

CEDAC Allocation Committee | Minutes

March 2, 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: Greg Shelton, Amber Meason, Mike Anderson, Susan Gregory, Leslie Jones, Ryan Henrie, Shelly Johnson, Becky Guertler, Todd Richards

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Vikram Ravi, Amanda Cordova, Mary Leonard, Mike Gallegos, Erika Fihaki

AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic *Welcome & No Anchor Location Statement* | **Presenter** Michael Anderson

Chair Michael Anderson welcomed the committee and read the No Anchor Location Statement

Agenda topic *Approval of February 23rd Meeting Minutes* | **Presenter** Michael Anderson

- Becky made a motion to approve minutes. Leslie seconded the motion. There were no objections. Motion passed by unanimous consent.
-

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

- Amada is waiting to get clarification on the follow-up questions from last week.
- Access to Volunteer Hours tracking - Vikram reminded committee members to input their volunteer hours.

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

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

There were none.

Agenda topic *Discussion Week 4 Applications* | Presenter *Committee Members*

- 1. Continue Week #4 Discussion: Urban County Jurisdictions (total of 1 application)**
 - a. Midvale City Corporation - Jordan River Parkway Improvement Project:** This project is eligible for funding. The project is in an area with residents nearby, there is no trailhead at that point. Budget slurry seal/tree removal: they will be patching an area. This consists of complete removal and replacement of area and complete reconstruction of the walkway. Tree roots are disrupting the trail. Tree trimming is maintenance and ineligible. This information is available in the "Extra" tab of their application. The new ask is \$43,359.00 ***This application was postponed to next week.***
- 2. Housing Rehabilitation & Public Facility Improvement Review Groups (total of 4 applications)**
 - a. Assist Inc - Community Design Center Emergency Home Repair, Accessibility & Community Design**
 - i. *Application Overview:* Leslie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
 - ii. *Priority Weighting:* Michael gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion..
 - iii. *Impact:* Susan gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
 - iv. *Goals & Outcomes:* Amber gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Michael discussed his assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion.
 - v. *Project Beneficiaries:* Becky gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
 - vi. *Budget:* Todd gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Michael discussed his assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did.
 - vii. *Leverage:* Todd gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did.

viii. *Sustainability*: Ryan gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was some general discussion about this application.

b. The Inn Between - The Inn Between (TIB) ADA Accessibility Project

- i. *Application Overview*: Shelly gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Leslie gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this section.
- ii. *Priority Weighting*: Michael gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was further discussion about this section.
- iii. *Impact*: Susan gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes*: Amber gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did..
- v. *Project Beneficiaries*: There was some discussion about this section..
- vi. *Budget*: Todd gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion.
- vii. *Leverage*: Todd gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion.
- viii. *Sustainability*: Ryan gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was further discussion about this.

c. Work Activity Center, Inc. - Economic Stability Through Health Outcome

- i. *Application Overview*: Leslie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Shelly gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion about this.
- ii. *Priority Weighting*: Michael gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. .
- iii. *Impact*: Susan gave an overview of this section. There was further discussion about this section.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes*: Amber gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries*: Becky gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion.
- vi. *Budget*: Todd gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Committee would like clarification on what the renovation includes. Are we paying for demolition? Clarify specifically what funds will be used for..
- vii. *Leverage*: Todd gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was further discussion.
- viii. *Sustainability*: Ryan gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was further discussion about this application. The questions about the budget were resolved during this discussion.

d. The Road Home - Palmer Court Rehabilitation: Staff was able to do a site visit. This application has portions of the project which are eligible. Other portions of the project are ineligible. If funding is awarded, there may be a need to adjust the

amounts funded and the specifics of the contract. Michael opened the floor to make a motion to postpone this application to next week. Becky made a motion to postpone. Leslie seconded the motion. There was discussion about this motion. Amber made an objection to the motion. Motion passed by unanimous vote. ***This application will be postponed until next week.***

Agenda topic *Identify Staff Follow-up*

Presenter *Amanda Cordova*

There were no follow-up items

Agenda topic *Plan for Next Meeting*

Presenter *Michael Anderson*

1. Review Group: Homeownership (3 applications)

- a. *Road Home - Palmer Court*
- b. *Community Development Corporation of Utah - Down Payment Assistance*
- c. *International Rescue Committee - Recovery Through Financial Stability: Refugee and New American Home Ownership*
- d. *Salt Lake Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc. dba NeighborWorks Salt Lake - Affordable Homeownership Support Loan*

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

Vikram will provide the committee with past funding awards prior to the ranking and allocation recommendations. Michael will be out of town next week. He will coordinate with staff and Vice-Chair Becky.

Agenda topic *Adjourn* | Presenter *Michael Anderson*

Meeting adjourned 2:00 pm