

CSSAC Allocation Committee | MINUTES

January 27, 2022 | 12:00 am | 2001 S State Street, Suite S1-950, Salt Lake City, UT 84190

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

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

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 thanked the Council for their time spent on the review of these applications.

Agenda topic Approval of January 13th & 20th Meeting Minutes | **Presenter** Stephanie Mackay

Approval of Jan 13th, 2022 minutes was postponed until the next meeting.

There was one revision necessary to the January 20th minutes – Change the Presenter Name on the Adjourn agenda item from *Marie Christman* to *Council Chair*. Stephanie made a motion to approve the minutes with the correction. Marie seconded the motion. Jessica Miller abstained from the vote due to being absent last week.

The Motion to approve the January 20th 2022 Minutes with the correction was passed by unanimous vote.

Agenda topic Follow-up on Issues, Questions & Concerns | **Presenter** Amanda Cordova

1. *Scorecard Worksheet Clarification* – Karen confirmed with the Council whether there were any remaining questions about the scorecard. There were none.
2. *Volunteer Hours*- Amanda reminded the council to track their volunteer hours via the SmartSheet Form.

Agenda topic Intent to abstain/recuse from review of Week 3 Applications | **Presenter** Council Members

There was a council member who abstained from reviewing the United Way of Salt Lake application. There was one other unrestricted conflict of interest.

1. Salt Lake Community College – The Mill Kitchen Incubator @ SLCC:
 - a. *Application Overview* – A Council Member gave an overview of the application and discussed why they ranked it the way they did. The Council would like clarification on what the acronyms are. The Council would like to provide feedback to the agency that future applications should clarify specifically what funds will be spent on.
 - b. *Priority Weighting* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did.
 - c. *Impact* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did.
 - d. *Goals & Outcomes* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. Council would like to provide feedback to the agency that clarification on whether funding would be used for financial aid or scholarships in future applications.
 - e. *Project Beneficiaries* – A Council 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 Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. Staff will follow up with agency on how the indirect cost amount was calculated.
 - g. *Sustainability* – A Council 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* – Staff will follow-up with agency to determine if supplies are an allowed expense. The Council would like to provide feedback to the agency that a pilot program application might have better served them.
2. Spy Hop Productions – Spy Hop Multi-Media Apprenticeship Program:
 - a. *Application Overview* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.
 - b. *Priority Weighting* – A Council 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 further discussion about this section.
 - d. *Goals & Outcomes* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. The Council would like clarification on how the age range targeted would be at risk of losing employment (question # 15?)
 - e. *Project Beneficiaries* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. The council wanted to know what percentage of population served is low income. Karen was able to show them this information on the application. The Council would like clarification on the length of the apprenticeship program. Council would like to know specifics about demographics of populations served.
 - f. *Budget & Leverage* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. The Council asked if they have received funding before. Karen was able to answer this question. Clarification on the amount requested to add such a small number of new students. Current budget per student is significantly less than request budget per person.

- g. *Sustainability* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. Question 26 has an unfinished sentence.
 - h. *Eligibility Notes* – Staff will follow-up with agency to determine if supplies are an allowed expense. Staff will follow-up with agency to determine if Apprentice Stipends is an allowed expense.
3. United Way of Salt Lake – Utah 211:
- a. *Application Overview* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.
 - b. *Priority Weighting* – A Council 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 Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.
 - d. *Goals & Outcomes* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. Karen was able to provide additional information about 211 services tracking the impact of these services.
 - e. *Project Beneficiaries* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. The Council would like more detail on surveys which will help determine impact. There was further discussion about this section.
 - f. *Budget & Leverage* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.
 - g. *Sustainability* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. Clarification on what knowledge around housing services means in relation to expansion. Council asked about historic applications for funding. Karen was able to answer.
 - h. *Eligibility Notes* – There were no eligibility notes.
4. Utah Legal Services Inc. – Benefit Enrollment Project:
- a. *Application Overview* – A Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. The council would like clarification on specific of what this program does.
 - b. *Priority Weighting* – A Council 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 Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section.
 - d. *Goals & Outcomes* – A Council 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 Council 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 Council Member gave an overview of this section and why they ranked it the way they did. There was further discussion about this section. There was a question about what the indirect costs are. Staff explained some Federal Regulations regarding agencies using a De-minimus rate for allocated indirect costs which answered this question.
 - g. *Sustainability* – A Council 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* – Staff explained some Federal Regulations regarding agencies using a De-minimus rate for allocated indirect costs.

5. Wasatch Community Gardens – Green Team Program: *Review of this application was moved to next week.*

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
<p>Clarifying Question SLCC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Council would like to provide feedback to the agency that future applications should clarify specifically what funds will be spent on. The Council would like clarification on what the acronyms are. Council would like to provide feedback to the agency that clarification on whether funding would be used for financial aid or scholarships in future applications. Staff will follow up with agency on how the indirect cost amount was calculated. 	HCD Staff	TBD
<p>Clarifying Question Spy Hop Productions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Council would like clarification on how the age range targeted would be at risk of losing employment (question # 15? Goals & Outcomes) The Council would like clarification on the length of the apprenticeship program. Council would like to know specifics about demographics of populations served. Clarification on the amount requested to add such a small number of new students. Current budget per student is significantly less than request budget per person. The Council would like clarification on the amount requested to add such a small number of new students. Current budget per student is significantly less than request budget per person. Question 26 has an unfinished sentence. Please complete this omission. 	HCD Staff	TBD
<p>Clarifying Question United Way 211:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are numerous blank placeholders throughout the application. The Council would like to know the omitted information. The Council would like more detail on the surveys which were used to help determine impact. 	HCD Staff	TBD

Agenda topic *Identify Staff Follow-Up on Week 3 Applications* **Presenter** *Erika Fihaki*

- Staff will follow-up with Spy Hop Productions to determine if supplies are an allowed expense.
- Staff will follow-up with Spy Hop Productions to determine if Apprentice Stipends is an allowed expense.

Agenda topic Plan for Next Meeting: Review of Week 4 Applications | Presenter Karen Kuipers

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

1. Wasatch Community Gardens – Green Team Program:

Domestic Violence & Sexual Assault (4 applications):

1. Legal Aid Society of Salt Lake – Domestic Violence Victim Assistance Program & Bridge the Gap Program
2. Rape Recovery Center – Stabilization Healing Services for Survivors of Sexual Violence
3. South Valley Sanctuary – Domestic Violence Homeless Services
4. YWCA Utah – Domestic Violence & Residential Services

Agenda topic Other Business | Presenter Stephanie Mackay

There was no other business

Agenda topic Adjourn | Presenter Marie Christman

Stephanie adjourned the meeting at 1:59 pm