

# CSSAC Allocation Committee | Minutes

---

February 18, 2021 | 12:00 am | 2001 S State Street, Suite S2-950, Salt Lake City, UT 84190

<b>Meeting called by</b>	Karen Kuipers	<b>Committee Members:</b> Laurie Roderick, Robert Brough, Karla Klingenberg, Aritra Ghosh, Stephanie White, Jen Seltzer, Marie Christman, Noelle Leiser, Jessica, Jared Aranda, Phillip Bernal, Kathy Fife, Claire Thomas, Stephanie Mackay, Christie Nguyen
<b>Type of meeting</b>	Allocation Committee	
<b>Facilitator</b>	Karen Kuipers	
<b>Note taker</b>	Erika Fihaki	
		<b>Staff:</b> Karen Kuipers, Vikram Ravi, Amanda Cordova, Mary Leonard, Ethan McPeak, Kathryn Thomson, Theresa Young, Mike Gallegos

## AGENDA TOPICS

---

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

Marie Christman welcomed the Committee and read the No Anchor Location Statement.

---

**Agenda topic** *Approval of February 4th & 11th Meeting Minutes* | **Presenter** *Marie Christman*

Several members of the committee were unable to review the minutes from February 11th. In light of that we postponed approval of the minutes from February 11th to the next meeting. Marie opened the floor for a motion to approve the minutes from February 4th. Noelle made a motion to approve. Robert seconded the motion. There were none opposed. Motion passed with a unanimous vote.

---

**Agenda topic** *Follow-up from February 11th Meeting* | **Presenter** *Vikram Ravi*

Vikram reminded the committee members that they will need to continue posting volunteer hours. He reminded the committee that they do not report the time spent in meetings, only time they spend reviewing the applications. There was some discussion about how to locate the link. Going forward staff will provide the link in the email sent out containing the agenda.

---

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

Marie asked the committee members to state any intent to abstain/recuse from review of these applications.

- Philip Bernal was on the board for the Rape Recovery Center in the 80s. Staff did not see this as a restricted conflict.
- Stephanie White works for Community Capital Bank who provides funding to the Legal Aid Society. Staff does not see this as a restricted conflict.

---

Agenda topic Discussion Week 3 Applications | Presenter Committee Members

## 1. CHILDREN & AT-RISK YOUTH (2 applications)

### a. Fathers & Families Coalition of Utah - Jobs Work Program

- i. *Application Overview:* Aritra gave an overview of this application and explained his reasons for ranking it the way he did. Jen gave her impression of the application and explained her reasons for rating it the way she did. The Committee would like clarification on the number of successful job/internship placements and distinction between phases. They would also like clarification on the breakdown of ages of clients served.
- ii. *Priority Weighting:* Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated them the way he did. Noelle discussed her observations about this program and how they can better relate their work to recovery from Covid.
- iii. *Impact:* Stephanie W gave an overview of the Impact of this program. She discussed her reasons for rating this section the way she did. Jessica added her thoughts about the Impact of this program and why she rated it the way she did. The Committee asked for clarification on who will served by this program. Karen clarified that they serve anyone who comes through their door. There was discussion about the organization using national data to drive their programs when there is local data available. There was some discussion about whether this program overlaps with DWS. Laurie commented that there's a potential for overlap in training and pay through a program run by DCFS. There was further discussion about the impact of this project.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes:* Robert gave an overview this section and why he rated it the way he did. He reiterated that he would like clarification on ages of clients served. Noelle discussed her thoughts on this section and why she rated it the way she did.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries:* Laurie gave an overview of this section and explained her reasons for rating it the way she did. Claire gave an overview of her perspective of this section of the application. Jared asked which organizations/cities the County is prioritizing to receive their funding. Karen showed the committee members where on the application they can find this information about target populations. Jared asked which section they would factor that information into. Karen advised that it's most applicable to the budget. There was some further discussion about this section.
- vi. *Budget:* Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did.
- vii. *Leverage:* Karla provided an overview of the leveraging for this program. Karla asked for clarification on the rating/scoring scale as it seems varied from application to application. Karen and county staff will compile that information and send it out to committee members.
- viii. *Sustainability:* Kathy F gave an overview of the program's sustainability and why she rated it the way she did. Phil also gave an overview of his thoughts on the sustainability of the program and why he rated it the way he did.

### b. Odyssey House - Youth Outpatient Transportation Services

- i. *Application Overview:* Jen provided an overview of the application. The Committee would like clarification on why they need a second bus after signing contracts to provide the service. Aritra added his thoughts on the application and why he rated it the way he did. He

liked the way it was written but he would like justification for the cost. The Committee would like clarification on how they will operate two busses with one driver, clarification on how they determined the dollar amount for the purchase. There was some further discussion about this section.

- ii. *Priority Weighting*: Christie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jared discussed his thoughts on this section and why he rated it the way he did.
- iii. *Impact*: Jessica discussed her thoughts on this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jason discussed his thoughts about this section and why he rated it the way he did.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes*: Noelle gave an overview of her thoughts about this section and why she rated it the way she did. Robert concurred with Noelle's thoughts.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries*: Claire gave an overview of her thoughts on this section and why she rated it the way she did. Laurie concurred with Claire's thoughts. She appreciated that they are serving those with impaired mobility, and they do a lot of outreach.
- vi. *Budget*: Phil gave an overview of his thoughts on this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was some further discussion about this section.
- vii. *Leverage*: Karla gave an overview of the thoughts on this section and why she rated it the way she did. The Committee would like clarification on how they intend to pay for insurance and maintenance. The Committee would like clarification on whether this grant allows for purchase of vehicles. Karen advised the committee that the grant does allow for the purchase of vehicles with restrictions. If this application is recommended for funding, those restrictions will be discussed as part of the Contract Negotiation.
- viii. *Sustainability*: Phil gave an overview of his thoughts on this section and why he rated it the way he did. The Committee would like clarification on why they need 2 vans.

**2. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE & SEXUAL ASSAULT (first 2 of 4 applications)**

- a. Legal Aid Society of Salt Lake - Domestic Violence Victim Assistance: ***The review of this application was postponed to the next meeting.***
- b. Rape Recovery Center - Stabilization Healing Services for Survivors of Sexual Violence: ***The review of this application was postponed to the next meeting.***

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
<b>Fathers &amp; Families application –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify distinction between phases and how that correlates to job placement/internship, and how this affects placement rates.</li> <li>• Clarify the breakdown of ages of clients served. Clarify if individuals served are contributing to household income.</li> <li>• Clarify where referrals come from.</li> </ul>	HCD Staff	02/25/2021

- Clarify whether there are requirements the agency needs to adhere to regarding safety of vehicles.
- Clarify justification for cost of vehicle.
- Clarify how they will operate 2 vehicles with one driver.
- Clarify why they need 2 vans.
- Clarify why they purchasing new vs used. Clarify how they intend to pay for insurance and maintenance.
- Clarify if the agency has awareness of the requirement for the driver to have a CDL

**Staff clarification on why scoring doesn't match between paper copy and electronic copy.**

---

*Agenda topic* Plan for Next Meeting: Review of Week 4 Applications  
Cordova

*Presenter* Amanda

Karen advised the committee that next week we will review all 4 Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault applications next week.

**1. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE & SEXUAL ASSAULT (last 2 of 4 applications)**

- a. South Valley Sanctuary - SVS Domestic Violence Homeless Services
- b. YWCA Utah Women in Jeopardy Program

**2. HOMELESS SERVICES (first 2 of 7 applications)**

- a. Catholic Community Services of Utah Employment Specialist - Weigand Homeless Resource Center
- b. First Step House - First Step House Housing Case Management Program

---

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

Vikram & Amanda will now have Open Office Hours on Fridays. They will provide information on how to connect during these times.

---

*Agenda topic* Adjourn | *Presenter* Marie Christman

The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 pm