CSSAC Allocation Committee | MINUTES

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

Committee Members: Aritra Ghosh, Christine Nguyen, Jacob Montague, Jared Aranda, Karla Klingenberg, Kathy Fife, Marie Christman, Marisol Vidal, Rex Marler, Robert Brough, Stephanie Mackay

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Amanda Cordova, Tom Swett, Adam Fordham, Michael Gallegos, Teresa Young

AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic *Welcome & Introductions* | Presenter *Stephanie Mackay*

Stephanie welcomed the group and expressed the importance of the work the Committee is doing in these meetings. Introductions of new staff and committee members were made.

Agenda topic *Administrative Issues* | Presenter *Karen Kuipers*

a. *Review Committee Binder Materials* – Karen gave an overview of the Binder Materials. There was a question about the score card which Karen was able to answer. Staff will ensure that everyone has the correct score card.
b. *Feedback on ZoomGrants Navigation Experience from New Members-* Karen asked the committee if there was any feedback on their experience with navigating ZoomGrants. There was no feedback to discuss.
c. *Volunteer Hours* – Karen explained the SmartSheet document for recording volunteer hours.

Agenda topic *Review Schedule of Meetings for PY 2022* | Presenter *Karen Kuipers*

Karen reviewed the Master Schedule for the year to determine if there are any conflicts of interest.

There were some disclosures that were made and will be documented on the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form.

Agenda topic *Discussion Week #2 Applications* | Presenter *Committee Members*

1. Columbus Foundation Inc. – NextWork Autism Program and Academy
    a. *Application Overview* – A committee member gave an overview of the application and discussed why they ranked it the way they did. There were some questions about the organization and program. One of the committee members with knowledge of the organization was able to answer these questions. There was a question about whether the application that asks if the organization has received grants in prior years. Karen was able

to direct the committee to where they can locate this information in the application. There was further discussion about the questions asked in the application.

b. *Priority Weighting* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There were some questions about this section which were answered. There was some discussion about this section.

c. *Impact* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was a question about how this program will quantify their impact.

d. *Goals & Outcomes* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.

e. *Project Beneficiaries* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was no further discussion about this section.

f. *Budget & Leverage* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There were some questions about their budget which Karen was able to answer. There was further discussion about this section.

g. *Sustainability* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.

h. *Eligibility Notes* – There were no eligibility notes.

2. Family Support Center – Case Management at LifeStart Village

a. *Application Overview* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was no further discussion about this section.

b. *Priority Weighting* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.

c. *Impact* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was no further discussion about this section.

d. *Goals & Outcomes* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was no further discussion about this section.

e. *Project Beneficiaries* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was no further discussion about this section.

f. *Budget & Leverage* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was a question about the administrative costs. Another committee member was able to answer that question.

g. *Sustainability* – A committee member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did.

h. *Eligibility Notes* – There were no eligibility notes.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Columbus Foundation: How will they quantify their impact?	Amanda Cordova	TBD

Agenda topic *Identify Staff Follow-Up on Week 2 Applications* **Presenter** *Erika Fihaki*

Staff will ensure that everyone has the correct score card before the next meeting.

Agenda topic *Plan for Next Meeting: Review of Week 3 Applications | Presenter Karen Kuipers*

Support for Special Populations in Low Income Households (last 5 applications).

a. Salt Lake Community College – The Mill Kitchen Incubator @ SLCC
b. Spy Hop Productions – Spy Hop Multi-Media Apprenticeship Program
c. United Way of Salt Lake – Utah 211
d. Utah Legal Services Inc. – Benefit Enrollment Project
e. Wasatch Community Gardens – Green Team Program

Agenda topic *Other Business | Presenter Stephanie Mackay*

There was discussion about whether the committee can provide insights about organizations applying for funds. County staff were able to answer these questions. There will be discussion next week about whether names are listed in the comments and discussion segment of these meetings.

Agenda topic *Adjourn | Presenter Stephanie Mackay*

Stephanie adjourned the meeting.