

CAC Citizen Advisory Committee

January 30, 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, Pat Holmes, Jacob Lawson, Antonio Valbuena, J. Todd Richards, Catherine Taylor

Online Committee Members: Rex Marler

Excused: Candy Tippetts, Mike Anderson

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

1. Call Meeting to Order -Jacob Lawson

- Chair – Jacob welcomed and called the meeting to order at 12:03.

2. Review and Approve Minutes – Jacob Lawson

- Robert motioned to approve the minutes from 1/23. Todd seconded the minutes, all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

3. OPMA Training – John Diaz

- Deputy District Attorney John Diaz presented the Open Public Meetings Act. John spoke on the requirements and violations of the OPMA.

4. Application Review – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- #9 – Ability Inclusion Center (Pathways)
 - \$100,000.00
 - Not currently funded.
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was poor. The narrative was just a list.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the narrative has a confusing tone.
 - Robert – Robert said the information was confusing and was not clear on the program innovation.
 - Todd – Todd was unclear on the budget, confusing.
 - Rex – Rex was unclear on the budget numbers.
 - Antonio – Antonio said they show a lot of experience, but the application was too general and not defined.

- Turner – Turner said there was no mention of the population served. The delivery was confusing. It was not clear if the program had a brick-and-mortar location or if it was mobile. The Federal funding is not defined.
- #10 – Wasatch Community Gardens (Green Team)
 - \$101,744.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the narrative was informative and descriptive.
 - Pat- Pat said it was a lovely application. The ask is 100% serving 16 people.
 - Robert – Robert said it is a very innovative program with job training. It serves a niche population.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget is detailed and leverage is good at 50%.
 - Todd – Todd spoke about the committed match and had a question on the budget “It does not add up”.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background is sound and they have good experience.
 - Antonio – Antonio agreed with what Catherine said.
 - Turner – Turner said the application is strong and meets the consolidated plan. Federal funding is good and detailed.
- #11 – Rape Recovery Center (Critical Crisis)
 - \$120,136.85
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the narrative is straightforward, but not as good as in previous years.
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was good and very specific.
 - Robert – Robert said their methods are very innovative. Mobile response teams, a bilingual workforce, and kits are provided to the victims.
 - Todd – Todd said the budget was easy to read and detailed. The leverage is good only asking for ¼ of the need.
 - Rex – Rex said the leverage is good. Unfortunately, this group needs to be in existence.
 - Catherine – Catherine said she had to dig for background details. They have good experience.
 - Antonio – Antonio feels this is a good program to consider funding.
 - Turner – Turner said they have good coordination pointing to specific goals and addressing barriers. They have in-depth Federal funding but could have better detail on funding sources.
- #12 – Utah Community Action (Rapid Rehousing)
 - \$146,228.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the narrative is good and specific.
 - Pat – Pat said they have a detailed process and a good argument why they need the funding.

- Robert – Robert was disappointed with the innovation. He thought it was not detailed and bland.
 - Todd – Todd said the leverage was poor no committed funds.
 - Rex – Rex said they have poor leverage.
 - Antonio – Antonio thought the background should have better detail for how long UCA has been around.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background on the application is mediocre.
 - Turner – Turner said the coordination is good for the consolidated plan. The Federal funding was not good for the experience that they have.
 - Committee – The committee members are asking for clarification on the “pending funding awards”. Asking for a summarization of pending awards that might change the scoring. Looking for an update by 2/15 for final scoring.
- #13 – Utah Community Action (Tenant-Based Rental Assistant)
 - \$180,000.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said this narrative was a copy and paste of the previous application.
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was lazy and the goals were not stated clearly. Could app 12 and 13 be the same?
 - Robert – Robert agreed the application was the same as the previous one.
 - Turner – Turner said that 12 and 13 are similar just a different amount.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget was the best part of the application.
- #14 – Utah Community Action (Head Start Expansion)
 - \$240,000.00
 - Has not been funded previously
 - Jacob – Jacob said he would like to see more detail in the narrative.
 - Pat – Pat said she thought it was a good narrative very succinct.
 - Robert – Robert thought it had a good description for being a pilot project.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget looked good he was worried about the total cost and the leverage was good.
 - Todd – Todd questioned the full 240k for just one class with eight students. Would like to see more detail since they are asking for the full amount.
 - Catherine – Catherine said it has good detail on the purpose and measurement. Also, it is 8-5 and year-round for the students. Not very descriptive on the population served.
 - Antonio – Antonio agreed with Catherine, but did have questions on the budget.
 - Turner – Turner said he would like to see a better description of how things fit in the budget. Federal funding was good as in 12, 13, and 14.
- #15 - THRIVE (Survivors of Torture)
 - \$100,000.00

- Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said they had a great narrative.
 - Pat- Pat said the narrative had good details.
 - Robert – Robert said it is a great organization and is represented well in resettling refugees.
 - Rex – Rex was concerned about the budget. The total program has a good line-item breakdown. Good leverage.
 - Catherine- Catherine said they have unique qualifications with clients. Need more details.
 - Antonio – Antonio said it was a good project with good experience.
 - Turner – Turner said the program met multiple touchpoints with emphasis on self. Federal funding is dependent on funding.
- #16 – Community Building Services (Community Capacity & Youth Positive Development Program)
 - \$100,000.00
 - It has not been funded previously.
 - Pat – Pat said the narrative was very wordy and had poor detail.
 - Jacob – Jacob said it was more ambiguous than it could have been.
 - Robert – Robert said it had a poor description of what the program does.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget was ok. Wondering how many people does it help. There was only a small amount of leverage.
 - Todd – Todd said the budget was vague and would like to see a better percentage breakdown.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the language was plain and difficult to understand.
 - Antonio – Antonio agreed with Catherine's comments.
 - Turner – Turner said they did a good job with the consolidated plan coordination. No experience with Federal funding.
- #17 – The Road Home (Resource Centers)
 - \$100,000.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the narrative was short and sweet straight to the point.
 - Pat – Pat said it was specific and to the point.
 - Robert - Robert mentioned they are partnering with the DL Division to help with ID's.
 - Todd – Todd said they are asking for the full project cost. Trying to fill in gaps from previous years.
 - Rex – Rex said the budget was basic, but it's good money spent and good leverage.
 - Antonio – Antonio said they have a good experience being around for over 100 years.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the description was good, but not very compelling.

- Turner -Turner said they are good with the consolidated plan. Good Federal funding experience.
 - The Road Home has a pre-negotiated rate of 18%.
- #18 – The Road Home (Rapid Rehousing)
 - \$151,822.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Jacob – Jacob said the narrative was good.
 - Pat- Pat said the narrative was not as detailed as others. Good not great.
 - Robert – Robert said he likes the housing first approach. The program is tailored to each household.
 - Todd - Todd said they have submitted for other funding, but the leverage is low.
 - Rex – Rex said the leverage is poor. 10 people at 101K seems high.
 - Antonio – Antonio said they have a good background.
 - Catherine –
 - Turner – Turner said they listed goals on the consolidated plan. Federal funding is good due to experience.
- #19 – The Road Home (Tenant-Based Rental Assistance)
 - \$350,000.00
 - Previously funded.
 - Pat- Pat said the narrative was poor and confusing.
 - Jacob – Jacob said they needed a better description.
 - Robert – Robert felt that it was a direct copy and paste from previous applications.
 - Todd- Todd said they had no budget.
 - Rex – Rex said they didn't speak to the correct program. They do have good leverage from their history.
 - Catherine – Catherine said the background was general.
 - Antonio – Antonio agreed with Catherine's comment.
 - Turner – The coordination was not specific to the program. Federal funding is good.
- #20 – University Of Utah (Community Capacity and Wellbeing)
 - Due to time constraints the committee will review 2/6/2025.

5. Review Next Meeting Dates and Adjourn – Jacob Lawson/Staff

- The next meeting will be at 9:30 – 11:30 on February 6, 2025.
- The meeting was adjourned at 2:01.

Next Meeting: Thursday, February 6, 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