

CSSAC Allocation Committee | Minutes

March 11, 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: Laurie Roderick, Marie Christman, Stephanie White, Robert Brough, Karla Klingenberg, Kathy Fife, Phillip Bernal, Jen Seltzer-Stitt, Aritra Ghosh, Jared Aranda, Stephanie Mackay, Noelle Leiser

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

AGENDA TOPICS

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

Marie welcomed the committee and read the No Anchor Location Statement.

Agenda topic Administrative Issues | Presenter Karen Kuipers

Marie opened the floor for a motion to approve changes to both the Standard Operating Procedures and the Council Member Responsibilities. Noelle made a motion to approve. Jared seconded the motion. None were opposed. Motion passed with unanimous vote.

- Standard Operating Procedures
- Council Member Responsibilities

Agenda topic Approval of Meeting Minutes | Presenter Marie Christman

- Approval of revised March 4th meeting minutes. Stephanie M made a motion to approve the March 4th minutes. Stephanie W seconded the motion. None were opposed. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Agenda topic *Staff Follow-up* | Presenter *Vikram Ravi*

- Amanda will provide a list of clarifying questions and the applicant responses by Close of Business today.

Agenda topic *Intent to abstain/recuse from review of Week 6 Applications* | Presenter *Council Members*

This agenda item was conducted via email. There were no Conflicts of Interest, and no one will abstain/recuse from discussion and scoring of these applications.

Agenda topic *Discussion Week 6 Applications* | Presenter *Committee Members*

1. Homeless Services (last 3 of 7 applications)

a. The Road Home - CDBG - Resource Center & Emergency Shelter Support

- 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 no 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. There was no 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 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. 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 were some questions about costs and sustainability of funding recurring costs. Staff was able to clarify this for the committee. There was no 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 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. There was further discussion about this section.

b. The Road Home - ESG - Resource Centers & Emergency Shelter:

- i. *Application Overview:* Jenifer gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no 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. There was no 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 no further discussion about this section.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries:* Laurie stated that her assessment of this application was the same as her assessment of the previous application. There was no further discussion on 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:* Karla 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.
- viii. *Sustainability:* Kathy rated this the same as the previous application. Phil gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion about this section.

c. The Road Home - Rapid Re-Housing:

- i. *Application Overview:* Jen gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. Aritra concurred with Jen's overview. There was no further discussion about this section.
- ii. *Priority Weighting:* Jared gave an overview of this section and why he rated it the way he did. Jared would like clarification on the amount listed under taxes. This clarification was resolved during the discussion. 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. There was no 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 gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- v. *Project Beneficiaries:* Laurie's assessment for this application was the same as the previous two. 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:* Karla 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 further discussion about this section and application in general.

2. Housing (1 of 1 application)

a. Odyssey House Inc - Transitional Living Program Case Management Support

- 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 no 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. There was no 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 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. There was no further discussion about this section.
- vi. Budget:* Stephanie W 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:* Karla 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. There was no further discussion about this section.

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:

- i. Application Overview:* Jen gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no 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 further discussion about this section.
- iii. Impact:* Stephanie W gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no 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 gave an assessment of this section and why he rated it the way he 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. 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:* Karla 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. Guadalupe Center Educational Programs, Inc. - Guadalupe Adult Education

- i. *Application Overview*: Jen gave an overview of this section and why she rated it the way she did. There was no further discussion about this section.
- 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.
- 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. Clarification on whether numbers stated in application are reported. 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. Clarify what outreach they are performing. 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*: Karla gave an overview 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. There was no further discussion about this section.

Agenda topic *Identify Staff Follow-up*

| Presenter *Vikram Ravi*

There were no follow-up items

Agenda topic *Assignments for Next Meeting* | Presenter *Marie Christman*

1. **Refugee & Immigrant Programs and ESL (last 2 of 4 applications)**
 - a. **International Rescue Committee - Resilience in the time of COVID**
 - b. **Utah Health and Human Rights Project - Survivors of Torture Treatment Program**
2. **Substance Abuse including Alcohol Abuse (3 of 3 applications)**
 - a. **First Step House - FSH Employment Placement and Preparation (EPP) Program**

- b. Helping Hand Association DBA the Haven - The Haven Continuum of Care**
- c. House of Home - Self Sufficiency Manager for High-Risk Families**

Agenda topic Other Business | Presenter Vikram Ravi

Staff advised the Committee about deadlines for scoring and what the upcoming meetings will entail.

Agenda topic Adjourn | Presenter Marie Christman

Meeting adjourned 2:06 pm