

Community Recovery Committee Meeting

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 16th, 2023

4:00-6:00pm

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

Jacob Maxwell, Chairman
Steve Anjewierden, Vice Chairman
Pook Carson
Jason Wessel

Also Present:

Jack Markman, Department of Community and Neighborhoods
Cathie Rigby, Department of Economic Development
Todd Andersen, Department of Economic Development
Amy Dorsey, Department of Finance
Tyler Durfee, Department of Community and Neighborhoods
Veatriz Alequin, Department of Community and Neighborhoods

Absent:

Sarah Longoria
Esther Stowell

1. Briefings by the Staff

Ms. Rigby reported on the City Council review of small business applications. As a result of adjustments made at the request of Council, forty-two (42) applicants will be awarded funding. This is using the same scoring established by the Committee and extended the list by eleven (11), awarding a little over \$1 million. Phase two (2) is still planned to be conducted later this year. Ms. Rigby conveyed the thanks from Council for the hard work of the Committee and the caution for staff to not overextend their efforts.

Mr. Markman reported that the admin review for nonprofit applications is still ongoing, and applications were anticipated to be ready for review by the Committee by Monday.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

1. Review and Adopt Minutes from 1/19 & 2/2 Meetings

Mr. Wessel requested a possible edit on the 2/2 minutes regarding. Staff suggested the relevant edit was unnecessary, but deferred the decision to the Committee, who deemed the change unnecessary. Mr. Wessel motioned to adopt the minutes from both the 1/19 and 2/2 meetings as presented. Vice Chairman Anjewierden seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Review and Discuss Nonprofit Applications

Mr. Markman began by requesting an update on the Committee's feelings about the pace of application review. Mr. Wessel communicated a preference to review a small, specific batch of applications each week, rather than receiving large batches to be reviewed as self-directed over the course of several weeks. Ms. Carson concurred with this opinion. Mr. Wessel suggested this should include a return to weekly Committee meetings, and Vice Chairman Anjewierden agreed. Chairman Maxwell also requested that all applications be unlocked for those who wished to review more applications during the week. Vice Chairman Anjewierden also requested this as a request for staff. No formal motions were made on this matter.

Several questions were asked by Vice Chairman Anjewierden regarding the service categories for nonprofit applications. Two examples were raised by Vice Chairman Anjewierden as examples of applications which may be better suited to a service category different from the one the applicants self-reported. Mr. Markman provided clarification on the justifications for both applications' current service categories but recommended that service categorization was not the most essential characteristic of applications at this time. Mr. Markman clarified that an agency could submit multiple applications in the same service category provided they were different applications/for different projects.

Ms. Carson asked a series of clarifying questions covering both confusing elements of specific applications and recurring elements across multiple applications. These included whether case management qualified as a direct service under the grant and how applicants would ensure staff would only be reimbursed under the grant for services rendered for Salt Lake City residents. Mr. Markman affirmed that case management was allowable as a direct service and that confirmation would be requested from all awarded agencies that funding would be restricted to Salt Lake City residents.

Mr. Wessel raised a concern about the wording of an application that suggested that services would be restricted to only those insured by Medicaid. Mr. Markman suggested this was indicative of their program as it currently stands, rather than how it would operate if funded, but recommended confirming this with the applicant at a later date.

Mr. Wessel also shared concerns on frequent discrepancies in proposals on question #9, 'Income Brackets Served.' These concerns were shared by other Committee members. Mr. Markman suggested that responses to question #9 that differed from question #8, 'Program Outputs,' could be attributed to several possible confusions: 1) applicants were reporting the percentage of clients in each income bracket, or 2) applicants were reporting the projected income of those served within each income bracket, rather than the projected number of clients served. It was also highlighted that Treasury guidance has alternative methods for determining 'impact' or 'Disproportionate impact,' such as a school being classified as Title 1, and that questions #10 and #11 can provide additional demographic information for Committee members reviewing proposals.

These questions prompted a discussion made by Vice Chairman Anjewierden regarding whether the Committee could request clarification on specific proposals from the applicants. Mr. Durfee affirmed that this was generally allowable by regulation but deferred to Mr. Markman on whether it was allowable under Treasury requirements. Mr. Markman affirmed it was, but that many proposals required clarification and requests could slow down the process substantially. Chairman Maxwell also suggested that requesting clarification could contaminate the process, as application response clarity should be considered in scoring. Vice Chairman Anjewierden compared the current standards to the more lenient process of the small business application review, and asked if it was appropriate to hold nonprofits that frequently apply for grant funding to a higher standard than small businesses that never applied for such funding. Mr. Markman agreed that this was an appropriate adjustment to make.

Mr. Wessel and Chairman Maxwell observed that it was also true that frequent mistakes on questions may suggest an issue with the wording of the question rather than the competency

of the applicant. This was recommended as something for Committee members to consider if they encountered frequent errors on the same questions.

It was proposed that any clarifications could occur after all applications were reviewed and be done for the sake of confirming eligibility.

Mr. Wessel asked for clarification on whether two 'Mitigating the Digital Divide' applications were for the same program, and whether this would disqualify them from funding. Mr. Durfee that this was also allowable with other funding streams and deferred to Mr. Markman on whether this would be allowable for Treasury funding. It was determined that they were not for the same program, so Treasury allowability was not a concern.

3. Other Business

None

4. 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 March 16th, 2023.

ARPA CRC 03.16.2023 Minutes

Final Audit Report

2023-05-30

Created:	2023-05-30
By:	Jack Markman (jack.markman@slcgov.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA3mtvn5YCVxMloBfoBnURWatKLQEn7B-u

"ARPA CRC 03.16.2023 Minutes" History

-  Document created by Jack Markman (jack.markman@slcgov.com)
2023-05-30 - 4:34:49 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to jacob.maxwell@slcgov.com for signature
2023-05-30 - 4:35:04 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by jacob.maxwell@slcgov.com
2023-05-30 - 5:29:16 PM GMT
-  Signer jacob.maxwell@slcgov.com entered name at signing as Jake Maxwell
2023-05-30 - 5:29:53 PM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Jake Maxwell (jacob.maxwell@slcgov.com)
Signature Date: 2023-05-30 - 5:29:55 PM GMT - Time Source: server
-  Agreement completed.
2023-05-30 - 5:29:55 PM GMT

