

CSSAC Allocation Committee | Minutes

February 25, 2021 | 12:00 am | 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: Marie Christman, Jen Seltzer-Stitt, Robert Brough, Christine Nguyen, Stephanie White, Karla Klingenberg, Jessica Miller, Laurie Roderick, Noelle Leiser, Jared Aranda, Stephanie Mackay, Phillip Bernal, Claire Thomas, Aritra Ghosh, Kathy Fife

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

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 February 11th & 18th Meeting Minutes* | **Presenter** *Marie Christman*

- Robert made a motion to approve both the February 11th and February 18th minutes. Christine seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous vote.
-

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

- 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*

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

- Marie is on the Policy Committee for YWCA. This committee has no decision-making authority, they only make policy recommendations. She has not been active on the committee for a year.

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

1. Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault (last 2 of 4 applications)

a. Legal Aid Society of Salt Lake / Domestic Violence Victim Assistance

- i. *Application Overview:* Jen gave an overview of this application and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- ii. *Priority Weighting:* Christine gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Jared also gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. The committee requested clarification on the definition of Affordable Housing. That clarification was provided by County Staff.
- iii. *Impact:* Stephanie W gave an overview of this section and her reasons for rating it the way she did. Jessica also discussed her assessment on this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes:* Noelle gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Robert gave his assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. He would like clarifying information on the Survey they conducted. There was no further 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.
- vi. *Budget:* Stephanie M gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. She would like clarification or an update on other funding they are expecting to receive and fund raising/private donations.
- vii. *Leverage:* Karla gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There were questions about clarifying questions or requests for further information. Karen reminded the committee that we are unable to ask for additional information unless we provide the opportunity to ALL applicants to provide additional information. We can ask clarifying questions about information provided. There was no further discussion.

viii. *Sustainability*: Kathy gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Phil also provided his assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion.

b. Rape Recovery Center/Stabalization Healing Services for Survivors of Sexual Violence

- i. *Application Overview*: Aritra gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Jen also gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- ii. *Priority Weighting*: Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Christine gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was further discussion.
- iii. *Impact*: Jessica gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Stephanie W gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- iv. *Goals & Outcomes*: Robert gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Noelle gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- 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. There was no further discussion.
- vi. *Budget*: Stephanie Mckay gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- vii. *Leverage*: Karla gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- viii. *Sustainability*: Kathy gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way he did. Phil gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way she did. There was further discussion.

c. South Valley Sanctuary - SVS Domestic Violence Homeless Services

- 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. The committee would like clarification on how they will sustain the program if they do not receive additional funding. They would also like clarification on how COVID has affected the rise in DV occurrences. There was no further discussion.
- ii. *Priority Weighting*: Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Christine gave her assessment of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- 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 no further discussion.
- iv. *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. There was no further 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.
- vi. *Budget:* Stephanie gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion
- vii. *Leverage:* Karla gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion
- 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 were some questions about the size of the shelter. The committee was able to clarify this information during the meeting. There was further discussion about this section.

d. YWCA Utah Women in Jeopardy Program

- 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. Aritra would like clarification on how he should score the overview section. Karen and other committee members provided that clarification. There was further discussion about this.
- 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.
- 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 no further discussion
- 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. The committee would like clarification about if the of the drop in child care program separate from those served in the for profit day care program. There was no further 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 how she rated it. There was no further discussion.
- vi. *Budget:* Stephanie M gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Clarify why no committed funds are listed. Clarify why they lost or were denied funding. There was further discussion about this section.
- vii. *Leverage:* Karla gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion.
- 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. There was no further discussion.

2. Homeless Services (first 2 of 7 applications)

- a. **Catholic Community Services of Utah / Employment Specialist - Weigand Homeless Resource Center:** *This application was moved to next week.*

- b. **First Step House / First Step House Housing Case Management Program** - *This application was moved to next week.*

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Legal Aid Society: Clarify information on the Survey they conducted. Clarify or update on other funding they are expecting to receive.	Amanda Cordova	3/11/2021
SVS: Clarify how they will sustain the program if they do not receive additional funding. He would like clarification on how COVID has affected the rise in DV occurrences.	Amanda Cordova	3/11/2021
YWCA: Clarification about if the of the drop-in child-care program separate from those served in the for profit day care program. Clarify why no committed funds are listed. Clarify Leveraging calculations. Clarify how/why they lost funding.	Amanda Cordova	3/11/2021

Agenda topic *Identify Staff Follow-up*

Presenter *Amanda Cordova*

Amanda will work on clarifying questions

Agenda topic *Plan for Next Meeting*

Presenter *Marie Christman*

1. **Change minutes from last meeting to indicate Phil is on the board for Rape Recovery, not employed by.**
2. **Finish YWCA Conversation**
3. **Review Clarifying Questions**
4. **Discuss Master Schedule**
5. **Catholic Community Services of Utah / Employment Specialist - Weigand Homeless Resource Center:**
6. **First Step House / First Step House Housing Case Management Program**
7. **Shelter The Homeless, Inc. - Homeless Resource Center Operations**

- 8. The INN Between (TIB), Medical Respite Housing for Terminally Ill and Medically Frail Homeless Adults**
- 9. The Road Home - CDBG - Resource Center & Emergency Shelter Support**
- 10. The Road Home - ESG - Resource Centers & Emergency Shelter**
- 11. The Road Home - Rapid Re-Housing**

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

There was no other business to discuss.

Agenda topic *Adjourn* | Presenter *Michael Anderson*

Meeting adjourned 2:11 pm