

MINUTES
FROM THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
BOARD MEETING (CDCIP)
Monday, November 5, 2018
451 South State Street, **Room 126**
City & County Building
Salt Lake City, Utah
5:30 p.m.

1. **Board Members**

Logan Darling
Loree Hagen
Hannah Lockhart
Tony Mastracci
Andrew Saalfield
Brooke Young

Board Members Not Present

Pamela Silberman

Also Present

Lani Eggersten-Goff
Dillon Hase
Shyann Hugoe

2. **Staff Updates**

Mr. Hase wanted to inform the Board about responses to their questions on October 29, 2018.
Mr. Hase presented the following questions and responses to the Board:

Odyssey House

Can OH please clarify how they come up with the number of individuals to be served (635)? The application says they serve 180 individuals a day. How long are people in the VT program? How long are clients in this program (not treatment)?

The number of individuals to be served is based on last years numbers of how many people the Adult Program serves in total for the year because all Adult Clients do also participate in VT since they are partner programs. The 180 served daily is a duplicated number. Each day it's about the same 180 in the program unless someone leaves and are replaced by another client in VT, so after 7-8 months there should be an entirely new group of clients in the VT Program. As for the length of the VT Program is about 7-8 months.

Salt Lake Donated Dental

How many dentists/dental assistants will this pay for?

The additional \$20,000 dollars is spread out as follows: \$12,000 will pay for a dentist, \$3,000 for dental assistants and the remaining \$4,000 for supplies and lab fees, this is the

increase asked for over last years grant. This increase will pay for an additional 87 patients or 70% of the patients we currently had to turn away last year.

How many of the 124 people not seen due to lack of a dentist being available?

All of the patients being turned away are a direct result of us not having a Donated Dentist who is willing to donate his time on any given day.

What level of funding is needed to be able to serve all people needing services?

The need in the community continues to grow and no amount of funds will meet the growing need.

The INN Between

I am confused about the number of people being served. Is this request related to the 50 bed facility that could become 75? Or is it the 30 beds that will become 40?

Where are they getting the space to increase capacity by 10 beds?

The INN Between's building has a physical capacity of 75 beds; however, we are only zoned and licensed to operate 50 beds. If the SLC Planning Division approves our request for a reasonable accommodation, we will be able to increase our zoned and licensed capacity to 75 beds

How do they get to their 911 cost saving number of \$1M?

Based on information provided by Salt Lake City Fire Department, each 911 call with medical transport costs the City about \$2,000. If we eliminate 500 unnecessary 911 calls, we save the City \$1,000,000.

What is the "Funding Gap" in the budget? If this gap is not filled, how many beds can they operate?

The INN Between must raise this additional funding in order to sustain our Assisted Living program, which carries higher medical staffing needs to comply with State regulations. If we do not bridge the gap, we will need to remain at 30 or fewer beds, and there is a possibility that we will need to discontinue the Assisted Living program altogether.

The Road Home- Men's Shelter

How is SLC residency defined? Last known address? Last permanent address?

The Road Home collects and records client-level data from all of our programs to allow for thoughtful program evaluation, reporting, and outcome measurement using Utah's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). At intake, clients are asked for the city and zip code of their last permanent residence of 90 days or more. This client-reported data would be used to determine the number of people we serve that identify as Salt Lake City residents for the Men's shelter, should we operate it.

YWCA

Application states that 45% of shelter residents will exit to safe, affordable permanent housing. What are outcomes for the other 55%?

Exits to safe, affordable permanent housing are our largest exit data point, however other common exit destinations are moving in with family/friends, moving to non-subsidized housing, reconciliation with former partner, and moving to another shelter.

3. Approval of the minutes of the October 29, 2018 meeting.

Ms. Hagen asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Young moved to approve the minutes of October 29, 2018 as presented. Mr. Mastracci seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Business

A. Welcome

Ms. Hagen welcomed the CDCIP Members and opened the meeting on November 5, 2018 at 5:30PM.

B. Application Review and Discussion

- 1) Alliance House – Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services: Mr. Hase explained the application to the Board. He stated that the staff scoring of the application on ZoomGrants was incomplete due to questions about eligibility. Mr. Hase added that staff is still waiting for a response from the agency and that staff would like to revisit the application with the Board next meeting.
- 2) Catholic Community Services of Utah – Weigand Resource Center: Mr. Hase explained the application to the Board. Ms. Hagen asked what the agency meant when the application stated the collect signatures. Mr. Hase responded that clients sign in when they use the facility. Mr. Darling inquired about the difference between this shelter and other shelters. Mr. Hase stated that the primary difference is this shelter is a day shelter. Ms. Lockhart would like to know the impact of the location of this shelter in anticipation of the Road Home closing. Mr. Hase stated that the agency did anticipate those forecasts in their application.
- 3) First Step House – Homeless Resource Center Behavioral Health Treatment Services: Mr. Hase presented the application to the Board. Mr. Mastracci asked per the outcome where 50% will exit into permanent housing, where would those units be located? Is this program connection to a housing program where units will be available? Mr. Mastracci also asked if this funding would be for new hires or existing staff. Mr. Hase stated that the agencies response was “Our Treatment services will include comprehensive housing case management services that work to address housing barriers and ensure that our patients exit to permanent housing. We work will all possible housing options and resources, including voucher programs through the housing authorities. There will also be an opportunity for Homeless Resource Center patients to access First Step House rental assistance and/or housing. We currently have CoC/HUD funded Rapid Rehousing program that provides short-term rental assistance for homeless individuals with a substance use disorder or mental health condition to move into scattered site permanent housing in the community. This program provides housing for up to 30 people per year. In addition, we will be opening our permanent supportive housing facility that will provide housing options for people who are homeless and struggle with mental illness. We anticipate using the funds for both new hire staff and utilize existing staff.” Ms. Hagen asked for clarity of the number of individuals served. Mr. Hase explained that the total number served is 5,000. Ms. Young asked if this program will operate regardless of which agency is selected to

operate the resource center. Ms. Eggertsen-Goff stated that First Step House anticipates continuing to operate regardless. Ms. Lockhart asked where the State of Utah commitment funding is coming from. Mr. Hase stated he would follow up.

- 4) Housing Authority of Salt Lake City – Homeless Prevention: Mr. Hase described the application to the Board. Ms. Young asked if this is a new program. Mr. Hase stated he would follow up with the agency and report back to the Board. Mr. Mastracci asked if there is a history of how this agency has spent funds in the past or if there are concerns for the new application. Mr. Hase stated that there are not any concerns about this agency spending funds because this agency has been awarded federal funds before.
- 5) Housing Authority of Salt Lake City – Rapid Rehousing: Mr. Hase addressed the application to the Board. Mr. Mastracci inquired if the individuals served in this application are the same individuals served in the previous application. Mr. Hase stated that the individuals served in each application are not duplicated because they serve different populations. Mr. Mastracci and Ms. Young would like clarity between both applications.
- 6) Salt Lake Community Action Program DBA Utah Community Action – Rapid Rehousing Program: Mr. Hase summarized the application to the Board. Mr. Mastracci asked with the increase in the number of clients served, are additional full time employees being hired or will the increase in clients be covered with the same staffing levels. Mr. Hase stated that the agencies response was “UCA will maintain the same staffing levels; however, the funding will allow us to increase the amount of time our full time employees can work with RRH clients.” Mr. Mastracci asked if this award will increase the time spent with RRH clients, then what is staff doing currently that they will stop doing as a result of the ESG award. Mr. Hase stated that the agencies response was “The full time employees would spend less time working our TANF grant and there would not be any effect to services rendered for the ESG award. UCA has other staff that would pick up the TANF grant responsibilities.” Ms. Young stated that there are a lot of rapid rehousing applications. Mr. Darling added that rapid rehousing is important because it prevents homelessness before it starts. Mr. Mastracci asked about how each organization conducts rapid rehousing and wants to know if there are superior strategies between the organizations. Mr. Hase explained that each agency provides rapid rehousing support to clients for different lengths of time
- 7) Salt Lake Community Action Program DBA Utah Community Action – Diversion Program: Mr. Hase explained the application to the Board. Ms. Hagen asked for clarification on the application where it states they will assess 2,000 individuals in need of shelter, and place 500 individuals into immediate housing. Mr. Mastracci asked of the 75% that are not diverted, do they get diversion services again if they are present at the shelter, and are the 2,000 unduplicated. He would also like to know what are the primary reasons for unsuccessful diversion. Mr. Hase stated that the agencies response was “Diversion is a strategy that helps people identify and access alternatives to entering shelter to resolve their immediate housing crisis and avoid homelessness. Our goal is to divert 500 individuals from entering the homeless shelter by establishing alternative housing options – doubling up with friends or family. The \$10,000 will allow us to provide food, transportation, and other fees associated with reaching a housing destination with family and/or friends. The 2,000 number is

unduplicated. The primary reason for unsuccessful diversions is that clients may not have feasible alternatives that they can reach out to avoid checking into the shelter.”

- 8) The Road Home – Proposed Men’s and Women’s Shelter and Resource Center: Mr. Hase presented the application to the Board. Mr. Hase asked the Board if there were any questions. There were no questions.
- 9) The Road Home – Proposed Men’s Shelter and Resource Center: Mr. Hase described the application to the Board. Ms. Young asked if this funding was for half the year. Mr. Hase stated that their ask could be lower due to other funding sources.
- 10) The Road Home – Rapid Re-Housing: Mr. Hase presented the application to the Board. Mr. Mastracci asked about clarification on program outcomes. Mr. Hase stated that the agencies response was “Based our FY 18 RRH Program, we project that the total number of individuals that will be served by this program will be 1,739 individuals, who will receive approximately 244,945 nights of housing. Drilling down further, of that the total number of people served by the program, we project that 1,275 individuals will report their last permanent residence of 90 days or more as being Salt Lake City, and that they will receive approximately 205,442 nights of housing through this program. We know based on extensive, historical data collected through HMIS, that 75% of families served through this program do not return to shelter within two years. This uses 2017 guidance from HUD regarding parameters; a one-day shelter stay threshold and the longest standard for reviewing a family’s return to shelter at two years beyond exit from shelter.
- 11) The Road Home – Community Shelter: Mr. Hase addressed the application to the Board. Mr. Saalfeild asked about the Road Home closing 2019. Mr. Hase discussed that the Downtown Shelter is scheduled to close by July 1, 2019. However, there is some uncertainty around this, since the HRCs are not currently up and running. They are scheduled to be completed by the, but we do not know with 100% certainty that they will be fully operational. We should have a better understanding of this when the City Council awards the final funding. As such, Staff have instructed Board Members to score the application at face value. Staff Admin scores have been updated to reflect this as well. If the Board awards them funding, the Board can also make a recommendation for a contingency if the Shelter does close.
- 12) The Road Home – St. Vincent de Paul Overflow Shelter: Mr. Hase summarized the application to the Board. Mr. Hase asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.
- 13) Volunteers of America, Utah – Youth Resource Center Shelter Operations: Mr. Hase explained the application to the Board. Mr. Hase added that staff would follow up with the Board about the budget because there were questions about ineligible expenses.
- 14) YWCA – Transitional Housing: Mr. Hase presented the application to the Board. Mr. Hase

asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

C. Other Business

5. Adjournment

There being no further business. The meeting was adjourned at 6:49PM.



CDCIP Board Chair Vice-Chair

This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the CDCIP Board meeting held November 5, 2018.