and building permit approval so there is not a firm timeline yet. 	Amanda Cordova	TBD

Action items

Person responsible Deadline

- Has the agency received an estimate on asbestos removal, and was that included in the budget.
- On the population served table what are the actual numbers to be served in 2020 – especially in light of reduced space during construction.

Agenda topic *The INN Between – Facility Improvements*

Exec Committee Summary:

- The agency will be checking with the building authority to determine how many of the 9 bathrooms need to be ADA.
- They've received funding in the past but have not been able to bill out and complete projects on time.
- The Executive Committee has concerns about the agency's ability to complete all items listed in the application. They may want to consider breaking this down into multiple projects to be funded over a couple of years.
- The agency has stated that the projects are listed in order of priority, the parking lot is the top priority.
- There is the possibility of a lesser cost if the asphalt is done with the standard mix, not in the winter.
- Because the parking lot needs to be completely removed and rebuilt, it is an eligible expense. The dumpster pad would need to be done as part of the parking lot rebuild.
- There is more engineering work that will need to be done to address the drainage issues in the parking lot.

Impact & Need – The committee discussed that the agency did a very good job of showing the impact and need of their programs.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The committee discussed that the agency showed a good relationship between their project goals and outcomes. The committee discussed that the services provided by this agency do increase housing stability. There was some discussion within the committee about the number of clients who completed programming to move on to housing stability.

Agency Capacity – The committee was divided about the agency's capacity to complete projects on time. It was discussed that the agency has shown a commitment to getting this facility running well. The agency has worked to overcome capacity challenges and get back on track. There was discussion among the committee that none of the projects they've received funding for over the past 3 years have been completed.

Cooperation & Collaboration – The committee discussed the agency's narrative response to this question. They've shown their ability and willingness to work with other organizations. The committee discussed that it would have been nice to have the agency show the work they do with local leaders in Sugarhouse, such as the community council and local businesses.

Budget – The committee discussed that the agency is depending on our funding for the majority of the project. The "in-kind" funding listed was for the planning portion, not for the actual project.

Leveraging – The committee discussed that the ratio of other committed funds was low. There was a discussion about the agency having a difficult time receiving funding from other organizations. The committee discussed that it would prefer the agency to do the paving in the spring at a lower cost.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
The INN Between – Facility Improvements Clarifying Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the “and others” listed in the coordination and collaboration section include coordinating and collaborating with the Sugarhouse community?• Provide clarification on what “exit to stable housing” means.• Provide clarification on the 96 medically frail clients – what happens to them once stabilized.• Is the table which indicates 100% of clients coming from entitlement cities or unincorporated Salt Lake County accurate?• The committee would like to clarify if the electrical listed in the project is a lower priority and is that a fire safety issue?	Amanda Cordova	TBD

Agenda topic Assignments for Next Meeting | Presenter Susan Gregory

Committee will review scoring to date. In our next meeting, there will be an initial review and discussion of scoring and rankings proposals. Identify follow-up. Provide results to staff to develop financing options. Our staff director suggested that the committee looks at impact when they are determining scoring and recommendations.

Staff Assignments: See clarifying questions

Agenda topic Other Business | Presenter Karen Kuipers

Our staff and the chairman will discuss whether showing the results of the Needs Assessment in the next meeting would potentially skew the scoring and funding recommendations. Our staff would like final scores input no later than 2:00 pm on Monday, March 9th. Staff will be starting an email conversation thread this afternoon. Karen Kuipers reminded the committee to do a “reply all” on that thread with any questions or comments.

Action Items

Kumar Shah made a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 1:51pm.