

909 12th Street, Suite 200
 Sacramento, California 95814
 (916) 447-7063: fax (916) 447-7052



SACRAMENTO REGIONAL EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER BOARD
 Jurisdictions 0824-00; 0938-00; 0816-00; 0670-00; 0650-00
ALLOCATIONS COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2009
 Time: 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.
 Location: The Salvation Army, 2550 Alhambra Blvd., Sacramento

Members Present:	Representing:
Nancy Vickers, Chair	American Red Cross
Beth White	Catholic Charities
Yasmin Hichborn	El Dorado County
Verna Catalano	The Salvation Army, Sacramento
Suzanne Hammer	Sacramento Co. Dept. of Human Assistance
Cindy Sherwood-Green	SETA
Maryfrances Collins	Yolo County
Ligaya Hattari	CIMC
Jeff Johnson	Love, Inc.
Members Excused	Representing:
Staff Present:	Representing:
Alan Lange	Community Services Planning Council
Others Present	Representing
Cynthia Hunt	Quinn Cottages
Frances Johnson	Food Bank of Yolo County
Jennifer Macias	St. John's Shelter
Christine Ourada	Acres of Hope
Darrell Sarmiento	Acres of Hope
Mark Orth	Sacramento Area Emergency Housing Center
Tom Stanko	St. Vincent de Paul
Jenni Toedtemeier	Roseville HomeStart
David Loya	Lazarus Project
Diane Hunt	Auburn Interfaith Food Closet

Advocate for homeless in attendance? Yes No

Thanks to The Salvation Army for the use of the meeting room and refreshments.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order and Introductions	The meeting was called to order. Self-introductions were made.	No action.
Review and Revise Scoring Criteria	<p>The following suggestions were made and recommended to be incorporated into the scoring criteria tool for reviewing applicants for phase 28 funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add County serving and funding components requesting to the top of the scoring tool. • Add a criteria: “Agency capacity to provide proposed services,” with 8 points possible. This statement will need to be added to the proposal language, as well. • Eliminate scoring category for “overall proposal preparation.” • Agencies that were not funded in Phase 27 will not be rated on reports being submitted on time (scoring based on an 88 as opposed to 100 point scale). • Eliminate unnecessary language from the scoring tool – description should be included in the proposal language. • Update points: Agency History to 6 pts; Agency Services to 6 pts; List of Agencies with Comparable Services to 4 pts; Population to be served to 8 pts; Days and Hours to 4 pts; make note that non-funded agencies from previous phase will be rated on an 88 point scale. <p>The proposal must also be updated in response to the scoring tool changes. In section A of the proposal, scoring will be updated, a note will be made that parts 3 through 10 are in reference only to the services for which funding is being requested (not entire agency). Other changes will include part 3: the geography is only the county; insert a new part 5: agency capacity to provide proposed services; add language to part 6 to include discussion of intake, collaboration, and referrals; add language to part 7 to include discussion of population demographics being served; explain in part 13 that applicants not funded will be rated on an 88 point scale.</p> <p>The section referencing “for EFSP staff use only” in the proposal will be removed.</p> <p>Finally, the introductory language will be moved in front of the cover page. And the discussion of format for proposals will be made to look similar to language used in SETA RFPs.</p>	The updates suggested were approved by consensus.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Additional Comments	The issue of reporting and what is considered to be “on time” was questioned. Expressed that reporting is due on the 10 th of each month. Reporting is considered on time if the Local Board Report is submitted (electronically or paper copy) by the 10 th of the month, so long as there are not gross errors.	No Action.
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 24, 2009.	No Action.
Adjournment	Meeting adjourned 10:45AM	