



## City Council AGENDA REPORT

**DATE:** 09/16/2021

**AGENDA OF:** 09/28/2021

**DEPARTMENT:** City Manager

**SUBJECT:** CORE Investments Stakeholder Engagement and RFP Framework Recommendations (CM)

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Receive update on the Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments Request for Proposals (RFP) Framework and stakeholder engagement, and motion to:

- 1) Approve recommendation for the CORE Investments term of three years.
  - 2) Consider options and provide staff direction regarding CORE Investments allocation method.
  - 3) Direct the staff to return on November 9, 2021 with the CORE RFP and an update on the application process, technical assistance for applicants, review panels and scoring, and award funding decisions process.
- 

**BACKGROUND:** The Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments is both a funding model and a movement designed to improve the well-being of county residents. This presentation shares the process and engagement efforts taken to date to prepare for the upcoming joint Request for Proposals (RFP) with the County of Santa Cruz.

Transition from Community Programs Funding Model to the Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments

In 2015, the Board of Supervisors approved a phased-in approach to transition from the historical Community Programs funding model to a results-based collective impact model and directed the Human Services Department (HSD) to lead the design and implementation process in partnership with interested funders and community partners. After extensive research, and in collaboration with a wide variety of stakeholders from multiple sectors, the HSD Community Programs funding process was transformed into a new model named the Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments. The County and the City of Santa Cruz partnered to implement the first funding cycle of CORE Investments by issuing a joint Request for Proposals (RFP) in 2017 to provide evidence-based safety net services in the areas of physical health, mental health, substance use and homelessness across the age spectrum.

With the first CORE RFP and awards, County funding for safety net services was increased to \$4.335 million, approximately 11%, due to the following actions approved by the Board:

- An increase to the base allocation from \$3.9 million to \$4.1 million (\$200,000)
- The addition of \$150,000 for small grants, called Set Aside awards
- The \$85,000 augmentation for Meals on Wheels

The City of Santa Cruz's contribution was approximately one million dollars resulting in \$5,235,000 in total funds available for award. A profile of the awarded investments by service area is included in Attachment 1.

These funds were dedicated for a funding term of 3 years; however, the term was extended twice, resulting in a five-year funding cycle thru FY 2022. The first extension was approved in December 2018 to align the CORE agreements and the final extension was approved in 2020 due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

### Current Investments

Currently, County CORE Investments base funding of \$4.255 million supports 42 agencies representing 67 programs. Current City CORE Investments base funding of \$1.035 million supports 35 agencies same programs County is funding? Overlap?

### Evolution of CORE

From the beginning, there was an acknowledgment that the CORE Investments model would evolve over time. Over the last five years, using a collective impact, results-based approach that is responsive to community needs, CORE Investments has moved beyond just the funding model to also become a movement to achieve equitable health and well-being in Santa Cruz County. This movement, facilitated by the CORE Consultants, Nicole Young from Optimal Solutions Consulting and Nicole Lezin from Cole Communications, has been driven by input, feedback, and ideas from multiple stakeholders including non-profits, public agencies, grassroots groups, funders, and community leaders. A suite of tools, including the continuum of evidence, the CORE Results Menu, and the Library of Evidence-based practices (EBPs) has been developed to support both funders and non-profit partners.

The evolution and refinement of the CORE Investments model and framework has been documented and approved by the County Board via progress reports submitted by HSD and Optimal Solutions Consulting. The framework is guided by the CORE vision, mission and values and is grounded in the interconnected CORE Conditions of Health and Well-Being, with equity at the center (Figure 1).



Figure 1

The mission of CORE is to inspire and ignite collective action to ensure Santa Cruz County is a safe, healthy community with equitable opportunities for all to thrive. The CORE Framework identifies equity as a CORE value, with a goal of uncovering the root causes of inequities and disrupting individual, organizational, and systemic practices and structures that perpetuate inequities in opportunities and outcomes.

To bring the original conception of CORE Investments together with the evolution of the movement, the following key elements will continue to be foundational in the recommendations described herein.

- CORE will continue to evolve through engagement with stakeholders.
- CORE Conditions are interconnected, and equity is at the center.
- CORE Conditions are aligned with the County Strategic Plan Focus Areas.
- Data and results are integral to the CORE framework.
- CORE tools have been developed and will be used, with technical assistance, to support the funding process.

June 16, 2021 and September 7, 2021 CORE Updates to the City’s Community Programs Committee (CPC)

On June 16, 2021, City staff, County HSD and the CORE consultants, updated the CPC on CORE’s progress and presented the timeline and process to build the next RFP. On September

7, 2021, City staff, County HSD and CORE consultants returned to CPC to update CPC on the various stakeholder engagement sessions convened and a timeline moving forward.

## **DISCUSSION:**

### Stakeholder Engagement regarding the RFP

Over the summer, HSD, the City of Santa Cruz, and the CORE consultants hosted a series of meetings with funders and community partners to gather input on how to apply the CORE framework and operationalize equity in the upcoming procurement process. These meetings also provided an opportunity to build a shared understanding of the CORE framework, and to deepen connections, communication, and opportunities for alignment for collective impact among funders and community partners. Additionally, those that registered or attended the engagement sessions were offered an option to submit comments via a survey. A summary of the stakeholder engagement process is included in Attachment 2- Core Engagement Meetings & Survey- Summer 2021: Summary of Key Take-aways.

Throughout the engagement meetings, funders and service providers were asked to weigh in on the following questions:

- How can the CORE framework be used for making decisions about funding allocations?
- How can we center equity in the CORE funding process in concrete and actionable ways for both funders and services providers?

As reflected in the Attachment 2, there were varying ideas and input as well as universal appreciation for the complexities of operationalizing the CORE framework into the procurement process. With regard to equity, some of the key feedback included making equity part of the scoring criteria and to recognize that equity is an ongoing process and applicants shouldn't be penalized for learning. Some common themes regarding the application included keeping the application simple and streamlined, having a different process for small vs large funding requests, and a recognition that simplicity isn't always as easy as it seems and still requires effort for both the funder and applicant. Feedback regarding data and evidence acknowledged their importance while also wanting to allow space for innovation.

Based on review of the lessons learned from the evaluation of the last procurement, recent stakeholder engagement, and discussions with HSD, staff is presenting the following recommendations for Council consideration.

### Staff Recommendations

#### Contract Term

Since the County will complete a one-year budget for FY 2023 before returning to the two-year budget cycle, County HSD is recommending a three-year contract term for the upcoming CORE RFP funding cycle. To stay in alignment with the County, City staff is recommending a similar three-year contract term from the City.

Base Funding, Set Aside and Grant Sizes:

For FY 2022, City CORE funding, totaled \$1.035 million. Award of funds for the next contracting cycle will be contingent upon the Council's approval of these funds in the FY 2023 budget. For the next RFP funding cycle, staff has the following recommendations that impact the amount of City funding available for awards; however the City's updated budget situation will need to be considered when Council takes formal budget action for FY 2023 and subsequent years:

1. Consider increasing the CORE base allocation to be in alignment with the proposed increase by the County, in future budget discussions.
2. Additionally, staff recommends folding the \$45,000 Set Aside allocation into the CORE Investments base funding. The Set Aside was intended for small awards utilizing a simple application process. These will be folded into the new grant size structure as small agreements. In line with this intention is staff's recommendation to create a tiered approach to grant size, where application requirements increase with the size of the grant request. The proposed funding tiers are based on historical funding patterns. The Set Aside awards would fall into the "small" category:
  - Small: \$5,000 - \$25,000
  - Medium: \$25,001 - \$150,000
  - Large: \$150,001 - \$450,000

Grants of all sizes would be driven by community needs as defined and articulated by the applicants. Applicants would describe how the needs they plan to address contribute to equitable health and well-being in one or more of the eight interconnected CORE Conditions.

#### Allocation Method Options:

Three options for the allocation method were discussed with stakeholders:

Option 1: Fund in a targeted manner and identify specific inequities to address in order to move the needle on targeted CORE Conditions. The benefit of this approach is that it increases the likelihood of impact in the targeted conditions, recognizing that there would be fewer programs funded with larger awards. City and HSD staff is not recommending this approach at this time as there isn't sufficient data to determine the conditions to target, and this approach would reduce funding for agencies and services not connected to the targeted CORE Conditions. However, staff recognize that as part of the evolution of CORE, this could be a more viable option for future procurements.

Option 2: Fund broadly across all CORE Conditions. This approach mirrors how funds are currently allocated and acknowledges the interconnectedness of the CORE Conditions. A benefit of the broad approach is that it recognizes that all the CORE Conditions have been identified as key aspects of a thriving community and supports many programs and services being offered. One of the limitations of this approach is that distributing limited funding across many programs and services results in smaller awards and potentially less impact. Staff is not recommending this approach for this funding cycle as it does not provide the impact envisioned for CORE.

Option 3: Fund a hybrid approach that is primarily broad but would also include one deeper investment. This option acknowledges both the need for a phased transition from funding safety net services broadly and the impact of deeper investments. This approach requires that a portion

of the funds available for award be targeted towards the larger investment, and as a consequence, we anticipate that fewer programs will be funded. The funds for this deeper investment would be separate from the large grant size tier described earlier. Currently, HSD is recommending to the County Board that \$500,000 of County funds be directed towards this option. For this investment, collective impact features would be built into the funding expectations and RFP criteria. In addition, the proposals will be expected to explicitly address equity as both a process and an outcome, regardless of which CORE Condition(s) is/are addressed.

The proposed allocations and methodologies for both Option 1 and 2 are in Attachment 3.

#### Next Steps - RFP Release

HSD and City staff will continue to incorporate the lessons-learned from the first RFP, feedback from stakeholders, and input from both the Board and City Council to develop the RFP. Staff intend to bring the CORE RFP to the Board and City Council on November 9, 2021 for approval to release. At that time, HSD and City staff will provide updates on the following:

- Application process
- Technical assistance for applicants
- Review panels and scoring
- Award funding decisions process

**FISCAL IMPACT:** CORE Investments awards are funded through City General Funds. Award of funds for the next contracting cycle will be contingent upon the Council's approval of these funds in the FY 2023 budget.

**Prepared By:**  
Ralph Dimaricut  
Principal Management  
Analyst

**Submitted By:**  
Laura Schmidt  
Assistant City Manager

**Approved By:**  
Rosemary Menard  
Interim City Manager

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. 2018 FUNDING AREAS.DOCX
2. CORE MEETINGS+SURVEY KEY TAKE-AWAYS - BRIEF (SEPT 2021).DOCX
3. ALLOCATION METHODS.DOCX

**Attachment 1: Funding by area, CORE Investments 2018**

City and County CORE Investments Funding by Area, 2018

Area	Percent of Funding	Total Funding
Children/Youth	85%	\$1,671,000
Health	72%	\$1,763,000
Homeless	75%	\$774,000
Senior	79%	\$1,027,000
Total	79%	\$5,235,000



## CORE Engagement Meetings & Survey – Summer 2021 Summary of Key Take-aways

### Overview

Between June and early September 2021, the Human Services Department (HSD) and the City of Santa Cruz (City of SC) provided a variety of opportunities for funders and community partners to learn about the Collective of Results and Evidence-based (CORE) Investments framework, understand the process and timeline for releasing the next CORE Request for Proposals (RFP), and provide input and advice on how to operationalize equity and apply the CORE framework in the upcoming funding process.

HSD and the City of SC, with assistance from the CORE consultants (Nicole Young, Optimal Solutions Consulting, and Nicole Lezin, Cole Communications), held the following seven engagement meetings attended by 138 unique individuals from 66 organizations:

- **Funders Meetings** (June 3 & July 20, 2021): 29 participants representing 17 local and regional funders (including HSD and City of SC staff)
- **Community Partners Meeting** (August 4, 2021): 88 participants representing 54 nonprofits, public agencies, and community groups
- **Community Partners & Funders Meeting** (August 12, 2021): 52 participants representing 30 community partner and funder organizations/groups
- **CORE Steering Committee** (August 30, 2021): 15 participants representing 13 organizations
- **City of Santa Cruz Community Programs Committee** (June 16 & September 7, 2021): Three Councilmembers serving on the Community Programs Committee (CPC)

In addition, the CORE consultants administered a brief online survey, providing an extended window of opportunity for individuals to submit input on the questions discussed during the August 12 meeting with funders and community partners. Eleven people responded to the survey, representing nine unique organizations.

### Framing the Issue

After explaining the evolution of CORE and the CORE framework (vision, mission, values, CORE Conditions for Health & Well-being), the CORE consultants described the current situation the County and City of SC were facing in terms of: What We Know (working assumptions), What We Don't Know (but need to know soon), Dilemmas, and the Big Hairy Questions that creates. Each of these pieces of context is described below.

- **What We Know:** CORE has evolved and continues to evolve; the commitment to CORE and continuous improvement is strong; there are several CORE tools to support the funding model and the movement; and funding decisions are inevitably complicated.



- **What We Don't Know Yet:** How simple or detailed the RFP and application will be; the criteria or guidelines for reviewing proposals; the method for making funding allocation decisions – and how best to operationalize equity throughout the funding process and decisions.
- **Dilemmas:** Government agencies are often constrained by bureaucracy, making them less nimble; the County and City of SC may not be able to be as flexible about application requirements as private foundations/funders; deciding ahead of time how much funding will be allocated for different types of programs/services can help make some decisions seem more concrete, but that could potentially reinforce siloed approaches vs. a collective impact approach; achieving or creating equity in funding practices means allocating/distributing resources in ways that some will experience as fair and just, and others will experience as a threat/loss/unfair; there will never be a perfect solution that will satisfy everyone.
- **Big, hairy questions:** How can we center equity in the CORE funding process in concrete, actionable ways – for both funders and service providers? How can the CORE Conditions be used as a framework for making decisions about funding allocations?

## Common Themes & Key Take-aways

A variety of ideas and opinions were shared throughout the engagement meetings and survey; They are summarized by broad categories below.

### Application

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep it simple, streamlined and only ask for what's needed.</li> <li>• Provide the option to submit non-written materials, such as videos.</li> <li>• Share the RFP &amp; scoring criteria and provide opportunities to give feedback on them before the official release date.</li> <li>• Provide as much lead time as possible (and avoid the holidays).</li> <li>• Have a different process for small vs large funding requests.</li> <li>• Provide technical assistance throughout – “Technical assistance is equity” because it builds experience and capacity to apply for grants beyond CORE.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplicity isn't always as simple or as easy as it seems. It still requires effort for both the funder and applicant.</li> <li>• Biases will still exist, and oversimplifying might unintentionally create room for biased decision-making.</li> <li>• Government funders have different rules and mandates than private philanthropy.</li> </ul>

## Data & Setting Priorities

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some people feel the County and City should set specific priorities based on data, focusing on those most in need or marginalized.</li> <li>We have great resources available now that didn't exist in the first round of CORE funding (e.g., DataShare, CORE Results Menu that links community-level impacts with community-level data in each of the CORE Conditions).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data gaps exist (missing, outdated, pre-COVID).</li> <li>Some suggested instead of the County and City determining what the priorities are, have applicants say, "These are the needs and inequities we see; this is the data we see; this is how we would solve this issue ..."</li> <li>Balance the need to respond to the "crisis of now" – immediate, acute needs – with investing in prevention and addressing root causes to create the conditions for health and well-being of future generations.</li> </ul>

## Evidence

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow innovation, not just traditional evidence-based programs &amp; practices (EBPs).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was how the first CORE RFP was structured, but the concept of EBPs was new to many, and there was some confusion about the definitions of the levels of evidence (Model, Promising, Innovative) that made the process of applying challenging for several agencies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't let go of existing, effective EBPs and evaluation tools being used; even though the first CORE application was hard, many agencies feel proud of the way they have implemented EBPs with both fidelity and flexibility and are getting great results. So the message is, don't completely throw everything out and start over.</li> </ul>

## Equity

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make equity part of the scoring criteria – it signifies the importance, centrality in this round of CORE funding.</li> <li>Request demographics of clients, staff, and Boards in the application (but don't make that the only equity consideration).</li> <li>Consider wage equity in nonprofits as part of equity discussion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize equity is an ongoing process (don't penalize applicants for learning).</li> <li>Create space, funding, technical assistance for organizations to focus on equity; even though there's more attention and talk re: equity, it's still hard work to create internal organizational changes needed to become antiracist, multicultural organizations; that is part of the ongoing role of CORE Institute events.</li> </ul>

## Reviewers

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use local experts and community members most affected by inequities; some feel panels should be made up of majority or 100% local experts.</li> <li>• Train reviewers on equity, scoring criteria.</li> <li>• Use different reviewers for different application elements (e.g., community members not expected to be experts on budget/technical portions of proposal).</li> <li>• Give reviewers the opportunity to ask applicants for clarification.</li> <li>• Provide feedback to non-funded applicants afterward.</li> <li>• Be transparent about how panels were formed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewers should be experts with a certain amount of formal education and/or professional experience.</li> <li>• Include experts from other areas/county – panels should be made up of anywhere between 20 – 85% out-of-county reviewers.</li> <li>• One survey comment: local panelists are definitely important, but reviewer’s knowledge about equity is more important than whether they are local or from outside the county.</li> </ul>

## Scoring

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Partners want clear expectations and transparency about scoring criteria: “Tell us what you’re looking for; don’t make us guess.”</li> <li>• Clarify disconnects between scores and award amounts.</li> <li>• In the Funders meetings, we heard some other specific suggestions, like train/remind reviewers to rate the quality of ideas in the proposals (versus grammar or fancy graphics or videos).</li> <li>• Some funders also suggested separating the technical review from the programmatic review.</li> <li>• When asked in the survey what “transparency” means in the context of reviewing and scoring proposals, most respondents said clear information about the scoring criteria and results and feedback about their proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A couple survey respondents said everything should be made public – everyone’s scores and funding recommendations – and open for public discussion.</li> </ul>

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One person felt that publicizing everyone's scores/results may do more harm than good.</li> </ul>	

**Funding broadly** (many CORE Conditions, many agencies/programs) **or funding deeply** (a more targeted approach)

We heard...	And also...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some people recommend funding broadly – touching on all CORE Conditions, since those have been identified as key aspects of a thriving community, and funding broadly so that many services can be offered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is also strong interest in funding more deeply and identifying specific inequities to solve in order to move the needle on targeted CORE Conditions.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Steering Committee meeting, the group started discussing the potential for a hybrid approach – perhaps funding a wide variety of basic needs services that support one or more of the CORE Conditions, but dedicating some funding for a deep, targeted approach that resembles a true collective impact approach (common agenda, shared measurement, etc.) that increases equity in multiple, intersecting CORE Conditions. The potential for a hybrid approach needs more thought to determine the operational implications and feasibility, but it's worth exploring.</li> </ul>	

### What Can & Can't Be Done

- As the engagement meetings progressed, HSD and the City of SC began to respond to participants' suggestions with general information about what can and can't be done (or is not likely to be possible in a community as small as ours. This contributed to building a shared understanding of the CORE RFP process and set realistic expectations.
- What Can't Be Done**, based on best practices for government procurement.
  - The County and City can't share the RFP and scoring criteria before the official release date
  - Also can't have staff/volunteers/interns/Board members of applicant agencies serving as panel reviewers because it creates a conflict of interest
  - The County and City can't share the panelists' identities beforehand – this helps ensure a fair process so that some applicants don't have access or the opportunity to try to influence the panelists' scores
  - Reviewers won't be informed of applicants' prior funding history with the County and City of SC, including whether and how much CORE funding they currently receive. This is to help minimize bias or preconceived notions that could affect how panelists review/score proposals (i.e., doesn't give previously funded agencies some kind of edge/advantage over new applicants)

- **What Can Be Done:** steps and commitments that HSD and the City of SC feel confident can be made, even before the Board and City Council make a policy decision about the funding allocation method.
  - **Clear, candid, continuous communication:** HSD and the City made a commitment to share information as clearly, early, and often as they can – within the parameters of a public procurement process. They will do their best to keep partners informed about the process, the decisions being made, and the things that are still unknown, can't be done, or can't be disclosed before the Board and City Council have reviewed them in a public process.
  - **Ongoing training, TA, tools & support:** like last time, the County and City are committed to providing significant support and TA throughout the application period. The CORE consultants are developing a TA plan that will include multiple options for group workshops and individualized assistance – through formats like the CORE Coffee Chats and Conversations, DataShare workshops, skills-based trainings, and individual coaching sessions.
  - **Continuous improvement with an equity lens:** the County and City of SC are committed to continuously improving the use of the CORE framework in the procurement process. This second funding process won't be perfect and government entities might not be able to make things as simple as everyone prefers, but we hope it will feel like a fair and reasonable process because HSD and the City have been listening and learning from partners about how to make it less burdensome and more equitable. Advancing equitable health and well-being in the CORE Conditions for Health & Well-being will be the guiding framework this time (versus trying to reverse engineer a set of priorities and results from existing strategic plans, like the first round of CORE funding).
  - **Application & Application period:** The County and City will do their best to keep the application simple, asking only for what's essential and having a simpler application for smaller grants versus larger ones. HSD and City staff are currently exploring options for how to do that. The RFP is likely to be released in early to mid-November, pending Board and Council approval, then will be due in early to mid-February. This means applicants will have approximately 3 months to prepare and submit their proposals.
  - **Small grants (vs. set-asides):** the Board has already decided to not have a separate process for what used to be called set-aside funds, but rather, incorporate small grants into the CORE RFP (again, with simpler application and reporting requirements).
  - **Data and evidence:** will still be important, but like last time, proposals with traditional, researched EBPs won't guarantee a higher score compared to innovative or newer programs, or programs with local evaluations. However, this time, the County and City will clarify terminology in the RFP to make sure the different types and uses of data and evidence are better understood. The training and TA provided by the CORE consultants will help applicants understand these concepts and how to use available tools, such as DataShare, the CORE Results Menu, the Promising Practices database, and other relevant tools.

## Engagement Meetings & Survey Participants

Organization	Participants per Org	CORE Contractor
Advocacy, Inc.	1	Y
Allison Guevara Social Impact Consulting	1	
Arts Council Santa Cruz County	4	Y
Big Brothers Big Sisters	1	Y
Cabrillo College	3	
Central California Alliance for Health	2	
Cindy J Wong (CJW) Consulting	1	
City of Capitola	1	
City of Santa Cruz	6	
City of Scotts Valley	1	
City of Watsonville	2	
Coastal Watershed Council	3	Y
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc.	7	Y
Community Bridges	7	Y
Community Foundation Santa Cruz County	2	
Community Health Trust of Pájaro Valley	2	
County of Santa Cruz, Health Services Agency	8	
County of Santa Cruz, Housing for Health	1	
County of Santa Cruz, Human Services Department	5	
County of Santa Cruz, Parks & Recreation	2	
County of Santa Cruz, Probation	2	
CSUMB	2	
DataShare Santa Cruz County	1	
Dientes Community Dental Care	3	Y
Encompass Community Services	1	Y
Families in Transition	3	Y
Family Service Agency	1	Y
First 5 Santa Cruz County	4	
Grey Bears	1	Y
Health Improvement Partnership	3	
hOMe	1	
Homeless Garden Project	1	
Human Care Alliance	1	
Impact Launch	1	
Jane Conklin Consulting	1	
Janus of Santa Cruz	2	Y
Kaki Rusmore Consulting & Possibility Works	1	
MENtors	1	
Monarch Services	3	Y
NAMI Santa Cruz County	2	Y

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Participants per Org</b>	<b>CORE Contractor</b>
Nonprofit Connection Santa Cruz County	1	
Pájaro Valley Prevention & Student Assistance	1	Y
Pájaro Valley Shelter Services	1	
Pájaro Valley Unified School District	3	Y
Positive Discipline Community Resources	3	
Recovery Cafe Santa Cruz	1	
Salud y Cariño	1	
Santa Cruz Community Health	2	Y
Santa Cruz Community Ventures	2	
Santa Cruz County Office of Education	2	
Santa Cruz Museum of Natural History	1	
Santa Cruz Toddler Care Center	1	Y
Sarah Marschall Strategy	1	
Seamster Consulting	1	
Second Harvest Food Bank Santa Cruz County	3	Y
Senior Citizens Legal Services	1	Y
Senior Network Services, Inc.	2	Y
Seniors Council of Santa Cruz & San Benito Counties	2	Y
Sunlight Giving Foundation	1	
Sutter Health	2	
The Diversity Center of Santa Cruz County	2	Y
The Parents Center	3	Y
United Way of Santa Cruz County	2	
Unknown	1	
Vista Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired	1	Y
Walnut Avenue Family & Women's Center	2	Y
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Participants per Org</b>	<b>CORE Contractor</b>
Advocacy, Inc.	1	Y
Allison Guevara Social Impact Consulting	1	
Arts Council Santa Cruz County	4	Y
Big Brothers Big Sisters	1	Y
Cabrillo College	3	Y
Central California Alliance for Health	2	
Cindy J Wong (CJW) Consulting	1	
City of Capitola	1	
City of Santa Cruz	6	
City of Scotts Valley	1	
City of Watsonville	2	
Coastal Watershed Council	3	Y
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County, Inc.	7	Y
Community Bridges	7	Y
Community Foundation Santa Cruz County	1	
Community Health Trust of Pájaro Valley	2	
County of Santa Cruz, Health Services Agency	8	
County of Santa Cruz, Housing for Health	1	
County of Santa Cruz, Human Services Department	5	
County of Santa Cruz, Parks & Recreation	2	
County of Santa Cruz, Probation	2	
CSUMB	2	
DataShare Santa Cruz County	1	
Dientes Community Dental Care	3	Y
Encompass Community Services	1	Y
Families in Transition	3	Y
Family Service Agency	1	Y
First 5 Santa Cruz County	4	
Grey Bears	1	Y
Health Improvement Partnership	3	
hOMe	1	
Homeless Garden Project	1	
Human Care Alliance	1	
Impact Launch	1	
Jane Conklin Consulting	1	
Janus of Santa Cruz	2	Y
Kaki Rusmore Consulting & Possibility Works	1	
MENtors	1	
Monarch Services	2	Y
NAMI Santa Cruz County	2	Y



<b>Organization</b>	<b>Participants per Org</b>	<b>CORE Contractor</b>
Nonprofit Connection Santa Cruz County	1	
Pájaro Valley Prevention & Student Assistance	1	Y
Pájaro Valley Shelter Services	1	
Pájaro Valley Unified School District	3	Y
Positive Discipline Community Resources	3	
Recovery Cafe Santa Cruz	1	
Salud y Cariño	1	
Santa Cruz Community Health	2	Y
Santa Cruz Community Ventures	2	
Santa Cruz County Office of Education	2	
Santa Cruz Museum of Natural History	1	
Santa Cruz Toddler Care Center	1	Y
Sarah Marschall Strategy	1	
Seamster Consulting	1	
Second Harvest Food Bank Santa Cruz County	3	Y
Senior Citizens Legal Services	1	Y
Senior Network Services, Inc.	2	Y
Seniors Council of Santa Cruz & San Benito Counties	2	Y
Sunlight Giving Foundation	1	
Sutter Health	2	
The Diversity Center of Santa Cruz County	2	Y
The Parents Center	3	Y
United Way of Santa Cruz County	2	
Vista Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired	1	Y
Walnut Avenue Family & Women's Center	2	Y
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>67</b> <b>Organizations</b>	<b>135</b> <b>Participants</b>
		<b>27</b> <b>CORE Contractors</b>

### Attachment 3 – Initial Proposed Funding Allocation Methods and Distribution

#### Option 2

Option 2 distributes available funds over three size categories and Table 1 displays how the distribution would be approached. The method proposed is to base the tiers of funding on how the size of awards were allocated in this fiscal year, FY 21-22, by applying the past patterns to the new total recommended dollars for FY 22-23. Since many prior awards were co-funded by the County and the City, the analysis was conducted on total award amount and then distributed within County and City funds relative to how it was done in each jurisdiction in FY 21-22.

<b>Table 1: Option 2</b>	<b>Total Available for Awards</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>County Funds</b>	<b>City Funds</b>
Small (\$5K-\$25K)	\$ 700,416	12%	\$ 607,416	\$ 93,000
Medium (\$25K-\$150K)	\$ 3,514,682	60%	\$ 2,757,682	\$ 757,000
Large (\$150K-\$450K)	\$ 1,618,901	28%	\$ 1,433,901	\$ 185,000
	<b>\$ 5,834,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 4,799,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,035,000</b>

#### Option 3

Table 2 displays analysis that applies award sizes patterns in FY 21-22 to the total recommended dollars for FY 22-23, while moving County only funds proportionally into a deep impact funding area of \$750,000. As in Option 2, the analysis was conducted on total award amount in FY 21-22 and then distributed within County and City funds relative to how it was done in each jurisdiction in FY 21-22.

<b>Table 2: Option 3</b>	<b>Total Available for Awards</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>County Funds</b>	<b>City Funds</b>
Small (\$5K-\$25K)	\$ 605,488	10%	\$ 512,488	\$ 93,000
Medium (\$25K-\$150K)	\$ 3,083,705	53%	\$ 2,326,705	\$ 757,000
Large (\$150K-\$450K)	\$ 1,394,807	24%	\$ 1,209,807	\$ 185,000
Collaborative Impact (\$750K)	\$ 750,000	13%	\$ 750,000	
	<b>\$ 5,834,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 4,799,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,035,000</b>

The final amounts could vary should the funding be modified or proposals differ considerably from past practices.