

CSSAC Allocation Committee | Minutes

March 4, 2021 | 12:00 pm | 2001 S State Street, Suite S2-950, Salt Lake City, UT 84190

Meeting called by Karen Kuipers
Type of meeting Allocation Committee
Facilitator Karen Kuipers
Note taker Erika Fihaki

Committee Members: Robert Brough, Laurie Roderick, Marie Christman, Noelle Leiser, Jessica Miller, Kathy Fife, Phillip Bernal, Christine Nguyen, Jen Seltzer, Stephanie White, Claire Thomas, Jared Aranda, Stephanie Mackay, Aritra Ghosh

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Vikram Ravi, Amanda Cordova, Mary Leonard, Teresa Young, Mike Gallegos, Erika Fihaki, Mary Kathryn Thomson, Ethan McPeak

AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic Welcome & No Anchor Location Statement | Presenter Marie Christman

Chair Marie Christman welcomed the committee and read the No Anchor Location Statement

Agenda topic Approval of Meeting Minutes | Presenter Marie Christman

- Approval of revised February 18th meeting minutes. Phil made a motion to approve the revised minutes. Christine seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote.
 - Approval of February 25th meeting minutes. Christine made a motion to approve the minutes. Robert seconded the motion.
-

Agenda topic Follow-up from February 11th Meeting | Presenter Amanda Cordova

- Finalize discussion from Week 4: Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault Applications: YWCA The committee would like clarification on eligibility requirements for daycare.
- Review clarifying questions for week #4 applications. There was discussion about providing all applicants with the opportunity to submit an updated budget. Marie opened the meeting for a motion to ask this question of all applicants. Stephanie M made a motion to request

funding updates of all applicants. Laurie seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Agenda topic *Intent to Abstain/Recuse from review of Week 3 Applications*
Presenter *Committee Members*

Marie opened the meeting for Committee Members to state any conflicts or if anyone is recusing themselves from review.

- Phil Bernal stated that he participates in a group which has 2 board members from Catholic Community Services.
- Phil Bernal is a commissioner with Housing Connect. They have a partnership with First Step House. He's been involved in approving those partnerships. He was also a commissioner with Salt Lake City Housing who also has partnerships with First Step House. He was involved in approving those partnerships. Staff does not see this as a restricted conflict due to the fact that he is not on the board for First Step House and he does not have direct responsibility to provide funding for First Step House.
- Noelle stated that in the Shelter The Homeless application they mention the Salt Lake Coalition to End Homelessness. She volunteers on task groups. Staff views that as an unrestricted conflict.

Agenda topic *Discussion Week 5 Applications* | **Presenter** *Committee Members*

1. Homeless Services (first 4 of 7 applications)

a. Catholic Community Services of Utah/Employment Specialist - Weigand Homeless Resource Center:

- Application Overview:* Jen gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Aritra gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was further discussion about this section.
- Priority Weighting:* Christine gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jared gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- Impact:* Stephanie W gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jessica gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this section.
- Goals & Outcomes:* Noelle gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Robert gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Clarify inconsistency between numbers served on question 14 & 19. Staff gave some further information about why there may

be an inconsistency in the numbers. This clarifying question was resolved in the discussion.

- v. *Project Beneficiaries*: Laurie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Claire gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vi. *Budget*: Stephanie M gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vii. *Leverage*: Marie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- viii. *Sustainability*: Kathy gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Phil gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion about this section.

b. First Step House/First Step House Housing Case Management Program:

- i. *Application Overview*: Jen gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Aritra gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was further discussion about this. Quantify past success?
- ii. *Priority Weighting*: Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Christine gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- iii. *Impact*: Jessica gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Stephanie W gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes*: Robert gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Noelle gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries*: Claire gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Laurie gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- vi. *Budget*: Stephanie M gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Clarify how many people will be served with the funding request. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vii. *Leverage*: Marie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- viii. *Sustainability*: Phil gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Kathy gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.

c. Shelter The Homeless, Inc. - Homeless Resource Center Operations

- i. *Application Overview*: Aritra gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Jen gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this section.

- ii. *Priority Weighting:* Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Christine gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section
- iii. *Impact:* Stephanie W gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jessica gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this section.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes:* Noelle gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Robert had nothing to add to Noelle's overview and assessment. There was no further discussion about this section.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries:* Laurie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Claire gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vi. *Budget:* Stephanie M gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vii. *Leverage:* Marie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Marie gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- viii. *Sustainability:* Kathy gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Phil gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did.

d. The INN Between - The INN Between (TIB), Medical Respite Housing for Terminally Ill and Medically Frail Homeless Adults

- i. *Application Overview:* Aritra gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Jen gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- ii. *Priority Weighting:* Christine gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jared gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did.
- iii. *Impact:* Stephanie W gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jessica gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this section.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes:* Robert gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Noelle gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this section.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries:* Laurie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Claire gave an assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vi. *Budget:* Stephanie M gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vii. *Leverage:* Marie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.

- viii. *Sustainability*: Kathy gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Phil gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did.

Action items

Person responsible

Ask all applicants to update their budget information to include any funding that was pending at the time of the application **Amanda Cordova**

Agenda topic Identify Staff Follow-up | *Presenter HCD Staff*

- Staff will send clarifying questions to applicants
- Staff will send post-meeting emails listing any follow up items
- Staff will send pre-meeting emails with agenda, previous meeting minutes and responses to clarifying questions.
- Staff will inform committee about determination on voting electronically to approve minutes and electronically disclosing any potential conflicts of interest/intent to abstain or recuse from review and scoring of application.

Agenda topic Review & Discuss updated Master Review Schedule | *Presenter Karen Kuipers*

Karen gave an overview of the updated Master Schedule, including deadlines for scores to be locked in. There was a discussion about streamlining the meetings. Staff will follow up with committee on attorney recommendations about the suggested ways of streamlining the meetings.

Agenda topic Plan for Next Meeting *Presenter Marie Christman*

1. Homeless Services (last 3 of 7 applications)

- The Road Home - CDBG - Resource Center & Emergency Shelter Support*
- The Road Home - ESG - Resource Centers & Emergency Shelter*
- The Road Home - Rapid Re-Housing*

2. Housing (1 of 1 application)

- Odyssey House Inc - Transitional Living Program Case Management Support*

3. Refugee & Immigrant Programs & ESL (First 2 of 4 applications)

- a. *English Skills Learning Center - Upward Mobility of Employment Opportunities for LMI Adult English Language Learners*
- b. *Guadalupe Center Educational Programs, Inc. - Guadalupe Adult Education*

Agenda topic *Other Business* | Presenter *Vikram Ravi*

There was no other business to discuss

Agenda topic *Adjourn* | Presenter *Marie Christman*

Meeting adjourned 2:06 pm