

Admin Review

Case Id:

Completed by sarah.nielsen@slc.gov on 2/3/2025 11:54 AM

Risk Assessment

Please provide the following information.

1. How well does this application align with plans, the current Thriving In Place plan, community initiatives, or other coordinating efforts?

- **0**
The applicant made no effort to align the project with any plan or other coordinated effort.
- **3**
The applicant made minimal effort to align the project to a plan or other coordinating effort. Narratives were generic and indicated that the applicant had not thoroughly understood the goal(s) of the initiative.
- **6**
The applicant made a moderate effort to align the project to a plan or other coordinating effort. Narratives lacked a strong connection to the goal(s) of the initiative, but suggested that the applicant had completed a review of the plan or effort for commonalities with the project.
- **9**
The applicant made a concerted effort to align the project to multiple plans or other coordinating efforts. Narratives were convincing and suggested that the applicant reviewed these plans/efforts thoroughly.
- **12**
The applicant clearly aligned the project to multiple plans or other coordinating efforts. Narratives cited the relevant plans or initiatives and provided actionable steps to achieve the goal(s) of the effort(s).

Scoring Committee Average

74

Risk Assessment Score

45

Admin Review Score

30

Score

149

Weighted Score

18

Final Score

73

Score:

12

Reviewer Comments:

B.3 shows alignment with the following goal(s):

Printed By: Dennis Rutledge on 4/3/2025

* Con Plan - Community services & Homeless services
(brief explanation of how project aligns with these goals;
reference forthcoming con plan)

* Mayor's 2024 priorities - Supporting more treatment
and housing options for people experiencing mental
illness and other chronic conditions, allowing us to
decrease reliance on the criminal justice system.

2. How reasonable are the beneficiary's goals?

- **0 - Very Unreasonable**

Beneficiary goals do not appear to be rooted in any evidential basis. Stated goals have no connection to expected values either by staff or comparable programs.

- **3 - Unreasonable**

Beneficiary goals appear either conservative or bold beyond a reasonable margin. Sources are nonexistent or questionable.

- **6 - Neither Reasonable nor Unreasonable**

Beneficiary goals generally align with either staff estimates or comparable programs, but the applicant provides tangentially-related sources.

- **9 - Reasonable**

Beneficiary goals align with either staff estimates or comparable programs. The goal may be slightly conservative or bold, but the applicant provides generally applicable sources.

- **12 - Very Reasonable**

Beneficiary goals align both with staff expectations and peer organization comparisons. The goal is neither too conservative nor too bold. The applicant provides strong, relevant sources.

Score:

9

Reviewer Comments:

Goals in C.4 and C.6 seem reasonable. Goals/beneficiaries served based on increased capacity of an existing program (See F.1).

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

- **0 - Very Ineffective**

The applicant does not identify any partners that they will coordinate with in this project.

- **3 - Somewhat Ineffective**

The applicant identifies 1-2 partners or networks, but the involvement of these partnering groups is vague at best.

- **6 - Neither Effective nor Ineffective**

The applicant identifies at least one partner that has an ancillary role to play in carrying out the project, but does not provide details on the partner's commitment to the project.

- **9 - Somewhat Effective**

The applicant identifies multiple partners that it will coordinate with during this project. The applicant identifies their role(s) along a continuum of care.

- **12 - Very Effective**

The applicant clearly documents a list of partnering agencies and their role along a continuum of care essential to the success of the project. The applicant additionally provides evidence of a letter(s) of commitment (LOC), proving that the partner is sufficiently prepared to support the project in the event of an award.

Score:

9

Reviewer Comments:

Has not received other federal funding in the last two years (E.2).

Clearly identified community partners and how they coordinate with them and ensure they're not duplicating services using HMIS (F.6).

Did not provide letters of commitment.

Total Risk Score:

30