



## Community Recovery Committee Meeting

### MEETING MINUTES Thursday, December 1, 2022 4:00-6:00pm

The following members of the Community Recovery Committee were present. All participated electronically:

Tanya Hawkins, Chairperson  
Jake Maxwell, Vice Chairperson  
Steve Anjewierden  
Pook Carson  
Jason Wessel  
Esther Stowell

Also Present:

Cathie Rigby, Department of Economic Development  
Todd Andersen, Department of Economic Development  
Dan Milam, SLC Information Management Services  
Amy Dorsey, Finance Department

Absent:

Sarah Longoria

#### Briefings by the Staff

a. Report from the Program Manager

Chairperson Tanya Hawkins entered the meeting at approximately 4:06 pm.

Ms. Rigby reminded the Committee to send their completed conflict-of-interest forms to staff by December 2<sup>nd</sup> at 5 p.m.

Ms. Rigby gave follow-up on a question that came up from Mr. Anjewierden during the first CRC meeting on 11/2: how is the 'term of service' on the CRC board affected if a board member's term of service on another committee is ending. City staff received direction from the City Attorney's office on this question and will brief the Committee on this during the next meeting.

Ms. Rigby gave a presentation regarding the direction of Committee scoring, ranking/sorting of the high-score applicants, and information to inform discussion and possible motion on Business Item #2.

b. Discussion – Supply Chain/Inflation Issues

Ms. Dorsey from the SLC Finance Department presented information regarding the appropriate use of supply chain/inflation impacts in a narrative when businesses want to include it as a reason for their decrease of business revenue. Ms. Dorsey explained federal ARPA regulations and supply chain/inflation issues which can be categorized as negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.



**BUSINESS ITEMS:**

1. Review and Adopt Minutes from 11/2 Meeting

Mr. Anjewierden said he did not see the 11/2 Minutes attached to the meeting invite. Mr. Andersen explained that the minutes were attached to the meeting notice on the Utah Public Notice Website. A link to the notice was included on the WebEx meeting invite. After a straw poll was conducted regarding which members did review the minutes, it was decided that the review and adoption of the 11/2 meeting minutes would be postponed until the next meeting. Staff would make access to the minutes easier by attaching the file directly to the Webex meeting invite.

2. Discussion of Possible Changes to Committee Scoring Rubric

3. Motion to Accept or Reject Changes to Committee Scoring Rubric

Mr. Wessel motioned to remove questions #2 and #7 from the Committee's scoring rubric, which were deemed to be non-subjective. Instead, staff will score those questions. Mr. Anjewierden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Dorsey entered the meeting at approximately 4:35 pm.

Mr. Anjewierden motioned for Staff to take the following steps regarding 10 applicants who left question #4 (COVID-19 impact narrative) blank on their application:

Give the following 4 applicants a chance to fill out question #4 (applicants left the question blank, but through staff oversight weren't notified previously to respond to the question):

- Case # 59669
- Case # 59698
- Case # 59714
- Case # 59664

For the following 6 applicants, Committee should score question #4 based on mentions of COVID-19 impact in other parts of their application:

- Case # 59793
- Case # 59696
- Case # 59805
- Case # 59702
- Case # 59762
- Case # 59768

Mr. Wessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Committee discussed possible motion to make requested changes/additions to scoring rubric that will make the review process more equitable. After discussion, Committee decided that a motion would not need to be made. Staff would handle the equity & priority items of the ordinance in scoring instead of the Committee. This is how the process already operates.

4. Review and Discuss Small Business Applications

Mr. Wessel stated that he did not score two recent applications because he thinks he knows the businesses based on their narrative. Ms. Rigby responded that the Committee can always let staff know if they feel uncomfortable scoring any specific applications and can abstain from scoring if requested.

Ms. Stowell entered the meeting at approximately 5:05 pm.

ERIN MENDENHALL  
*Mayor*



**DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY  
and NEIGHBORHOODS**  
---  
**DEPARTMENT of ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT**

Ms. Rigby briefed the Committee on the option of advancing the top applications each week to a ‘final review pool’ and allowed the Committee to discuss. The Committee determined after review of the weekly batch of 15 applications, the top 3 applications with the highest scores would move on to final review. When the Committee reviews 20 applications per week, the top 4 applications would move on to final review. At the end of scoring, the last two Committee meetings would be reserved to give members the opportunity to re-review applications and re-adjust scores while considering all applications and equity & priority items of the CRC ordinance. Vice Chairperson Maxwell confirmed that because this was a discretionary decision not based on process, that a motion to approve would not be needed.

5. Briefing on Upcoming Week’s Small Business Applications

6. Other Business

None.

7. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Tanya Hawkins, Chair

This document and the recording constitute the official minutes of the Community Recovery Committee meeting held December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022.