



Community Recovery Committee Meeting

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, February 2nd, 2023
4:00-6:00pm

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

Jacob Maxwell, Chairperson
Steve Anjewierden, Vice Chairperson
Pook Carson
Esther Stowell
Jason Wessel
Sarah Longoria

Also Present:

Cathie Rigby, Department of Economic Development
Todd Andersen, Department of Economic Development
Dan Milam, Information Management Services (IMS)

Absent: None

1. Briefings by the Staff
 - a. Report from the Program Manager

Ms. Rigby explained that there was a technical issues that caused staff to not be able to see 5 of the applications that still needed to be scored. The 5 applications have already been sent to Committee members for review and scoring. These 5 applicant's scores will be considered along with all other Phase 1 applications.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

1. Review and Adopt Minutes from 12/15 Meeting

Mr. Wessel motioned to adopt the minutes from the 12/15 meeting as presented. Vice Chairperson Anjewierden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Discussion Regarding District 6 Representation

Ms. Rigby explained that after further sorting all Committee scores, no applicants from District 6 would make the recommended list. After analyzing District 6 applicants and finding those with the highest scores, the Committee debated the pros and cons of allowing either one or two of the applicants from District 6 to move up to the recommended list.



Ms. Longoria asked if the Committee should seek equal proportionality between districts for all applicants. This would mean the proportion of recommended grantees by District would match the proportion of all applicants by District (for example, if applicants from District 2 represented 20% of all applications, then 20% of the final recommended list should be from District 2). Chairperson Maxwell and Ms. Stowell expressed concerns with this idea because it would complicate the work the Committee had already done.

The Committee decided on moving up one applicant: #60991, which is eligible for \$8,000 in funding. Ms. Carson motioned that for the sake of geographic equity, applicant #60991 be included in the list of recommended applicants. Mr. Wessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Review and Discuss Small Business Applications

Mr. Wessel asked for clarification on applicant #63107 who seemed to indicate they had more than 50 employees in their application, which would deem them ineligible for the program. Ms. Stowell mentioned she was also confused by how the applicant explained their employee count. Ms. Rigby responded there were some applicants who had over 50 employees before the pandemic, and under 50 employees when they applied for the grant. Program rules allowed them to apply if they were under 50 employees at the time of applying.

Mr. Wessel noted an applicant that stated they suffered a “hypothetical loss” in revenue due to COVID-19. He asked if a hypothetical loss could be counted as official revenue loss due to COVID-19. Ms. Rigby responded that hypothetical or projected losses could **not** be counted as revenue loss in an application. Applicants that cannot prove revenue loss through financial documents can still be reviewed and scored by the Committee but would be eligible for \$0 in funding.

Ms. Carson noted that currently the Committee’s recommended funding amount was less than the target \$750,000 by around \$10k. She asked what would be done with this \$10k. Ms. Rigby responded that staff is following the previous recommendations from Council to give out as much funding as possible, even if that means going over the \$750,000 in the first phase of funding. If the recommended funding is still below \$750,000 even after the carve-outs for businesses in Districts 1 and 6, then the Committee would look to fund the applicant with the next highest score outside of the initial recommended list.

Ms. Carson asked if the Committee could just lower the funding amounts for two District 6 applicants, so that they both would receive funding instead of just one. Mr. Wessel responded that the Committee debated this in the last meeting and voted on the “sliding scale” method of funding applicants, which the Committee saw as the fairest merit-based method of funding. Mr. Wessel cautioned that further changing the rules would push the Committee farther away from merit-based funding and closer to giving special treatment to specific applicants.

4. Other Business

Ms. Rigby noted that staff was preparing the transmittal to Council and would present to the Council on February 21st. She invited Committee members to attend the February 21st meeting.

Ms. Rigby solicited the Committee for any further feedback to inform the next phase of funding and make improvements to the program.



The Committee gave the following feedback:

Mr. Wessel

- The Committee should receive a copy of the application filled out by applicants. He feels this would help visualize how the applicant is viewing their application.
- When giving technical assistance, staff should encourage applicants to answer every part of a question and be as specific as possible.

Ms. Carson

- There should be a character limit for narrative questions in the application.

Chairperson Maxwell

- Provide Phase 2 applicants with “gold star examples” of previous applications so that applicants can see what type of application scores well.

Ms. Rigby explained that unsuccessful applicants would be required to meet with staff for 20-minute appointments to apply for Phase 2. Staff will help applicants improve their applications for Phase 2.

Mr. Wessel followed up with Chairperson Maxwell’s question from a previous meeting, regarding if roll call voting procedures needed to be followed for every type of motion. He stated that when meetings are online, the Committee should follow roll call voting procedures regardless of the type of motion.

5. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Committee Chair

This document and the recording constitute the official minutes of the Community Recovery Committee meeting held February 2nd, 2023.