



# The State Bar of California

---

## Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Bank Grants Committee Teleconference

Open Session Minutes  
Monday, September 11, 2023  
1:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m.

**Time Meeting Commenced:** Bank Grants Committee meeting commenced in open session at 1:00 p.m.  
**Time Meeting Adjourned:** 1:57 p.m.  
**Chair:** Tammy Mahoney  
**Committee Coordinator:** Jennifer Zelnick  
**Members Present:** Jeff Ball, Tammy Mahoney, James Meeker  
**Members Absent:** Diana Kruze  
**Advisors Present:** None  
**Advisors Absent:** None  
**Liaisons Present:** Melanie Snider (Judicial Council)  
**Staff Present:** Michael Chong, Danielle MacRae, Jennifer Zelnick

### OPEN SESSION

#### 1. Call to Order

The committee was called to order by Chair Mahoney.

#### 2. Roll Call

Roll call was taken and a quorum was established.

#### Call for Public Comment

Chair Mahoney called for public comment, inquiring as to whether there were person(s) who wished to comment on any agenda item. There was one member of the public that provided public comment on a topic that was not on the agenda.

#### 3. Consent

##### 3.1 Open Session Minutes: July 28, 2023

**RESOLVED**, that the Bank Grants Committee approves the minutes as posted on the agenda.

*Moved by Meeker, seconded by Ball.*

*Ayes – (3) Ball, Mahoney, Meeker*  
*Noes – (0)*  
*Abstain – (0)*  
*Absent – (0)*

*Motion carries.*

#### **4. Discussion and Action Items**

##### **4.1 Initial Calibration of Selected 2024–2025 Bank Grant Proposals**

**Presenter:** Jennifer Zelnick, Senior Program Analyst, Office of Access & Inclusion

Zelnick presented on the 2024–2025 Bank Grant grantmaking timeline, grant parameters, scoring rubric, and submitted proposals. Twenty-nine applications were submitted (21 from qualified legal services projects and 8 from support centers). The proposals requested a total of \$14,088,163; \$4,520,570 is available for funding.

When discussing the rubric category “project impact and strategies,” the committee indicated that relevant factors include the communities served, the services provided, and the impact of those services. The committee discussed the importance of the project having a clear link to foreclosure prevention or community redevelopment, and the relative number or depth of services proposed for the amount of money requested.

When discussing the rubric category “administration,” the committee viewed having experience and staffing for the project as “meet expectations.” Commissioners mentioned that State Bar staff can often provide more detail on a grantee’s monitoring visit findings or compliance concerns, which may impact this rubric category.

When discussing the rubric category “project evaluation,” the committee debated whether a brief reference to evaluative work merited a “not addressed” or “below expectations.” The committee noted the importance of detail for the evaluation plan. Some commissioners gave preference to projects that budgeted for evaluation.

When discussing the rubric category “serves rural populations,” the committee indicated that the extent to which the applicant accessed and referred to Medical Service Study Areas (MSSAs) in their application might contribute to a higher score. Proposals that indicated they would not serve rural populations scored “not addressed.”

When evaluating the rubric category “partnerships and/or subgrants,” the committee discussed that having multiple partners, funding those partners, and an expansion of services provided by the partnership(s) might contribute to a higher score.

ADJOURN

DRAFT