

**LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND COMMISSION  
PARTNERSHIP GRANTS COMMITTEE MEETING  
Meeting Summary and Action Items  
Thursday, May 12, 2022, 1:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m.  
State Bar of California (Conference Call via Zoom)**

---

Roll Call		
<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Advisors</b>	<b>Staff</b>
Chair Eric Isken	Hon. Lisa Jaskol	Christal Bundang
Will Boschelli		Elizabeth Hom
Jason Galkin	<b>Liaisons</b>	Danielle MacRae
Diana Kruze	Melanie Snider (Judicial	Dan Passamaneck
Christina Vanarelli	Council)	Colleen Seto
		-----
		<b>Members Absent</b>
		Joseph Lee

---

**OPEN SESSION**

Chair Isken called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

**I. ROLL CALL**

Roll call was taken, and quorum was established.

**II. CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Isken invited members of the public to comment on any items on the agenda. No public comment was made.

**III. CONSENT**

**A. Approval of Meeting Summary and Action Items from April 6, 2022, Meeting**

The Partnership Grants Committee approved the April 6, 2022, meeting summary and action items by unanimous roll call vote (Isken moved, Kruze seconded).

**IV. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Discuss 2023 Partnership Grant Proposals and Develop Tentative Funding Recommendations**

Lead Program Analyst Christal Bundang provided an overview of the 31 proposals submitted, including scoring rubric results, counties served, and substantive areas that would be addressed by the proposed projects.

Bundang reminded the committee of its approach in developing tentative funding recommendations for the 2022 Partnership Grants and the Partnership Grants 2.0 (PG 2.0) grant cycle.

The initial 2022 Partnership Grants cycle fully funded new projects up to \$120,000. Applicants for continued funding were recommended with gradual reductions to their requested amounts based on the number of years funded by Partnership Grants, with some considerations for projects serving rural counties.

PG 2.0 offered two options - supplemental funding for a 2022 project or funding for a new or substantial expansion to a current project. Since all supplemental PG 2.0 projects addressed any prior application deficiencies, or sufficiently demonstrated how additional funding would support the project, they were recommended for full funding of the supplemental requested amounts. For new PG 2.0 projects, tentative funding recommendations were based on the average score across projects of 83 points. Proposals who scored at or above 83 points were recommended full funding. Proposals scoring below 83 points recommended funding that was 15 percent less than requested. As the total requested funding amount exceeded the amount available, the two lowest scoring proposals were not recommended for PG 2.0 funding.

Historically, tentative funding recommendations have been based on the total amount distributed in the prior grant year. However, since the funding pattern for 2022 was anomalous due to an unanticipated increase in EAF funds, and the 2023 amount is still pending, the committee made tentative recommendations based on two different scenarios.

Under scenario 1, available funds would be approximately \$6.5 million, assuming that the 2023 allocation is similar to the combined initial 2022 allocation and PG 2.0 allocation. Under scenario 2, available funds would be approximately \$2.6 million if available funding is similar to the initial 2022 allocation.

For both scenarios, staff recommended fully funding all projects who scored at least the average of 77 points and deferred the remaining allocations to the committee. The committee agreed with this approach and focused its discussion on the 12 proposals who scored below the average. The committee considered whether scores were based on funding priority ranking or substantive issues, and whether continuity planning scores accounted for challenges faced by programs in areas with fewer community resources.

Under scenario 1 with the prospective \$6.5 million in funding, the committee tentatively recommended fully funding projects who scored at least 60 points.

Under scenario 2 with the prospective \$2.6 million in funding, the committee first agreed on a tentative funding range of \$25,000 to \$150,000. Considering this range, the committee made the following tentative funding recommendations:

- Projects who scored at least 77 points would be fully funded up to \$150,000
- Projects who score 70-76 points would be funded at least 85 percent of either their original requested amount or \$150,000 for larger requested amounts
- Projects who scored 60-69 points would be funded at least the bottom range of \$25,000

As for the two remaining proposals who scored in the 50s, the committee did not develop tentative funding recommendations without supplemental information. The committee delegated authority to an ad hoc working group comprised of Christina Vanarelli and Diana Kruze to review these proposals, work with staff to address any substantive concerns, and present its recommendations as to funding at the next committee meeting.

Staff will follow up with projects facing a potential decreased award to confirm their ability to administer the project at those funding levels.

The committee and staff briefly shared feedback on the 2023 proposal review process, which they thought worked well. Staff benefitted from the insights brought by each committee member, and scoring was more transparent and consistent. Committee members shared that with this process, they better understood the scores and rationale for proposals they did not review. The committee will have a more in-depth debrief discussion on the review process and scoring rubric at its next meeting.

## **V. ADJOURN**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.