

Monitoring Risk Assessment

Case Id:

Completed by sarah.nielsen@slc.gov on 2/3/2025 9:55 AM

Risk Assessment

Please provide the following information.

GRANT MANAGEMENT

1. How large is the applicant's request?

- **0 - Very Large**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was two or more standard deviations greater than the mean budget size.
- **3 - Large**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was more than one standard deviation greater than the mean budget size.
- **6 - Moderate**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was either equal to or within one standard deviation greater than the mean budget size.
- **9 - Small**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was either equal to or within one standard deviation greater than the mean budget size. Among all applicants, this applicant's request was less than the mean budget size.

Score:

0

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's request is greater than 2 standard deviations above the mean size.

2. Is this a new, similar, or existing project?

- **3 - New Project**
Higher probability for unforeseen circumstances (e.g., issues with capacity development, unanticipated expenses, etc.)
- **6 - Similar Project**
Applicant has familiarity with these types of projects and can pull from existing internal resources.
- **9 - Existing Project**
Existing infrastructure, capacity, and understanding of budget leads to a lower level of risk.

Score:

9

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant put Existing project in question E 1

3. How familiar/experienced is the applicant with federal funding?

- **3 - Unfamiliar**
The applicant is either new to federal funding, or last received funding more than two years ago.
- **6 - Familiar**
The applicant has recently (i.e., within 2 years) received federal funding, but not through SLC.
- **9 - Pass-Through Familiar**
The applicant has recently (i.e., within 2 years) received federal funding through SLC.

Score:

3

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant did not list any federal funding experience in question E 2

4. How much federal, state, or SLC funding has the applicant previously administered in the past two years?

- **0 - Small**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was less than the mean total award size.
- **3 - Moderate**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was either equal to or within 1 standard deviation greater than the mean total award size.
- **6 - Large**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was more than 1 standard deviation greater than the mean total award size.
- **9 - Very Large**
Among all applicants, this applicant's request was 2 or more standard deviations greater than the mean total award size.

Score:

0

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's previous funding amounts to less than the mean total award size.

5. To what extent have there been disruptive project staff changes/attrition to the applicant's staff?

- **0 - Very Disruptive**
The applicant has seen changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but vacancies are not filled.
- **3 - Disruptive**
The applicant has seen changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has filled the vacancies.

- **6 - Neither Disruptive Nor Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has created new positions that are not filled.
- **9 - Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has created and filled new positions.
- **12 - Very Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to key project staff in the last 2 years.

Score:

9

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant indicated no changes to existing project staff, but has created and filled new positions.

6. To what extent have there been disruptive financial staff changes/attrition to the applicant's staff?

- **0 - Very Disruptive**
The applicant has seen changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but vacancies are not filled.
- **3 - Disruptive**
The applicant has seen changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has filled the vacancies.
- **6 - Neither Disruptive Nor Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has created new positions that are not filled.
- **9 - Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has created and filled new positions.
- **12 - Very Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to key project staff in the last 2 years.

Score:

3

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant indicated changes to existing financial staff, but vacancies have been filled.

7. To what extent have there been disruptive executive staff changes/attrition to the applicant's staff?

- **0 - Very Disruptive**
The applicant has seen changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but vacancies are not filled.
- **3 - Disruptive**
The applicant has seen changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has filled the vacancies.
- **6 - Neither Disruptive Nor Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has created new positions that are not filled.

- **9 - Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to existing key project staff in the last 2 years, but has created and filled new positions.
- **12 - Very Stable**
The applicant has not seen any changes to key project staff in the last 2 years.

Score:

6

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant indicated no change to existing executive staff, but has created new positions that are not filled.

8. How effectively has the applicant spent previously awarded funds?

- **0 - Very Disruptive**
The applicant left more than 33% of all awarded funds unspent in the past two years.
- **3 - Disruptive**
The applicant left 25%-33% of all awarded funds unspent in the past two years.
- **6 - Neither Disruptive Nor Stable**
The applicant left 10%-25% of all awarded funds unspent in the past two years. -OR- The applicant has no history of awarded funds.
- **9 - Stable**
The applicant left 10% or less of all awarded funds unspent in the past two years.
- **12 - Very Stable**
The applicant left little to none (i.e., less than \$1,000 or 1%, whichever is less) of all awarded funds unspent in the past two years.

Score:

6

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant indicated having no previous federal, state, or SLC funding.

9. How well has the applicant performed in past monitoring's/audits?

- **0 - Very Poorly**
The applicant's previous monitoring results revealed that there were 1) several findings, 2) unresolved findings, and/or 3) an escalation of the resolution requiring HUD involvement.
- **3 - Poorly**
The applicant's previous monitoring results revealed 1 or more findings, but findings were corrected in a timely manner and documented for review by SLC.
- **6 - Neither Well Nor Poorly**
The applicant's previous monitoring results revealed minor corrective actions and/or documented concerns, but no findings.

- **9 - Well**
Previous monitoring results for the applicant revealed no findings, concerns, or other corrective actions.
- **12 - Very Well**
The applicant does not have a record of previous monitoring results.

Score:

6

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant indicated having no previous federal, state, or SLC funding.

10. How recently was the applicant monitored?

- **0 - Very Poorly**
A project managed by the applicant has never previously been monitored.
- **3 - Poorly**
SLC records indicate that 1 or more of the applicant's projects were monitored, but not in the past 2 years.
- **6 - Neither Well Nor Poorly**
1 or more of the applicant's projects were monitored in the past 2 years.
- **9 - Well**
1 or more of the applicant's projects were monitored in the past year.

Score:

6

Reviewer Comments:

Applicant indicated having no previous federal, state, or SLC funding.

Total Risk Score:

45