



Sacramento
Employment and
Training
Agency

GOVERNING BOARD

ERIC GUERRA
Councilmember
City of Sacramento

PATRICK KENNEDY
Board of Supervisors
County of Sacramento

DON NOTTOLI
Board of Supervisors
County of Sacramento

SOPHIA SCHERMAN
Public Representative

MAI VANG
Councilmember
City of Sacramento

DENISE LEE
Interim Executive Director

**925 Del Paso Blvd., Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95815**

**Main Office
(916) 263-3800**

**Head Start
(916) 263-3804**

Website: <http://www.seta.net>

REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD

DATE: Wednesday, January 12, 2022

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85788669894?pwd=Tk5sZ2VOSjZOenVUdFAzcXFacXJmUT09>

In response to the AB361 (Brown Act Section 54953) relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic, the Sacramento Employment and Training Agency Community Action Board is conducting this meeting on Zoom at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85788669894?pwd=Tk5sZ2VOSjZOenVUdFAzcXFacXJmUT09>. Members of the public may join the meeting by clicking the link above or typing the meeting address above into their web browser, or listen to the meeting on One tap mobile + 16699006833, 85788669894# US (San Jose). Meeting ID: 857 8866 9894. Passcode: 528258. Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85788669894?pwd=Tk5sZ2VOSjZOenVUdFAzcXFacXJmUT09>. Members of the public are encouraged to participate in the meeting by submitting written comments by email to: Monica.Newton@seta.net. Any member of the public who wishes to speak directly to the board regarding any item on the agenda may contact Monica Newton at (916) 263-3753, or Monica.Newton@seta.net. Please include in your request on which item you would like to participate. Additionally, during the meeting any questions or comments may be submitted via the Q&A or chat features on Zoom. Public comments will be accepted until the adjournment of the meeting, distributed to the Governing Board and included in the record.

In the event of disruption which prevents broadcasting of the meeting to members of the public using the call-in or internet-based service options, or in the event of a disruption which prevents members of the public from offering public comments, the Board shall take no further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting is restored.

Closed captioning will be available. This document and other Board meeting information may be accessed through the Internet by accessing the SETA home page: www.seta.net.

AGENDA

PAGE NUMBER

- | | | |
|------|---|-------|
| I. | <u>Call to Order/Roll Call</u> | 1 |
| II. | <u>Consent Item</u> | |
| A. | Approval of Minutes of the November 10, 2021 Regular Meeting | 2-10 |
| III. | <u>Action/Discussion Item</u> | |
| A. | Approval of Findings and Authorization to Extend Use of Teleconferencing Procedures for Board Meetings During Declared State of Emergency and/or While State or Local Officials Continue to Impose or Recommend Measures to Promote Social Distancing (Legal Counsel) | 11-12 |
| B. | Election of Officers to the Community Action Board | 13-14 |
| IV. | <u>Information Items</u> | |
| A. | Community Services Block Grant Fiscal Monitoring Reports (Julie Davis-Jaffe) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Salvation Army• WIND Youth Services• World Relief Corporation | 15-21 |
| B. | Program Operator Report – 3 rd Quarter | 22-28 |
| V. | <u>Reports to the Board</u> | 29 |
| A. | Chair | |
| B. | Executive Director | |
| C. | Program Manager | |
| D. | Members of the Board | |
| E. | Public | |
| VI. | <u>Adjournment</u> | |

DISTRIBUTION DATE: Monday, January 3, 2022

**COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD
MEETING ATTENDANCE
2021**

BOARD MEMBER	Represented Sector	1/13	2/10	3/10	4/14	5/24 *	5/25 *	6/9	7/14	8/11	9/8	10/13	11/10	12/8	# of meetings attended
LaShelle Dozier	Public Sector	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		8
Dominique Espinosa (8/1)	Low Income Sector	X		A	X	A	A		X			X	X		5
John Foley (3/24)	Private Sector				X	X	X		X			X	X		6
Anthony Garcia	Public Sector	X		A	A	X	X		A			X	X		5
Kristin (9/18/19) Gibbons	Public Sector	X		A	A	A	A		X			X	X		4
Genevieve Levy	Private Sector	X		X	A	SFBFS chose to no longer serve on CAB 5/2021									
Jara Lindgren (7/1)	Low Income Sector	X	REPLACED BY S. PIERCE												
Donald Migge	Private Sector	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		8
Shannon Pierce (2/2021) Alt: Donna Bonner	Low Income Sector			X	X	A	A		AP			X	A		3
Jon Rango (2/6)	Private Sector	A	RESIGNED 1/20/2021												
Rivkah Sass	Public Sector	X		X	A	X	X		A			A	A		4
Sam Starks	Public Sector	X		X	X	X	X		X			A	A		6
Fienishia Wash (5/19)	Low Income Sector	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		8

*Special meeting
AP: Alternate Present

ITEM II-A- CONSENT

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 10, 2021 REGULAR MEETINGS

BACKGROUND:

Attached are the minutes of the November 10, 2021 regular board meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review, make any necessary corrections and approve the minutes.

PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD

Minutes/Synopsis

(The minutes reflect the actual progression of the meeting.)

Electronic meeting

Wednesday, November 10, 2021
10:00 a.m.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Garcia called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. The roll was called and a quorum was established.

Members Present:

LaShelle Dozier, Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency
Fienishia Wash, Head Start Policy Council
John Foley, Self Help Housing
Anthony Garcia, Child Action, Inc. *(joined at 10:02)*
Dominique Espinosa, Vice Chair; Mutual Housing California
Kristin Gibbons, County Department of Human Assistance
Donald Migge, Chair; California Community Credit Union

Members Absent:

Sam Starks, Secretary/Treasurer; SMUD
Rivkah Sass, Sacramento Public Library Authority
Shannon Pierce, Head Start Policy Council

II. Consent Item:

A. Approval of Minutes of the October 13, 2021 Regular Meeting

The minutes were reviewed, there were no questions or concerns.

Moved/Foley, second/Dozier, to approve the minutes for October 13, 2021 Regular Meeting.

Roll call vote:

Aye: 7 (Dozier, Wash, Foley, Garcia, Espinosa, Gibbons, Migge)

Nay: 0

Absent: 3 (Starks, Sass, Pierce)

III. Action/Discussion Item

A. Approval of Findings and Authorization to Extend Use of Teleconferencing Procedures for Board Meetings During Declared State of Emergency and/or While State or Local Officials Continue to Impose or Recommend Measures to Promote Social Distancing

Ms. Julie Davis-Jaffe reviewed this item.

Moved/Garcia, second/Espinosa, to approve the Findings and Authorization to Extend Use of Teleconferencing Procedures for Board Meetings During Declared State of Emergency and/or While State or Local Officials Continue to Impose or Recommend Measures to Promote Social Distancing

Roll call vote:

Aye: 7 (Dozier, Wash, Foley, Garcia, Espinosa, Gibbons, Migge)

Nay: 0

Absent: (Starks, Sass, Pierce)

B. Approval of Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Funding Recommendations for Program Year 2022

Ms. Davis-Jaffe reviewed this item. On August 6, 2021, SETA released a request for proposals (RFP). This request is brought to the board every two years. The request for funding solicited services under the Safety-Net, Youth and Senior Support, and Family Self-Sufficiency categories. The amount of funding available is estimated at \$900,000. The RFP included a special project of importance and value to the board, which is serving and eliminating recidivism among felony and misdemeanor arrests in Sacramento County among African American youth ages 14-17. Special project proposals will be eligible to receive up to \$50,000. The deadline for the proposals was September 16, 2021. There were 26 proposals received. The total requested amount of funds is \$1,713,496, which is greater than the availability of funds. Staff and other entities including the City, County, SETA's Fiscal and program departments, and Contracts Unit read and rated the proposals. Staff considered identified high risk and underserved neighborhoods that would have access to services and ensured all target groups would be serviced. Only 15 proposals are being recommended for funding, due to limited available funds.

Ms. Espinosa asked if 30 percent will go towards homeless services, and what help is available for the homeless.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe answered that the safety-net service category required agencies to budget 70 percent for customers. There is a cap to meet the high level of need. Family self-sufficiency is a case managed program; we ask that they budget 15 percent direct participant costs. Ms. Davis-Jaffe offered for the CSBG team to work with Ms. Espinosa in assisting an individual person.

Ms. Espinosa commented it seemed the recipients for this round are not serving the homeless; it is mostly self-sufficiency programs.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said services are recommended for the homeless populations as well. They have to meet eligibility which is 100 percent of the poverty level. Any of the providers could be working with the homeless population.

Ms. Espinosa said she has been told the homeless shelters are closed due to COVID-19 liability.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said not all agencies SETA funds oversee shelters. Sacramento Steps Forward is working to find housing for the homeless. Ms. Davis-Jaffe offered to assist Ms. Espinosa directly on this issue.

Ms. Gibbons said she can also assist Ms. Espinosa to find additional resources.

Mr. Foley asked for clarification on the scoring criteria. What are the distinctions in scoring?

Ms. Davis-Jaffe clarified that we start with the highest-ranking proposal and work down from there. If additional funding becomes available, SETA goes down the list to offer the available funding.

Mr. Foley asked if the board provided guidance on the criteria.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe clarified we start off with the Community Action Plan. This year was more challenging due to COVID-19. The RFP is written, approved by the CAB and SETA Governing Board, then released to the public for responses. After that, the funding recommendations go to the board for approval. Toward the end of 2022, staff will return with funding recommendations for program year 2023, then begin working on a new Community Action Plan.

Ms. Dozier asked what the difference is between an 83 and 84 to be above the line. There are providers who provide services to the homeless and others who provide housing for the homeless; is this a distinction in the criteria?

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said we made recommendations based on ranking order. Ms. Moore said for Volunteers of America, they applied for funding for motel vouchers, which is not a housing program.

Ms. Dozier said it is important to not only provide housing but also a comprehensive understanding of services to clients, connecting clients to permanent housing. It would be good to work on the distinction in the future.

Mr. Garcia said looking at the needs and the services on hand with the score for approval of funds, from an equity lens are we fully supporting the community in all languages? Not only how we use the score to assign funding, but how do we look at the services that each agency is writing in their narrative? How do we put

weight behind highly needed services, even if there are lower scoring agencies on the list?

Mr. Migge said a way to address this would be to alter the solicitation slightly. The scoring system is needed to justify the funding to the community. If we move away from the scoring system then it becomes harder to clearly define the reason behind funding choices.

Ms. Gibbons said the scoring can be taken into account with key considerations.

Ms. Kossick agreed, suggesting the board can more clearly define the priority when writing future RFPs. Then proposers can write to that priority in their proposals.

Ms. Espinosa asked for clarification on the International Rescue Committee. Why is their score so high and need that much money? When Roberts Family Development, who does so much good work, scored low and no funding. How does social integration concerns merit on the scoring?

Ms. Davis-Jaffe clarified on the scoring, the evaluation team goes through the proposal for each question answered to determine whether it was within the parameters of the RFP. The score is the average of the 13 individual reader's scores. Scores are based on how each question was answered. It is not based on how much work they do in the community. Those areas can be looked at in the next RFP.

Ms. Kossick commented that board members are invited to participate in the process.

Ms. Espinosa asked how the ranking differs for one over another.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe welcomed Ms. Espinosa to be a part of the process in the future. There is discussion and feedback during the scoring process if a reader has questions regarding an answer or proposer.

Mr. Migge commented there are organizations that hire proposal writers or have better writers. This could be a flaw in the system.

Ms. Espinosa agreed this aspect is a flaw in the system.

Ms. Gibbons asked although it is intrinsically unfair to reward those that can afford to hire grant proposal writers, do we have a proposal on how we can look at that effect.

Mr. Kim commented on the evaluation system. CAB can make decisions on priorities, activities, populations or other things in the Community Action Plan. In

the evaluation process, the evaluation team can award performance points. The board can assign greater weight to past performance rather than the written proposal. The decisions made around the RFP, are still the controlling procurement document. There is not enough funding to give to everyone. The board has discretion over what are the priorities and where they want to award more points.

Ms. Espinosa commented the homelessness in the African American community was a priority of the board this year.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe answered that we had a special project for African American youth; we are funding the Rose Family Foundation. Last year we funded them at \$40,000; this year we put more funding into that category. They were the only agency that applied for the special project category.

Ms. Espinosa asked if partial funding is an option.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe answered funding is based on the program design, the number served and cost per participant.

Mr. Kim commented these are staff recommendations; the board can change the recommendation if they wish to do so.

Ms. Espinosa motioned to change the recommendation.

Mr. Migge acknowledged the motion.

Mr. Garcia asked for clarification on the motion. Is the motion to adjust the staff recommendation?

Ms. Gibbons asked for the criteria on why we are changing the recommendation. Does it match the criteria we are holding the other agencies to?

Ms. Espinosa said the reason is the Roberts Family Development Center is focused on helping at risk youth. The African American youth in the Roberts Family Development Center area need help facing gun and gang violence. She would like to see at least some funding go to them. Their low score should not hold them back from funding as they provide value to the community.

Ms. Gibbons said the low score does not indicate the work they do is not valuable to the community. The score shows they did not meet the criteria of what was asked in the RFP.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said the proposal may not always include everything the agencies do, because they focused on what the funds can go towards.

Mr. Foley asked if the agency would have scored differently if they applied under the special category.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe answered possibly.

Mr. Kim said the score would have been different; whether it was greater or less than is hard to say.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said they were focused on the educational piece for the RFP.

Ms. Dozier said after having the conversation in last year on the priority of at risk African American male youth and the homeless it is hard to see why the scores do not match the priority. What does a 74 mean for the criteria? It would be helpful to have a breakdown of each score, to understand the disparities. This conversation is helpful for next year in creating the criteria.

Mr. Migge said the motion was too general; there was no second. The motion was tabled.

Mr. Garcia said the cost per participant for Rose Family Creative Empowerment is \$5,000 which is double what it should be at \$2,500.

Ms. Moore said they were not taking into account carryover youth from their current program. It should be \$2,500.

Mr. Garcia said based on 20 participants it would come out to \$2,500 per participant, not \$5,000.

Mr. Kim confirmed it was correct based on the chart.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said \$50,000 is the cap in that category.

Mr. Garcia asked is it the funding requested amount divided by the number of participants served that equals the cost per participant.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe agreed with Mr. Garcia; it was doubled in the correction. It should be \$2,500 per participant.

Ms. Moore offered to look specifically at why Roberts Family Development's score was low.

Ms. Dozier said that information would be helpful.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said that many responses given by the Roberts Family Development were very brief, half page responses.

Mr. Migge commented that it comes back to proposal writers.

Mr. Garcia commented in regards to Roberts Family Development on what they do in the community; the difference in scores make a \$50,000 difference between 7 points. Social integration and support for learning loss versus the need in the community long term. It is an opportunity to look at the flexibility of how funds are being awarded. There is value in this discussion to inform the criteria decisions and what is going forward for the next two years.

Mr. Kim commented that the Rose Family proposal was under the special category. Rose Family could go under a category alone. Roberts Family should be compared against the other two proposers, as they did not propose under the special category.

Mr. Garcia asked what would happen if more funding trickled down to priority agencies. Would this agency fall under the category of unfunded and potentially funded with additional funding?

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said if additional funding comes through, then we would come back to the Community Action Board for approval of funding additional recommended agencies, then it would go to the Governing Board for approval.

Mr. Foley said for the agencies that are not funded, at the staff level we try to meet with them to go over their proposal and discuss how the proposal could be improved. Roberts Family is an example of an agency that might benefit by meeting with staff.

Mr. Garcia agreed. Is the cap of \$50,000 for the category or is it for each agency in the category?

Ms. Dozier commented it would be important to have a post conversation with agencies that fell below the line. She said at the federal level, requests can be made for an interview when funding is not approved. Maybe the \$50,000 is too low, or expand to make those priorities clear.

Moved/Garcia, second/Gibbons, to approve the staff funding recommendations for the Program Year 2022 Community Services Block Grant.

Roll call vote:

Aye: 6 (Dozier, Wash, Foley, Garcia, Gibbons, Migge)

Nay: 1 (Espinosa)

Absent: 3 (Starks, Sass, Pierce)

IV. Information Item

A. Community Services Block Grant Fiscal Monitoring Reports

Ms. Davis-Jaffe said there are no recommendations for corrective action for documents reviewed by fiscal.

B. Program Operator Report (CARES Act) – 3th Quarter

Ms. Davis-Jaffe reviewed the report. September 30, 2021 marked a full year of the CARES Act in operation. Many agencies have asked to move their funds around. The example given was if there is a higher need for rental assistance and less need for food assistance, the agency may ask to move money to that category to help cover the rental needs of customers. At least one or more agencies are behind on their billing, partially due to new fiscal staff. Several invoices are past the due date, leading the numbers to be incorrect. The SETA Fiscal Department is working with the providers to bring their reporting up to date. Letters have gone out to providers on observations and findings. This item could be back to the board in December or January to move funds around under the CARES Act.

V. **Reports to the Board**

A. Chair: No Report

B. Executive Director:

Ms. Kossick thanked the board for its efforts and there are more discussions to come on priorities. This is Ms. Kossick's last board meeting before her retirement on December 3, 2021.

C. Program Manager: No Report

D. Members of the Board:

Ms. Dozier thanked Ms. Kossick for all her dedication to the Agency.

Mr. Garcia and Ms. Espinosa thanked Ms. Kossick.

E. Public: None.

VI. **Adjournment**: The meeting was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.

ITEM III-A- ACTION

APPROVAL OF FINDINGS AND AUTHORIZATION TO EXTEND USE OF TELECONFERENCING PROCEDURES FOR BOARD MEETINGS DURING DECLARED STATE OF EMERGENCY AND/OR WHILE STATE OR LOCAL OFFICIALS CONTINUE TO IMPOSE OR RECOMMEND MEASURES TO PROMOTE SOCIAL DISTANCING

BACKGROUND:

California Governor Gavin Newsom has recently extended until March 31, 2022 the long-existing state of emergency related to COVID-19. Governor Newsom had previously authorized local agencies, by Executive Order, to conduct meetings under the Brown Act utilizing Zoom or other remote procedures to conduct meeting by modified teleconference procedures. Recently the legislature signed and passed into law AB 361, which amended Section 54953 of the Brown Act to similarly authorize teleconferencing of Board Meetings, provided necessary procedures are followed. The Governing Board on January 12, 2022 will be the first board meeting conducted utilizing the AB 361 Procedures, which are reflected in the Notice for the Board Agenda.

Under AB 361, in the event of disruption which prevents broadcasting of the meeting to members of the public using the call-in or internet-based service options, or in the event of a disruption which prevents members of the public from offering public comments, the legislative body shall take no further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting is restored.

AB 361 also authorizes public agencies to continue to hold subsequent meetings via teleconference procedures during any state of emergency that directly impacts the ability of the members to meet safely in person or while State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing. The Governor's declared continuing state of emergency remains active and continues to serve to protect members of the public from unnecessary risk and exposure to COVID-19. In addition, Sacramento County continues to follow recommendations of the federal CDC promoting social distancing outside of the home and especially indoors. Given these circumstances, in order to allow for the next Board meeting to be held by teleconference procedures consistent with AB 361, the Board must make the following findings no later than 30 days after the first teleconferencing meeting and every 30 days thereafter by majority vote:

- a. The legislative body has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
- b. Any of the following circumstances exists:
 - i. The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person.

ITEM III-A-ACTION (continued)

Page 2

- ii. State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the continued use of teleconferencing for Governing Board meetings under AB 361, occasioned by the continuing state of emergency issued by Governor Newsom and the continuation of local and federal recommendations promoting social distancing outside of the home and especially indoors and, based thereon, make the following findings in support of this action:

- a. The Board has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
- b. The following circumstances exist:
 - i. The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person.
 - ii. State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

PRESENTER: Legal Counsel

ITEM III-B – ACTION

ELECTION OF OFFICERS TO THE COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with the Community Action Board (CAB) Bylaws, "... officers shall be elected by the members of the Board at the January meeting, and shall consist of a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary-Treasurer" (pg. 15, CAB Bylaws).

Current officers are Chair – Mr. Don Migge, Vice-Chair - Ms. Dominique Espinosa, and Secretary/Treasurer - Sam Starks.

6.2 Chair

The Chair shall be the presiding officer of the Community Action Board and of the Executive Committee. The Chair shall be responsible for management of the affairs of the Community Action Board and shall see that all orders and resolutions of the Community Action Board are implemented. The Chair shall appoint committee members in accordance with Article VII, herein. The Chair shall represent the Community Action Board to the SETA Governing Board and to the community. The Chair shall request that the SETA Governing Board initiate the processes for filling vacancies on the Community Action Board as they occur. The Chair shall have such additional powers and duties as may be assigned from time to time by the Community Action Board. (pg.15, CAB Bylaws)

6.3 Vice-Chair

The Vice-Chair shall perform such duties and have such authority and power as the Community Action Board may from time to time assign, or as the Chair may from time to time delegate. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair shall perform all the duties of the Chair. The Vice-Chair shall succeed to the office of the Chair in the event of death, resignation, or removal from office of the Chair. (pg. 16, CAB Bylaws)

6.4 Secretary/Treasurer

The Secretary/Treasurer shall attend all meetings of the Community Action Board and of the Executive Committee, and keep or cause to be kept the minutes of such meetings. The Secretary/Treasurer shall assure that the minutes of each meeting are sent to each Community Action Board member five (5) days in advance of the next regular meeting. The Secretary/Treasurer shall give or cause to be given, notice of all regular, special and emergency meetings of the Community Action Board. The Secretary/Treasurer shall report or cause to be reported to the Community Action Board full and accurate accounts of disbursements; and current fiscal conditions of the Community Action Program. (pg. 16 CAB Bylaws)

ITEM III-B-ACTION (continued)

Page 2

RECOMMENDATION:

Conduct an election to select a CAB Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary/Treasurer, consistent with the CAB Bylaws.

PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

ITEM IV-A- INFORMATION

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT FISCAL MONITORING REPORTS

BACKGROUND:

Attached for your information are the latest CSBG fiscal monitoring reports.

Staff will be available to answer questions.

PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lt. Larry Carmichael **DATE:** November 2, 2021

FROM: Tracey Anderson, SETA Fiscal Monitor

RE: Desk Fiscal Monitoring of The Salvation Army

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>	<u>CONTRACT PERIOD</u>	<u>PERIOD COVERED</u>
CSBG	Safety Net	\$75,000	1/1/2021-12/31/2021	1/1/2020-9/30/2021
CSBG	SN-CARES	\$60,000	11/2/2020-3/31/2022	11/2/2020-9/30/2021

Monitoring Purpose: Initial ☒ Follow-up Special Final

Date of review: October 2021

AREAS EXAMINED		COMMENTS			
		SATISFACTORY		RECOMMENDATIONS	
		YES	NO	YES	NO
1	Accounting Systems/Records	X			
2	Internal Control	X			
3	Bank Reconciliations	X			
4	Disbursement Control	X			
5	Staff Payroll/Files	X			
6	Fringe Benefits	X			
7	Participant Payroll	N/A			
8	OJT-Contracts/Files/Payment	N/A			
9	Indirect Cost Allocation	N/A			
10	Adherence to Budget	X			
11	In-Kind Contribution	N/A			
12	Equipment Records	N/A			

Program Operator: The Salvation Army

Findings and General Observations:

- 1) We have reviewed the CSBG Safety Net program from January 1, 2021 to September 30, 2021 and the CSBG Safety Net CARES Act program from November 2, 2020 to September 30, 2021. The costs reported for these programs have been traced to the subgrantee's records. The records were verified and appear to be in order.

Recommendations for Corrective Action:

None

cc: Kathy Kossick
Governing Board

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. SuTonya Lopez **DATE:** October 28, 2021

FROM: Tracey Anderson, SETA Fiscal Monitor

RE: Desk Fiscal Monitoring of WIND Youth Services, Inc.

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>	<u>CONTRACT PERIOD</u>	<u>PERIOD COVERED</u>
CSBG	CARES-FSS	\$78,042	11/2/2020-3/31/2022	11/2/2020-6/30/2021
CSBG	CARES-SN	\$24,800	11/2/2020-3/31/2022	11/2/2020-6/30/2021

Monitoring Purpose: Initial ☒ Follow-up Special Final

Date of review: August 2021; 8/24, 9/7, 9/22, 10/7, 10/14, 10/20, 10/27

		COMMENTS			
		AREAS EXAMINED		SATISFACTORY RECOMMENDATIONS	
				YES	NO
1	Accounting Systems/Records			X	
2	Internal Control			X	
3	Bank Reconciliations			X	
4	Disbursement Control			X	
5	Staff Payroll/Files			X	
6	Fringe Benefits			X	
7	Participant Payroll			X	
8	OJT-Contracts/Files/Payment			X	
9	Indirect Cost Allocation			N/A	
10	Adherence to Budget			X	
11	In-Kind Contribution			N/A	
12	Equipment Records			N/A	

Program Operator: WIND Youth Services, Inc.

Findings and General Observations:

- 1) We have reviewed the CSBG CARES Act programs of Family Self-Sufficiency and Safety Net from November 2, 2020 to June 30, 2021. The costs reported for these programs have been traced to the subgrantee's records. The records were verified and appear to be in order.

Recommendations for Corrective Action:

None

cc: Kathy Kossick
Governing Board

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Kerry Ham **DATE: December 14, 2021**

FROM: David Benjamin Clark, SETA Fiscal Monitor

RE: Fiscal Desk Monitoring of World Relief Corporation - Sacramento

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>	<u>CONTRACT PERIOD</u>	<u>PERIOD COVERED</u>
CSBG	SN CARES	\$ 37,724	11/2/20 - 3/31/22	11/2/20 - 10/31/21
CSBG	FSS CARES	\$ 78,506	11/2/20 - 3/31/22	11/2/20 - 10/31/21

Monitoring Purpose: Initial ☒ Follow-up Special Final

Date of review: 9/24/21
Follow up: 11/5, 11/15, 11/30

AREAS EXAMINED		SATISFACTORY		COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS	
		YES	NO	YES	NO
1	Accounting Systems/Records	X			
2	Internal Control	X			
3	Bank Reconciliation's	X			
4	Disbursement Control	X			
5	Staff Payroll/Files	X			
6	Fringe Benefits	X			
7	Participant Payroll	N/A			
8	OJT Contracts/Files/Payment	N/A			
9	Indirect Cost Allocation	N/A			
10	Adherence to Budget	X			
11	In-Kind Contribution	N/A			
12	Equipment Records	N/A			

Program Operator: World Relief Corporation - Sacramento

Findings and General Observations:

The total costs as reported to SETA for the RSS grants from November 2, 2020 to October 31, 2021 have been traced to the subgrantee's fiscal records. The records were verified and appear to be in order.

Recommendations for Corrective Action:

None

cc: Denise Lee
Governing Board

ITEM IV- B INFORMATION

PROGRAM OPERATOR REPORT – 3rd QUARTER

BACKGROUND:

Attached for your information is the CSBG Program Operator report with program and fiscal data through the 3rd Quarter.

Staff will be available to answer questions.

PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

Community Services Block Grant Delegate Agency Report:

Family Self-Sufficiency, Employment

Third Quarter through September 30, 2021

Family Self-Sufficiency: Employment	Enrollments						Employed				Employed 180 Days			
	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Carry- overs	New Enrollments	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate
ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (EGACE)	50	40	14	7	21	53%	43	25	7	28%	43	36	7	19%
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP	30	23	9	12	21	91%	15	10	8	80%	6	3	4	133%
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE	70	60	37	28	65	108%	28	20	20	100%	23	18	31	172%
LAO FAMILY	45	35	9	27	36	103%	25	18	23	128%	17	6	19	317%
SAINT JOHN'S PROGRAM FOR REAL CHANGE	25	18	15	28	43	239%	6	5	9	180%	6	3	5	167%
WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT	80	65	45	27	72	111%	35	26	17	65%	18	10	10	100%
WIND YOUTH SERVICES	40	32	19	25	44	138%	35	27	11	41%	22	18	0	0%

Definitions

Annual Goal: Subgrantee Projected Goals for 2021

YTD Goal: Subgrantee Projected Goals January 1 - September 30, 2021

Carryovers: Clients Enrolled in 2020 who the Subgrantee Continued to Work With in 2021

New Enrollments: Clients Newly Enrolled in 2021

YTD Actual: Carryovers + New Enrollments

YTD Rate: Percentage of Total YTD Enrollments Compared to Projected YTD Enrollments

**Community Services Block Grant Delegate Agency Report: Family
Self-Sufficiency, Housing and Disability Services
Third Quarter through September 30, 2021**

Family Self-Sufficiency: Housing	Enrollments						Housed				Housed 180 Days			
	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Carry-overs	New Enrollments	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate
ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (EGACE)	5	4	0	0	0	0%	5	4	0	0%	5	4	0	0%
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP	8	5	5	12	17	213%	5	4	4	100%	3	2	2	100%

Family Self-Sufficiency: Disability	Enrollments						Maintained Independence				Maintained Independence 180 Days			
	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Carry-overs	2021 New Enrollments	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP	5	2	2	2	4	80%	3	2	4	200%	2	1	2	200%

Definitions

Annual Goal: Subgrantee Projected Goals for 2021

YTD Goal: Subgrantee Projected Goals January 1 - September 30, 2021

Carryovers: Clients Enrolled in 2020 who the Subgrantee Continued to Work With in 2021

New Enrollments: Clients Newly Enrolled in 2021

YTD Actual: Carryovers + New Enrollments

YTD Rate: Percentage of Total YTD Enrollments Compared to Projected YTD Enrollments

Community Services Block Grant Delegate Agency Report
Youth and Senior Supports
Third Quarter through September 30, 2021

Youth and Senior Supports	Enrollments						Service Goals				Comments
	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Carry-overs	New Enrollments	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	YTD Actual	YTD Rate	
LA FAMILIA COUNSELING	40	33	12	22	34	103%	34	28	25	89%	Goal: Decrease truancy &/or gang-related behavior
ROSE FAMILY CREATIVE EMPOWERMENT CENTER (SPECIAL PROJECT)	15	15	12	0	12	80%	15	12	2	17%	Goal: No recidivating event for 180 days
SAINT JOHN'S PROGRAM FOR REAL CHANGE	182	118	25	42	67	57%	146	94	67	71%	Goal: Decrease truancy &/or gang-related behavior
WAKING THE VILLAGE	75	53	34	36	70	132%	68	48	68	142%	Goal: Decrease truancy &/or gang-related behavior

Definitions

Annual Goal: Subgrantee Projected Goals for 2021

YTD Goal: Subgrantee Projected Goals January 1 - September 30, 2021

Carryovers: Clients Enrolled in 2020 With Whom the Subgrantee Continued to Work in 2021

New Enrollments: Clients Newly Enrolled in 2021

YTD Actual: Carryovers + New Enrollments

YTD Rate: Percentage of Total Enrollments Compared to Projected Enrollments

**Community Services Block Grant Delegate Agency Report
Third Quarter Through September 30, 2021**

EXPENDITURES				EXPENDITURES			
DELEGATE AGENCIES	2021 BUDGET	Expended Through 3rd Qtr.	% Expended	DELEGATE AGENCIES	2021 BUDGET	Expended Through 3rd Qtr.	% Expended
ELK GROVE FOOD BANK (SN)	\$34,870	\$0	0.0%	RIVER CITY FOOD BANK (SN)	\$50,000	\$14,287	28.6%
ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (EGACE) (FSS)	\$35,218	\$22,239	63.1%	ROSE FAMILY CREATIVE EMPOWERMENT CENTER (SPECIAL PROJECT) (YSS)	\$40,000	\$25,217	63.0%
ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (EGACE) (SN)	\$38,342	\$29,108	75.9%	SAINT JOHN'S PROGRAM FOR REAL CHANGE (FSS)	\$35,218	\$25,806	73.3%
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP (FSS)	\$64,563	\$32,942	51.0%	SAINT JOHN'S PROGRAM FOR REAL CHANGE (YSS)	\$45,000	\$20,368	45.3%
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP (SN)	\$56,508	\$12,462	22.1%	SALVATION ARMY (SN)	\$75,000	\$62,244	83.0%
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE (FSS)	\$65,001	\$45,990	70.8%	SOUTH COUNTY SERVICES (SN)	\$61,768	\$32,273	52.2%
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE (SN)	\$31,000	\$12,154	39.2%	VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA- GREATER SACRAMENTO & NORTHERN NEVADA (SN)	\$27,870	\$6,151	22.1%
LA FAMILIA COUNSELING (YSS)	\$60,000	\$25,364	42.3%	WAKING THE VILLAGE (YSS)	\$40,000	\$21,009	52.5%
LAO FAMILY (FSS)	\$50,000	\$16,347	32.7%	WIND YOUTH SERVICES (FSS)	\$40,000	\$21,120	52.8%
MY SISTER'S HOUSE (SN)	\$34,100	\$18,151	53.2%	WIND YOUTH SERVICES (SN)	\$29,000	\$3,109	10.7%
NEXT MOVE (SAEHC) (SN)	\$45,542	\$21,221	46.6%	WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT (FSS)	\$40,000	\$29,800	74.5%

Definitions: Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS); Youth & Senior Support (YSS); Safety-Net (SN)

Agencies with less than 50% expended in funds may have been awarded funds for similar services through other sources, or experienced low enrollments due to COVID-19.

**Community Services Block Grant Delegate Agency Report
Third Quarter Through September 30, 2021**

	Total Households Served YTD	Food				Eviction Assistance 1st Month's Rent				Utilities				Off-Site Shelter (Motel)			
SAFETY-NET		Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%
ELK GROVE FOOD BANK	316	744	496	316	64%												
ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (EGACE)	66	60	45	60	133%	20	15	24	160%	20	18	22	122%				
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP	36	150	100	21	21%	26	20	15	75%	5	4	3	75%	2	1	0	0%
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE	21					42	32	17	53%	40	30	3	10%				
MY SISTER'S HOUSE	41					36	32	26	81%	28	19	29	153%				
River City Food Bank	3,387	3,500	2,400	3,387	141%												
NEXT MOVE (FRANCIS HOUSE)	52	73	54	37	69%									73	54	50	93%
SALVATION ARMY	335					207	88	124	141%	102	40	117	293%	36	14	42	300%
SOUTH COUNTY SERVICES	112	116	87	54	62%	47	36	20	56%	80	60	28	47%				
VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA	27	50	30	4	13%	20	15	3	20%	12	9	1	10%	27	21	7	33%
WIND YOUTH SERVICES	73	350	280	67	24%	7	5	0	0%								

**Community Services Block Grant Delegate Agency Report
Third Quarter Through September 30, 2021**

	Employment Supports				Transportation				Clothing/Diapers				Hygiene			
SAFETY-NET	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%	Annual Goal	YTD Goal	Actual	%
ELK GROVE FOOD BANK																
ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (EGACE)					54	40	54	135%					7	6	6	100%
FOLSOM CORDOVA COMM PARTNERSHIP	5	4	1	24%	110	55	0	0%	40	30	9	30%	20	15	2	13%
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE	10	8	0	13%	10	8	1	0%								
MY SISTER'S HOUSE																
RIVER CITY FOOD BANK																
NEXT MOVE (FRANCIS HOUSE)																
SALVATION ARMY																
SOUTH COUNTY SERVICES					232	174	28	16%								
VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA					70	60	18	30%								
WIND YOUTH SERVICES*					350	280	50	18%								

* For Wind Youth Services, this category is for car repairs as an employment support

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

ITEM V - REPORTS TO THE BOARD

A. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair of the SETA Community Action Board on a regular basis receives numerous items of information concerning legislation, current programs and agency activities.

The important information from the material received and meetings attended will be shared with the entire Board and the method proposed by the Chair is to give a verbal report at each regular meeting. It will also allow time for the Board to provide input on items that may require future action.

B. INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

This item is set aside to allow the Interim Executive Director of the Community Action Program to report to the Board on any items of important information or to deal with special requests which need to be addressed but, because of time constraints, were not included in the formal SETA Community Action Board packet.

The Interim Executive Director's Report also allows the opportunity for the Executive Director to apprise the Board of upcoming events, significant agency activities, or conferences.

C. PROGRAM MANAGER

This item provides an opportunity for Ms. Julie Davis-Jaffe, the CSBG program manager, to provide an oral report on issues not included in the agenda packet.

D. MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

This item provides the opportunity for SETA Community Action Board members to raise any items for consideration not covered under the formal agenda. It also provides the opportunity for Board members to request staff to research or follow up on specific requests or to ask that certain items be placed on the next agenda.

E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Participation of the general public at SETA Community Action Board meetings is encouraged. Members of the audience are asked to address their requests to the Chair, if they wish to speak.