

# CEDAC Allocation Council | MINUTES

February 09, 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 Council

Facilitator Karen Kuipers

Note taker Erika Fihaki

**Council Members:** Susan Gregory, Amber Measom, Camille Bowen, Leslie Jones, Michael Anderson, Ryan Henrie, Shelly Johnson, Stacey Phillips, Todd Richards, Greg Shelton

**Staff:** Karen Kuipers, Vikram Ravi, Amanda Cordova, Mary Leonard, Michael Gallegos

## AGENDA TOPICS

Agenda topic *Welcome* | Presenter *Michael Anderson*

Karen Kuipers welcomed the group. Michael Anderson read the No Anchor Location statement.

Agenda topic *Approval of Meeting Minutes 02/02/2021* | Presenter *Michael Anderson*

This agenda item was moved to next week's agenda.

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

1. Proposed minor changes to CEDAC governing documents
  - a. Standard Operating Procedures – Karen gave a brief overview of the proposed minor changes to the CEDAD governing documents. This document will be distributed to council members for review. The council will vote in the next meeting whether to ratify these changes.
  - b. CEDAC Member Roles & Responsibilities – Karen gave a brief overview of the proposed minor changes to the CEDAC Member Roles & Responsibilities. This document will be distributed to the council members for review. The council will vote in the next meeting whether to ratify these changes.

## Action items

## Person responsible Deadline

Review Changes to Governance

Council Members

02/16/2021

Agenda topic *Review Schedule of Meetings for FY 2021* | Presenter *Amanda Cordova*

1. Timeline for Application Reviews - Amanda gave a review of the Master Schedule of meetings for this Fiscal Year's allocation process.
2. Review List of Proposals & Identify Potential Conflicts of Interest – The council members discussed various potential conflicts of interest. Council members were asked to ensure that they listed any potential conflicts on the disclosure statement they've received. Council members will also be asked to disclose conflicts in ZoomGrants on each application. Council members were

advised that prior to reviewing each application they will be asked to declare any potential conflicts and if there is a conflict they will be asked to recuse themselves from discussion.

---

**Action items****Person responsible**   **Deadline**

Review list of applications and determine potential conflicts of interest.   Council Members   02/16/2021

---

**Agenda topic** *Training/Refresher on ZoomGrants* | **Presenter** *Karen Kuipers*

Karen provided a training and refresher on ZoomGrants.

Leslie asked if they are required to mark whether they are required to certify that they have no conflict. Karen confirmed that they are required to indicate that, even if they don't have a conflict.

Mike Anderson advised the Council that any notes they write, any conversations had will be considered public. So be please maintain decorum in all things.

Karen was asked for the definition of recovery. Karen defined it as the ability of individuals to equitably regain losses and return to and surpassing pre-pandemic status through gaining economic mobility.

Karen was asked if she could send out the scorecard to council members. Karen confirmed each council member will receive a scorecard.

Mike Anderson advised the council that their score is out of 80 possible and the other 20 would come from Salt Lake County Staff.

There was a question about the budget section, requesting clarification on Ratio of low to moderate income served. Karen explained in order to qualify for these funds, 51 % of the clients the agencies serve need to be in the Low to Moderate Income range. An agency would get a higher score for having a higher percentage of clients served which belong to the Low to Moderate Income range.

---

**Agenda topic** *Review Changes in application format & budget for 2021*  
**Presenter** *Karen Kuipers*

Karen asked the council members to confirm that they are able to log in to ZoomGrants and view the applications. Staff noted the names of individuals who required further assistance with this.

1. Review Binder Materials – Karen gave an overview of the materials that are included in both the electronic binders and the physical binders.
  - a. Scoring Worksheets – Karen gave an overview of the Scoring Worksheet.
  - b. Library Documents – Karen gave an overview of the Library Documents.
2. Review applicant view of application template – Karen showed the council an example of what an application looks like when viewed by the applicant.

Karen provided explained the difference between the two type of applications and funding. She provided more information about the applications for Urban County Jurisdictions.

Karen went over the changes in the scoring of applications.

1. **City of South Salt Lake – South Salt Lake Opportunity Center:** Mike advised the Council that they can as follow up questions about anything listed in the application. Amanda clarified that The Council can only ask clarifying questions, they may not ask for new information.
  - a. *Application Overview* – Leslie Jones volunteered. Leslie gave a brief background on the city of South Salt Lake and its diverse population. Leslie gave an overview of the application and explained how it is a recovery effort. There were questions about some of the specifics of what the funding would be used for. The Council Members discussed their reasons for their scores.
  - b. *Priority Weighting* – Shelly Johnson volunteered. Shelly gave an overview of the priority weighting. The Council discussed their reasons for their scores.
  - c. *Impact/Project Design* – Camille Bowen volunteered. Camille gave an overview of the impact of this project and the project’s design. The Council would like to clarify how the applicant came up with the number of individuals served per year. County staff will send all clarifying questions to the applicant. Mike would like to clarify what participation in the program means. Karen will include that in the question.
  - d. *Goals & Outcomes* – Susan Gregory volunteered. Karen clarified the weighting of scoring of this section and how it relates to the other sections. The Council discussed their reasons for their scores.
  - e. *Project Beneficiaries* – Susan Gregory volunteered. Susan gave an overview of the populations that would benefit from this project. The Council discussed their reasons for their scores. The Council would like clarification on how program will accommodate individuals with disabilities.
  - f. *Budget* – Todd Richards volunteered. Todd gave an overview of the project budget. There were some questions about leveraging of the budget. Todd clarified that this is covered more under the leverage section. Mike added that in this section the Council will look at various areas related to their budget, ensuring that the project proposal budget is realistic. Mike asked County staff to clarify which portions of the budget would not be covered under CDBG funds. Karen advised the Council that County staff will be requesting clarification on a few small items in the budget. She will follow up with the Council on the specifics of what they will be requesting clarification on. The Council would like clarification on whether Maintenance Insurance and Bonding are covered. Karen explained that those are part of the bid from the contractor for the construction of the project, so it would be an eligible expense.
  - g. *Leverage* – Mike Anderson volunteered. He gave an overview of why he scored the way he did. There was no further discussion on this item.
  - h. *Sustainability* – Becky Guertler volunteered. Becky gave an overview of the sustainability of the project and her reasons for scoring the way she did. The Council discussed their reasons for rating this the way they did.
2. **Greater Salt Lake Metropolitan Service district – 4805 S 4480 W, 4835 Loop Sidewalk:** This application review was postponed to the next meeting.
3. **Greater Salt Lake Metropolitan Service District – Magna Downtown Revitalization Expansion:** This application review was postponed to the next meeting.

---

Agenda topic *Identify Staff Follow-up* | Presenter *Michael Anderson*

County staff identified the following clarifying questions.

- Clarify who is getting funding.
- Clarify how number of 400 individuals was calculate and what it means to participate
- Clarify persons w/disability how will staff accommodate

---

Agenda topic *Assignments for Next Meeting* | Presenter *Michael Anderson*

1. Areas of Focus:
  - a. Application Overview – Leslie & Shelly volunteered
  - b. Priority Weighting – Camille volunteered
  - c. Impact/Project Design – Becky & Susan volunteered
  - d. Goals & Outcomes – Amber & Mike volunteered
  - e. Project Beneficiaries – Stacey volunteered
  - f. Budget – Todd volunteered
  - g. Leverage – Todd & Greg volunteered
  - h. Sustainability – Ryan was placed in his absence
2. Review & Score Applications:
  - a. Finish reviews of any applications from prior week that were not completed
  - b. Midvale City Corporation – Jordan River Parkway Improvement Project
  - c. Midvale City Corporation – Main Street Art House Project
  - d. Millcreek City (*does not require review*) – Entitlement Jurisdiction

---

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

Assignments for next meeting:

- a. Application Overview – Leslie & Shelly
- b. Priority Weighting – Camille Bowen
- c. Impact/Project Design – Becky Guertler & Susan Gregory
- d. Goals & Outcomes – Amber Measom & Michael Anderson
- e. Project Beneficiaries – Stacey Phillips
- f. Budget – Todd & Greg
- g. Leverage – Todd & Greg
- h. Sustainability – Ryan Henrie

---

Agenda topic *Adjourn* | Presenter *Council Chair*

Michael adjourned the meeting