



**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL (HSOC)  
Executive Committee Meeting Agenda**

February 19, 2025, at 3 p.m.

**Committee members must participate in person** (unless excused for just cause reasons, or for emergency reasons approved by the HSOC).

**Room 356, County of San Luis Obispo Department of Social Services  
3433 South Higuera, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401**

Members (those with just cause reasons approved by the HSOC staff) and the public may participate by Zoom video call:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89243624459?pwd=aVBj4fGGowBtuOyR5m0XJNWkWTYm8y.1>

Or dial in:

+16694449171

Meeting ID: 892 4362 4459

Passcode: 768998

1. Call to Order and Introductions (2 minutes\*)
2. Public Comment (6 minutes\*)
3. Consent: Approval of Minutes (2 minutes\*)
4. Action/Information Discussion
  - 4.1. HSOC Administration and Membership
    - 4.1.1. Action Item: Vote to Approve Austin Solheim as Alternate for Wendy Lewis (5 minutes\*)
      - 4.1.1.1. Committee Questions
      - 4.1.1.2. Public Comment



- 4.1.1.3. Committee Discussion and Vote
- 4.2. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 4 – Create, Identify, and Streamline Funding and Resources
  - 4.2.1. Action Item: HSOC Grant Process Recommendations (20 minutes\*)
    - 4.2.1.1. Committee Questions
    - 4.2.1.2. Public Comment
    - 4.2.1.3. Committee Discussion and Vote
  - 4.2.2. Discussion Item: March HSOC Planning Session (30 minutes\*)
    - 4.2.2.1. Committee Questions
    - 4.2.2.2. Public Comment
    - 4.2.2.3. Committee Discussion
  - 4.2.3. Discussion Item: Federal Budget and Federal Program Updates (15 minutes\*)
    - 4.2.3.1. Committee Questions
    - 4.2.3.2. Public Comment
    - 4.2.3.3. Committee Discussion
- 4.3. Future Full HSOC Agendas
  - 4.3.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Agenda for March (5 minutes\*)
    - 4.3.1.1. Committee Questions
    - 4.3.1.2. Public Comment
    - 4.3.1.3. Committee Discussion



#### 4.4. Committee Reports

##### 4.4.1. Discussion Item: Committee Reports (5 minutes\*)

###### 4.4.1.1. Committee Questions

###### 4.4.1.2. Public Comment

###### 4.4.1.3. Committee Discussion

##### 4.5. Discussion Item: Updates from County Staff on County Initiatives (15 minutes\*)

###### 4.5.1. Committee Questions

###### 4.5.2. Public Comment

###### 4.5.3. Committee Discussion

##### 4.6. Discussion Item: Learnings, Trends and Concerns, Future Issues and Next Steps (3 minutes\*)

###### 4.6.1. Committee Questions

###### 4.6.2. Public Comment

###### 4.6.3. Committee Discussion

#### 5. Future Discussion/Report Items (2 minutes\*)

#### 6. Next Regular Meeting: April 16, 2025

#### 7. Adjournment

The full agenda packet for this meeting is available on the SLO County HSOC web page:



<https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/departments/social-services/homeless-services-division/homeless-services-oversight-council>

\*Times allotted for discussion are approximate and subject to change

**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL (HSOC)  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Date**

December 18, 2024

**Time**

3:04 pm-5:21 pm

**Location**

Rm 356, Department of Social Services  
3433 S. Higuera St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

**Members Present**

Brenda Mack (Zoom)  
Jack Lahey  
Mark Lamore  
Michelle Pedigo  
Michelle Shoresman  
Susan Funk

**Staff and Guests**

Devin Drake  
George Solis  
Janel Fletcher (ICA)  
Jeff Al-Mashat  
Kari Howell  
Kate Bourne  
Laurel Weir  
Merlie Livermore  
Niko Frambuena  
Russ Francis

**1. Call to Order and Introductions**

Michelle Shoresman called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm.

**2. Public Comment**

George Solis reported that California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has announced that any returning applicants for the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA) plan can turn in their applications as is, until the new HCD requirements are released.

Janna Nichols shared that at the last HSOC meeting, she had not anticipated to be recused for a funding decision. She asked if it is possible to note on future agendas that recusals will be required as necessary and conflicted members will need to step out of the room.

Janna further suggested providing the results of the decisions on certain action items to those individuals who were recused once they come back into the room.

Jack Lahey shared that CAPSLO (Community Action Partnership of San Luis Obispo County) is relaunching their SLO HUB program, which provides sobriety and mental health support for individuals with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse issues. Jack also mentioned that they will focus on underserved Latino population. He also shared that they are hiring a therapist to work in this program.

### **3. Consent: Approval of Minutes**

Jack Lahey moved the motion for approval of the minutes. Mark Lamore seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by voice vote.

### **4. Action/Information/Discussion**

#### **4.1. HSOC Administration and Membership**

##### **4.1.1 Action Item: Vote to Recommend a Slate of Candidates for the HSOC Executive Committee**

Susan Funk moved the motion to approve the recommended slate of candidates for the HSOC Executive Committee. Mark Lamore seconded the motion. Roll was called. The motion passed unanimously with the Candidates and their positions as follows:

Chair	Michelle Shoresman
Vice Chair	Susan Funk
Data & Performance Chair	Janna Nichols
Coordinated Entry Chair	Jack Lahey
Services Coordinating Chair	Wendy Lewis
Housing Representative	Michelle Pedigo
Lived Experience rep	Brenda Mack

#### **4.2. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 3 - Improve and Expand Data Management Efforts Through HMIS and Coordinated Entry System to Strengthen Data-Driven Operational Guidance and Strategic Oversight**

##### **4.2.1. Discussion Item: HMIS Data Dashboards**

Kate Bourne, Business Systems Analyst with the Homeless Services Division, presented a snapshot of the HMIS dashboard tiles that will be posted on the Social Services website. The goal is to present a dashboard that will be interactive in the future.

#### **4.3. Implementing Five-Year Plan Line of Effort 4 – Create, Identify, and Streamline Funding and Resources**

##### **4.3.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Grant Process Review working group draft recommendations**

Laurel Weir provided the composition of the Ad Hoc working group and presented the recommended output and outcome-focused scoring criteria for future grant application processes. Laurel also mentioned that the recommendations will be presented at the HSOC meeting in February.

#### **4.4. Future Full HSOC Agendas**

##### **4.4.1. Discussion Item: HSOC Agenda for January**

- 2025 Action Plan Homeless Services Funding Recommendation
- More discussion on Grant Process Review recommendations
- HHAP 5 funding priorities

#### **4.5. Committee Reports**

##### **4.5.1. Discussion Item: Committee Reports**

Mark Lamore reported that the Data & Performance Committee has been busy working on reviewing Client ROI (Release of Information), updating HMIS Policies and Procedures, and the HMIS User Agreement. Mark also mentioned that January 28<sup>th</sup> has been chosen and approved as the date for the Sheltered PIT (Point in Time) Count and HIC (Housing Inventory Count). He mentioned that the sheltered PIT data will come from HMIS information.

Laurel Weir shared that the Services Coordinating Committee's first quarterly meeting is scheduled for February and will discuss encampment policy. A doodle poll will be sent out to the members to determine the definite time and date of the meeting.

Jack Lahey reported that the Coordinated Entry Committee will continue to have more discussions on guidance, policies and procedures until they get to a consensus on a more effective Coordinated Entry systems approach.

#### **4.6. Discussion Item: Updates from County Staff on County Initiatives**

None presented.

#### **5. Next Regular Meeting: February 19, 2025**

#### **6. Adjournment**

Michelle adjourned the meeting at 5:21 pm.

**HOMELESS SERVICES OVERSIGHT COUNCIL  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
ACTION ITEM  
February 19, 2025**

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: 4.2.1**

**ITEM:** Approve Grant Review Process Guidelines and Scoring Criteria

**ACTION REQUIRED:** It is requested that the Executive Committee approve the Grant Review Process Guidelines and Scoring Criteria.

**SUMMARY NARRATIVE:**

On May 21, 2024, the County Board of Supervisors directed the "HSOC Executive Committee to develop guidelines for future funding allocations that will include the following:

- "How future funding will be allocated between new project startups such as new shelters, new housing and/or new services and supporting existing shelters and services such as shelter operations, outreach services and day center services. This may include a percentage split between new projects and supporting existing projects or other allocation methodology.
- "How performance metrics will be weighted when making funding recommendations.
- "How cost of services will be weighted when making funding recommendations.
- "Resolution process for resolving differences between grant review committee recommendations and HSOC adopted recommendations."

In the Summer of 2024, after receiving input from the HSOC Executive Committee, the HSOC Chair appointed a working group to develop the recommendations. The working group included a representative from a homeless services agency, a person with lived experience who now works at a homeless services agency, a representative from the Housing Authority, a representative from a local foundation, a local elected official, and was staffed by the Homeless Services Division, with additional support from the County Purchasing Office.

The Working Group began meeting in August 2024 and reviewed County Purchasing guidelines as well as current scoring processes and sample scoring rubrics. The Working Group also discussed types of grants the HSOC reviews, scoring used in other counties and criteria used by a private foundation. The Working Group also considered performance metrics available in HMIS. Based on this information, the group



#### Action Item 4.2.1

developed guidelines (See Attachment 4.2.1.1) and recommended scoring criteria (see Attachment 4.2.1.1 A).

In addition to developing scoring criteria that would use HMIS data to provide outcome data and looking at other performance metrics, the Working Group sought to develop a set of principles that would provide for increased transparency, consistently measured performance-based decision-making, and ensure funding for services across the county. Per the instructions from the Board, the principles also include a recommendation to create a formal process for developing final recommendations should the HSOC and the Grant Review Committee have different recommendations.

The recommendations were brought to the HSOC Executive Committee in December 2024 for initial review. The recommendations were further revised in response to the feedback from the Executive Committee and were brought to the full Homeless Services Oversight Council in January 2025 for review and comment.

Following the January meeting of the HSOC, staff made further revisions in response to the comments.

#### **BUDGET/FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The recommendations are not expected to change the amount of funding made available through grants but will guide how allocations are made.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS:**

If the Executive Committee approves the guidelines and scoring criteria, staff will bring a consent item to the Board of Supervisors with the guidelines and criteria.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment 4.2.1.1 –Principles for Grant Review Process

Attachment 4.2.1.1 A – Recommended Output and Outcome-Focused Scoring Criteria for Future Grant Application Processes

## **Homeless Services Oversight Council (HSOC) Principles**

### **Guidelines for Revised Grant Review Process, 2025**

Purpose: To provide for increased transparency, consistently measured performance-based decision-making, ensuring funding for services across the county, and providing a mechanism for making a final recommendation to the County Board of Supervisors (hereinafter “the Board”) should there be a difference between the Grant Review Committee and HSOC regarding grants for which the HSOC provides recommendations to the Board.

1. Adopt a Grant Planning Process to improve opportunities for consensus
  - a. Implement an Annual HSOC Planning process which includes the following elements:
    - i. Review Current Year and Anticipated Future Grant environment
      1. What grants we expect to receive over the course of the current year for which HSOC will be making funding recommendations
      2. Eligible activities for each grant
      3. Amount we expect to receive/have, if known, or estimated based on funding from prior years, and what one-time grants will be ending
      4. The activities and agencies that were funded with prior year funding and whether that funding was from an ongoing or one time grant
      5. To the extent possible, provide information about what is happening with other state and federal grants that significantly affect homeless services (e.g. Bringing Families Home, Home Safe, Homekey, Behavioral Health grants), as well as future years if known
    - ii. Receive input from HSOC Data and Performance Committee, or County Department of Social Services (DSS) Homeless Services Division (HSD) staff on System Performance Measures results and analysis– where are we performing well and need to sustain, and where do we need to improve.
    - iii. Update on progress in achieving Five-Year Plan Lines of Effort.
    - iv. Vote on key funding priorities for the year.
  - b. Pre-Request for Proposals (RFP) specific recommendations
    - i. This process will only occur for grants for which both of the following conditions are met:
      1. there is sufficient time between a funder’s grant announcement and the application deadline (i.e. there are at least 17 weeks between the grant announcement from the funder and the date by which local projects must be selected); and
      2. where the process and the recommendations are consistent with grant guidelines, to the extent known
    - ii. When both the provisions in 1(b)(i) are met, staff will seek guidance from the HSOC for provision to the Grant Review Committee (GRC) on funding priorities
    - iii. Funding priorities could include recommended priority activities and recommended percentages of funding to sustain existing versus new projects

- iv. When allowable, include a discussion of minimum funding percentages by region (see Attachment B)
  - v. Guidance to the Grant Review Committee should be consistent with the grant's authorizing statute, regulations and guidance, e.g. minimum or maximum funding by activity type, required priorities, and factors affecting grant competitiveness. Thus, this prioritization may not apply to all grants, e.g. the Continuum of Care (CoC) grant.
2. Incorporate standardized performance measures into scoring rubrics
- a. Add specific measures on outcomes by project type (see Attachment A)
  - b. Review cost per outcome by project type; use cost per unit for housing development
  - c. Rubrics for each grant must be consistent with the funder guidelines for funding opportunity with the aim of maximizing grant awards.
3. Give the Chair the Authority to Create an Ad Hoc Committee to make final recommendations, should there be a difference between the HSOC and the Grant Review Committee's recommendations, or to make a request for a new Request for Proposals (RFP)
- a. Trigger for formation of Ad Hoc Committee vs. request for new RFP
    - i. Trigger for request for new RFP
      - If HSOC either
        - 1. substantially changes the priorities or other provisions of the issued Request for Proposals;
        - 2. recommends funding for agencies that were not recommended by the Grant Review Committee;
        - 3. recommends zero funding for projects that were recommended for funding by the Grant Review Committee or where County staff determine that a proposed funding award change is significant enough to make the recommended program unfeasible; or
        - 4. cannot pass an alternate recommendation at the meeting where Grant Review Committee recommendations are presented;

AND ~~and~~ where all of the following conditions are met: there is sufficient time to issue a new RFP, hold the local competition and bring recommendations to the HSOC at the next meeting while still meeting grant application or implementation deadlines;

~~then~~ THEN the HSOC Chair will request that County staff issue a revised RFP and begin the grant recommendation process over again.

  - ii. Trigger for formation of Ad Hoc Committee
    - If HSOC either
      - 1. fails to approve the Grant Review Committee recommendations and instead approves recommendations that do not meet any of the four conditions that trigger a request for a new RFP; or

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 2", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2", First line: 0"

2. meets one of the four conditions above that would ordinarily trigger a request for a new RFP, but there is not sufficient time to issue a new RFP and still meet grant application or implementation deadlines; then the Chair will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to meet and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the HSOC in time to ensure grant requirements are met.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2", First line: 0"

b. Composition and Operation of Ad Hoc Committee

i. Composition

1. Required: Regional city managers or their designees, or elected officials or their alternates appointed by their jurisdiction to the HSOC ~~elected officials appointed by their jurisdiction to the HSOC~~ (one from each region), a person with lived experience of homelessness, and County ~~Rep~~ staff (at least one staff and one decisionmaker, e.g. Director of Social Services, Behavioral Health Director, etc.).
2. Optional: Housing organization that is not an applicant, and/or countywide organization (e.g. VA, CenCal, Dignity/Adventist, County Office of Education, County Public Health, etc.)
3. Required and Optional members are not required to be appointed members of the HSOC, but the Chair will ensure one or more of the members are appointed HSOC members.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Hanging: 0.25", Right: 0.06", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 2" + Indent at: 2"

ii. Operation

1. The Committee will be required to make recommendations that are consistent with the provisions of the RFP.

Formatted: Tab stops: 1.63", Left

## Attachment 4.2.1.1 A

### Recommended Output and Outcome-Focused Scoring Criteria for Future Grant Application Processes

#### Performance Metrics by Program Type

The following performance criteria shall be requested from entities applying for funding through the HSOC grant application processes as a standard, when applying for one of the below types of homeless services. All data will be gathered from the County's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) or an HMIS-compliant database, unless otherwise noted, and provided to the Grant Review Committee as part of the scoring process. The metrics will measure performance over the prior grant period. When needed to comply with grant requirements and direction from the funding agency or to ensure competitiveness for the grant, County staff may alter the criteria.

Metrics highlighted in **RED** will be used to evaluate cost effectiveness of each program. (See below for more explanation of cost-effectiveness metrics.) ***Emergency Shelter (ES)***

- Number of persons or households<sup>1</sup> enrolled in project over the previous grant year
- Bed Utilization Rate (percentage of shelter beds filled)
- Number of persons or households experiencing chronic homelessness
- **Number of successful exits of persons or households into housing and number of persons or households experiencing chronic homelessness placed**
- Percentage of housed persons or households who returned to homelessness over the previous grant year

#### ***Street Outreach (SO) and Overnight Supportive Parking***

- Number of persons or households enrolled in project over the previous grant year
- **Number of successful exits of persons or households and number of persons or households experiencing chronic homelessness with successful exits**

#### ***Supportive Services Only (SSO)***

- Number of persons or households enrolled in project over the previous grant year

#### ***Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)***

- Number of persons or households placed into permanent supportive housing in the previous grant year

---

<sup>1</sup> As determined by grant funder requirement.

- Percentage of persons or households with total income increases from time of exit to either one year (for stayers) or at exit (for persons or households who have left in the previous grant year)
- Percentage of total persons or households who exited back to homelessness in the previous grant year (exits to homelessness divided by total participants housed in the program)
- Median number of years that persons or households were homeless prior to entering into housing
- Percentage of persons or households who entered with a score 11 or higher on the VISPDAT (organizations with 75% or higher will get the highest number of points; organizations with 40-70% would get the second highest score; 20-39% would get the third highest; organizations that serve 0-19% would get the lowest).
- Bed utilization rate (percentage of PSH beds being filled) **Transitional Housing (TH)**
- Number of persons or households served
- Percentage of persons or households exiting to permanent housing
- Bed utilization rate
- Number of persons or households within the previous grant year who exited to homelessness

**Rapid Rehousing (RRH)**

- Number of persons or households served, and percentage of households enrolled over the previous grant year who have a Housing Move In Date

**Homelessness Prevention (HP)**

- Number of persons or households enrolled in homelessness prevention the project within the previous grant year
- Percentage of persons or households who were exited from a homeless prevention program and subsequently became homeless within one year of exiting from the prevention program

**Affordable Housing (all of these measures from sources other than HMIS)**

- Number of units created in the last five years
- Populations served – more credit for units set aside for households experiencing homelessness and extremely low-income households according to RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Allocation) definitions. 2 points for each unit set aside for people experiencing homelessness and 1 point for each unit set aside for extremely lowincome households
- Experience leveraging tax credits or similar financing
- Experience providing services proposed • Number of units proposed to be built

### **Cost Effectiveness**

- Measure cost effectiveness based on the same measures used in performance metrics, e.g. for street outreach projects, calculate the average cost per placement into housing or other positive destinations and cost per number of persons or households experiencing chronic homelessness placed, using requested grant amount and proposed outcomes.

### **Other Scoring Criteria**

In addition to the metrics noted above, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends using the following additional criteria in the evaluation of grant applications by each Grant Review Committee. County staff may also add additional criteria based on requirements of the funding stream and factors affecting grant competitiveness.

- Add criteria for measuring the extent to which client input is solicited and used to improve the program (this is a non-HMIS measure) ○ Ask how, and how frequently, the organization seeks input from program participants and ask for an example of how the input was used to make a change to the program
- Organizational Capacity including Financial Capacity (these are taken from the application and not HMIS) ○ Maintain existing criteria used by the Homeless Services Division: experience providing similar services and working with proposed population; experience in securing and effectively using public funding; understanding of client needs; reasonable and allowable costs; reasonable cost per client
- Program Design
  - Keep existing criteria: type and scale of supportive services; plan to address barriers to clients securing housing; plan to market of services within the geographic area; plan to rapidly implement the program; landlord recruitment strategy; strategy to assist clients to obtain mainstream benefits
- Affordable Housing
  - Keep existing criteria: Extent project is located in proximity to transit, employment, and/or services; Total number of new deed-restricted affordable units proposed; Extent to which project provides housing for vulnerable populations (persons experiencing homelessness, chronically homeless, veterans, seniors, unaccompanied youth under 25 years of age, persons fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence); Percentage of other financing committed at application; Review of land use entitlements/permits, CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act)/NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) reviews, architectural plan completion, status of construction permits, etc.

of 5

- Need for program
  - Is project consistent with HSOC Annual Planning Priorities (new criteria) and Five-Year Plan Priorities (existing criteria), and consistent with grantor-approved plans?

### **Threshold requirements**

- Do they participate in the San Luis Obispo County CoC's HMIS (Homeless Management Information System) or comparable database, or, if not, will they agree to participate if funded? (Excludes affordable housing grants without set-aside units or other grants serving people who don't meet HMIS criteria)
- If applicable, does the agency participate in the San Luis Obispo County CoC's Coordinated Entry System?
- Will they agree to send a representative to the Data and Performance Committee if the project is funded?

### **Reliability of Metrics**

Evaluate Reliability of Agency Projections Regarding Future Outcomes

- For RFPs issued in CY2025:
- To the extent possible, prior to bringing Grant Review Committee recommendations to the HSOC, review applicants recommended for funding to see if organizations funded in prior rounds or for similar grants served the number of persons in the applicable grant period that they proposed in their applicable application.
- If an applicant has not previously been approved for similar activities, weight the application questions re project design, financial and organizational capacity, and client input more heavily.
- For RFPs issued in CY2026, conduct the following review:
- Was the applicant previously approved for funding for this or other activities? If so, review their application and outcomes for the grant period in which they were funded and determine whether the applicant met or achieved an outcome within 10% of the proposed goals on the following metrics for that time period:
  - For Street Outreach and Overnight Supportive Housing projects, number of exits to successful destinations)
  - For Emergency Shelter projects, housing placement as measured by exits to housing
  - For Rapid Rehousing projects, housing placement, as measured by housing move-in dates

of 5

- For Transitional Housing projects, exits to permanent housing
- For Permanent Supportive Housing projects, housing retention rates
- For Homelessness Prevention projects, number of persons or households assisted
- For Affordable Housing projects, number of units created
- Take into consideration force majeure for failing to meet goals, but if not applicable and verifiable, then consider outcomes of next highest



scoring applicants. Present that data to the Grant Review Committee, if time allows, or to the full HSOC if not.

- As with the above recommendation, if the organization has not previously been approved for similar activities, weight the questions re project design, financial, and client input more heavily.

Attachment 5.2.2.1 B

HHAP-5 AWARD

\$ 4,316,586

Admin (7%) \$ 302,161

Youth set-aside (10%) \$ 431,659

Balance \$ 3,582,766

1st disbursement (50%) \$ 1,791,383

Option A: 60% allocated to Sustain existing projects. Each region receives automatic 10% of allocation (including projects serving clients countywide)

60% of allocation to sustain projects is available on a competitive basis

40% of total allocation is available for new projects countywide

60% SUSTAIN - 40% NEW

sustain \$ 1,074,829.80 60%

New \$ 716,553.20 40%

SUSTAIN PROJECTS

Countywide \$ 107,482.98 10%

North \$ 107,482.98 10%

Central \$ 107,482.98 10%

South \$ 107,482.98 10%

HHAP-5 BUDGET

NEW Affordable Housing 42%

Sustain Permanent Housing 21%

Sustain Interim Shelter 21%

Rapid Rehousing 9%

Admin 7%

NEW PROJECTS

\$ 716,553.20

Remainder	\$	644,897.88	60%
TOTAL	\$	1,074,829.80	

Page 1 of 2  
Attachment 5.2.2.1 B

Option B: 75% allocated to Sustain existing projects. Each region receives automatic 10% of allocation (including projects serving clients countywide)

60% of allocation to sustain projects is available on a competitive basis

25% of total allocation is available for new projects countywide

75% SUSTAIN - 25% NEW			
sustain	\$	1,343,537.25	75%
New	\$	447,845.75	25%
SUSTAIN PROJECTS		NEW PROJECTS	
Countywide	\$	134,353.72	10%
North	\$	134,353.72	10%
Central	\$	134,353.72	10%
South	\$	134,353.72	10%
Remainder	\$	806,122.35	60%
TOTAL	\$	1,343,537.25	

Option c: 75% allocated to Sustain existing projects. Each region receives automatic 15% of allocation (including projects serving clients countywide)

40% of allocation to sustain projects is available on a competitive basis

25% of total allocation is available for new projects countywide

SUSTAIN PROJECTS		NEW PROJECTS	
Countywide	\$	201,530.59	15%
		\$	447,845.75

North	\$	201,530.59	15%
Central	\$	201,530.59	15%
South	\$	201,530.59	15%
Remainder	\$	537,414.90	40%
Total	\$	1,343,537.25	