



## Community Recovery Committee Meeting

### MINUTES

**Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2023**  
**4:00-6:00pm**  
**451 S State Street, Room 126**  
**Salt Lake City, Utah 84111**

The Community Recovery Committee meeting will be held as a hybrid meeting, with in-person and virtual options to attend.

To access and attend the meeting, please visit:  
<https://saltlakecity.webex.com/saltlakecity/j.php?MTID=mcdf5a05de850943e60a0e095b3e2d70f>

**Meeting Number:** 2482 991 0456  
**Meeting Password:** 5xiNb4nGAb9 (59462464 from phones)  
**Call Number:** +1-408-418-9388

1. Roll Call  
Jacob Maxwell – Chair  
Esther Stowell  
Pook Carson  
Sarah Longoria  
Steve Anjewierden – Vice Chair  
Amy Dorsey

**Staff:**

Jack Markman  
Cathie Rigby  
Todd Andersen  
Heather Royall  
Veatriz Alequin

2. Briefings by the Staff

Cathie Rigby

Gave your recommended list along information about the program to the Director, during the Committee Meeting so they can have an understanding of issues on our product and how we develop the program. We knew that funding decision was likely not being made in that meeting. They really appreciated the dedication of this committee, the recommendation, the hard work and the number of hours that went into the recommended list. They feel like the process works sufficiently well enough so that we have so many applicants and are wanting to expand the funding that happens in phase one so, there is a request to our staff to come back to them on March 7<sup>th</sup> with a couple of options or proposals on how funding happens slightly differently than we anticipated. We are carrying three options to increase the funding lists (looking more of the applicants with lower scores than this committee recommended for funding, not require them to come back for a phase two but simply expand the amount of dollars. Option two would be to expand the bonus points and wave the root that is re applying to allow them to receive a bonus for doing the process the second time. We will send an email about this information where you can watch the presentation. We will pair those options and present them on the 7<sup>th</sup>, to see what the council would like to do. We have many people in the community aware of phase 2 because we were not anticipating ramping up. We have a list of businesses that are waiting for phase two but, it is the council's

ERIN MENDENHALL  
Mayor



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

decision whether there will be a phase two.

Jacob Maxwell

Council liked the makeup of our community and there was a straw poll about having a second round and I think the determining factor and tipping point for that was because this board is exactly how they want it to be and they wanted to trust our decision. This board has a good reputation.

Jack Markman

Is the committee is going to be revisiting any of these details when you're expanding the amount of applications that are going to be awarded potentially?

Cathie Rigby

No, the score and the scaling would stay in place, so they are appreciative of the work that went into scoring these, they liked the general consensus. We would just look to tell them what the dollar impact is, how far down the list we could with funds still available.

3. Steve Anjewierden made a motion to adopt the Minutes from 1/12 meeting. Pook Carson seconded – unanimously in favor.
4. Jack Markman

Prepared a presentation that involved a list of items that should be reviewed and discussed, including:

- Reaffirming CRC Funding decisions should be based on scores (be transparent to outside audiences).
- How should the committee scoring questions be adjusted?
- Should the committee fund as many as possible at full (eligible) ask or at reduced ask?
- Should the scores be weighted based on category and number of competing applications in that category?
- Whatever the committee decides, what is an appropriate pace for applications? Should applications be considered by category?

Alternative scoring questions and weights were proposed to the Committee for consideration.

Jacob Maxwell

As far as time goes, I love the idea of 5 questions. However, I think these applications are complex; there's a lot of details and a lot of things to consider. Do you feel that we are able to, on these 5 concepts, to stratify the quality of each applicant or do you feel like it's a little too reduced? That would be my fear.

Jack Markman

I need to talk with some other individuals within my department who are more familiar with brand management and scoring than myself. We are trying to balance your time and committee member, also the different capacities and life experiences. All of you, committee members, are familiar with some of the questions that deal with AMI and we want to be sensitive to that.

About your question, whether it still preserves the complexity of the application I would say Yes. And the reason being is: this is two thirds of the component aggregates score. There is also admin score, which deals with more of the complex internal questions to deal with AMI indirect costs budgeting, our eligibility lines, these sort of things that I wouldn't expect ask the committee members to have to parse. Your position is to determine the program as it's presented or whether the community it seems appropriate over other applications. The more technical side is going to be supported by the admin myself and others.

Jacob Maxwell

ERIN MENDENHALL  
Mayor



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

Does it increase the set of application questions referenced?

Esther Stowell

I like the idea of referencing certain questions that apply to that question.

Jack Markman

Agreed.

4:27pm Jason Wessel joined the meeting.

Jacob Maxwell

Speaking for myself: My 1<sup>st</sup> preference is to make sure that I'm critiquing these in the most fair and equitable way and time saving comes second. As long as you feel like those ratios are good.

Jack Markman

I'm happy to update these in any other way and add the academic questions corresponding to each of these questions draft. I'd also be open too have committee members emailing me later, any revisions they have.

Sarah Longoria

If we have only 5 questions and each one is worth 5 points, the total will be just 25 points, this could bring a lot of ties or close scores because the range is smaller.

Jack Markman

In smaller captions, in blue you can see that each question I put a weights to each of these questions. For example, they are worth 5 but your score out of the 5 and your score will be multiplied by 3. So, the committee scores total out to 65 which will be added to 35 points score to the admin for a total 100.

Heather Royall

I think these 5 questions still get at the heart of what you are trying to do with these funds.

Pook Carson

Asked about the scoring math and how the committee member's and the admin's score will be added.

Jack Markman

The system will take each committee member's scores and add them up.  
For admins, there is about ten questions; most of them are out of 2 points, 1 weight.  
The total score for each application is out of 100.

Pook Carson

I think that the weighing is very nicely done because the program benefits our underserved group. Will receive. That's why I didn't talk about the impact. Thank you.

Steve Anjewierden

ERIN MENDENHALL  
Mayor



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

In these 5 questions. Does it capture the nonprofits ability to actually do the work?

Question number 4 – the clarity of the proposal and the scope of work, they're convincing us that they can do the work and, if that's the case I think that should be weighed more heavily.

If question number 3 is more academic and financial, I know that that's important but, if that's what that is, I think that's weighed a little heavily.

Jack Markman

Yes. That was what question 3 was intended to capture and Jake's suggestion can change the word capacity to ability might make it bit more clear.

The scope of work in question 4 but also questions 1 and 2 sort of covered the delivery of services. The proposal promotes community recovery efforts and if it's effective and serving underserved populations, in my mind that lease a judgement on their capacity to deliver the necessary services and it doesn't ask why is it explicitly as it does with the ability to manage bonds and more academic or technical term if you think it would be more appropriate to have a specific question on capacity to provide services as opposed to having it folded into those 3 questions, that's something I can work on and explore

Steve Anjewierden

I feel like a lot of the questions previously were very similar to each other so there was redundancy. I also feel comfortable reducing it to a smaller number of questions.

Jack Markman

I will make the adjustments that have been suggested and will upload this to ZoomGrants so it can be used by the committee as your current template going forward.

[Considered whether the Committee should award all at full (eligible) ask or reduce amounts to award to more applicants] A way that I would recommend doing this (if we were to take the 2<sup>nd</sup> option) is to multiply the award eligible asks by their scores (so, if an agency asked for \$100k and they've got a total score of 83, a little more than \$83k). That gives us a bit more money to go around and that would be a fair way to ensure that we are not just arbitrarily choosing which agency is funded what and the highest rated still gets the closest amount to what they asked.

Pook Carson

Proposed a vote between the 2 options.

Jacob Maxwell

I guess the third option is: can we get a feel for these applications to better understand what the programming looks like? Because we may have more of a sense of the purpose and may feel more compelled to fund at full or after reading budgets and scopes of work we may feel more compelled to take option 2.

Steve Anjewierden

The last round of percentages were pretty high. I'd like to start to see what the percentages com in on this because if we as a group tend to score them low and we tie money to that, that could impact their budgets as well.

Esther

I am in agreement. I feel like this new round of applications is different and making a decision right now will make it difficult for us to move forward at the end. Let's wait and see how things turn out.

Tyler Durfee

ERIN MENDENHALL  
Mayor



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

You don't have to make a decision right now. What we want is you to keep this framework in mind as you go and keep these ideas in mind as you are scoring.

Jason Wessel

One of the reasons why we went with that second model last time was also because of how closely grouped together so many of the applicants were; it was within a percentage point or 2 that it the does were getting dropped off so, we tried to spread the money a little bit further.

Jack Markman

After reviewing the applications, there is a section for you to put your recommended amount and that can be edited.

Jason Wessel

I think last time where we scored it based on the merits and then addressed equity at the end, worked well. What do you all think?

Jacob Maxwell

I agree with that and my discomfort comes from not going in and judging a solid set of applications; a better answer would come to light after judging 10 or more.

Jack Markman

[Asked the Committee at what speed they would like to consider applications]

Pook Carson

Proposed to try with 5 first and see how things go. Then, decide to slow the pace down or go faster.

Sarah Longoria

Jake wanted more at a time in order to be able to compare applicants with each other so that we can see the whole scope. So, maybe we could have access to all of them without getting them all done.

Jack Markman

I could assign 20 applications sometime tomorrow and use 3 weeks to judge.  
Jake suggested 5 to 10 applications.

Jason Wessel

Agreed.

Jack Markman

[Presented slide asking Committee whether they would prefer to consider applications segregated by service category or consider a mix of all at a time].

Sarah Longoria

Would be fine with getting 20 applications, whatever the categories are, with a 3 weeks period to review them.

ERIN MENDENHALL  
*Mayor*



**DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY  
and NEIGHBORHOODS**

---  
**DEPARTMENT of ECONOMIC  
DEVELOPMENT**

Jason Wessel

Agreed.

Steve Anjewierden

Agreed but suggested to communicate by email or call another meeting if we have to adjust.

Jack Markman

We'll set a tentative meeting for next week. I will assign the same 6 applications to be reviewed on this first week to start with the process.

Adjourned at 5:26pm

---

Jacob Maxwell – Chair