



MINUTES

CEDAC ALLOCATION COMMITTEE

February 13, 2024 | Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 South State Street, South Building, Rm S2-950

| Meeting called to order by Becky Guertler at 12:10

In Attendance

Committee Members: Todd Richards, Candy Tippetts, Antonio Valbuena, Ryan Henrie

Online: Mike Anderson, Becky Guertler, Steve Van Maren (resident)

Staff: Karen Kuipers, Amanda Cordova, Maria Sweeten, Dan Tisdale, Angie Love

Excused:

Absent: Howard Van Horn II, Tyler Holt, Eric Hawker

1. Welcome –

Becky Guertler

- Becky thanked members for their time, especially those members who attended last week's 2024 Provider Expo
 - 53 providers and over 120 community members attended
- Becky also thanked SLCo for their work in executing the expo

2. Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes from 1/23/2024 –

Becky Guertler

- Todd motioned to approve the minutes, Ryan seconded the motion all in favor, and no opposed motion passed.

3. Staff Overview – Agency responses to clarifying questions –

Amanda Cordova

- **CDCU –**
 - **Clarifying Question:** It is unclear within the application how you calculated the number of individuals/clients that will be served. Please explain.
 - **Response:** In the budget, we included 20 households receiving grants of up to \$5,000.00 and loans of up to \$20,000.00. We estimated the average household size to be three individuals based on historical client data (even though this is slightly higher than Salt Lake County's average of 2.26) to get 60 individuals served.
 - **Committee:** No additional clarification is needed.
- **Maliheh Free Clinic –**
 - **Clarifying Question:** It is unclear within the application if your agency owns or leases the building located at 941 E 3300 S Millcreek, UT 84106. Please clarify.
 - **Response:** Awaiting response from Maliheh

- **City of South Salt Lake –**

- **Clarifying Question:** Please clarify and explain what line item “QC” means on the budget.
- **Response:** Quality Control – Typically this is concrete testing and special inspections to make sure the materials are delivered as specified.
- **Clarifying Question:** It is unclear in the application budget that was submitted what each “UNIT” abbreviation means. Please provide clarification.
- **Response:**
 - LS = Lump Sum (typically a percentage of the total cost)
 - SY = Square Yard
 - CY = Cubic Yard
 - LF = Linear Foot
 - EA = Each
 - TON = 2000 lbs
- **Clarifying Question:** Please explain what the line item “Survey” includes and identify how this expense was calculated to total \$15,000.00.
- **Response:** Survey will be performed by a licensed surveyor. They will use existing surveys as a starting point and then confirm the right-of-way lines, utilities, and all features. They will also provide topography (elevations) to use in the drainage design.
- **Clarifying Question:** Please clarify why the contingency expenses are so high. Contingency – 50% \$101,700.00
- **Response:** Typically, at a concept level, we have a contingency of at least 30% because there are still many unknowns. In addition, construction costs have been so wildly variable in the past few years, they have been hard to predict. The city is certain it will spend at least \$400,000 to get all the items shown on the drawings, and if anything, would likely have to cut from the whole picture shown to achieve this budget. This contingency is based on projects in the last three years. We know construction cost inflation has slowed, but it is difficult to base these costs on other projects in the city in the last year because this scope is so much smaller, and likely higher cost per unit.
- **Committee:** No additional clarification is needed.

- Any additional recap needed or follow-up discussion from the committee members who weren't in attendance last week?
 - None

4. Intent to abstain/recuse from review of Week #4 applications – Becky Guertler

- None

5. Finalize Review of Non-Profit & Quasi-Government Applications - Becky Guertler

- **Odyssey House Inc, Utah – Clinic and Lighthouse Roof Replacement**
 - Replacing 24-year-old roof
 - Asking for 25K for a 110K project
 - Basic, simple project
 - Very strong partnerships
 - Very successful program with a proven record and great outreach
 - Applied for county funding well over 10 years
 - Administration costs are quite low – positive
 - Well-supported/financially backed project
 - Good to see the agency is capturing
- **Shelter the Homeless, Inc – STH – Interim Family Housing Laundry Room**
 - Asking \$40K 2/3 of \$60K project budget
 - Low-cost project with high-impact return
 - Washers and dryers are the biggest expense
 - Management oversight of only \$5K
 - A portion of the space is already in the process of being renovated
 - Great collaboration with other non-profit agencies
 - Provides homeless families with independence and self-reliance (very good)
 - Strong partnerships
 - Works very closely with the City of Salt Lake, which fully supports STH
 - STH's project is independent of the City of Salt Lake's application request
no competition between the two
- **The INN Between – TIB – Electrical Systems and Generator Upgrades**
 - \$50K requested to cover the upgrade
 - Requesting the full amount of the project cost
 - If not approved for funding, the facility will have to shut down when the generator is no longer operatable
 - Extremely valuable service to the community
 - TIB has come a long way in just a short amount of time (almost 10 years)
 - A lot of heavy hitter partnerships – good and strong, very positive
 - Provides a safe environment for clients (when faced with court-ordered restrictions)
 - A positive – some clients improved their overall health because of the care they received at the facility. TIB gives individuals a place to go when faced with life-ending health issues
 - No concerns with TIB's current PY23 project
- **YWCA Utah – Elevator renovation at YWCA Utah's TH Facility**
 - \$100K requested for the \$145K total cost of the project
 - Critical upgrade
 - If not approved for funding will have to close off the top two floors (leaving only one floor operational)

- Code violations on elevator
- Great systemic and service provider partnerships
- Collaborative partnership model demonstrates 5-key benefits (great system taking very good care of people)
- YWCS Utah established in 1906 – one of the few agencies that support domestic violence survivors
- Did not get approved for funding last year, the agency team was gracious for the feedback received from the SLCo staff during their debriefing

6. Finalize Review of Urban County Jurisdiction Applications – Becky Guertler

- Herriman City – Herriman Community Center
 - Herriman accepted entitlement but has chosen to have the SLCo execute funds
 - SLCo ensuring the project meets the area benefit requirements
 - Seniors – English as a second language (ESL)
 - ESL would qualify as low- to moderate-income
 - Not reviewing the application competitively – just for feedback
 - Creating a refugee immigrant service facility
 - Priority for Herriman City Council
 - A lot of input from the community
 - Good partnerships to include community
 - Community saw a need to help individuals who are having a hard time communicating because of language barriers
 - High school resource advisors saw an increase in ESL students
 - Mayor is involved and doing a lot of outreach
 - Project timeline documentation missing
 - Budget is all over – dollar amounts not consistent
 - How ready is the project (shovel?)
 - Information within the application is “what has been done in the past to get to this point”
 - Want to see all the partners that are interested in seeing this happen and maybe listing those out to be a little more clear

7. Identify Staff Follow-up - Amanda Cordova

- Clarifying questions from this week’s review:
 - **YWCA** – If this activity was recommended for partial funding, what additional funding resources would be available to bridge the funding gap? Please provide clarification and explanations.
 - **Herriman** – It is unclear within the application summary and the attached budget what the "Total Project Cost" is for this activity. Please clarify and explain the "Total Project Cost" and each of the budgeted line items associated with this request. Are there any concerns with meeting the projected timeline that was submitted with the application? Is the project considered "Shovel Ready"? Please explain.
- Amanda will be presenting the administration summary

8. Other Business –

Staff

- Volunteer Hours: If you attended last week's 2024 Provider Expo, please ensure to include those hours in your volunteer reporting
- Submit scoring
- April's Public Hearing meeting with the Mayor: There's a possibility of scheduling this meeting for the last week of March due to scheduling conflict

9. Adjourn –

Becky Guertler

- The meeting was adjourned at 1:37

Next Meeting: February 22, 2024 @ 12:00 p.m.