ERIN MENDENHALL
Mayor

DEPARTMENT of **COMMUNITY**
and **NEIGHBORHOODS**

DEPARTMENT of **ECONOMIC**
DEVELOPMENT

Community Recovery Committee Meeting

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, January 19th, 2023
4:00-6:00pm

The following members of the Community Recovery Committee were present. All participated in-person (451 S State Street, Room 126) except Esther Stowell, who participated electronically.

Jacob Maxwell, Interim Chairperson
Steve Anjewierden
Jason Wessel
Sarah Longoria
Esther Stowell (participated electronically)

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

Absent:
Pook Carson

1. Briefings by the Staff

    a. Report from the Program Manager

Ms. Rigby stated that staff sent scoring data to CRC members which will be discussed during the meeting. Data will only be available for CRC member reference and not be visible to attendees over WebEx. This meeting's goal will be to award $750,000 to a recommended list of businesses that seeks to achieve demographic, geographic, and business category equity.

Ms. Stowell entered the meeting at approximately 4:06 pm.

Ms. Rigby explained that staff worked hard to include home-based businesses and sole proprietors as eligible applicants, as the SLC Arts Council advised that many in the local arts community fall under these categories. She also explained that the City's Business Development team asks the committee to consider preserving brick-and-mortar businesses who are employers and 'place makers' in the City.

Ms. Rigby shared a slide (attached) outlining feedback we received from many applicants after calling them. Applicants were asked 1) if they had any questions/concerns about the grant process, and 2) if they had feedback for the Committee.

ERIN MENDENHALL
Mayor

DEPARTMENT of **COMMUNITY**
and **NEIGHBORHOODS**

DEPARTMENT of **ECONOMIC**
DEVELOPMENT

BUSINESS ITEMS:

1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Ms. Rigby explained that Chairperson Hawkins had submitted her resignation from the Committee and an election would be held for a new Chair and Vice Chairperson. Ms. Rigby added that staff were in the process of finding a new member to replace Ms. Hawkins on the Committee. Pursuant to CRC bylaws, staff notified the Mayor's Office will work together to find a replacement from the Racial Equity in Policing Committee. Staff anticipates that the new member will join the Committee prior to the nonprofit phase of scoring.

Vice Chairperson Maxwell asked if it would be better to wait to elect a new Chair and Vice Chairperson until after the new member joins. This would allow the new member to vote in the election or nominate themselves to one of the positions. Ms. Rigby responded that the Committee has the choice of holding the election this evening or waiting until the new member joins.

Mr. Anjewierden motioned to elect Jacob Maxwell as the Chairperson of the Community Recovery Committee. Ms. Longoria seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Maxwell motioned to elect Steve Anjewierden as the Vice Chairperson of the Community Recovery Committee. Mr. Wessel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Review and Adopt Minutes from 12/8 Meeting

Mr. Wessel motioned to adopt the minutes from the 12/8 meeting as presented. Ms. Stowell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Review and Discuss Small Business Applications

The Committee received a scoring spreadsheet to use as a reference, as they deliberated on: 1) the list of applicants that would be recommended for funding, and 2) how much funding would be each recommended applicant would receive.

There were two main ideas proposed regarding which applicants would be recommended for funding, and how much funding they would each receive:

(1) Ms. Longoria proposed that a 'sliding scale' be used to determine how much funding an applicant would receive. With the sliding scale, an applicant's amount of eligible funding would be multiplied by the average score they received from Committee scoring to get their recommended funding amount (for example, a business who was eligible for $10,000 and had an average score of 90.0 would be recommended $9,000 in awarded funds). This sliding scale would be applied to top scorers (starting with the applicant with the highest average score and going down) until the $750,000 in funds were exhausted.

ERIN MENDENHALL
Mayor

DEPARTMENT of **COMMUNITY**
and **NEIGHBORHOODS**

DEPARTMENT of **ECONOMIC**
DEVELOPMENT

Committee members who supported this approach felt that more businesses could be recommended for funding if the sliding scale were used. Ms. Stowell expressed concern that giving less than the full amount to recommended applicants would complicate the process to much and could be seen as not being fair to applicants who had the top-scoring applications. She urged that the Committee keep it simple for this phase of scoring, and a more advanced approach to scoring (such as the sliding scale) could be used in the second phase.

(2) Applicants would receive 100% of their eligible funding. This would be applied to top scorers (starting with the applicant the highest average score and going down) until the $750,000 in funds were exhausted.

Mr. Wessel motioned that for the sake of geographic equity, applicant #60261 be included in the list of recommended applicants. Staff explained previously that City Council District 1 had no applicants that were among the top scorers, and applicant #60261 was the closest District 1 applicant to being in the list of top scorers. This would ensure that District 1 has at least one applicant that would be recommended for grant funding. Vice Chairperson Anjewierden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Committee conducted a straw poll between 1) a 'sliding scale' to determine how much funding an applicant would receive, and 2) applicants receiving 100% of their eligible funding. Chairperson Maxwell, Vice Chairperson Anjewierden, Mr. Wessel, and Ms. Longoria voted for the 'sliding scale' idea of recommended funding. Ms. Stowell voted that applicants receive 100% of their eligible funding.

Mr. Wessel opened the floor up for any debate before a motion is made. Ms. Stowell opted to not debate her dissenting vote, as debate had already happened previously in the meeting.

Mr. Wessel motioned that the 'sliding scale' approach be used to determine how much funding an applicant would receive. With the sliding scale, an applicant's amount of eligible funding would be multiplied by the average score they received from Committee scoring to get their recommended funding amount. Ms. Longoria seconded the motion. A roll call vote was held.

Chairperson Maxwell – Yes
Vice Chairperson Anjewierden – Yes
 Mr. Wessel - Yes
Ms. Longoria – Yes
Ms. Stowell – No

The motion passed with a 4-1 vote.

4. Final Review and Sorting of Applicant Scores

None.

ERIN MENDENHALL
Mayor

DEPARTMENT of **COMMUNITY**
and **NEIGHBORHOODS**

DEPARTMENT of **ECONOMIC**
DEVELOPMENT

5. Other Business

Ms. Rigby explained that staff would organize the recommended list of applicants/funding amounts and send to the Mayor's Office the following week. Staff would then address any concerns from the Mayor's Office. If the Mayor has no concerns, then the recommended list will be finalized into a transmittal sent to the City Council for their February 7th meeting. She invited Committee members to attend the February 7th Council meeting to see the outcomes to the Committee's work.

Ms. Rigby also noted that the Committee was welcome to send a letter to City Council explaining the Committee's process and decisions. Mr. Anjewierden liked this idea and proposed to detail the Committee's thoughtfulness and effort to get as much money to as many businesses as possible. The Committee understands the need and they really tried to find a fair process in a difficult situation. Ms. Rigby said that staff could attach a letter from the Committee to the Council transmittal.

Ms. Stowell suggested that when speaking to unsuccessful applicants and inviting them to apply in Phase 2, staff should also provide a list of other resources that are available to assist businesses. Ms. Rigby responded that staff has previously shared other resources/funding opportunities to applicants throughout Phase 1. A list of applicants was also shared with SLC Business Development and the SLC Arts Council, so that any future opportunities from these departments could be shared with grant applicants.

Mr. Wessel suggested that applicants in Phase 2 who are given technical assistance be trained on what the Committee wants to see in an application when they score. Ms. Rigby responded that Phase 2 applicants would be trained on examples of excellent applications.

6. 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 January 19th, 2023.

POSITIVE FEEDBACK FROM APPLICANTS

- *"Thanks for the updates and work."*
- *"It's all great."*
- *"Grant process was smooth and easy."*
- *"Grant process was great, impressed with communication and responding to emails within 24 hours."*
- *"Process was not confusing or frustrating for them, also wanted to give kudos to staff and especially Committee for taking their own time to administer this program"*
- *"Smooth application"*
- *"Feels the program went smoothly."*
- *"He said we were very helpful to him even when missed a couple steps of the application; said this was one of the easier applications he's done."*
- *"He appreciates that 1 or 2 people were always the one to contact him and assist him; he's applied to other grant programs that had many more staff trying to assist and it was confusing."*
- *"Program is pretty coherent."*
- *"Program was efficient and effective."*

CONSTRUCTIVE FEEDBACK FROM APPLICANTS

- *"Would have liked to know metrics ahead of time. Wants committee to know that she summitted early because was worried it worked like PPP and money would run out so didn't take advantage of TA."*
- *"Process is taking too long. State process for grants only took 60 days. Also doesn't think that reimbursement is best for businesses to receive funds. Money needed to pay for expenses upfront. Thankful for what we are doing to help businesses."*
- *"Application online-uploading documents were difficult."*
- *"In the early days of the application being open, we could've been clearer on the website of what was required; she also mentioned that the timing of the grant could be sped up."*
- *"Did find training she attended to not be super helpful."*
- *"Had problems uploading documents in the application portal; not clear on what criteria the Committee would use to score applications."*
- *"Wishes timeline was quicker but understands that there were many applicants."*
- *"It was quite a lengthy process and it seemed like there were no firm dates given on when decisions would be made or if we could reapply for future phases and when would they be."*