

CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

January 23, 2024, | Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 South State Street, South Building, Rm S2-950

| Meeting called to order by Dan Tisdale

In Attendance

Committee Members: Robert Brough, Turner Bitton, Pat Holmes, Jacob Lawson, Antonio Valbuena, J. Todd Richards, Catherine Taylor

Online Committee Members: Rex Marler, Michael Anderson, Candace Tippetts

Excused:

Staff: Dan Tisdale, Amanda Cordova, Russell Goodman, Caitlin Lea, Derick Davis

1. Call Meeting to Order -Jacob Lawson

Chair- Welcomed attendees to the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

2. Review and Approve Minutes – Jacob Lawson

- Catherine motioned to approve the minutes. Candy seconded the motion. All in favor, Robert abstained, none opposed. Motion passed.

3. Application Review – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- #2 - Odyssey House (Transitional Housing)
 - Not currently funding.
 - Pat: Pat said the narrative was not good and confusing about their program.
 - Jacob: Jacob said the application was average.
 - Candy: Candy said the program description was good, but not many specifics.
 - Robert: Robert agreed with what Candy said.
 - Todd: Todd is questioning the difference. Their budget shows 85k and the contract shows 100k.
 - Rex: Rex had a question about the contract with different numbers of people being helped. One part stated 20 and another stated 24. Poor leverage with no other supporters. Basic budget.
 - Antonio: Antonio said they have good experience.
 - Catherine: Catherine said the application had scant information. They did not highlight their experience.
 - Mike: Mike said the federal funding showed significant experience with the grants due to the total number they do.

- Turner: Turner was disappointed with this application compared to others they have submitted. They do a good job with federal funding. He would like to see better explanations of terms in the application such as Davis-Bacon.
- The committee discussed the scoring process.
 - Jacob: In summary, this application was less than ideal.
- #3 – The INN Between (Medical Supportive Housing)
 - Currently being funded.
 - Pat: Pat said they had an excellent narrative.
 - Jacob: Jacob agreed with Pat.
 - Robert: Robert was disappointed with the innovation of such a great program.
 - Candy: Candy agreed with Robert. She said there was less information in the application.
 - Rex: Rex said the leverage was low, the numbers are vague, and it needs more description.
 - Todd: Todd mentioned they are asking for the full amount of funding. No leverage.
 - Catherine: Catherine said this is the only facility that she knows that does this for the community.
 - Antonio: Antonio was impressed by their experience and partners.
 - Mike: Mike said they have incredible services for the special population. They are good with Federal funding.
 - Turner: Turner agreed with Mike on the services provided.
- #4 – Project Connection (Mental Health Access)
 - Jacob: Jacob said the narrative was well articulated.
 - Pat: Pat said the narrative was excellent and it should be used as an example for its specificity.
 - Candy: Candy was glad to see it centered on the younger population.
 - Robert: Robert was glad to see the admin costs are covered by outside funding.
 - Todd: Todd said they have good leverage. 2/3 of the asks are coming from other sources.
 - Rex: Rex would like to see what percentage of the population served is low-income.
 - Catherine: Catherine thought the background description was poor.
 - Antonio: Antonio thought their background was good.
 - Turner: Turner said they are good at providing essential services and they have good experience with pass-through funding.
 - Mike: Mike said the availability of these services can be the difference in someone surviving.
 - Jacob: In summary, the reporting was not great, and the application was repetitive, what is the number of served, knowing the impact and cost per service?

- #5 – Legal Aid Society (Bridge the Gap)
 - Currently being funded.
 - Jacob: Jacob said the narrative was descriptive.
 - Pat: Pat said the narrative was great and well thought out.
 - Robert: Robert said they are looking for 7 paralegals and 2 attorneys. He said they make the process easy, and it can all be done at the courthouse in a matter of hours.
 - Candy: Candy agreed with Robert.
 - Todd: Todd had a question about the funding. The ask is 150,000.00, but the budget shows 146,800.00. Why the discrepancy? The budget description is good.
 - Rex: Rex agreed with Todd about questioning the difference. The budget is well-defined.
 - Catherine: Catherine said they are very qualified and have good programs.
 - Antonio: Antonio agreed with Catherine.
 - Mike: Mike recused himself. He stated he may have a conflict of interest.
 - Turner: Turner said they have a defined population, and they back up their goals. He said they do a good job of managing VOCA Federal funding.

4. Break – Members

- The committee took a 5-minute break.

5. Application Review – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- #6 – YWCA (Children's Services)
 - Not currently being funded
 - Jacob: Jacob sees no issues with the narrative.
 - Pat: Pat said they have a good explanation in their narrative.
 - Candy: Candy said they have good leverage with mixed funding sources. She is glad to see YWCA focusing on mental health in children.
 - Robert: Robert was glad to see the involvement with parents and children.
 - Todd: Todd said they have good leverage with different programs. He would like to see what match is in the budget. Todd had a question on the ETO database cost compared with the other YWCA application.
 - Rex: Rex agreed with Todd on the leverage.
 - Antonio: Antonio said they have good experience and focus on family relations.
 - Catherine: Catherine agreed with Antonio.
 - Mike: Mike said they are good with mental healthcare for children. He is impressed with how they use the Federal funding.
 - Turner:
- #7 – YWCA (Health and Wellness)
 - Not currently funding.
 - Jacob: Jacob is concerned about collaborating with other agencies.

- Pat: Pat said the good narrative and grant writing.
 - Robert: Robert said his first read was good, on the second and third read he had questions on the partnerships. He thought they were vague.
 - Candy: Candy agreed with Robert nothing else to add.
 - Rex: Rex said the budget was detailed and they are asking for help from other sources.
 - Todd: Todd said they have a good budget line description.
 - Catherine: Catherine said they were vague in their responses.
 - Antonio: Antonio agreed there was much information.
 - Turner: Turner said they have good coordination with the population that they serve.
 - Mike: Mike agreed with Turner.
- #8 – VOA (Youth Resource Center)
 - Currently funding
 - Pat: Pat said the narrative was good and detailed.
 - Jacob: Jacob agreed with Pat.
 - Candy: Candy said it was well-written with good details with the programs that it covers.
 - Robert: Robert said it was a good program to help the age group from 15-22 years. Helping them get out of the shelter and into stable housing.
 - Todd: Todd spoke on the budget and that they don't have a lot of leverage.
 - Rex: Rex spoke on the leverage being a little bit tricky. They seem to have a lot of other funding to help with the programs. He said he feels they have a good program.
 - Catherine: Catherine talked about the program for around for 25 years. They have good training and experience with a lot of moving parts.
 - Antonio: Antonio said that it is a good program but could do better to meet the needs of the population.
 - Turner: Turner said they have good Federal funding experience. Should define acronyms.
 - Mike: Mike liked the multiple projects and everything they can do for youth housing. The federal side was well written, and they have confidence in promises.
 - Jacob: In summary, the application was well done but had poor leverage.
- #9 -Ability Inclusion Center (Pathways)
 - The committee will review 1/30.
 - #10 – Wasatch Community Gardens (Green Team)
 - The committee will review 1/30.
 - #11 – Rape Recovery Center (Critical Crisis)
 - The committee will review 1/30.

6. Review Next Meeting Dates and Adjourn – Members

- The Committee Members were unable to get through all the applications this week. They will resume reviewing applications including 9,10, and 11 from this week. Jacob adjourned the meeting at 2:06 pm.

Next Meeting: Thursday, January 30, 2025.

Committee member breakdown for application review:

- Narrative – Pat and Jacob
- Innovation – Candy and Robert
- Leverage/Budget – Todd and Rex
- Background – Catherine and Antonio
- Coordination/Federal Funding – Mike and Turner