

CEDAC Allocation Committee Meeting | MINUTES

February 25, 2020, | 11:30 AM – 2:00 PM | 2001 S State Street, S2-950, Salt Lake City UT

Meeting called by Susan Gregory

Facilitator Karen Kuipers

Note taker Erika Fihaki

Next Meeting: March 03, 2020, 11:30 AM

CEDAC Committee: Susan Gregory, Leslie Jones, Ryan Henrie, Todd Richards, Becky Gertler, Kumar Shah, Camille Bowen, Shelly Batten, Allen Litster, Michael Anderson

Excused: Tyler Money, Jamie Peterson

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Sharon Pierce, Erika Fihaki, Mike Gallegos

AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic *Approval of February 18th Meeting Minutes* | Presenter *Susan Gregory*

Action Items

Make the following revisions to the 02/18/2020 minutes

- Kearns Sidewalk project – “the ask”
- Action Items – remove seconded

Allen Litster made a motion to approve as corrected. Leslie Jones seconded.

Agenda topic *Review of Conflicts of Interest* | Presenter *Susan Gregory*

Susan Gregory asked if there were any conflicts of interest for the applications which were to be reviewed today. Camille Bowen has a conflict of interest with the Columbus Foundation. She does not have any input/say on who receives funding. Per Karen Kuipers, this is a non-restricted conflict.

Agenda topic *Midvale City – Holden Street Improvement Project*

Exec Committee Summary –

- This is an access issue – meaning are the residents going to be served by this, or would it be serving the industrial buildings in the area? There was a discussion among the committee about this issue.
- This is a redevelopment area. Are there redevelopment funds that could help support this project?
- There was a question on eligibility based on the area and whether there are enough Low Mod residents in this tract. We will need to do more research.

Impact & Need – There was a discussion about the lack of sidewalks being a major safety concern. It is a top priority for the city. Improving a neighborhood increases safety which improves housing stability. There was discussion about the need for this project is great and the impact would be very beneficial due to the populations in this area.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The committee was divided on their thoughts about how clearly the project goals and outcomes were stated. Regarding housing stability, the committee was divided on how well the grant was written.

Agency Capacity – The committee felt this agency is capable of completing the project on time.

Cooperation & Collaboration – The committee felt that the agency expressed how they cooperate to reduce costs, but did not show how they are collaborating on obtaining funding. There was a discussion that there has been significant cooperation and collaboration with the community and the municipality on implementing this project.

Budget – The committee was concerned about the budget showing that the city’s portion of the budget was not committed. The committee would like to clarify with the agency if the city’s funds are committed.

Leveraging – The committee discussed that there was no leveraging listed, so they wondered if other funds have been provided or could be provided aside from CDBG funding.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Midvale City – Holden Street Improvement Project Clarifying Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the city’s funds committed in this project budget? • Clarify if they have any information about the population served for 2020. • Are there any state or redevelopment funds available. • Eligibility question on the percentage of low mod residents. 	Amanda Cordova	TBD

Agenda topic *Topic Columbus Foundation – Columbus Facility HVAC Upgrades*

Exec Committee Summary:

- This project is not an emergency.
- This is in their capital replacement plan.
- If not funded they would replace in stages.
- One building is 20 years old the other is 12 years old.
- There are concerns about modifying the curb or disturbing the roof. We are currently funding roof repairs.
- The Executive Committee is curious if there are other efficiency options available.
- The agency is in the process of selling a warehouse, so could they use proceeds from that?
- There are eligibility concerns as this could be considered ongoing maintenance as opposed to an urgent need. The organization needs to have a capital replacement budget for this type of item.

Impact & Need – There was a discussion that they did not specify the current condition of their existing units. They did a good job explaining the program but not the need for the project. There was a discussion about the need not being urgent as they stated in the application that the HVAC would need to be replaced in the next 1 – 3 years. The committee felt there was not a big tie into the housing stability.

Project Goals & Outcomes – The committee felt that the agency did not clearly indicate the goals of this particular project and what outcomes this would provide. There was discussion about the agency being more clear about which units are more critical than others for replacement. Our staff clarified that based on the site visit we did, the agency stated that none of them required critical replacement. The committee inquired if they would be able to convert efficiency savings into greater services provided.

Agency Capacity – The committee concurred that the agency has had a lot of success in utilizing CDBG funding in the past. Their capacity to complete the project is good.

Cooperation & Collaboration – The committee discussed they did an ok job showing the different organizations they work with to provide services to their clients. The committee was interested to know how they determine if there are individuals around them who could utilize their services. There were several generic terms listed with no specifics about whom they are collaborating with. The committee would like to see greater outreach in the community.

Budget – The committee discussed that there is a \$40K discrepancy in the budget. The committee discussed that their cost savings per year are not significant.

Leveraging – The committee discussed the ratio of other funding compared to their ask from us is not very healthy.

Action items

Person responsible Deadline

Columbus Foundation – Columbus Facility HVAC Upgrades	Amanda Cordova	02/25/2020 11:30 AM
---	----------------	---------------------

Clarifying Questions: None

Agenda topic *Guadalupe Center Educational Programs – Guadalupe School Health & Safety Improvements*

Exec Committee Summary:

- We need clarification from HUD on whether the chair is an eligible expense.
- Their current security system is unable to zoom in to see details about vehicles if there is an incident.
- No speakers in the security manager's office and the kitchen to notify staff if there is a lockdown.
- The building is 5 years old and camera coverage is not adequate 3-4 would be updated for wide-angle as well as the ability to zoom, also the ability for staff to access cameras from their smartphones.
- The speaker system is not adequate – there are a few offices that are unable to hear announcements.
- We will need to do some additional checking on their populations served.
- During the day there are approximately 430 individuals including students, pre-school and staff.
- They hold adult educational programs during the day and in the evening.
- This application is for two chairs.

Impact & Need – The committee felt the organization did an ok job of evidencing the need for these improvements. The committee discussed that this school is located in a dangerous area, so the need for cameras and security in the program is great. The committee concurred that grant writing was not well done, however, the need could be important. The committee discussed that there was no specific information about the need for the chair lift whether it was for staff or clients. Our staff clarified that this is not a chair lift. It's a manual device that you can strap someone into and bring them down the stairs. The committee discussed the need for ADA accommodations for entrance to the public and faculty. The committee felt that there was not a significant tie in with Housing Stability.

Project Goals & Outcomes – 2

Agency Capacity – The committee was initially concerned about this agency's ability to manage the grant successfully, however after our staff clarified that they have received other types of funding from our office, that concern was alleviated. The committee was not satisfied with the generalities used in evidencing their capacity.

Cooperation & Collaboration – The committee discussed that there were some good examples listed of their cooperation with outside agencies. The committee appreciates the discussion in the “impact and need” section as it helped clarify all other aspects of the application. There is not a lot of input from parents of clients and the community.

Budget – They have 10% of the required funds committed. The cost of the project is pretty low compared to other applications. There was a question about whether they’ve bid the jobs out. Is the proposal listed as a result of the bidding process? Our staff clarified that the county will ensure the processes are followed.

Leveraging – The committee was concerned about their lack of leveraging of funds from financial institutions.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Guadalupe Center Educational Programs – Guadalupe School Health & Safety Improvements Clarifying Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarify eligibility of chairClarify populations servedClarify whether the agency has bid out vendorsStaff will inquire about flood plane information	Amanda Cordova	02/25/2020 11:30 AM

Agenda topic *Millcreek City – Sunnyvale Park Improvements*

Exec Committee Summary:

- We are currently funding phase 1. They have a budget shortfall for phase 1 due to bids coming back too high. The agency may need to scale back.
- The Executive Committee has concerns about how this request will affect phase 1.
- Is there the potential to pull funds committed to phase 2 and use them for phase one?
- Scorecard – quarterly report was late. They have not billed out, however, our staff has been communicating with them to ensure that Davis Bacon is being complied with.
- #8 is missing the number of clients served.
- This used to be a county park – according to a title search, it remains a county park.

Impact/Need: This is listed as a high priority in their master plan. This is in an area where there are low-income households, refugees. The need for an improved park is large. The committee concurred that the importance of safe and vibrant spaces is huge.

Project Goals & Outcomes: The committee discussed that the goals and outcomes were poorly stated. Rather than listing statistics, they listed generalities. The benefits listed did not tie in well to Housing Stability. The committee discussed that the information given was not comprehensible.

Agency Capacity: The committee felt the agency did not clearly identify their ability to complete the project.

Cooperation & Collaboration: The committee discussed that there was no significant evidence of the agency’s collaboration with other agencies. The committee discussed that some of the vagueness in the projects and goals section was further explained in the agency’s response to question 24. The committee discussed that this section introduced additional goals and outcomes. There was no information about them interacting with local and national park organizations which could provide additional funding.

Budget: The committee would like to find out what foundational funding sources they are referencing. The agency references their city budget. The committee noted that there was no funding from Salt Lake

County Parks for 2019/2020. The city will commit \$150K of its own funding. They have listed other foundational funding.

Leveraging: The committee discussed that there is concern about their lack of leveraging because they haven't completed phase 1 yet.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Millcreek City – Sunnyvale Park Improvements Clarifying Questions	Amanda Cordova	02/25/2020 11:30 AM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will they be able to finish out phase 1 before they get funding for phase 2. If not, how will that impact phase 2?• Please clarify the clients served.• Clarify ownership of the park• The application shows funding from the city, but it is not reflected in the city's overall budget.• Clarify where \$150K foundation funding is coming from.		

Agenda topic *Assignments for Next Meeting* | **Presenter** *Susan Gregory*

Scoring section assignments will remain the same:

Impact/Need – Leslie & Shelly

Project Goals & Outcomes – Allen & Kumar

Agency Capacity – Ryan & Susan

Cooperation & Collaboration – Michael & Becky

Budget – Tyler & Todd

Leveraging – Jamie & Camille

Staff Assignments: See clarifying questions

Agenda topic *Other Business* | **Presenter** *Susan Gregory*

Amanda provided information about the clarifying questions document which was handed out to committee members. Be aware that March 10th we will add in the needs assessment report back to this committee on information gained.

Action Items

Kumar made a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 2:03 pm.