Document Generated:
Thursday, 10/15/2026,
12:45PM

Austin

THE AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE WILL MEET ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2026 AT 9:30 AM, 301 W. SECOND STREET, AUSTIN, TX AND SOME MEMBERS MAY BE PARTICIPATING VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

Kirk Watson, Chair
Ryan Alter, Vice Chair
Vanessa Fuentes
Jose "Chito" Vela
Marc Duchen
Krista Laine (Alternate)

Public comment will be allowed in person or remotely by telephone. Speakers may only register to speak on an item once either in person or remotely. Items posted for possible action are available for sign-up. Briefings are not open for sign-up. For full instructions on participation in person or by telephone, please visit the Council Committee Information Center home page, which is linked here:
https://www.austintexas.gov/council/council_committee_info_center

A quorum of the City Council may be present at this meeting. Action will only be taken by the members of the committee, and an alternate member may only vote when a regular committee member is absent.

The committee may go into a closed session under the Open Meetings Act, Section 551.071, of the Texas Government Code, to receive advice from legal counsel on any item on this agenda.

CALL TO ORDER

Public Communication: General

Speakers signed up prior to the meeting being called to order will each be allowed three minutes to address their concerns regarding items not posted on the agenda. This section is limited to five speakers.

Approval of Minutes

1. Approve the minutes for the July 16, 2025, and August 19, 2026, meetings of the Audit and Finance Committee.
2. Approve the corrected minutes for the March 27, 2024; July 23, 2024; May 19, 2025; September 17, 2025; October 15, 2025; and January 14, 2026 meetings of the Audit and Finance Committee, and the corrected minutes for the August 5, 2025; October 16, 2025; and February 3, 2026 special called meetings of the Audit and Finance Committee.

Discussion and Possible Action

3. Discussion and possible action regarding bylaw amendments for the Hispanic/Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission and Austin Travis County Food Policy Board.

   Sponsors: Mayor Kirk Watson, and Council Member Ryan Alter

4. Discussion and possible action to set the Audit and Finance Committee meeting dates for calendar year 2027.

   Sponsors: Mayor Kirk Watson, and Council Member Ryan Alter

5. Discussion and possible action on the City Auditor's calendar year 2027 Audit Plan.

   Sponsors: Mayor Kirk Watson, and Council Member Ryan Alter

Briefings

6. Briefing on City's Redevelopment and Public Facilities Portfolio, including Colony Park, St. John Site, Northeast Service Center, and Public Safety Headquarters; and Real Estate and Asset Strategy [Mandy DeMayo, Real Estate and Asset Strategy Officer; Kim Olivares, Director - Austin Financial Services]

   Sponsors: Mayor Kirk Watson, and Council Member Ryan Alter

7. Briefing on social services strategy that will include issue area, compliance, and policy discussion. [Stephanie Hayden-Howard, Assistant City Manager - City Manager's Office; Kerri Lang, Director; Daniel Culotta, Assistant Director - Austin Budget and Organizational Excellence] ***Sponsors:*** Mayor Kirk Watson, and Council Member Ryan Alter

8. Briefing on Living Wages Audit, which looks at whether departments are monitoring their contracts to ensure compliance with the living wage requirements. [Kathie Harrison, Assistant City Auditor; Mateo Macias, Senior Auditor - Austin City Auditor's Office]

   Sponsors: Mayor Kirk Watson, and Council Member Ryan Alter

Future Items

9. Identify items to discuss at future meetings.

Previously Distributed Memos to Mayor and Council (Information only; not for discussion)

Social Services Agreement Evaluation and Reset Update (Resolution No. 20260812-022) dated September 24, 2026

ADJOURN

The City of Austin is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications will be provided upon request.

For assistance, please call 512-974-2210 or TTY users route through 711.

AUDIT AND FINACE COMMITTEE MEETING
July 16, 2025

Committee Members Present:

1. Kirk Watson, Chair
2. Ryan Alter, Vice Chair
3. Marc Duchen
4. Jose Vela

Committee Members Absent:

1. Vanessa Fuentes

Call to Order

Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Public Communication: General

There was one speaker.

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approve the minutes of the May 19, 2025, Special Called Audit and Finance Committee Meeting.**
   The minutes of the May 19, 2025, Special Called Audit and Finance Committee were approved. The motion was made by Council Member Alter and seconded by Council Member Vela. The motion was passed on a 4 – 0 vote.

Briefings

2. **Draft sunset review process and update on actions taken relevant to Council Resolution 20241212-133 regarding review of and recommendations to improve the clarity of purpose and efficient operation of current boards and commissions, task forces, council corporations, and intergovernmental bodies.**

   The committee Received a briefing from Stephanie Hall, Assistant to the City Clerk of the Office of the City Clerk and Jessica Ferrari, Assistant to the City Manager of Management Services.

3. **Update on City's Public Facilities Corporation and projects.**
   The committee received a briefing from Kim Olivares, Director of the Financial Services department.

Future Items

4. **Identify items to discuss at future meetings.**
   - Mayor Watson discussed the Special Called Meeting on July 22, 2025, geared towards budget items and for Tax Rate Election
   - Building on the efforts of the City Manager's KPI

Mayor Watson adjourned the committee meeting at 10:30 a.m.

DRAFT

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2656, **Agenda Item #:** 1. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Approve the minutes for the July 16, 2025, and August 19, 2026, meetings of the Audit and Finance Committee.

powered by Legistar™

SPECIAL CALLED AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

August 5, 2025

Committee Members Present:

1. **Mayor Kirk Watson**
2. **Council Member Alter**
3. **Council Member Fuentes**
4. **Council Member Vela**
5. **Council Member Duchen**

Committee Members Absent:

None

Call to Order

Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Public Communication: General

Zenobia Joseph

Discussion and Possible Action

Recommendation of a tax rate election and certifying conditions for the election.

The Audit & Finance Committee approved making a recommendation to City Council that a Tax Rate Election be conducted. The motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Fuentes and seconded by Council Member Alter. The motion passed on a 5 – 0 vote.

Future Items

Identify items to discuss at future meetings.

No items identified

Mayor Watson adjourned the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

DRAFT

AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 27, 2024

Committee Members Present:

1. **Council Member Alison Alter**
2. **Council Member Leslie Pool**
3. **Council Member Ryan Alter**
4. **Council Member Vanessa Fuentes**

Committee Members Absent:

1. **Council Member Mackenzie Kelly**

Call to Order

Council Member Alison Alter called the committee meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Public Communication: General

None

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meeting of January 24, 2024.**

   The minutes of the January 24, 2024 Audit and Finance Committee meeting were approved on Council Member Ryan Alter's motion, and Council Member Pool's second, on a 3-0 vote with Council Members Kelly and Fuentes off the dais.

Briefings

2. **Update regarding the results from the Animal Service Audit that was presented in September 2023.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Don Bland, Animal Services Office and Stephanie Hayden-Howard, Management Services.

3. **The Citywide Ethics Assessment which assessed the effectiveness of the City's Ethics and Compliance program.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Patrick Johnson, Office of the City Auditor and Ed Van Eenoo, Financial Services Department.

4. **The Austin Energy Vulnerable Registry Audit which evaluated Austin Energy's registry for the medically vulnerable.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Henry Katumwa, Office of the City Auditor and Kerry Overton, Austin Energy.

5. **Updates to the SBE/Local Preference Program and its application to professional service procurements.**

   The Committee received a briefing from James Scarboro, Financial Services Department and Edward Campos, Small and Minority Business Resources.

DRAFT

6. **Fleet Management and Optimization update and related Austin Climate Equity Plan goals.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Jennifer Walls and Rick Harland, Fleet Services Department.

Future Items

7. **Identify items to discuss at future meetings.**

   Pensions Actuarial Audit, External Audit, Single Audit, Audit Recommendations Report, Integrity Unit Update, City Criminal Background Investigation Audit, and Boards, Commissions by-laws and 911 Special Report.

Briefings

8. **Update on MBE/WBE Procurement Program.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Edward Campos, Small and Minority Business Resources.

Chair Alison Alter adjourned the meeting at 11:21 a.m.

DRAFT

SPECIAL CALLED
AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
February 3, 2026

Committee Members Present:

1. Kirk Watson, Chair
2. Ryan Alter, Vice Chair
3. Jose "Cbito" Vela, Mayor Pro Tern - Virtual
4. Marc Duchen
5. Vanessa Fuentes

Additional Council Members Present:

1. T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Call to Order

Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Public Communication: General

There were no speakers

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meeting of January 14, 2026.**

The minutes of January 14, 2026, Audit and Finance Committee meeting were requested to be approved at the next Audit and Finance meeting.

Discussion and Possible Action

2. **Discussion and possible action regarding a framework for developing a general obligation bond program.**

The Audit and Finance Committee approved recommending version two of the Bond Decision Tree to the full council. The motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Vela and seconded by Vice-Chair Alter. The motion passed on a 5 – 0 vote.

Briefings

3. **Briefing on status of remaining General Obligation bond funds.**

The committee received a briefing from Kim Olivares, Director of Financial Services.

Future Items

4. **Identify items to discuss at future meetings.**

Mayor Kirk Watson adjourned the committee meeting at 2:27 p.m.

DRAFT

AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 14, 2026

Committee Members Present:

1. Kirk Watson, Chair
2. Ryan Alter, Vice Chair
3. Jose "Chito" Vela, Mayor Pro Tem
4. Marc Duchen- Virtual
5. Vanessa Fuentes

Additional Council Members Present:

1. Krista Laine
2. Paige Ellis

City Executives Present:

1. T.C. Broadnax, City Manager

Call to Order

Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Public Communication: General

There was one Speaker

Approval of Minutes

1. Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meeting of December 3, 2025.

The minutes of December 3, 2025, Audit and Finance Committee meeting were approved on Mayor Watson's motion, Council Member Vela's second on a 5-0 vote.

Discussion and Possible Action

2. **Discussion and possible action regarding bond programs.**

3. Discussion and possible action regarding establishing an officeholder expense policy.

The Committee and additional Council Members discussed the Mayor and Council Office Expense and Spending Policy. The Committee recommended adoption of the proposed policy, with the full Council retaining the opportunity to offer amendments at the January 22, 2026, Council Meeting. The motion was made by Council Member Fuentes and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Vela. The motion passed on a 5-0 vote.

4. Discussion and possible action regarding establishing a Comprehensive Efficiency Assessment for the City.

The committee received a presentation from Jason Hadavi, City Auditor.

Briefings

5. Fiscal Year 2024-2025 financial report.

The committee received a briefing from Kerri Lang, Director of Office of Budget and Organizational Excellence

DRAFT

6. **Update on debt capacity calculations regarding 2026 bonds.**
The committee received a briefing from Kim Olivares, Director of Financial Services.

7. **Audit on speed reduction efforts.**
The committee received a briefing from Sam Socolow, Auditor of the City Auditor's Office

Future Items

8. Identify items to discuss at future meetings.

Previously Distributed Memos to Mayor and Council (Information only; not for discussion)

- Mueller Master Development Agreement Assignment Update memo dated December 10, 2025.
- Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Amended Budget memo dated December 29, 2025.
- Additional Information on 2025 FEMA Reimbursements memo dated December 30, 2025.

Mayor Kirk Watson adjourned the committee meeting at 12:50 p.m.

DRAFT

DRAFT

AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

July 23, 2024

Committee Members Present:

1. **Council Member Alison Alter**
2. **Council Member Mackenzie Kelly (virtual)**
3. **Council Member Ryan Alter**
4. **Council Member Vanessa Fuentes**

Committee Members Absent:

1. **Council Member Pool**

Call to Order

Council Member Alison Alter called the committee meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Public Communication: General

There were 5 speakers.

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meeting of May 22, 2024.**

   The minutes of the May 22, 2024, Audit and Finance Committee meeting were approved on Council Member Ryan Alter's motion, and Council Member Fuentes' second, on a 4-0 vote with Council Member Pool off the dais.

Briefings

2. **Homelessness Assistance Follow-up Audit.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Ashley Diaz, Office of the City Auditor; and David Gray, Homeless Strategy Office.

3. **Sensitive Data Audit.**

   Item 3 Briefing taken up in Executive Session during Item 5.

4. **Proposed bylaw amendments for the Resource Management Commission and the Joint Inclusion Committee.**

   The Committee received a briefing from Stephanie Hall, City Clerk's Office; Clark Cornwell, City Law Department; and Larry Graham, Texas Gas Service.

   The proposed bylaw amendments for the Joint Inclusion Committee were approved and sent to Council. The motion was made by Council Member Ryan Alter and seconded by Council Member Kelly. The motion passed on a 3 – 0 vote, with Council Members Pool and Fuentes off the dais.

   Proposed bylaw amendments for the Resource Management Commission item was postponed to the next Audit and Finance Committee meeting.

DRAFT

Executive Session

5. **Discuss findings and recommendations for an audit of the City's handling of sensitive data (Security Audit - Sections 551.076 and 551.089 of the Texas Government Code)**

Item was discussed in the Executive Session.

Discussion and Possible Action

7. **Discussion and possible action regarding a comprehensive climate implementation program and comprehensive bond package program for a general obligation bond election to occur no later than November 2026, including direction regarding the formation of a Bond Election Advisory Task Force.**

The Committee received a briefing from James Snow, Capital Delivery Services; Zach Baumer, Office of Sustainability.

Future Items

6. **Identify items to discuss at future meetings.**

No discussion

Chair Alter adjourned the meeting at 11:31 a.m.

DRAFT

SPECIAL CALLED AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES
MAY 19, 2025

Committee Members Present:

1. **Mayor Kirk Watson**
2. **Council Member Alter**
3. **Council Member Fuentes**
4. **Council Member Vela**
5. **Council Member Duchen**

Call to Order

Chair Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Public Communication: General

Kevin Welch, & McKenzie Rhine

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meeting of April 16, 2025, and the Special Called Audit and Finance Committee meetings of April 28, 2025, and May 6, 2025.**

The minutes of the Audit & Finance Committee meeting of April 16, 2025, and Special Called Audit & Finance Committee meetings of April 28, 2025, and May 6, 2025, were approved. The motion was made by Council Member Alter and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Fuentes. The motion passed on a 5 – 0 vote.

Discussion and Possible Action

2. Selection of the recruitment firm for the City Auditor recruitment process.

The Audit & Finance Committee nominates Ralph Anderson and Associates as the recruitment firm for the City Auditor recruitment process. The motion was made by Council Member Alter and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Fuentes. The motion passed on a 5 – 0 vote.

Briefings

3. Proposed changes to the City of Austin Financial Policies for Fiscal Year 2026

The Committee received a briefing from Kerri Lang, Director- Budget and Organizational Excellence.

4. Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation (DHR) investigations audit

The Committee received a briefing from Mariel Dempster, Senior Auditor - Office of the City Auditor.

5. Audit of APD License Plate Reader Program

The Committee received a briefing from Jake Perry, Senior Auditor - Office of the City Auditor.

6. Audit of Identity and Access Management

The Committee received a briefing from Tyler Myers, Supervising Senior Auditor - Office of the City Auditor.

7. City Auditor recruitment process

The Committee received a briefing from Rebecca Kennedy, Department Director - Human Recourses Department.

DRAFT

Executive Session

8. **Audit of Identity and Access Management (Security Personnel, Security Devices, or a Security Audit - Section 551.056 of the Government Code)**
   The Committee discussed security audit matters related to item #6.

Identify Future Items

Identify items to discuss at future meetings.

No Items identified.

Chair Mayor Watson adjourned the meeting at 11:39 a.m.

DRAFT

SPECIAL CALLED AUDIT AND FINACE COMMITTEE MEETING

October 16, 2025

Committee Members Present:

1. Kirk Watson, Chair
2. Ryan Alter, Vice Chair- Virtual
3. Marc Duchen
4. Vanessa Fuentes

Committee Members Absent:

1. Jose Vela

Call to Order

Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Public Communication: General

No Speakers

Discussion and Possible Action

1. Discussion and possible recommendation to Council regarding candidates to interview for City Auditor

   The committee recommends the following three people to be interviewed by the city Council on Tuesday October 21, 2025. Spencer Bright of Seattle Washington, Certus George of New York City, and Jason Hadavi of Austin Texas. Motion by Mayor Pro Tem Fuentes and Second by Council Member Duchen. The motion passed on a 4 – 0 vote with Council Member Vela off the dais.

Executive Session

2. Discuss personnel issues related to the appointment of a new City Auditor. (Personnel matters - Section 551.074 of the Government Code).

Mayor Watson adjourned the committee meeting at 10:47 a.m.

DRAFT

AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
September 17, 2025

Committee Members Present:

1. **Council Member Alter**
2. **Council Member Fuentes**
3. **Council Member Vela**
4. **Council Member Duchen**

Committee Members Absent:

1. **Mayor Watson**

Call to Order

Vice Chair Alter called the committee meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Public Communication: General

There was one speaker

Approval of Minutes

1. **Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meeting of August 20,2025.**

   The minutes of the August 20, 2025, Audit and Finance Committee meetings were approved on Council Member Fuentes' motion, and Council Member Duchen's second with no objection, on a 4-0 vote.

Discussion and Possible Action

2. **Discussion and possible action on proposed bylaws for the Community Police Review Commission and proposed bylaw amendments for the Commission on Aging and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Quality of Life Advisory Commission Stephanie Hall, Assistant City Clerk - Office of the City Clerk.**

   The proposed bylaws for the Community Police Review commission and the Commission on Aging and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Quality of Life Advisory Commission were approved and sent to Council. The motion was made by Council Member Vela and seconded by Council Member Fuentes. The motion passed on a 4 – 0 vote.

Briefings

3. **Audit of Lobbyist compliance with City Code**

   The committee received a briefing from Mateo Macias, Senior Auditor of the Office of the City Auditor.

4. **Audit of Austin Resource Recovery's recycling and composting education efforts.**

The committee received a briefing from Kathie Harrison, Acting Assistant City Auditor – Office of the City Auditor.

5. **Update on City of Austin redevelopment projects.**

DRAFT

The committee received a briefing from Kim Olivares, Director; Christine Maguire, Division Manager - Financial Services Department.

Future Items

6. **Identify items to discuss at future meetings.**

Previously Distributed Memos to Mayor and Council (Information only; not for discussion)

- **City of Austin Chevy Blazer Electric Police Pursuit Vehicle Pilot Program memo dated August 20, 2025 [Jennifer Walls, Director - Fleet Mobility Services Department].**
- **Fitch Upgrade of the City of Austin's Credit Rating to 'AAA' memo dated September 2, 2025 [Kimberly Olivares, Director - Financial Services Department].**

Vice Chair Alter adjourned the meeting at 11:11 a.m.

DRAFT

DRAFT

AUDIT AND FINACE COMMITTEE MEETING
October 15, 2025

Committee Members Present:

1. Kirk Watson, Chair
2. Ryan Alter, Vice Chair
3. Marc Duchen
4. Jose "Chito" Vela

Call to Order

Mayor Watson called the committee meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Public Communication: General

There was one speaker

Approval of Minutes

1. Approve the minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meetings of September 17, 2025 and October 14, 2025.
   The Minutes of the Audit and Finance Committee meetings of September 17, 2025 and October 14,2025 were approved on Council Member Vela's motion, Council Member Duchen 's second on a 4-0 vote.

Discussion and Possible Action

2. Discussion and possible action regarding setting the Audit & Finance Committee meeting dates for calendar year 2026.
   The committee received an overview on the 2026 CY Meeting Dates by Jason Hadavi, Deputy City Auditor - Office of the City Auditor.
   The committee approved the proposed Audit & Finance Committee 2026 Calendar. The motion was made by Council Member Alter and seconded by Council Member Vela, on a 4 – 0 vote.

3. Discussion and possible action on the calendar year 2026 Audit Plan.
   The committee received an overview on the 2026 Audit Plan by Jason Hadavi, Deputy City Auditor- Office of the City Auditor.
   The committee approved the calendar year 2026 Audit Plan. The motion was made by Council Member Duchen and seconded by Council Member Alter. The motion passed on a 4-0 vote.

4. Draft sunset review process and update on actions taken relevant to Council Resolution 20241212-133 regarding review of and recommendations to improve the clarity of purpose and efficient operation of current boards and commissions, task forces, council corporations, and intergovernmental bodies.
   The Committee received an update by Stephanie Hall, Assistant City Clerk- Office of the City Clerk; Jessica Ferrari, Assistant to the City Manager - Management Services.

5. Discussion and possible action regarding the re-appointment of Dr. Michael Granof to the Austin Police Retirement System board.
   The committee recommends reappointment of Dr. Michael Granof to the Austin Police Retirement System Board. The motion was made by Council Member Alter and seconded by Council Member Vela. The motion passed on a 4 – 0 vote.

6. Discussion and possible action regarding candidates for the Austin Firefighters Retirement Fund Board of Trustees.
   The committee recommends appointing to Gia Lee to the Austin Firefighters Retirement Fund Board of Trustees. The motion was made by Council Member Duchen and seconded by Council Member Alter. The motion passed on a 4 – 0 vote.

7. Discussion and possible action regarding the re-appointment of Dick Lavine to the City of Austin Employees Retirement System board.
   The committee recommends reappointment of Dick Lavine to the City of Austin Employees Retirement System Board. The motion was made by Council Member Alter and seconded by Council Member Duchin. The motion passed on a 4 – 0 vote.

Briefings

8. City Auditor's Integrity Unit annual report. [Brian Molloy, Chief of Investigations-Office of the City Auditor].

Executive Session

9. Discussion regarding candidates for appointments to retirement system boards. [Personnel matters - Section 551.074 of the Texas Government Code).

Future Items

10. Identify items to be discussed at future meetings.

    Beginning January 2026, we will be including any bond election updates to the Audit and Finance Committee

Mayor Watson adjourned the committee meeting at 10:30 a.m.

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2657, **Agenda Item #:** 2. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Approve the corrected minutes for the March 27, 2024; July 23, 2024; May 19, 2025; September 17, 2025; October 15, 2025; and January 14, 2026 meetings of the Audit and Finance Committee, and the corrected minutes for the August 5, 2025; October 16, 2025; and February 3, 2026 special called meetings of the Audit and Finance Committee.

powered by Legistar™

BYLAWS OF THE
Austin Travis County Food Policy Board

ARTICLE 1. NAME.

The name of the board is Austin Travis County Food Policy Board.

ARTICLE 2. PURPOSE AND DUTIES.

The purpose and duties of the board are as follows: to serve as an advisory body to the City Council and Travis County Commissioners Court concerning the need to improve the availability of safe, nutritious, locally, and sustainably-grown food at reasonable prices for all residents, particularly those in need, by coordinating the relevant activities of city and county government, as well as nonprofit organizations, and food and farming businesses. The Board shall: (1) monitor the availability, price and quality of food throughout the Austin and Travis County area; (2) collect data on the food security (i.e., access to an affordable, diversified local food supply) and the nutritional status of city residents; (3) inform city and county policy makers, administrators, and the public at large about the status of the region's food system and food security; (4) monitor and analyze the administration of city and county food and nutrition programs; (5) explore new means for the city and county to improve the local food economy, the availability, sustainability, accessibility, and quality of food and our environment, and assist city and county departments in the coordination of their efforts; (6) review availability and recommend measures to promote the preservation of agricultural land in the City of Austin and Travis County; and (7) recommend to the city and county adoption of measures that will improve existing local food production and add new programs, incentives, projects, regulations, or services.

ARTICLE 3. MEMBERSHIP.

(A) The board is composed of thirteen members. Seven members are appointed by the city council. Six members are appointed by the Travis County Commissioners Court.

(B) Seven members serve at the pleasure of the City Council; six members serve at the pleasure of the Travis County Commissioners Court.

(C) City-appointed board members serve for a term of four years beginning March 1st on the year of ~~3~~6 appointment. County-appointed board members serve for a term of ~~two~~ four years beginning ~~in February~~ March 1st of the year of appointment.

(D) An individual board member may not act in an official capacity or speak on behalf of the board except through the action of a majority of the board in which the board identifies who is authorized to speak and identifies the actions the individual board member is authorized to take or topics on which the individual board member is entitled to speak.

(E) A board member who is absent for three consecutive regular meetings or one-third of all regular meetings in a “rolling” twelve month timeframe automatically vacates the member’s position subject to the holdover provisions in Section 2-1-27 of the City Code. This does not apply to an absence due to illness or injury of the board member, an illness or injury of a board member’s

immediate family member, active military service, or the birth or adoption of the board member's child for 90 days after the event. The board member must notify the staff liaison of the reason for the absence not later than the date of the next regular meeting of the board. Failure to notify the liaison before the next regular meeting of the board will result in an unexcused absence.

(F) At each meeting, each board member shall sign an attendance sheet (or if participating virtually via videoconference, send an email as provided by City Code Section 2-1-24(D)) which indicates that the member does not have a conflict of interest with any item on that agenda, or identifies each agenda item on which the member has a conflict of interest. Failure to sign the sheet results in the member being counted as absent and his/her votes are not counted.

(G) A member who seeks to resign from the board shall submit a written resignation to the chair of the board, the staff liaison, or the city clerk's office. If possible, the resignation should allow for a thirty day notice so the city council can appoint a replacement.

ARTICLE 4. OFFICERS.

(A) The officers of the board shall consist of a chair and a vice-chair.

(B) Officers shall be elected annually by a majority vote of the board at the first regular meeting after April 1st. In the event a current officer becomes ineligible to serve as an officer, the board may hold an emergency election as needed.

(C) The term of office shall be one year, beginning May 1st and ending April 30th. An officer may continue to serve until a successor is elected. A person may not serve as an officer in a designated position of a board for more than four consecutive one-year terms. A person who has served as an officer in a designated position of a board for four consecutive terms is not eligible for re-election to that designated office until the expiration of two years after the last date of the person's service in that office. The board may override the term limit provision for an officer by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the authorized board members.

(D) A member may not hold more than one office at a time.

ARTICLE 5. DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

(A) The chair shall preside at board meetings, appoint all committees, represent the board at ceremonial functions and approve each final meeting agenda as provided in Article 6(A).

(B) In the absence of the chair, the vice-chair shall perform all duties of the chair.

ARTICLE 6. AGENDAS.

(A) Two or more board members may place an item on the agenda by oral or written request to the staff liaison at least seven business days before the meeting. After first consulting with and receiving input from the staff liaison, the chair shall approve each final meeting agenda prior to posting,

except that posting language may be adjusted in order to ensure compliance with Government Code Chapter 551 (Open Meetings Act).

(B) The board liaison shall submit the meeting agenda through the online agenda posting system for each meeting not less than the 4th business day before the scheduled meeting date.

(C) Posting of the agenda must comply with Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

ARTICLE 7. MEETINGS.

(A) The board meetings shall comply with Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

(B) Board meetings shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

(C) The board may not conduct a closed meeting without the approval of the city attorney.

(D) The board shall meet t at least 8 times a year. In November of each year, the board shall adopt a schedule of the meetings for the upcoming year, including makeup meeting dates for the holidays and cancelled meetings.

(E) The chair may call a special meeting, and the chair shall call a special meeting if requested by three or more members. The call shall state the purpose of the meeting. A board may not call a meeting in addition to its regular scheduled meetings as identified in its adopted meeting schedule, more often than once a quarter, unless the meeting is required to comply with a statutory deadline or a deadline established by Council.

(F) Seven members constitute a quorum.

(G) If a quorum for a meeting does not convene within one-half hour of the posted time for the meeting, then the meeting may not be held.

(H) To be effective, a board action must be adopted by an affirmative vote of the number of members necessary to provide a quorum.

(I) The chair has the same voting privilege as any other member.

(J) The board shall allow members of the public to address the board on agenda items and during a period of time set aside for public communications on non-agenda items. The chair shall allow a speaker to speak for no less than two minutes per agenda item and for three minutes on a non-agenda item.

(K) The staff liaison shall prepare the board minutes. The minutes of each board meeting must include the vote of each member on each item before the board and indicate whether a member is absent or failed to vote on an item.

(L) The city clerk shall retain agendas, approved minutes, internal review reports and bylaws. Austin Climate Action and Resilience shall retain all other board documents. The documents are public records under Texas Local Government Code Chapter 552 (Texas Public Information Act).

(M) The chair shall adjourn a meeting not later than 10 p.m., unless the board votes to continue the meeting.

(N) Each person and board member attending a board meeting should observe decorum pursuant to Section 2-1-48 of the City Code.

ARTICLE 8. COMMITTEES/WORKING GROUPS.

COMMITTEES

(A) Each committee must be established by an affirmative vote of the board. A committee cannot meet until its creation is approved by the Council Audit and Finance Committee. Each committee shall consist of at least three board members appointed by the chair. A staff member shall be assigned to each committee by the director of Austin Climate Action and Resilience.

(B) The board chair shall appoint a board member as the committee chair, with the member's consent.

(C) A majority of the total number of appointed committee members constitutes a quorum.

(D) Each committee shall meet on a regularly scheduled basis at least quarterly.

(E) Each committee shall make an annual report to the board at the January board meeting.

(F) Committee meetings must be posted in accordance with Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

(G) At each committee meeting, a committee member shall sign in on a sheet provided (or if participating virtually via videoconference, send an email as provided by City Code Section 2-1-24(D)) and shall indicate that the member has no conflict of interest with any item on the committee meeting agenda, or identify each agenda item on which the member has a conflict of interest.

(H) The Austin Travis County Food Policy Board currently has no committees.

WORKING GROUPS

(A) The board can determine the size of a working group but the number of board members serving on the working group must be less than a quorum of the board.

(B) A working group may designate a chair, with the member's consent, but is not required to do so.

(C) Quorum requirements do not apply to working groups.

(D) Staff support will not be provided for working groups.

(E) Working groups are not required to post their meetings in accordance with the Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

ARTICLE 9. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY.

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the board in all cases to which they are applicable, except when inconsistent with these bylaws or with special rules of procedure which the board or city council may adopt.

ARTICLE 10. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS.

A bylaw amendment is not effective unless approved by Council after review by the Council Audit and Finance Committee.

The bylaws were approved by the Austin Travis County Food Policy Board at their meeting held on February 11, 2016. *The bylaws were revised in accordance with Ordinance 20251120-008 on March 26, 2026.*

Amanda Rohlich
Food Policy Advisor, Staff Liaison
Austin Climate Action and Resilience

BYLAWS OF THE
Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission

ARTICLE 1. NAME.

The name of the board is the Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission.

ARTICLE 2. PURPOSE AND DUTIES.

The purpose and duties of the board are as follows:

The commission shall advise the City Council on issues relating to the quality of life for the City's Hispanic/Latino community and shall recommend programs and policies designed to alleviate any inequities that may confront Hispanics and Latinos in social, economic, and vocational pursuits including education, youth services, housing and community development, cultural arts, economic development, health, ~~civic engagement and transportation.~~ civic engagement, public safety, and transportation.

ARTICLE 3. MEMBERSHIP.

(A) The board is composed of eleven members appointed by the city council.

(B) A member serves at the pleasure of the city council.

(C) Board members serve for a term of four years beginning March 1st on the year of appointment.

(D) An individual board member may not act in an official capacity or speak on behalf of the board except through the action of a majority of the board in which the board identifies who is authorized to speak and identifies the actions the individual board member is authorized to take or topics on which the individual board member is entitled to speak.

(E) A board member who is absent for three consecutive regular meetings or one-third of all regular meetings in a "rolling" twelve month timeframe automatically vacates the member's position subject to the holdover provisions in Section 2-1-27 of the City Code. This does not apply to an absence due to illness or injury of the board member, an illness or injury of a board member's immediate family member, active military service, or the birth or adoption of the board member's child for 90 days after the event. The board member must notify the staff liaison of the reason for the absence not later than the date of the next regular meeting of the board. Failure to notify the liaison before the next regular meeting of the board will result in an unexcused absence.

(F) At each meeting, each board member shall sign an attendance sheet (or if participating virtually via videoconference, send an email as provided by City Code Section 2-1-24(D)) which indicates that the member does not have a conflict of interest with any item on that agenda, or identifies each

agenda item on which the member has a conflict of interest. Failure to sign the sheet results in the member being counted as absent and his/her votes are not counted.

(G) A member who seeks to resign from the board shall submit a written resignation to the chair of the board, the staff liaison, or the city clerk's office. If possible, the resignation should allow for a thirty day notice so the city council can appoint a replacement.

ARTICLE 4. OFFICERS.

(A) The officers of the board shall consist of a chair and a vice-chair.

(B) Officers shall be elected annually by a majority vote of the board at the first regular meeting after April 1st. In the event a current officer becomes ineligible to serve as an officer, the board may hold an emergency election as needed.

(C) The term of office shall be one year, beginning May 1st and ending April 30th. An officer may continue to serve until a successor is elected. A person may not serve as an officer in a designated position of a board for more than four consecutive one-year terms. A person who has served as an officer in a designated position of a board for four consecutive terms is not eligible for re-election to that designated office until the expiration of two years after the last date of the person's service in that office. The board may override the term limit provision for an officer by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the authorized board members.

(D) A member may not hold more than one office at a time.

ARTICLE 5. DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

(A) The chair shall preside at board meetings, appoint all committees, represent the board at ceremonial functions and approve each final meeting agenda as provided in Article 6(A).

(B) In the absence of the chair, the vice-chair shall perform all duties of the chair.

ARTICLE 6. AGENDAS.

(A) Two or more board members may place an item on the agenda by oral or written request to the staff liaison at least seven business days before the meeting. After first consulting with and receiving input from the staff liaison, the chair shall approve each final meeting agenda prior to posting, except that posting language may be adjusted in order to ensure compliance with Government Code Chapter 551 (Open Meetings Act).

(B) The board liaison shall submit the meeting agenda through the online agenda posting system for each meeting not less than the 4th business day before the scheduled meeting date.

(C) Posting of the agenda must comply with Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

ARTICLE 7. MEETINGS.

(A) The board meetings shall comply with Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

(B) Board meetings shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

(C) The board may not conduct a closed meeting without the approval of the city attorney.

(D) The board shall meet monthly. In November of each year, the board shall adopt a schedule of the meetings for the upcoming year, including makeup meeting dates for the holidays and cancelled meetings.

(E) The chair may call a special meeting, and the chair shall call a special meeting if requested by three or more members. The call shall state the purpose of the meeting. A board may not call a meeting in addition to its regular scheduled meetings as identified in its adopted meeting schedule, more often than once a quarter, unless the meeting is required to comply with a statutory deadline or a deadline established by Council.

(F) Six members constitute a quorum.

(G) If a quorum for a meeting does not convene within one-half hour of the posted time for the meeting, then the meeting may not be held.

(H) To be effective, a board action must be adopted by an affirmative vote of the number of members necessary to provide a quorum.

(I) The chair has the same voting privilege as any other member.

(J) The board shall allow members of the public to address the board on agenda items and during a period of time set aside for public communications on non-agenda items. The chair shall allow a speaker to speak for no less than two minutes per agenda item and for three minutes on a non-agenda item.

(K) The staff liaison shall prepare the board minutes. The minutes of each board meeting must include the vote of each member on each item before the board and indicate whether a member is absent or failed to vote on an item.

(L) The city clerk shall retain agendas, approved minutes, internal review reports and bylaws. The City Clerk's Office shall retain all other board documents. The documents are public records under Texas Local Government Code Chapter 552 (Texas Public Information Act).

(M) The chair shall adjourn a meeting not later than 10 p.m., unless the board votes to continue the meeting.

(N) Each person and board member attending a board meeting should observe decorum pursuant to Section 2-1-48 of the City Code.

ARTICLE 8. COMMITTEES/WORKING GROUPS.

COMMITTEES

(A) Each committee must be established by an affirmative vote of the board. A committee cannot meet until its creation is approved by the Council Audit and Finance Committee. Each committee shall consist of at least three board members appointed by the chair. A staff member shall be assigned to each committee by the City Manager's Office.

(B) The board chair shall appoint a board member as the committee chair, with the member's consent.

(C) A majority of the total number of appointed committee members constitutes a quorum.

(D) Each committee shall meet on a regularly scheduled basis at least quarterly.

(E) Each committee shall make an annual report to the board at the January board meeting.

(F) Committee meetings must be posted in accordance with Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

(G) At each committee meeting, a committee member shall sign in on a sheet provided (or if participating virtually via videoconference, send an email as provided by City Code Section 2-1-24(D)) and shall indicate that the member has no conflict of interest with any item on the committee meeting agenda, or identify each agenda item on which the member has a conflict of interest.

(H) The Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission currently has no committees.

WORKING GROUPS

(A) The board can determine the size of a working group but the number of board members serving on the working group must be less than a quorum of the board.

(B) A working group may designate a chair, with the member's consent, but is not required to do so.

(C) Quorum requirements do not apply to working groups.

(D) Staff support will not be provided for working groups.

(E) Working groups are not required to post their meetings in accordance with the Texas Government Code Chapter 551 (Texas Open Meetings Act).

ARTICLE 9. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY.

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order shall govern the board in all cases to which they are applicable, except when inconsistent with these bylaws or with special rules of procedure which the board or city council may adopt.

ARTICLE 10. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS.

A bylaw amendment is not effective unless approved by Council after review by the Council Audit and Finance Committee.

The bylaws were approved by the Hispanic/Latino Quality of Life Advisory Board at their meeting held on February 11, 2016.

The bylaws were revised in accordance with Ordinance 20251120-008 on January 20, 2026.

The bylaws were amended by the Hispanic/Latino Quality of Life Advisory Board at their meeting held on July 28, 2026.

_____ _____

(Signature of Executive or Staff Liaison) *(Insert – Title -- Executive or Staff Liaison)*

PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENTS - October 2026			
NAME OF BOARD	**PROPOSED AMENDMENT**	**BUSINESS JUSTIFICATION PROVIDED BY THE COMMISSION**	**STAFF COMMENTS**
Hispanic/Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission	Edit Bylaws Article 2 Purpose and Duties - add "public safety" to read as: The purpose of the board is to advise the City Council on issues relating to the quality of life for the City's Hispanic/Latino community and shall recommend programs and policies designed to alleviate any inequities that may confront Hispanics and Latinos in social, economic, and vocational pursuits including education, youth services, housing and community development, cultural arts, economic development, health, civic engagement, public safety, and transportation.	Adding public safety to the commission's purpose would formally recognize equitable access to public safety resources as essential to the quality of life for Austin's Hispanic/Latino community, codifying the Commission's existing oversight of interactions with law enforcement and closing a gap in its current enumerated duties.	Staff has no concern with the proposed edit. If this proposed amendment is recommended, an ordinance would be necessary to amend City Code § 2-1-146
Edit Bylaws Article 3 Membership (C) - edit the term of County appointed board members to four years beginning March 1st of the year of appointment.	Edit Bylaws Article 3 Membership (C) - udpate the term of County appointed board members to four years beginning March 1st of the year of appointment.	These are recommendations approved by Travis County and Board to streamline and align the term limits more closely with the City appointments.	Staff supports the proposed amendments.

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2658, **Agenda Item #:** 3. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Discussion and possible action regarding bylaw amendments for the Hispanic/Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission and Austin Travis County Food Policy Board.

Lead Department

Austin City Clerk.

powered by Legistar™

2027 PROPOSED MEETING DATES
AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Date: October 21, 2026

Agenda Item: Item 4

Audit and Finance Committee Proposed Meeting Dates:

January 20, 2027 at 09:30AM

February 17, 2027 at 09:30AM

March 10, 2027 at 09:30AM

April 14, 2027 at 09:30AM

May 12, 2027 at 09:30AM

July 14, 2027 at 09:30AM

August 18, 2027 at 09:30AM

September 15, 2027 at 09:30AM

October 13, 2027 at 09:30AM

November 10, 2027 at 09:30AM

December 1, 2027 at 09:30AM

Sponsors/Department:

Sponsors: Mayor Kirk Watson and Council Member Ryan Alter

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2659, **Agenda Item #:** 4. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Discussion and possible action to set the Audit and Finance Committee meeting dates for calendar year 2027.

powered by Legistar™



Austin City Auditor's Office | 2027 Audit Plan

New Audits | 2027

	Audit Topic	Objective(s)
1	Artificial Intelligence	Does Austin have effective governance in place to protect the City's information from risks associated with the adoption and use of artificial intelligence?
2	Facilities Management	Are Austin departments using office space efficiently to support effective operations?
3	Access to City Services: Parks Availability	Are Austin's park facilities and programs available for members of the public?
4	Police Oversight	Is Austin Police Oversight effectively providing impartial oversight of police conduct to enhance accountability and transparency for the community?
5	Noise and Sound Complaints	Are Austin's enforcement efforts responsive to citizen complaints about noise and sound issues?
6	Road Resurfacing	Are Austin's efforts to resurface roads effective, efficient, and equitable?
7	Transparency	What are other cities doing to proactively share information with the public and what can Austin do to improve access to information?
8	Employee Compensation	Are Austin's employee compensation practices aligned with best practices and competitive to attract and retain talent needed to provide effective City services?
9	Long-Term Water Availability	Does Austin's plan for long-term water needs align with best practices and is Austin Water making progress?
10	Critical Systems – IT Controls	Does Austin manage its critical systems effectively to safeguard against unauthorized access, prevent data loss, and ensure timely recovery?

Alternate Audits | Can be started in 2027

A1	Access to City Services: Parks Maintenance	Are Austin's park amenities regularly maintained so they are safe and available for use for residents and visitors?
A2	Special Event Management	Is Austin managing special event responsibilities efficiency and effectively?
A3	Workday Implementation	Has the Workday system made Austin's employee processes more efficient and effective?
A4	Efficiency Flex Project 1	To be determined based on early findings from the efficiency consultant team
A5	Efficiency Flex Project 2	To be determined based on early findings from the efficiency consultant team

DRAFT



Austin City Auditor's Office | 2027 Audit Plan

Original photos (in order) courtesy of Alvaro Montoro, George Pagan III, and Tim Arterbury

Carryover Audits | Started in 2026 to be completed in 2027

	Audit Topic	Objective(s)
C1	Homelessness Strategy and Operations Coordination	Is the Homelessness Strategies and Operations Office effectively and efficiently coordinating homeless-related services?
C2	Austin Police: Field Training	Does police field training align with what is taught in the Academy as well as general orders (policies and procedures) and is it provided consistently across the department?
C3	EMS: Revenue Collection	Does the Emergency Medical Services billing process ensure that charges for service are timely and accurate?
C4	Budget Line-Item Spending	Is excessive line-item spending flagged, reviewed, and approved, especially near the end of the fiscal year?
C5	Critical System IT Controls	Are critical City systems adequately protected from harm?
C6	Austin Water Infrastructure Cybersecurity Assessment	Is the technology environment supporting Austin Water's critical business and operational functions secure?

Efficiency Assessment Oversight

The Austin City Auditor's Office is providing contract management oversight of Public Works, LLC, the consultant conducting an independent efficiency assessment of City operations. Public Works will assess each City department over a three-year period to address City Council goals to safeguard public confidence, assure operational efficiency, and deliver the best value in City services.

2027	General Fund departments that provide direct services to residents and visitors, including Animal Services, Development Services, Public Safety, Housing, Parks, Public Health, and Library
2028	Support Services departments that provide internal services to other City departments as well as Aviation, Convention Center, Transportation and Public Works, and Watershed Protection
2029	Enterprise departments that provide utility services to customers – Austin Energy, Austin Resource Recovery, and Austin Water

Austin
City Auditor's Office

Telephone: (512) 974-2805
E-mail: AustinAuditor@austintexas.gov
Website: http://www.austintexas.gov/auditor

City Auditor
Jason Hadavi

Deputy City Auditor
Kelsey Thompson

AustinAuditor

Copies of this and other reports are available on our website: http://www.austintexas.gov/auditor
Alternate formats available upon request

DRAFT

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2661, **Agenda Item #:** 5. 10/21/2026

Posting Language
Discussion and possible action on the City Auditor’s calendar year 2027 Audit Plan.

Lead Department
Austin City Auditor’s Office.

powered by Legistar™

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2665, **Agenda Item #:** 6. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Briefing on the City's redevelopment projects, including Colony Park, the Northeast Service Center, and the St. John's Redevelopment Project. [Mandy DeMayo, Real Estate and Asset Strategy Officer; Kim Olivares, Director - Austin Financial Services]

Lead Department

Austin Financial Services.

powered by Legistar™

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2930, **Agenda Item #:** 7. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Briefing on social services strategy that will include issue area, compliance, and policy discussion. [Stephanie Hayden-Howard, Assistant City Manager - City Manager's Office; Kerri Lang, Director; Daniel Culotta, Assistant Director - Austin Budget and Organizational Excellence]

Lead Department

Austin Budge and Organizational Excellence; City Manager's Office.

powered by Legistar™

Austin
City Auditor's Office

Audit Report

Living Wage Program

October 2026



Austin's Living Wage Program monitoring is inconsistent due to insufficient training and guidance. We found that City staff did not consistently collect required program documentation nor did they consistently conduct spot checks for contractor compliance. We also found City staff had a lack of awareness regarding program requirements due to insufficient training and guidance.

DRAFT

Austin City Auditor's Office

Audit Highlights
October 2026

Living Wage Program

Objective

The objective of this audit was to determine whether departments are monitoring their contracts to ensure compliance with the Living Wage requirements.

What We Found

The Living Wage Program was created in 2016 by the City of Austin to establish a minimum wage for contracted non-construction employees. We found that monitoring for the City's Living Wage Program is inconsistent due to insufficient training and guidance.

Contract managers did not consistently collect the required Program documentation or perform randomized spot checks. Even if the City consistently collected these forms, the forms rely on the contractor and employees' attestation as opposed to verifying employees' pay.

The City's training and guidance for the Living Wage Program are limited. The only training provided to staff regarding the Living Wage Program is one part of an overall purchasing refresher training which is high-level and focuses on program updates as opposed to how to apply Living Wage monitoring procedures.

As a result, some staff responsible for managing contracts were unaware of Program requirements, monitoring procedures, and responsibilities, and 5% of employees in our sample were not paid a living wage.

What We Recommend

We recommend to help ensure Living Wage contracts are consistently managed across departments, the Director of Austin Financial Services should improve training and guidance for City staff responsible for monitoring so they know what the Living Wage requirements are and how to monitor contractor compliance.

DRAFT

Contents

Objective & Background 3
Finding 1 4
Additional Observation 6
Recommendations & Management Response 7
Scope & Methodology 9

Cover: Living Wage - words on wooden blocks on the background of a graph and a magnifying glass, Zhanna/Adobe Stock

Objective

The objective of this audit was to determine whether departments are monitoring their contracts to ensure compliance with the Living Wage requirements.

Background

The City adopted the Living Wage Program under a City Resolution and the City enforces the Program through City rules.

The City of Austin created the Living Wage Program in 2016 to establish a minimum wage for contracted non-construction employees. The City adopted the Living Wage Program under a City Resolution and the City enforces the Program through City rules.

The Program was launched in 2019 and is administered by Austin Financial Services (AFS). AFS and individual City departments with contracts in the Program are responsible for monitoring.

The Living Wage Program requirements apply to contracts that meet all of the following criteria:

1. The contract is for non-construction services performed on City Property or on City Vehicles.
2. The contract comes from a competitive bidding process.
3. The contract requires authorization by City Council.
4. The Program applies to directly assigned Contractor Employees of the primary contractor and all subcontractors.

Austin City Council annually revises and adopts the Living Wage rate during the budget process for the upcoming fiscal year. Since fiscal year 2021-2022, the Living Wage rate has increased from $15 per hour to the current rate of $22.05 per hour.

When a contractor submits a bid for a Living Wage contract, they must include a signed Contractor Certification Form which affirms the contractor understands and agrees to the program requirements. The form also instructs the contractor to list all employees assigned to the work. Then, contract managers collect an Employee Certification Form acknowledging that the contractor will pay the employee the living wage rate. Contract managers should collect these Employee Certification Forms with the contractor's first invoice and annually thereafter throughout the contract term. The City's Procurement Manual lists the expected Living Wage monitoring activities at each stage of the procurement and contract management processes:

DRAFT

Exhibit 1: The City's Procurement Manual Lists Living Wage Monitoring Procedures

Stage	Responsible Party	Procedure
1. Pre-Contract Award	Procurement Specialists (AFS)	Include Living Wage language in the contract
		Include Living Wage Contractor Certification form
		Verify Living Wage Contractor Certification was signed and included in the Vendor's offer
		Check the Living Wage checkbox in the contracting system
2. Post-Contract Award	Contract Managers	Add Living Wage deliverables in contracting system
		Periodically review submitted data form compliance (annually or as stated in contract)
		Upload signed Contractor Certification and signed Employee Certifications in the contracting system
		Report noncompliance issues
		Conduct spot checks by randomly requesting the Employee Certifications throughout the contract's term

Source: ACAO's review of living wage procedures in AFS's Procurement Manual, September 2026

Austin Energy, Austin Water, and Austin Fleet Mobility Services managed the most active Living Wage contracts in our scope period.

Finding 1

Austin's Living Wage Program monitoring is inconsistent due to insufficient training and guidance.

We found that City staff did not consistently collect required program documentation nor did they consistently conduct spot checks for contractor compliance. We also found City staff had a lack of awareness regarding program requirements due to insufficient training and guidance. As a result, 5% of employees in our sample were not paid a living wage.

Contract managers did not consistently collect required program documentation. We took a random sample of 59 contracts. For 50 contracts, the City received a Contractor Certification Form. However, six forms did not list the specific employees working on the contract and said general statements such as "all employees will be provided a living wage." The City did not collect a Contractor Certification Form for nine contracts. Without these forms, monitoring staff may have difficulty confirming who is assigned or whether those employees are being paid the required wage.

Contract managers are also supposed to collect Employee Certification Forms with the contractor's first invoice and annually thereafter. However, contract managers did not collect Employee Certification Forms for 46% of the employees listed on the Contractor Certification Forms in our sample.

DRAFT

Additionally, one Employee Certification Form listed an incorrect living wage rate of $11 per hour instead of the correct $21.63. This error may cause employees to be unaware of how much they are supposed to be paid. Additionally, while monitoring procedures require random spot checks to request the Employee Certification Form throughout the contract term, some contract managers said they do not consistently conduct these random spot checks.

Employees can submit complaints by emailing the City's Wage Theft Team, which investigates potential noncompliance.

Even if the City consistently collected these forms, the forms rely on the contractor and employees' attestation as opposed to verifying employees' pay. We obtained pay information for employees working with 36 contracts. Across four contracts, 5% (15 of 285) of employees did not receive the living wage as required. We referred these 15 instances of noncompliance to the City's Wage Theft team.

The City's training and guidance for the Living Wage Program are limited. The City's Procurement Manual and Contract Monitoring Guide provide some information regarding monitoring for the Living Wage Program. The only training provided to staff regarding the Living Wage Program is one part of an overall purchasing refresher training which is high-level and focuses on program updates as opposed to how to apply Living Wage monitoring procedures.

Some staff responsible for managing contracts were unaware of Program requirements, monitoring procedures, and responsibilities. Furthermore, when we requested pay information and Employee Certification Forms from department staff for our sample of Living Wage contracts, it was evident that City staff did not have a strong awareness of the Living Wage Program. The following are some examples the audit team observed:

- One contract manager did not know what a Contractor Certification Form was.
- One division manager did not know that it is also the responsibility of departments to monitor contracts for the Living Wage requirements.
- One contract manager did not know when to collect forms.
- One procurement manager did not know how to apply the Program's eligibility requirements.
- One contract manager did not know it was their responsibility to collect the Employee Certification Form.

Additionally, some program guidance is unclear. Living Wage Program materials do not clearly state whether requirements apply only to employees with taxes withheld by the employer or independent contractors responsible for paying their own taxes. Program rules define employees broadly, but while Austin Financial Services said an independent contractor responsible for paying their own taxes is not exempt from the program, some contract managers said they were told otherwise by Austin Financial Services. Program guidance also does not clarify how to determine compliance with the living wage for employees who are paid on a salary, commission, or project basis.

DRAFT

Additional Observation

Austin's monitoring efforts do not focus on employees who earn near the living wage rate. Current monitoring practices require contract managers to spend time monitoring contracts for employees who already earn well above the living wage rate. Of the employees in our sample for whom we could confirm pay information, 65% are paid more than $25 an hour. Contract managers said this is unnecessary and inefficient.

Exhibit 2: More than half of employees in our sample were paid above $25 per hour



Source: ACAO analysis of sampled employee payment information, September 2026

DRAFT

Recommendations and Management Response

1 We recommend to help ensure living wage contracts are consistently managed across departments, the Director of Austin Financial Services should improve training and guidance for City staff responsible for monitoring so they know what the Living Wage requirements are and how to monitor contractor compliance.

Management Response: Agree

Management agrees that training and guidance for City staff monitoring Living Wage contracts, while generally effective currently, can be further improved.

While we agree with the recommendation, we would like to include the following points that were not mentioned in the audit.

1. **Existing Contract Management Training.** In addition to the Annual Procurement Education Refresher and Training (APERT) which also addresses the monitoring of Living Wage contracts, Austin Financial Services – Central Procurement (AFS) also addresses Living Wage monitoring in our Advanced course within our three-level Contracts Management training program (Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced).

2. **Required Contract Kick-off Meetings for Living Wage Contracts.** Before a department may proceed with a contract that includes Living Wage requirements, a mandatory kick-off meeting is held. This meeting ensures both the department's contract manager/monitor(s) and the contractor understand their roles and obligations with respect to the contract's Living Wage requirements.

3. **Large majority of sampled employees were paid in compliance with Living Wage requirement.** The audit identified a small number of contracts that may not be compliant with the Living Wage requirement – AFS is investigating these now. For context, a large majority of sampled contractor employees, as much as 95%, appear to be compliant with the Living Wage requirement.

Proposed Implementation Plan:

Several Initiatives already underway will address the recommendation by strengthening training, guidance, oversight, and accountability City staff monitoring contracts with Living Wage requirements.

1. **New Sourcing and Contract Management System (FY27).** A new City procurement system to be implemented in FY27 will improve the City's ability to track, report, and manage contract requirements, including Living Wage compliance.

2. **Contract/Vendor Performance Evaluation (CPE/VPE) Expansion (Early 2027).** Performance evaluations will be expanded to all City contracts. Such evaluations have been applied to design and construction contracts for several years. With this expansion, Living Wage compliance will be included as a specific evaluation criterion. Contract managers will be required to collect documentation to support their evaluations of contracts with Living Wage requirements.

3. **Updated Contract Management Training Program (Late FY27).** The overall training program will be revised to ensure full alignment with policies and requirements, including Living Wage. Features will include:

    - Mandatory annual refresher training, specifically for City staff monitoring contracts with Living Wage requirements, and
    - Contract monitoring certification requirement for all staff monitoring contracts, including contracts with Living Wage requirements.

DRAFT

Scope

The audit scope included all executed contracts within Fiscal Years 2023-2025.

Methodology

To complete this audit, we performed the following steps:

- Reviewed policies, procedures, and other relevant documentation related to the City's Living Wage Program
- Interviewed staff from Austin Financial Services; Austin Fleet Mobility Services; Austin Water; Austin Energy; Austin Culture, Music, and Entertainment; Austin Police Department; Austin Parks and Recreation; Wage Coordination and Wage Theft Teams
- Selected a random sample of 59 Living Wage contracts executed within fiscal years 2023-2025 to determine if they were correctly exempted from or included in the City's Living Wage Program based on the Program's requirements – due to the sampling method, the results should not be projected to the population
- Reviewed documentation of Living Wage contracts from the sample to identify if Contractor Certification Forms and Employee Certification Forms were present – due to the sampling method, the results should not be projected to the population
- Analyzed employee payment information from Living Wage contracts from the sample to determine whether employees were paid the living wage
- Referred potential cases of noncompliance to the City's Wage Theft Team
- Evaluated the risk of fraud, waste, and abuse related to the City's Living Wage Program
- Evaluated internal controls related to the City's Living Wage Program management efforts and practices

Audit Standards

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

DRAFT

The Austin City Auditor's Office was created by the Austin City Charter as an independent office reporting to City Council to help establish accountability and improve City services. We conduct performance audits to review aspects of a City service or program and provide recommendations for improvement.

Audit Team
Kathie Harrison, Audit Manager
Mateo Macias, Auditor-in-Charge
Kristina Kern
Justin Lanier
Keith Salas
Emily Souksan
UT Student Team

City Auditor
Jason Hadavi

Deputy City Auditor
Kelsey Thompson

Austin City Auditor's Office
phone: (512) 974-2805
email: AustinAuditor@austintexas.gov
website: http://www.austintexas.gov/auditor

AustinAuditor
@AustinAuditor
Austin Auditor

Copies of our audit reports are available at
http://www.austintexas.gov/page/audit-reports

Alternate formats available upon request

DRAFT

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2667, **Agenda Item #:** 8. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Briefing on Living Wages Audit, which looks at whether departments are monitoring their contracts to ensure compliance with the living wage requirements. [Kathie Harrison, Assistant City Auditor; Mateo Macias, Senior Auditor - Austin City Auditor's Office]

Lead Department

Austin City Auditor’s Office.

powered by Legistar™

City of Austin

Recommendation for Action

File #: 26-2668, **Agenda Item #:** 9. 10/21/2026

Posting Language

Identify items to discuss at future meetings.

powered by Legistar™

Austin

MEMORANDUM

To:	Mayor and City Council
Through:	Ed Van Eenoo, Chief Financial Officer
From:	Kerri Lang, Director, Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence
Date:	September 24, 2026
Subject:	**Social Services Agreement Evaluation and Reset Update (Resolution 20260812-022)**

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a response to Resolution 20260812-022 and an update on the City's ongoing review of its social services strategy and portfolio of services.

Background

Resolution 20260812-022, adopted August 12, 2026, directed the City Manager to evaluate existing social services agreements potentially affected by the FY27 budget reductions and develop recommendations for each agreement, stating whether it should be maintained, modified, or reduced, along with the reasons for the recommendation. The resolution further directed that affected providers and Council be notified of recommended changes before October 1, 2026.

Evaluations and Results

Staff from eight departments (Economic Development, Equity & Inclusion, Homelessness Strategy & Operations, Municipal Court, Parks & Recreation, Police, Public Health, and Small & Minority Business Resources) completed evaluation forms for each social services agreement identified as potentially affected by the reductions proposed in the FY27 budget process. For each agreement the department documented the funding level, contract structure, performance history, level of community need, and any related partnerships, as well as provided a recommendation of Maintain, Modify, or Reduce along with supporting reasoning.

Departments used these definitions in the evaluations:

- Maintain – recommend keeping the agreement at its current funding level.
- Modify – recommend changing the structure or funding level for the agreement while maintaining the funding level for the service and/or Issue Area.
- Reduce – recommend decreasing funding, up to and including elimination, because need is reduced for the service or Issue Area, and/or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

A total of 133 agreements, representing approximately $48.2 million in funding, were evaluated. The results are as follows:

- Maintain: 106 agreements, $39.7 million (82 percent of evaluated funding)
- Modify: 27 agreements, $8.5 million (18 percent of evaluated funding)
- Reduce: 0 agreements

The recommendations resulted in the overall funding level for social services being maintained for FY27. Departments noted a compliance concern on 26 (20 percent) of the 133 agreements. Compliance concerns are inclusive of administrative, financial, and programmatic categories. Departments address compliance issues through established monitoring and corrective action processes which can include increased reporting requirements, cure notices, stop payment status, and/or contract termination. All evaluation forms are included as an attachment to this memo.

Departments have notified affected vendors that current contracts will be maintained (or extended, where applicable) to avoid any gaps in service. Agreements currently subject to a corrective action process, or any that exhibit the need for one in the future, are still subject to the established steps and remedies of those processes. Vendors have been notified that all social services agreements will be subject to modification and/or solicitation over the next twelve months, with new agreements planned to take effect on or before October 1, 2027.

Next Steps

The evaluations required under Resolution 20260812-022 are complete, and no changes to FY27 social services funding levels are being recommended as a result. Staff will continue to monitor the 27 agreements recommended for modification, and those with compliance concerns, and will report on progress through the quarterly updates to the Audit and Finance, Public Health, Public Safety Committees, and/or full City Council beginning on September 22, 2026.

This evaluation is one component of a broader strategic reset of the social services portfolio also called for under Resolution 20260226-056 and Resolution 20260812-014. That effort, being led by a working group with representation from Budget & Organizational Excellence, Economic Development, Equity & Inclusion, Financial Services, Government Relations, Homelessness Strategy & Operations, Municipal Court, Parks & Recreation, Police, Public Health, and Small & Minority Business Resources will address Issue Area prioritization, service portfolios, and funding levels; contract and grant structures; performance and accountability frameworks; and solicitation timing for FY28. Staff expect to complete this evaluation and strategy work by the end of December 2026, which will inform agreement modifications and solicitations ahead of FY28.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Daniel Culotta, Assistant Director of Austin Budget and Organizational Excellence at Daniel.Culotta@austintexas.gov.

cc: T.C. Broadnax, City Manager
Erika Brady, City Clerk
Jason Hadavi, City Auditor
Mary Jane Grubb, Municipal Court Clerk
Judge Sherry Statman, Municipal Court
CMO Executive Team
Department Directors

Attachments:

- Social Services Agreement Evaluation Forms

FY27 Social Services Contract/Grant Decision Sheets

Organized by Department

Table of Contents

Austin Public Health (APH) (88 agreements)

African American Youth Harvest Foundation - Cradle to Contributor 7
Amala Foundation - Circle Up LBJ 10
American Gateways - Immigrant Legal Representation 13
American Gateways - Legal Pro Se Assistance Program 16
Any Baby Can - Ready Families Collaborative+ 19
ASHwell - ASHwell 22
Asian American Resource Center - Asian American Community Health Navigator 25
Asian American Resource Center, Inc. - Community Health Navigation for Seniors 28
Austin Area Urban League, Inc. (AAUL) - Austin Public Health Neighborhood Services Unit (NSU) Financial Assistance 31
Austin Child Guidance - Infant and Early Childhood Services 34
Austin Child Guidance Center - Mental Health Services for Underserved Families 37
Austin Child Guidance Center - Thrive 40
Austin Independent School District (AISD) - Family Resource Centers 43
Austin Independent School District (AISD) - Parent Support Program 46
Austin Independent School District (AISD) - Prime Time After-school + 49
Austin Independent School District (AISD) - VICTORY Tutorial + 52
Austin Revitalization Authority - Women Healthy Love 55
Austin Travis County Mental Health & Mental Retardation Ctr - Bridge to Recovery 58
Austin Travis County Mental Health & Mental Retardation Ctr - Promoting Care Continuity with Community Health Workers 61
Austin Voices for Education and Youth (AVEY) - Family Stabilization 64
Austin Youth & Community Farm, Inc. - Youth Program Cohort: Growing Leaders 67
Austin-Travis County Mental Health & Mental Retardation - Aging Care on Wheels 70
Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center - CAN Administration 73
Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center - Main Mental Health Services 76
Austin/Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR) - General Fund HIV Non-Medical Case Management-CARE Program 80
Boys and Girls Club of Austin/ Travis County (BGCAA) - Great Futures Program 83
Breakthrough - Student Success Initiative 86
Caritas of Austin - Behavioral Health Services+ (BHS+) 89
Catholic Charities of Central Texas - Counseling Services 92
Catholic Charities of Central Texas - Filing Fee Assistance for Immigrants 95
Catholic Charities of Central Texas - Immigration Legal Services and Counseling 98
Central Texas Community Health Centers - Substance Misuse Street Medicine 101
Central Texas Food Bank - Eastern Crescent Food Access 104
Central Texas Food Bank - Travis County School Food Access 107
Central Texas Food Bank, Inc. - Travis County Senior Nutrition 110
Central Texas Food Bank, Inc. (CTFB) - College Food Access 113
Central Texas Food Bank, Inc.(CTFB) - Food Distribution + 116
Communities for Recovery - Recovery in Action 119
Communities for Recovery - Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Convener 122
Communities in Schools (CIS) of Central Texas - Case Management and Pebble Project + 125
Communities In Schools of Central Texas - Expanding Support for Students Program 128
Con Mi Madre - Advancing Latinas to Higher Education 131
Council on At-Risk Youth (CARY) - PeaceRox 134
Court Appointed Special Advocates of Travis County (CASA) - Teen Advocacy 137

Table of Contents (continued)

Easterseals Central TX, Inc - High-Quality Behavioral Health Services 140
El Buen Samaritano Episcopal Mission - Access to Reproductive Healthcare 143
El Buen Samaritano Episcopal Mission - Rundberg Food Access & Equity Program 146
Equidad ATX, Inc. - LiveWell ViveBien 149
Family Eldercare - Counseling for Seniors 152
Family Eldercare - Financial Advocacy 155
Farmshare Austin - Mobile Markets and Home Delivery 158
Foundation Communities Inc - Food Access and Benefit Enrollment 161
Foundation Communities Inc - PSH Behavioral Health Program 164
Foundation Communities Inc. - Tax Centers 167
GENaustin - Girl Connect + 170
Get Up Project - Asian Pacific Islander Health Navigation 173
Girl Scouts of Central Texas (GSTX) - School-Based Community Programs 176
Helping Hand Home for Children, Inc. - Behavioral Health for Children in Foster Care - 2026 179
Jails to Jobs - ATX Peace Community Violence Intervention 182
Life Anew, Inc. - Youth Anew 185
Lock Arms for Life - Safe Gun Storage Saves Lives 188
Meals on Wheels & More, Inc. - Home Delivered Meals 191
Mexic-Arte Museum - Community Art & Scene It! 194
Out Youth - LGBTQIA+ Mental Health Services 197
Out Youth - Life-Saving Mental Health Services 200
Project Transitions, Inc - HIV45637 - General Fund HIV-PT - 2025 204
Saffron Trust Women's Foundation - Solid Ground+ 207
Samaritan Center for Counseling & Pastoral Care Inc - Whole Body Mental Health Services + 210
Seedling Foundation - Children Who Have a Parent Incarcerated 213
Sickle Cell Texas Marc Thomas Foundation - Sickle Cell Navigation Services 216
Sunrise Community Church - Prevent Violence by Intervention and Education Program 219
Sustainable Food Center, Inc. - Double Up Food Bucks Austin 222
Texas Harm Reduction Alliance - Substance Misuse Mobile 225
Texas RioGrande Legal Aid Inc - Public Benefits & Housing 228
The Austin Geriatric Center Inc - Rebekah Baines Johnson (RBJ) Senior Center of Excellence 231
The Austin Theatre Alliance - Literacy to Life+ 234
The SAFE Alliance - Bridge to Safety 237
The SAFE Alliance - Domestic Violence Shelter 240
The SAFE Alliance - ER - Prevention and Support 243
The SAFE Alliance - Victim Services 246
The University of Texas - Alliance for African American Health in Central Texas 249
The University of Texas - AMEN 252
The University of Texas - Mama Sana/Vibrant Women Maternal Equity Program 255
Todos Juntos Learning Center - La Escuelita Program 258
VinCare Services of Austin Foundation dba Saint Louise House - Quality Care for Children Overcoming Homelessness 261
Vivent Health - AIDS Services Austin (ASA) 264
Youth and Family Alliance - Community-Based Counseling 268
Youth and Family Alliance - Youth Education and Development 272

Austin Homelessness Strategy and Operations (AHSO) (9 agreements)

Austin Area Urban League - Cold Weather Shelter Program 276
Caritas of Austin - BSS Plus RRH Program 278
Casa Marianella - Open Doors to Homeless Immigrants Program 280

Table of Contents (continued)

Family Eldercare, Inc. - Rehousing Aging Adults Program 282
Family Endeavors, Inc. - Rapid Rehousing for Vulnerable Populations Program 284
Integral Care - CityACT Expansion Combined Program 286
Sunrise Community Church - Mobile Outreach and Housing Navigation Program 288
Youth and Family Alliance (LifeWorks) - Rapid Rehousing Youth Program 290
Youth and Family Alliance (LifeWorks) - Workforce Development Program 292

Austin Economic Development (AED) (17 agreements)

13-20 vendors are selected annually with funding - Grant for Technology Opportunities Program (GTOPs) 295
Austin Chamber of Commerce - Opportunity Austin 298
Austin Free-Net - Community Technology Access Lab Management Services 301
Austin ISD - Adult Education & Literacy 304
Austin Voices for Education and Youth - On-Ramp to Employment 307
Easter Seals - Central Texas - Workforce Readiness for Adults 310
Goodwill Centex - Ready to Work+ 313
Jail to Jobs d/b/a Nineveh Ministries - JtoJ Workforce Development 316
Latinitas - A Seat at the Table 319
Literacy Coalition of Central Texas - Literacy Partners Workforce Collaboration 322
Mainspring Schools - Magic Quality Investment Project program 325
Rise Child Development Center, Inc. / The Rise Center Of Liberation In Early Childhood Education - Black Mothers program; RISE 328
Skillpoint Alliance - Gateway 331
The Arc of the Capital Area - Employment Services 334
Todos Juntos Learning Center - Adult Education 337
Worksource Greater Austin Area Workforce Board / Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board - 5-year Interlocal w Workforce Solutions for QC3 340
Youth and Family Alliance d/b/a Lifeworks - Workforce Development+ 343

Austin Police Department (APD) (5 agreements)

Brave Alliance Mission - Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner Services 347
Center for Child Protection - Reimbursement of expenses related to the protection of abused children 350
Court Appointed Special Advocates of Travis County - Direct financial assistance to victims of crime & trauma 353
The University of Texas at Austin - Mental Health Services for APD, AFD, and ATCEMS Employees 355
Young Women's Christian Association of Greater Austin - Harm Reduction Therapy Services 358

Austin Small and Minority Business Resources (SMBR) (3 agreements)

Asian Contractors Association - Outreach and Technical Assistance 362
Business Resource Consultants (BRC), agent of Austin Area Black Contractors Association (ABCA) - Outreach and Technical Assistance 364
US Hispanic Contractors Association de Austin - Outreach and Technical Assistance 366

Austin Community Court (CC) (8 agreements)

Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center- Integral Care - Expanded Mobile Crisis Outreach Team (EMCOT) 369
Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center- Integral Care - Road to Recovery 372
Austin-Travis County Sobriety Center Local Government Corpor - Sobering Center Program 375

Table of Contents (continued)

Communities for Recovery - Peer-based Recovery Support 378
Family Eldercare, Inc. - Permanent Supportive Housing 381
Family Eldercare, Inc. - Representative Payee Services and SOAR Application Assistance 384
Foundation Communities - Permanent Supportive Housing 387
The Other Ones Foundation, Inc. - Re-entry Roundtable 390

Austin Equity and Inclusion (AEI) (1 agreement)

Equity Minigrant Program 394

Austin Parks and Recreation (APR) (2 agreements)

Austin Independent School District - AISD Literacy First 398
The Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG) - Capital Area Council of Governments Contract for Older Americans Act Activities (Senior Congregate Meal Program) 400

Austin Public Health (APH)

88 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Cradle to Contributor*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*African American Youth Harvest Foundation*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides hands-on service through school and community-based programs. Increasing work-based learning and job readiness training opportunities. Increasing student knowledge of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) concepts, promoting teamwork, leadership, and academic achievement. Promotes youth development competencies, increases youth leadership opportunities, and increases awareness of characteristics of strong families.* Desired Outcomes: - Clients will complete an educational program that improves their knowledge. - Clients will demonstrate improved life skills.
Target population	*Clients are African American and/or Hispanic, with primary focus on those residing in areas of Austin/Travis County. Large percentage of children, youth, and adult family members who face significant barriers such as involvement in the justice system, under- or unemployment, lack of transportation, no insurance, lack of childcare options, and/or lack of access to broadband technology connections. AAYHF clients are members of historically disadvantaged populations. All individuals residing in Austin or Travis County are eligible to receive services.*

Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$441,680*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*None. City is 100% of funding.*
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) - *economic stability. CHA highlights relationship between education and income; childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities* *This program prioritizes communities of color, a MH priority listed in the CHA.* *When this contract was awarded, it addressed needs that were in the City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, which continue to be relevant today. These needs were also identified in 2021 Austin Public Health Community Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*4*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	N/A Agency has exceeded performance goals set for program with minor performance concerns and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a

narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, and Principles of Trauma Informed Care. The agency Utilizes full funding every year and meets its performance goals.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	N/A

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Circle Up LBJ
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	Amala Foundation
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Eliminates barriers that have historically kept wellness practices inaccessible to the African American community in Austin/Travis County. Desired Outcome: Clients will demonstrate improved life skills and achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	African American community in Austin/Travis County.
Geography	LBJ High School, Eastside Memorial Early College High School, Gus Garcia Middle School, Bertha Sadler Means Middle School, Jordan Elementary, and Norman Sims Elementary.
FY26 contract amount	$65,250
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown, City is 57% of total program funding.
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158).
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	3

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Maintain funding so that the agency can continue to meet community needs. Agency consistently meets their performance goals and utilizes full funding.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Unknown
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If funding is maintained, agency can continue to provide services that meet community needs
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	This program’s evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, and

	Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Immigrant Legal Representation***
Department	***Austin Public Health (APH)***
Vendor/Provider	***American Gateways***
Focus Area	***Health Equity/Reimaging Public Safety***
Services description and desired outcomes	The goal of this program is to stabilize the immigration status of immigrants in Austin/Travis County by providing screenings, consultations, group information sessions, workshops, pro se assistance and legal representation. Desired Outcome: Clients will obtain and maintain public benefits as a result of receiving services through this Health Equity Social Service Contract.
Target population	***Immigrants seeking legal services for immigration issues who either reside in Austin /Travis County or are in a detention facility.***
Geography	***Austin/Travis County Area***
FY26 contract amount	***$378,000***
Payment structure	***Input***
Co-funders (if known)	***n/a***
Community need basis	Community Health Assessment (CHA) categories Health Equity and Economic Stability. Community needs addressed by this contract are highlighted by Vera Institute of Justice and in the 2022 Recommendations from the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee, Commission on Immigrant Affairs, Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission, and the Asian American Quality of Life Advisory Commission

Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2014 Austin City Council Welcoming City Resolution, the City of Austin's participation in the Welcoming Cities initiative.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	unknown
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Agency has also met/exceeded its outcomes and outputs to serve clients over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to meet it performance for FY26 contract cycle. This is an important service for the immigrant community.*
Documented performance	*None*

concerns (if any)	
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	This is one of only two contracts funded by APH that provide these services.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program adheres to evidence-based practices by the American Bar Association's Standards for Civil Legal Services, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, and Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Legal Pro Se Assistance Program**
Department	**Austin Public Health**
Vendor/Provider	**American Gateways**
Focus Area	**Basic Needs - Immigration**
Services description and desired outcomes	The goal of this program is to provide assistance to individuals with specific legal needs where there is an upcoming court appearance or deadline and that can be done with pro se legal assistance, will ensure that individual Respondents, who have Notices to Appear (a notice to appear before an Immigration Judge at a specified time) are supported through pro se assistance and focus on helping these individuals understand their potential eligibility for relief from deportation, apply for that relief, and obtain assistance in related matters. Desired Outcome: Clients will achieve physical, mental, emotional and social functioning as a result of receiving services through this Health Equity Social Service Contract.
Target population	**Clients served are low-income and have either no immigration status or unstable immigration status. The majority of clients served are individuals in removal proceedings, those who are at risk of deportation, with Notices to Appear.**

Geography	**Austin Travis County Area**
FY26 contract amount	**$161,280.00**
Payment structure	**Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)**
Co-funders (if known)	**N/A**
Community need basis	Community Needs Assessment (CHA)/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) Economic Stability Community needs addressed by this contract are highlighted by Vera Institute of Justice and in the 2022 Recommendations from the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee, Commission on Immigrant Affairs, Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission, and the Asian American Quality of Life Advisory Commission
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/CHIP, 2014 Austin City Council Welcoming City Resolution, the City of Austin's participation in the Welcoming Cities initiative.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry

Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Agency has met/exceed its outcomes and city outputs to serve client over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to meet it performance for FY26 contract cycle. This reflects the effectiveness of this program serving clients who need assistance with specific legal needs where there is an upcoming court appearance, thus achieving some semblance of physical, mental, emotional and social functioning as the client and staff work their way through the legal system.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*This is the only contract funded by APH that provides these services.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	*Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Agency has also met/exceeded its outcomes and city outputs to serve clients over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to meet it performance for FY26 contract cycle.* *This program adheres to evidence-based practices by the American Bar Association's Standards for Civil Legal Services, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, and Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Ready Families Collaborative+*
Department	*Austin Public Health (APH)*
Vendor/Provider	*Any Baby Can*
Focus Area	Early Childhood
Services description and desired outcomes	*Addresses challenges associated with a lack of parenting knowledge, inadequate resources for early development, and achieving self-sufficiency for families. Services include child development, family, and prenatal support. Partners provide information, support, and education to pregnant women reducing the risk of adverse birth outcomes such as preterm labor and low birth weight.* *Desired outcome:* *Individuals will demonstrate improved life skills*
Target population	*Low-income City of Austin/Travis County families who are at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and have children between the ages of 0-5. The demographics and characteristics of this population may include diverse cultural backgrounds, varying levels of education, limited access to healthcare, and potential barriers to employment.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$1,466,186*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 7% of total program budget.*
Community need basis	*Prioritizes communities of color, a MH priority listed*

	in the Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA). *CHA highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities.* *These needs were also highlighted in the APH 2023 Early Childhood Community Survey, The City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee 2022 Recommendation, the Early Childhood Council 2022 Recommendation, City of Austin 2023 Strategic Direction*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA-, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin-Travis County Success By 6 Coalition Plan, Texas Prenatal to Age 3 Collaborative, GenATX Plan*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*Agency met their City Goals however they were -3.17 below their Outcomes. This may have been due to the current immigration environment climate of the clients they serve. Outcome performance is within an acceptable variance.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency spends 100% of their funds and falls slightly short of their Outcome goals. They serve a community facing significant challenges, including limited parenting knowledge, insufficient early childhood development resources, and barriers to achieving family stability.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Evidence-based practices include Medical Case Management, Early Childhood Intervention), Nurturing Families Program practices, Nurturing Fathers Program practices, Parents as Teachers, Nurse-Family Partnership, No Estás Solo, Texas Mother Friendly Worksite strategies, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, and Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	ASHwell
Department	Austin Public Health (APH)
Vendor/Provider	ASHwell
Focus Area	HIV Services
Services description and desired outcomes	ASHwell provides comprehensive HIV case management, linkage, re-engagement, and referral services to connect clients to medical care and essential supportive services. Ashwell coordinates with medical providers and community partners to address barriers to care, facilitate access to services, and support clients throughout the HIV care continuum. ASHwell clients will remain connected to appropriate HIV medical care and supportive services, with reduced barriers to care, improved treatment adherence, and increased stability and self-sufficiency. Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	People with HIV
Geography	Travis, Hays, Caldwell, Bastrop, and Williamson Counties
FY26 contract amount	$86,667
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown

Community need basis	Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections. The Austin Area HIV Planning Council FY 2024-2025 Part A allocation model and data evaluation plan. This program also provides Housing Stability (another key CHA category) Austin Public Health General Funds are used to help meet maintenance of effort requirements of Ryan White Part A federal funds.
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), HIV Planning Council- The Austin Area HIV Planning Council FY 2024-2025 Part A allocation model and data evaluation plan. - APH's HIV Resource Administration Program Policy Clarification Notice (PCN) #16-02: Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services: Eligible Individuals & Allowable Uses of Funds. -Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services Report (RSR)"

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a

narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain current funding level for FY27.
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	ASHwell consistently demonstrates strong performance in meeting the needs of people with HIV and provides comprehensive, essential services that are well-established and valued within the Austin community. This contract is used annually to show Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for the HRSA Ryan White A grant. This is the only contract funded by APH that provides these services.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	No concerns currently
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A or Not Known
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include: HRSA'S HIV/AIDS Bureau Clinical Quality Management Policy Clarification Notice 15-02; Austin Area HIV Planning Council's Ryan White Part A Service Standards; Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) Standards 4, 5, 6, and 7 are current Federal requirements for all recipients

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Asian American Community Health Navigator*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Asian American Resource Center*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of this initiative is to provide community health system navigation services for members of linguistically isolated Asian American (AA) immigrant groups. These services will promote self-management of health and wellness through the clinical community links that enable culturally and contextually relevant care.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level and the Asian American population in Austin/Travis County, particularly individuals with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) who have difficulty accessing and navigating healthcare systems due to language and cultural barriers.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$528,574*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding.*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability. Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare*

	access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158). *The need for this program's services was also identified in 2022 Recommendations from the Asian American Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission, Commission on Immigrant Affairs and Human Rights Commission; 2022 Council Member Fuentes Budget Rider.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin City-Community Reimagining Public Safety Task Force 2021 Mid-Year Recommendations Report*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency focuses on serving community they sought out to in their Request for Proposal at almost 100%.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency utilizes full funding every year while also meeting their performance goals. At a time when the Asian population in Austin is growing, there is an increased need for this type of navigation and social support.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None, Agency has met their performance goals.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Community Health Navigation for Seniors*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Asian American Resource Center, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Health Equity – Aging Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of the program is to increase access to essential health and social services for older adults by providing appointment accompaniment, interpretation, and care navigation services through trained Community Health Navigators (CHNs). The program will ensure vulnerable seniors are supported in accessing medical care and social services.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level and predominantly Asian and Asian American adults aged 65 and older.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County, mainly in the North-East Austin area.*
FY26 contract amount	*$93,316*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding.*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic*

	Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158). Other sources that highlight community needs addressed by this program are: 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, 2022 Office of the City Auditor audit report City Services to Older Adults, and Austin's Commission on Aging Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Recommendation, Older Adult Quality of Life Study 2025
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*This program year has 100% served their intended target populations.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*

Reasons for recommendation	*The agency meets a need with navigating the healthcare system, especially in a demographic of older community members. They continue to meet their goals within the first program year with lower funding than proposed in their Request for Proposal and having to cut staff due to reduced funding. The agency has shown that they can handle the work at the funding they're at. This is the only agency funded through APH social services to provide community health worker services specifically to older adults.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Agency is meeting their performance and on track for 25-26 program year.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*The program prioritizes trusted, in-language, and culturally affirming care coordination, health and social service education, and advocacy, which research has shown to improve service utilization and chronic disease management in marginalized communities. Other evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Austin Public Health Neighborhood Services Unit (NSU) Financial Assistance**
Department	**Austin Public Health (APH)**
Vendor/Provider	**Austin Area Urban League, Inc. (AAUL)**
Focus Area	**Basic Needs**
Services description and desired outcomes	**Austin Area Urban League will act as the Fiscal Agent managing and distributing direct financial assistance funds for rent or utility assistance for APH Neighborhood Centers, NSU Financial Assistance Program.** **Desired outcome – Helping clients avoid eviction**
Target population	**Clients in crisis to pay their rent/utilities due to financial crisis.**
Geography	**Austin/Travis County Area**
FY26 contract amount	**$698,351.00**
Payment structure	**Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)**
Co-funders (if known)	**n/a**
Community need basis	**Basic needs and financial assistance addressed as part of Economic Stability in the Community Health Assessment (CHA) pp 46-58.** **Services provided by this contract were also identified as key community needs in 2023 APH Basic Needs Community Survey, 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022**

	Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data.
Associated City or Regional Plans	**CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)**

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	3
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*n/a*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	**Modify**
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	**Due to the increase cost of rents in the Austin /Travis County area, rental assistant request amounts are much higher than expected which decreases the number of checks be distributed. It is recommended that the agency City Goal be reduced to reflect the actual performance from prior and current contract terms .**
Reasons for recommendation	**This service supports and stabilizes families. The agency has not been able to meet**

	performance targets because 1 – the agency overestimated the number of checks to be distributed when the contract was developed, and 2- With the higher rents in the Austin /Travis County area, this reduces the number of checks that are being distributed to landlords across the city/county.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	**Agency has had an issue meeting its City Goals**
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	**No**
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	**n/a**
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	**n/a**
Notes and supporting evidence	**Austin Area Urban League (AAUL) acts as the Fiscal Agent managing, distributing direct financial assistance funds for rent or utility assistance for APH Neighborhood Centers, agency has spent down all funding in FY24 and FY 25 and is on target to spend down all funding in FY26. Agency did not meet their City Outputs in FY 24 or 25 and do not look to meet their FY26 City Goals. With the higher rents in the Austin /Travis County area, this reduces the number of checks that are being distributed to landlords across the city/county.** **The program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services.**

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Infant and Early Childhood Services*
Department	*Austin Public Health (APH)*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Child Guidance*
Focus Area	*Early Childhood*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Promotes school readiness and improves the social-emotional health of at-risk children while reducing the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children ages zero to five (0-5). Increase early childhood education staff knowledge and understanding of child development. Increase parent/guardian participation in their child's development and activities. Improve the social-emotional health of the youngest and most vulnerable Central Texas children through assessment, individually focused consultation, plans and routines, and family support.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge*
Target population	*Infant and Early Childhood (IEC) program clients include early childhood educators making $25 per hour or less; children ages 0-5 from families who have low income; teens and adult parents and guardians who have low income; people identifying as Black, Indigenous, or Person of Color (BIPOC); people living at our below 250% of FPL; and residents of Austin/Travis County living in childcare deserts. The primary clients served through IEC are*

	early childhood education staff. IEC serves early childhood education centers whose families are racially and ethnically diverse and may experience financial barriers or low income.
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$124,740*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City funds 46% .*
Community need basis	Economic Stability – The Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities. Additionally, APH 2023 Early Childhood Community Survey, the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee 2022 Recommendation, the Early Childhood Council 2022 Recommendation, *City of Austin 2023 Strategic Direction* all highlighted community needs addressed by this contract.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA; Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP); Austin-Travis County Success by Six Coalition Plan, Texas Prenatal to Age 3 Collaborative, GenATX Plan*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency has exceeded performance goals set for the program and serves the demographic area they intended to meet their performance goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed.

Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Agency spends all funds and meets their performance goals, however they have several missed deadlines for claims and status reports.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Unknown*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Agency met performance goals and spent down all funds for the last 2 years they had the contract. They are on target to do the same this contract year.* *This program's evidence-based practices include Second Step Early Learning Curriculum, The Pyramid Model by The Center for the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning and the Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Youth Children, Teacher-Child Interaction Therapy, Parent-Child Interaction Therapy, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Mental Health Services for Underserved Families
Department	Austin Public Health (APH)
Vendor/Provider	Austin Child Guidance Center
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Improve the mental health of children and their families which meet the City's eligibility requirements who live, work, and/or attend school in the Rundberg area, through early intervention, diagnosis, and treatment to help them develop emotional skills. Desired Outcome: Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Children ages zero to 17 and their family members who meet City's eligibility requirements and live, work and/or attend school in the Rundberg area
Geography	Austin/Travis County; Rundberg area, defined as the area in North Austin bounded by Braker Lane to the north, Highway 183 and North Lamar to the south, Metric Blvd to the west, and Cameron/Dessau Road to the east.
FY26 contract amount	$71,376
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown, City is 10% of Total Program Funding
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA), Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) - The CHA has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. The City of Austin and Go Austin/Vamos Austin’s 2021 partnership initiative with social services organizations, clinical partners, community leaders, and residents identified key needs in the Rundberg

	area that addressed by this contract.
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/CHIP

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	1
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Mental health support for children and their families has been identified as an ongoing need in the community. This is one of two APH-funded contracts specifically dedicated to the Rundberg area.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Agency is well below targets, Outcome raw numbers are at a -97% variance, having achieved just around 4% of their estimated clients helped.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps	Gaps not expected due to lower utilization of funds

expected if this recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	The program’s evidence-based practices include: licensed clinicians, Child and Family Traumatic Stress Intervention, Parent Child Interaction Therapy, Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Thrive*
Department	*Austin Public Health (APH)*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Child Guidance Center*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Improving the mental health of children, adolescents, and their families living at or below 250% of Federal Poverty Income Guidelines (FPIG) through early intervention, diagnosis, and treatment to help them develop the emotional skills for meeting life challenges.* *Desired Outcome - Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals. Individuals' mental status is measured on standardized assessments for improvement.*
Target population	*Children (5-17) and families living at or below 200% of FPIG and residing in Austin/Travis County. Specific outreach activities center on children who are Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American, Multiracial, Asian; individuals with disabilities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, ally, asexual, two-spirited, and those residing in the 78701, 78702, 78704 zip codes and the eastern crescent.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$188,140*
Payment structure	*Input*

Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown, Other funders make up 71% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health, Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) , 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*2*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Potentially modify goal rates
Reasons for recommendation	*This agreement provides 31% of the funding needed to improve the mental health of children, adolescents, and their families living in Austin/Travis*

	County through early intervention, diagnosis, and treatment, helping them develop the emotional skills for meeting life's challenges.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*The Thrive program is performing below service goals. Secondary clients, not yet included in the totals, will be added in the Q4 performance report; however, these additions are unlikely to meet annual targets. The agency reports that current goals exceed clinicians' capacity, and efforts to negotiate lower targets with APH have been unsuccessful. Additionally, the political climate and public mistrust of government have hindered the collection of eligibility documentation, resulting in many potentially qualified clients being deemed ineligible for APH funding.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Family Resource Centers*
Department	*Austin Public Health (APH)*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Independent School District (AISD)*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Family Resource Centers work to stabilize families through engagement efforts, responsive and case-managed services, and community development efforts; helping families achieve/maintain stability. Services supplement those provided through entities such as Community Centers and Neighborhood Centers.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will demonstrate improved life skills.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level and students and families attending Title 1 campuses.*
Geography	*Austin's Eastern Crescent, Title 1 AISD schools, Spanish speaking families, and other students and families attending schools in the Austin Independent School District.*
FY26 contract amount	*$100,034*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 30% of program funding.*
Community need basis	*Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Economic Stability*
Associated City or Regional	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health*

Plans	*Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to exceed performance goals set for program and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has spent down their funding and exceeded their goal expectations.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Performance met by a 150% variance and is on track to exceed their goal again for the current fiscal year with reduced funding.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this	*N/A*

recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Parent Support Program*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Independent School District (AISD)*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Austin Independent School District Parent Support Program aims to empower families to become active participants in the education of their child/children, to develop positive relationships with parents and families, and to provide service coordination, support, and training to meet the needs of students and families. Parent Support Specialists are provided with monthly professional development sessions to enhance their knowledge, skills and strategies in assisting families with educational, social, and health goals.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level and families, guardian, and community members of Title I campuses.*
Geography	*Eastern Crescent area of Austin in Title I schools.*
FY26 contract amount	*$1,161,000*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 30% of total program funding.*
Community need basis	*Mental Health, economic stability. The Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has*

	sections focused entirely on mental health and economic stability as key social determinants of health. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/ Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to exceed outcome performance goals set for program and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals, missed output goal last year and currently on track to miss again this year. This is likely due to decreased enrollment at AISD. Outcomes for participating students are successful.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if	*N/A*

Modify)	
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has spent down their funding and exceeded their outcome expectations.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Performance hasn't been met fully in recent program years due to need of documentation from clients and decreased enrollment at AISD. Recently, the agency has fully staffed the program and plans to meet goals set from the beginning of the year.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Prime Time After-school +*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Independent School District (AISD)*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Prime Time Program delivers after school and summer programming to children who are overwhelmingly from low-income households. Students are challenged to build relational, academic, and problem-solving skills through a variety of engaging activities and experiences situated both on and off campus.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will advance to the next academic level.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level, specifically students Pre-K through 12th grade*
Geography	*Mainly in the Eastern Crescent, south, and south-east Austin area of Austin.*
FY26 contract amount	*$1,495,829*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*None, City is 100% of program funding.*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses childcare as a key aspect of Economic Stability (CHA pp 62-64, 151-152).* *Needs addressed by this contract were also*

	highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/ Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency still prioritized serving the demographics that were set in their goals and provided services in mainly Title I schools.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The after-school and summer programs allow students to gain additional skills and experiences.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Agency has missed goals over the 10% variance due to a decline in student enrollment within Austin ISD. However, this program year has exceeded goals through marketing and stable site staffing.*

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*VICTORY Tutorial +*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Independent School District (AISD)*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of the AISD VICTORY Program is to offer students high quality, academic support to reach grade level standards in core subjects. VICTORY defines success as a successful tutor-student relationship in which the student achieves academic growth in a positive, affirming relationship, receiving high-quality tutoring services to which they otherwise would not have access.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will progress to the next academic level.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level and students attending a Title I campus*
Geography	*Areas include Rundberg, Eastern Crescent, South Austin, and Southeast Austin.*
FY26 contract amount	*$205,243*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Economic Stability, Mental Health* *CHA highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition,*

	healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/ Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*(N/A) Agency continues to exceed performance goals set for program and serves the demographic that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency continues to meet and exceed its goals.*
Documented performance	*Performance is being currently exceeded by over*

concerns (if any)	*250% with the reduced funding experienced this year and has exceeded similarly in past program years.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Women Healthy Love
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Austin Revitalization Authority
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Reduced racial/ethnic health disparities related to HIV Prevention targeted to African American Women residing in low-income housing developments or in the surrounding neighborhoods. Desired Outcome Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	African American Women residing in low-income housing developments or in the surrounding neighborhoods.
Geography	zip codes 78701, 78702, 78704, 78723, 78745, 78752, 78753, 78756, and 78758, and all housing developments where African Americans reside.
FY26 contract amount	$68,921
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	City is 100% of program funding
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158)
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin City Council Resolution 20150507-027

Scores

Field	Entry

Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Agency has spent down their funding and met their goals in their past program years.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program’s evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.

- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Bridge to Recovery*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Travis County Mental Health & Mental Retardation Ctr*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provide a higher level of care and treatment beds for individuals being served and referred by the Sobering Center* *Desired Outcome:* *Individuals will make progress towards their treatment plans.*
Target population	*Eligible clients include individuals residing in Austin/ Travis County who are living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Limit (FPL) and are identified as having a substance use disorder (SUD). Clients may also have co-occurring mental illness (including serious mental illness) and SUD and may be at risk of involvement with the criminal justice system. Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals.*
Geography	*Austin/ Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$206,932*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding*
Community need basis	*The Community Health Assessment (CHA)- Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) has a*

	section dedicated to mental health and recovery. Needs addressed in this contract were also highlighted by City of Austin 2018 Opioid Resolution; Austin/Travis County 2019 Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs, Needs Assessment; Council Member Casar 2020-2021 Budget Amendment for Substance Use Continuum of Care
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/CHIP, City of Austin 2018 Opioid Resolution*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*2*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Solicit funding to expand the scope of services needed for substance use disorders.*
Reasons for the recommendation	*The program spent 70% of its funding in 24/25 and 62.4% of its budget in 22/23, and is currently on track to underspend again for 25/26.*
Documented performance	*N/A*

concerns (if any)	
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This agreement provides 100% of funding to provide a safe place for publicly intoxicated individuals to sober up as an alternative to emergency rooms or jail. It also supports assessment and referral to treatment and recovery services. This program's evidence-based practices include Cognitive behavioral therapy, the National Harm Reduction Coalition Harm Reduction Principles*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Promoting Care Continuity with Community Health Workers*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/ Provider	*Austin Travis County Mental Health & Mental Retardation Ctr*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Expand and reengage individuals with a behavioral health diagnosis in outpatient services including clinical and intake services with a targeted focus on minority and underserved communities. Success will be defined by meeting goals and objectives related to outreach, reengagement, and linkage to ongoing services.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals.*
Target population	*This program services individuals with a behavioral health diagnosis living in underserved areas who have either been unable to engage in services and/or need to be reengaged in service.*
Geography	*Underserved areas in Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$112,227*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*No other funders.*
Community need basis	*Mental Health (MH) – Community Health Assessment (CHA). Prioritizes communities of color, a MH priority listed in the CHA. Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*

Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*As the Local Mental Health and Intellectual and Developmental Disability (IDD) Authority of Travis County, Integral Care partners with local organizations to strengthen a community network in support of mental health, offers guidance to other behavioral health agencies, and battles the stigma that surrounds mental illness, substance use disorder, and IDD. Integral Care is responsible for planning, developing policy, and coordinating resources for mental health and IDD services throughout Travis County. Additionally, Integral Care plays a significant role in planning for and providing*

	substance use services. Through dual roles as both a service provider and the Local Mental Health Authority, Integral Care has established and sustained collaborative relationships in the community
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*This agreement provides 100% of the funding to connect people with outpatient behavioral health services.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Family Stabilization
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Austin Voices for Education and Youth (AVEY)
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	Increase family stability by providing case management, food access, transportation access, and family and community engagement. Desired Outcomes Individuals will obtain or maintain public benefits. Households at the risk of homelessness will maintain housing and public benefits
Target population	Focus on residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level.
Geography	"Eastern Crescent" of Austin zip codes that are served by AVEY's Family Resource Centers (FRCs) (defined as five clusters). The North Austin cluster covers four zip codes and consists of 12 neighborhoods. AVEY has FRCs at Austin Independent School District (AISD) Schools. All will serve as community "hubs" of resources for families. The Central East Austin cluster covers two zip codes and consists of nine neighborhoods and their AISD schools. The Montopolis and Dove Springs cluster covers two zip codes and consists of four neighborhoods and their AISD schools.
FY26 contract amount	$202,500
Payment structure	Input - Reimbursement of eligible expenses.
Co-funders (if known)	Program is 26.26% funded by City, 73.74% of funding comes from other sources
Community need basis	Economic Stability. Basic needs and financial assistance addressed as part of Eco. Stability Community Health Assessment (CHA) pp 46-58. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in 2023 APH Basic Needs Community Survey, 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts

	for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Cutting this initiative would: Reduce food access, increase homelessness risk, fracture community networks, increase student instability, intensify pressure on schools and public systems. The program is a structural support system that keeps families stable, connected, and able to meet basic needs.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None – agency always exceeds goal

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Partial – city funds 26% of this program
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program uses evidence-based practices endorsed by Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMSHA) for mental health services and National Association for Social Workers (NASW) for social work best practices and national standards, including integrating trauma-informed care and National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Youth Program Cohort: Growing Leaders
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Youth & Community Farm, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides curriculum, workshops, and activities for youth development programs creating emotionally and physically safe spaces for youth participants to meet the following program goals and objectives: Leadership skill building, social and emotional skill building, and civic engagement with a focus on food justice.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will* demonstrate improved life skills
Target population	*Youth that are diverse in a variety of ways including but not limited to race, culture or ethnic background, gender identity, sexual orientation, nationality, English language proficiency, and abilities. Participants in the Farm Internship Program (FIP), Advanced Leadership Internship program (ALI), and South Austin Internship program (SAI), youth will be14-17 years old and be enrolled in high school. Participants in the Food and Leadership Fellowship program (FLF), will be 17-23 years old and not be enrolled in high school. The majority are living in underserved areas of Austin/Travis County who qualify for free and reduced lunch or with family incomes below Federal Poverty Level.*
Geography	*Austin's Eastern Crescent and the Dove Springs area in South Austin*

FY26 contract amount	$108,00.00
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown, City is 71.15% funding*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability* *Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities.* *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/ Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The agency experienced a slight shortfall in meeting its target goals. In response, staff responsibilities have been thoughtfully restructured to strengthen operations and ensure all target areas are fully achieved moving forward*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	2

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented

need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency spends their funding fully and is within normal variance on target goals. In response, staff responsibilities have recently been restructured to strengthen operations and ensure all target areas are fully achieved moving forward*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*The agency helps bridge the gap for young adults in the community by providing essential skill-building opportunities.* *This program's evidence-based practices include:* *The Five C's of Positive Youth Development,* *Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services* *Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Aging Care on Wheels
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Austin-Travis County Mental Health & Mental Retardation
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Brings mental health and primary care services directly to individuals and families across Austin and Travis County. Eliminating barriers to care by providing critical outreach, screenings, and treatment to people who might otherwise go without support. Desired Outcome: Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Elderly individuals with a behavioral health diagnosis living in senior housing communities for people with low-income
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$64,914
Payment structure	Input
Co-funders (if known)	City is 100% of program funding.
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Other sources that highlight community needs served by this program include: 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, 2022 Office of the City Auditor audit report City Services to Older Adults, Austin's Commission on Aging Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Recommendation, Austin Older Adult Quality of Life Study 2025
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/ Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	This is new contract as of Fiscal Year 25-26. The agency is expected to meet their goals.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	New contract, on pace to meet their goals. This is the only agency funded through APH social services to provide mobile mental health services (which allows increase accessibility) to older adults.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A

Notes and supporting evidence	The program's Qualified Mental Health Professionals provide trauma-informed screening, assessment, diagnosis, and patient-centered treatment planning and treatment delivery. The project uses the following Evidence Based Practices: 1. Motivational Interviewing 2.Seeking Safety, a manual-based model used to strengthen coping skills and reduce self-destructive behavior for individuals with co-occurring trauma and substance use histories. SS has demonstrated effectiveness in improving Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and/or trauma symptoms and reducing substance use 3. Illness Management and Recovery, a curriculum-based rehabilitation program for people with severe mental illness 4.Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*CAN Administration*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center*
Focus Area	*Admin & Planning*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Community Advancement Network (CAN) is a unique partnership of public, private, non-profit and faith-based organizations working together to enhance the social, health, educational and economic well-being of Central Texas. As a neutral convener, connector, and informer in the community, the CAN partnership works to promote a community of equity and opportunity for all.* *Desired Outcome: A forum is maintained to organize key stakeholders.*
Target population	*The Community Advancement Network does not provide direct social services to clients. The Community Advancement Network provides a community forum for creative and collaborative problem-solving inclusive community participation and community consensus building. Key stakeholders include policymakers, administrators, planners, leaders of issue area groups and coalitions, other community-based organizations, and the community at large.*
Geography	*The CAN is governed and led by the CAN members, representing key funders and stakeholders in Austin/Travis County who share a common vision that enhancing the community's well-being requires working collectively across many jurisdictions.*

FY26 contract amount	*$90,717*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City funding is 30.15% or program, other funders make up the remaining 69.85%*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Economic Stability*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*This agreement provides about 30% of the program's funding to support a network of community providers and collaborators. This collaboration enhances the community's capacity for*

	assessment and planning, helping public, private, non-profit, and faith-based organizations optimize resources and promote equity and opportunity for everyone.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*N/A*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Main Mental Health Services*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*As the designated Local Mental Health Authority (LMHA) and Local Intellectual and Developmental Disability Authority (LIDDA), is the only public agency in the Austin/Travis County area qualified to receive certain State and Federal grant allocations through a required local match. Integral Care is also a Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinic. The City of Austin has consistently satisfied the requirement for local matching funds through its taxing authority.* *Desired Outcome: This government-to-government collaboration has allowed Integral Care to serve over 32,000 Austin/Travis County residents with critical, evidence-based mental health and intellectual/developmental disability (IDD) services, creating a safety net for those diagnosed with some of the most severe disabilities found in our community. The City of Austin, in turn, can utilize Integral Cares ability to leverage its dollars and be assured that safety net services are in place. The City of Austin's match leverages contracts from the State of Texas and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. These contracts include program service targets that were derived with the expectation that additional funding is required. In addition to the local match, an array of*

	funding sources includes private insurance, Medicaid, Medicare and, Health Maintenance Organizations amongst others. Therefore, the LMHA and LIDDA contract program service targets are combined to be the same reporting targets required in this Agreement.
Target population	*Adult homeless population -Client financial eligibility is determined using criteria established by Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC)*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$1,998,591*
Payment structure	*Deliverable*
Co-funders (if known)	*State of Texas and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. City makes up 7.87% of funding, remaining 92.13% is from other sources*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health; Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if

other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center, dba Integral Care, is a non-tax-based local governmental entity, and, as the designated Local Mental Health Authority (LMHA) and Local Intellectual and Developmental Disability Authority (LIDDA), is the only public agency in the Austin/Travis County area qualified to receive certain State and Federal grant allocations through a required local match.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	This government-to-government collaboration has allowed Integral Care to serve over 32,000 Austin/Travis County residents with critical, evidence-based mental health and intellectual/developmental disability (IDD) services, creating a safety net for those diagnosed with some of the most severe disabilities found in our community. The City of Austin, in turn, can utilize Integral Cares ability to leverage its dollars and be assured that safety net services are in place. The City of Austin's match leverages contracts from the State of Texas and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program’s evidence-based practices include Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration’s practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of*

	Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	General Fund HIV Non-Medical Case Management-CARE Program
Department	Austin Public Health (APH)
Vendor/Provider	Austin/Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation (MHMR)
Focus Area	HIV Services
Services description and desired outcomes	This program will provide Non-Medical Case Management Services through Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse Outpatient Care, Linguistic Services, Medical Transportation, and Residential Substance Abuse Services to people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) in the Austin Austin Transitional Grant Area (TGA). Desired Outcomes: Clients will receive Non-Medical Case Management services that reduces barriers to care resulting in increase the number of HIV positive individuals who are in care and reduce health disparities for HIV positive clients.
Target population	People living at or below 400% of the federal poverty level (FPL) in the Austin/Travis County area, who have a documented diagnosis of HIV, as well as a substance use diagnosis and/or a mental health diagnosis. In addition, specific efforts are made to target the sub-populations living in the Austin TGA known to be disproportionately impacted by HIV.
Geography	Austin Transitional Grant Area (TGA). Counties include Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Caldwell, Fayette, Hays, Lee, Llano, Travis, Williamson.
FY26 contract amount	$156,667.00
Payment structure	Input
Co-funders (if known)	*None*
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) categories Economic Stability and Health Access Austin Public Health General Funds are used to help meet maintenance of effort requirements of Ryan White Part A federal funds.

Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/ Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), The Austin Area HIV Planning Council FY 2024-2025 Part A allocation model and data evaluation plan. Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)'S Policy Clarification Notice (PCN) #16-02: Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services: Eligible Individuals & Allowable Uses of Funds. Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services Report (RSR)

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	The Austin/Travis County MHMR C.A.R.E. Program consistently demonstrates great performance in meeting the needs of people with HIV who experience mental illness and provides comprehensive, essential services that are well-established and valued within the Austin community. This contract is used annually to show Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for the HRSA Ryan White A grant.

Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No. Specialized services provided.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Intended population will continue to be substantially served and communities' needs will be met if funding is maintained. This program is the only one of its kind funded by APH.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This agency is in good standing with all required monitoring, goals and reporting. Improvements are made as needed with ease. This contract continues to meet community needs and contributes to addressing the high capacity and variety of needs that people living with HIV in the Austin TGA face. While there are several HIV related programs this agency provides specialized mental health services that are necessary for well-rounded quality care to continue, both inside and outside of their agency to supporting clinics. This program's evidence-based practices include: Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) Standards 4, 5, 6, and 7 are current Federal requirements for all recipients; Austin Area HIV Planning Council's Ryan White Part A Service Standards; HRSA'S HIV/AIDS Bureau Clinical Quality Management Policy Clarification Notice 15-02

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Great Futures Program*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	Boys and Girls Club of Austin/ Travis County (BGCAA)
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides Out of School Time (OST) programming that aligns with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) standards that supplement school day learning. BGCAA OST programming allows the agency to pursue objectives aligned with Texas Education Agency statewide outcomes including improved grades; fewer absences; fewer behavioral problems; increased promotion rates; and increased graduation rates. Goal is to provide a safe and productive environment where children acquire the skills and knowledge they need to graduate from high school prepared for success. Desired outcome of program is youth who are prepared to graduate from high school ready for post-secondary success, are engaged and involved in their communities, and who adopt a healthy lifestyle - including wise dietary choices and a commitment to fitness.* Desired Outcome: Clients will progress to the next academic level
Target population	*Primarily minority youth (Hispanic and African American) ages 6-18 who attend Title 1 schools in Travis County. 81% of Club families qualify for free/reduced lunch. Clubs are open to all youth regardless of zip code, school, or residence.*

	Enrollment is open to all youth ages 6-18.
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$349,878.00*
Payment structure	*Input - Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown, City is 18.51% funding*
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) - *Economic Stability, Mental health. CHA highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities.* *Needs addressed by this program were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a

narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency spends their funding fully and meets or exceeds their performance goals*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based contracts include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Student Success Initiative*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Breakthrough*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of this program is to support the academic success and eventual high school graduation of youth in grades 6-12 attending Title I Travis County schools where 40% of the student population or greater qualify for free or reduced lunch.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will progress to the next academic level.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level specifically 6th – 12th grade students in Travis County where at least 40% of the student population qualifies for free or reduced lunch. Primarily Title I schools with 55% speaking English as their second language.*
Geography	*Primarily serving campuses and students in the Del Valle, Northeast Austin/Manor, Eastern Crescent, Southeast Austin, and the Rundberg areas.*
FY26 contract amount	*$145,800*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 8% of total program funding.*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as*

	safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted by City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to exceed performance goals set for program and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency spends their funding fully and meets their performance goals, usually exceeding their total output.*

Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Behavioral Health Services+ (BHS+)
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Caritas of Austin
Focus Area	Behavioral Health
Services description and desired outcomes	Provides professional mental/behavioral health care counseling, psychiatric services, and peer mentoring to Caritas of Austin clients. BHS supplements intensive case management services provided by housing programs for people who have experienced homelessness. BHS helps clients achieve housing stability and individualized goals of building well-being by providing client-centered services to address substance use, trauma, and complex behavioral health needs. Desired Outcome: Clients' mental health status will improve as measured on a standardized assessment.
Target population	The BHS target population includes individuals who are experiencing one or more of the following A mental health and/or behavioral health diagnosis and do not have immediate access to public mental/behavioral health services or are otherwise underserved by those services Prior involvement in the criminal justice system Difficulty maintaining or obtaining housing and lack of or inadequate access to mental/behavioral health services
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$261,506
Payment structure	Reimbursement of eligible expenses
Co-funders (if known)	City is 100% of funding
Community need basis	Mental Health. The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Austin

	Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	The BHS program serves adults experiencing homelessness across Austin and Travis County, providing essential mental health, substance use, and psychiatric support. Without this funding, clients would lose critical services that help them stabilize their housing, reduce crises, and avoid returning to homelessness. The community would face increased pressure on emergency systems and a rise in untreated behavioral health needs.
Documented performance	None

concerns (if any)	
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No – minimal programs provide mental health services/costs of these services is very expensive, so if cut it would limit the resources.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	This program is needed because it provides essential mental health, substance use, psychiatric, and peer-support services to adults experiencing homelessness in Austin/Travis County. Without it, clients are more likely to face untreated behavioral health crises and lose housing stability, increasing returns to homelessness and strain on local systems.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services; Principles of Trauma Informed Care.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Counseling Services***
Department	***Austin Public Health***
Vendor/Provider	***Catholic Charities of Central Texas***
Focus Area	***Behavioral Health***
Services description and desired outcomes	***This program improves awareness of mental health disorders and treatment access, reduces symptoms of behavioral health disorders, increases empowerment of individuals to manage their treatments, and collaborates with community partners to meet additional needs of families. They will deliver counseling sessions to individuals annually.*** ***Desired Outcome: The clients will demonstrate improved mental health status on a standardized assessment and will report that they are engaged in behavioral health.***
Target population	***The target client population is those less likely to pursue mental health services due to barriers related to cost, language, distance, and stigma.***
Geography	***Austin/Travis County Area***
FY26 contract amount	***$99,450.00***
Payment structure	***Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)***
Co-funders (if known)	**Other funding listed but source not known**
Community need basis	***The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as***

	a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update
Associated City or Regional Plans	***CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update***

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	3
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	**Modify**
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	**Modify the performance**
Reasons for recommendation	Agency utilizes its full funding every year however, the agency reports many clients are presenting with mental health issues that

	require more frequent or longer-term counseling sessions. Since the agency works with a client until their needs are resolved. This results in providing more sessions delivered to fewer unduplicated clients, it is recommended to decrease the city business outcome to reflect the agency actual number of clients effectively being served to ensure that each client achieves improved mental health.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Agency has been unable to meet its City Goals in FY 24, FY25 and to date, FY26 due to more sessions and longer sessions needed by individual clients, Agency performed well in Outcomes in FY24 & FY25. To date FY26 agency is under performing on Outcomes due to individual assessment not showing improvement in mental health.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	**No**
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	**N/A**
Notes and supporting evidence	Agency was able to spend down all funding in FY24 and FY 25 and is on target to spend down its funding in FY26. Agency has been unable to meet its City Goals in FY 24, FY25 and to date, FY26 due to more sessions and longer sessions needed by individual clients, Agency performed well in Outcomes in FY24 & FY25. To date FY26 agency is under performing on Outcomes due to individual assessment not showing improvement in mental health. The program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Filing Fee Assistance for Immigrants**
Department	**Austin Public Health**
Vendor/Provider	**Catholic Charities of Central Texas**
Focus Area	**Basic Needs**
Services description and desired outcomes	This program's target population is immigrants with low-income or family members of immigrants in City of Austin/Travis County who qualify for immigration benefits, legal status, or protections. The agency covers application filing fees for eligible immigrants unable to pay for the application fees. Desired Outcome: Clients will obtain and maintain public benefits as a result of receiving services through this Health Equity Social Service Contract.
Target population	**immigrants with low-income or family members of immigrants in City of Austin/Travis County who qualify for immigration benefits, legal status, or protections.**
Geography	**Austin/Travis County Area**
FY26 contract amount	**$126,720.00**
Payment structure	**Input (reimburse of eligible expenses)**
Co-funders (if known)	**Other funding**
Community need basis	**Community Health Assessment (CHA)/Community Health Improvement Plan**

	(CHIP) - Economic Stability. **About 20% of existing clients cannot pay the fees for their applications. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) proposed a new fee schedule in January 2023 that increased fees for adjustment of status by 130% (from $1,225 to $2,820), fees for Naturalization by 19% (from $640 to $760), and fees for applications for employment authorization 59% (from $410 to $650).** **Community needs addressed by this contract are highlighted by Vera Institute of Justice and in the 2022 Recommendations from the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee, Commission on Immigrant Affairs, Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission, and the Asian American Quality of Life Advisory Commission**
Associated City or Regional Plans	**CHA/CHIP, 2014 Austin City Council Welcoming City Resolution, The City of Austin participation in the Welcoming Cities Initiative.**

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	n/a
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	n/a
Reasons for recommendation	Agency has been able to maintain its Performance throughout FY24, FY25 and FY26
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*This is the only contract funded by APH that provides these services.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care. Agency does report that they will be underspent in this contract term due to approximately 50% of cases this year being refugee Adjustment of Status (AOS), which does not have a filing fee. Do not suggest any changes at this time since clients may vary in FY2027.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Immigration Legal Services and Counseling**
Department	Austin Public Health (APH)
Vendor/Provider	Catholic Charities of Central Texas
Focus Area	Reimagining Public Safety/Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Helps immigrants stabilize their immigration status, re-uniting them with family members and providing them with work authorization. The program's goal is to keep families together and safe. Desired Outcome: Clients will obtain and maintain public benefits and improve physical, mental and social functioning as a result of receiving services through this Health Equity Social Service Contract.
Target population	Immigrant community in and around the City of Austin and Travis County.
Geography	Austin/Travis County Area
FY26 contract amount	**$188,872.00**
Payment structure	Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)
Co-funders (if known)	Other funding - 91.38% of program funding is from other sources
Community need basis	The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has two sections focused entirely on mental health and economic stability as a key social determinant of health. Community needs addressed by this contract are highlighted by Vera Institute of Justice and in the 2022 Recommendations from the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee, Commission on Immigrant Affairs, Hispanic Latino Quality of Life Resource Advisory Commission, and the Asian American Quality of Life Advisory Commission

Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2014 Austin City Council Welcoming City Resolution, The City of Austin's participation in the Welcoming Cities Initiative.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	3
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	n/a
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	n/a
Reasons for recommendation	The agency has spent down all funding from FY24 and FY25 and is on target to spending funding for FY26. Agency performance for City Goals has under-performed due to the various immigration policy changes however the agency has been able to meet its Outcomes within a reasonable variance.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*CCCTX reports difficulty reaching the priority population. Some clients have expressed concerns about attending court or leaving home to access services. Among clients who do participate, the program is achieving positive outcomes within the allowable variance.*

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	I have scored this as Maintain, the agency has spent down all funding from FY24 and FY25 and is on target to spending funding for FY26. Agency performance for City Goals has underperformed due to the various immigration policy changes however the agency has been able to meet its Outcomes within a reasonable variance. This is the only contract funded by APH that provide these services to these priority populations.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	With the ongoing immigration policy shifts and immigration enforcement, this is one of few supports available to the community. This program's evidence-based practices include Universal Representation, the American Bar Association's Standards for Civil Legal Services, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Substance Misuse Street Medicine*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Central Texas Community Health Centers*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Expand treatment and services for substance use disorder (SUD), including substance abuse counseling, navigation, and wraparound support services. Specifically, this project aims to increase support for people with low income affected by SUD who may be experiencing or at risk of homelessness, who want to change the way SUD impacts their health and quality of life.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*This program serves people with low-income who are experiencing SUD, including those who are experiencing or who are at risk of homelessness in Austin.*
Geography	*Austin encampments*
FY26 contract amount	*$182,800*
Payment structure	*Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)*
Co-funders (if known)	*City makes up 50.95% of funding, other funders make up remaining 49.05% of budget*
Community need basis	*Mental Health – The Community Health Assessment*

	(CHA) dedicates an entire section to mental health as a key social determinant of health. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted by City of Austin 2018 Opioid Resolution; Austin/Travis County 2019 Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs, Needs Assessment; Council Member Casar 2020-2021 Budget Amendment for Substance Use Continuum of Care.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP); CommUnityCare collaborates with Central Health. The two organizations are in a co-applicant agreement to support CommUnityCare's administration of the Federally Qualified Health Center program. CommUnityCare also participates in planning with City of Austin Fast Track Cities initiative to end the HIV epidemic.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*

Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	*Program provides life-stabilizing support to low-income individuals experiencing substance use disorder, especially those who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Additionally, agency continues to meet performance goals within variance and spends down funds.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*500+ clients will be served annually and will make progress on treatment plans (3B)*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	*Consistently overperforms and increases goal of clients served.* *This program's evidence-based practices include National Harm Reduction Coalition Harm Reduction Principles, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services; Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Eastern Crescent Food Access
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Central Texas Food Bank
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Provides emergency food assistance to eligible food-insecure individuals and households, providing healthy, nutritious food in a client choice model. Serves communities that are not served by other agencies because of lack of capacity or where no agencies are present. Desired Outcome 97,200 pounds of food will be distributed annually.
Target population	Clients who live in and/or receive services through distributions in Austin's Eastern Crescent.
Geography	Eastern crescent of Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$162,000
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown, City is 4% of total program funding.
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a key social determinant of health
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 – Access.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5

Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Maintain funding so that the agency can continue to provide services to meet community needs. Program exceeds food distribution goals annually.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Unknown
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If funding is maintained, the agency will be able to continue providing services that meet community needs
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	This program’s evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.

- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Travis County School Food Access*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Central Texas Food Bank*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Increase food security for Travis County children and families. Program will launch pantries in schools within Travis County. These pantries will improve access to consistent, healthy food for students, families, and school staff.*
Target population	*School districts in Austin/Travis County categorized as Title I schools.*
Geography	*Northwest and East Austin areas.*
FY26 contract amount	*$150,000*
Payment structure	*Deliverable*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding .*
Community need basis	*Food Security - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA)*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*

Performance results	*N/A*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*New program, no performance to base rating*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*New program, no performance to base rating. Program was funded at the direction of Council Members Siegel and Lane, and should be allowed to provide services for at least one year to determine success.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program’s evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Travis County Senior Nutrition*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Central Texas Food Bank, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Reduce food insecurity and increase nutritional intake for older adults aged 55+ in Travis County, improving their physical, mental, and social functioning by providing reliable and direct monthly home deliveries of fresh groceries at no cost each fiscal year.* *Desired Outcome:* *Individuals will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level, specifically older adults age 55 and older, residing in Travis County who receive qualifying government benefits.*
Geography	*Across Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$93,316*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 55% of total program funding.*
Community need basis	*Food Security - CHA addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a key social determinant of health. Other sources that highlighted this need include: 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin*

	Action Plan, 2022 Office of the City Auditor audit report, City Services to Older Adults, and Austin's Commission on Aging Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Recommendation, 2025 Austin Older Adult Quality of Life Study.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA), Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The agency is serving the community and meeting the goal that they set for themselves, but because demographic data isn't recorded fully, we're not sure what demographics are truly being served.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency is on track to fully spend budget amount.*

	This is their first program year and we don't have enough data to decide to reduce or modify the current budget amount. *Only one other agency funded by APH social services provides food access tailored to older adults' needs*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Agency is exceeding their goals by about 140% in their first program year. We expect for them to continue to exceed their goals at this rate and grow the home delivery program.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Service model aligns with Feeding America's best practices for senior hunger interventions and trauma-informed care and principles recommended by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program outreach follows evidence-based strategies endorsed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for increasing benefit participation among older adults.* *Nutrition education materials are based on USDA's MyPlate for Older Adults guidelines and are culturally adapted to meet the needs of diverse senior populations.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*College Food Access*
Department	*Austin Public Health (APH)*
Vendor/Provider	*Central Texas Food Bank, Inc. (CTFB)*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*This program works with Austin's colleges and universities to provide targeted funds, guidance, and/or food-related services to assist them in serving their student, faculty and staff populations. The College Food Access Services program leverages student -driven initiatives to strategically address hunger on their campuses, with CTFB providing tailored resources to awardees with a focus on impact and sustainability.* *Desired Outcome: CTFB will strengthen and sustain partnerships with Austin/Travis County colleges and universities that will address hunger of students, faculty, and staff as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Students, faculty, and staff at colleges and universities*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County colleges and universities*
FY26 contract amount	*$141,750*
Payment structure	*Activity*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% program funding*
Community need basis	*Food Security: Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a*

	key social determinant of health
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Continued funding for the College Food Access program would sustains reliable, stigma-free food access for students, faculty, and staff across multiple Austin/Travis County campuses, many of whom experience food insecurity that threatens academic performance, retention, and overall wellbeing. Central Texas Food Bank ensures these programs remain effective, operational, and tailored to each institution's needs. Maintaining funding strengthens long-term partnerships, expands outreach, and enables campuses to provide*

	equitable access to nutritious food through pantries, grab-and-go options, classroom deliveries, and fresh produce markets.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Around 10 campuses together will distribute hundreds of thousands of pounds of food and have thousands of pantry touchpoints.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Program has expanded to new campuses since starting.* *It's evidence-based practices include a Food Access Convening Tool (FACT) which forecasts needs, and overlays existing services including food distribution to quantify remaining meal gap and identify priority locations for services and partnerships. The program also implements National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Food Distribution +*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Central Texas Food Bank, Inc.(CTFB)*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provide immediate access to nutritious food to individuals with low income or who are experiencing food insecurity* *Desired Outcome: Individuals with low income or who are experiencing food insecurity and living in Travis County or Austin will have immediate access nutritious food and thousand of pounds will be distributed to them as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Individuals with low income or who are experiencing food insecurity and living in Travis County or Austin*
Geography	*Travis County or Austin*
FY26 contract amount	*$360,055*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 3% of program funding, other funders provide 97% of funding*
Community need basis	*Food Security: Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a key social determinant of health.* *This contract's services are also highlighted as key needs in 2023 APH Basic Needs Community Survey,*

	2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP); CTFB is a member of the Feeding America network and Feeding Texas, Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access, Goal 7 Food Recovery*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	*Continued funding for the Central Texas Food Bank Food Distribution program is essential because it provides the primary infrastructure that ensures households with low income in Austin and Travis County have consistent access to nutritious food. By*

	supplying groceries at no cost to a broad network of Partner Agencies—including pantries, shelters, senior centers, and youth programs—the program fills critical gaps in the local hunger-relief system and supports thousands of residents experiencing food insecurity. Maintaining funding allows these agencies to meet growing community needs, respond effectively during emergencies, and deliver food safely and efficiently to individuals who rely on this support for their health and stability. Additionally, agency continues to meet performance goals within variance and spends down funds.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Access to nutritious food for those facing food insecurity will continue*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	*Program overperforms; changes in economy and political landscape have increased need.* *The program evidence-based practices include a Food Access Convening Tool (FACT), which forecasts needs and overlays existing services including food distribution to quantify remaining meal gap and identify priority locations for services and partnerships. The program also implements National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Recovery in Action
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Communities for Recovery
Focus Area	Behavioral Health
Services description and desired outcomes	The program will increase the recovery capital of individuals living with substance use disorder (SUD) by expanding recovery supports and services to individuals in the City of Austin with a focus on Hispanic and African American/Black communities and provide outreach and educational activities with community partners focusing on substance use recovery, stigma, overdose reversal training and accessing community services. Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress on their treatment plan goals.
Target population	Members of underserved communities with a focus on Hispanic and African American/Black communities, individuals living with lack of housing, individuals re-entering communities following incarceration or treatment, and individuals living with substance misuse and mental health symptoms.
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$149,245
Payment structure	Input
Co-funders (if known)	City funds 75.61% Other Funders 24.39%
Community need basis	Mental Health. The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update.

Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	2

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	This program provides recovery supports to Austin's underserved Hispanic and African American/Black communities, helping individuals with substance use disorder maintain stability and access lifesaving peer coaching, groups, and overdose-prevention education.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Partial – City funds 75% of program
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Without this funding, clients would lose recovery supports, increasing relapse risk, reducing access to culturally responsive services, and placing greater strain on local health and emergency systems.

Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include Center for Medicaid and State Operations standards for peer support; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Convener*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Communities for Recovery*
Focus Area	*Admin & Planning*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Travis County, City of Austin, and Central Health (the "Funders") are collaboratively funding and providing oversight to the Program following the Memorandum of Understanding for the Development of a SUD Consortium amongst Central Health, City of Austin, and Travis County. Communities for Recovery (Contractor) through SUD Consortium Convener (Program) shall conduct the following: - Establish a SUD consortium in Travis County ("SUD Consortium" or "Consortium"); - Create a framework or model for a SUD continuum of services and supports ("SUD Continuum" or "Continuum"); and - Create and distribute a SUD community plan ("SUD Plan" or "Plan").*
Target population	*This contract does not provide direct services to the community. By working with key stakeholders and the community, a framework for the continuum of SUD services and support and community plan is being developed to minimize duplication and create efficiencies across the continuum.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$102,000*
Payment structure	*Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) Activity (delivery of services)*

Co-funders (if known)	*Central Health and Travis County – City is 31.03% of budget and other funders make up remaining 68.97%*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health; City of Austin 2018 Opioid Resolution; Austin/Travis County 2019 Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs, Needs Assessment; Council Member Casar 2020-2021 Budget Amendment for Substance Use Continuum of Care*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agencies collaboratively funding and providing oversight to the Program following the Memorandum*

	of Understanding for the Development of a Substance Use Disorder Consortium amongst Central Health, City of Austin, and Travis County.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Case Management and Pebble Project +*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Communities in Schools (CIS) of Central Texas*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*CIS supports students in elementary, middle, and high schools in Austin Independent School District (AISD) with case management services, reducing dropout rates and increasing graduation rates through tiered services to students, schools, and families. Pebble Project child abuse prevention workshops educate and empower children to contribute to their own safety through recognizing abusive or dangerous situations, resisting abuse, and telling a trusted adult if they have been harmed.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will progress to the next academic level.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level specifically elementary through high school students enrolled in Title I schools with a high proportion of students who qualify for free or reduced lunch.*
Geography	*North Central, Northeast, Central East, Southeast, and South Central areas of Austin.*
FY26 contract amount	*$472,500*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 7% of total program funding.*

Community need basis	*Mental Health/Substance Abuse - The Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.* *Services addressed in this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to exceed performance goals set for program and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has spent down their funding and met their*

	goal expectations.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Performance is currently on track to exceed goals by about 50% with the reduced funding from earlier this program year and has met or exceeded output goals in past program years.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Expanding Support for Students Program*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Communities In Schools of Central Texas*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Mental Health and Wellbeing (MH&W) program at Communities In Schools of Central Texas (CIS) addresses unmet mental and behavioral health needs among students in Austin Independent School District (AISD) schools with whom CIS partners. The objectives of this program are to offer support to students experiencing mental health crises, helping them to move through this crisis and return to a healthier mindset.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals and demonstrate improved life skills as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Students in the Austin Independent School District*
Geography	*Austin Independent School District (AISD) schools with whom CIS partners; such as 78701, 78702, and 78704 zip codes, and the Eastern Crescent; in fact, 14 of the AISD schools served by CIS are located in the 78702 or 78704 zip codes.*
FY26 contract amount	*$81,000*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 7.88% program budget; other funders unknown*

Community need basis	*Mental Health: The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.* *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP); Kids Living Well, Greater Austin Area My Brothers Keeper Initiative, Greater Austin Community Schools Coalition, United Ways Success by Six, and the Joint Subcommittee Mobility Task Force, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*3*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*

Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Adjust clients served goal to better align with work.*
Reasons for recommendation	*The program has shown improvement in meeting goals but still falls outside the variance.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Program faces ongoing staffing challenges*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Performance will better align with work and staffing capacity*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Program spends down and has been improving clients served goal and outcome goals.* *This program's evidence-based practices include Integrated Student Supports, Comprehensive School Mental Health System, Project Access, Dialectical Behavior Therapy, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Advancing Latinas to Higher Education***
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Con Mi Madre*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Preparedness and participation programs for college prep, career knowledge, improving academic performance, developing effective communications and coping skills for students. The program also provide education for female-identifying parents to educate them on how to best support their child.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will progress to the next academic level*
Target population	*Female-identifying students from 6th grade through undergraduate in the Central Texas area, City funds are reserved for those attending schools in the Austin/Travis County school districts*
Geography	*Austin Independent School District, Del Valle Independent School District, Hays Independent School District, Taylor Independent School District*
FY26 contract amount	*$50,400.00*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 21.69% of funding.*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability- Austin Public Health Community*

	Health Assessment (CHA) highlights relationship between education and income; and childhood readiness and economic factors such as safe environments, nutrition, healthcare, and upward mobility (p 69), throughout CHA priorities Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The agency consistently meets its established performance goals and effectively serves the target demographics outlined in its program objectives*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A

Reasons for recommendation	*Agency spends their funding fully and meets their performance goals and their total output goals. Agency has successfully spent additional funding in the past and has capacity to expand the program with adequate funding.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*PeaceRox*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Council on At-Risk Youth (CARY)*
Focus Area	*Reimagining Public Safety*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Reduce juvenile delinquency, break the cycle of victimization/violence, and improve the community's response to violence with a targeted group of students and their families who have been previously hard to reach. This is accomplished through skill training (interpersonal relationship effectiveness, anger management, empathic reasoning, and character education) group sessions, counseling, and parent empowerment. The funding for this program serves multiple schools.* *Desired Outcome - Individuals will demonstrate improved life skills.*
Target population	*Middle school and high school youth who are involved in serious disciplinary incidents on school campuses, including assault, aggression, abuse, gang involvement, and other behaviors.*
Geography	*Support at five of the most underserved schools in Austin. 1) Northeast High School in 78752, 2) Juan Navarro High School in 78758, and 3) Martin Middle School in 78702, 4.) Dobie Middle School in 78753, and 5.) Decker Middle School in 78724*
FY26 contract amount	*$126,000*
Payment structure	*Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)*

Co-funders (if known)	*Other funders make up 92.4% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in the FBI 2022 Uniform Crime Report, US Census Bureau 2020 American Community Survey, RPS Taskforce 2021 Mid-Year Recommendations Report*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency spends their funding fully and meets their performance goals, usually exceeding their total output.*

Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services; Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Teen Advocacy***
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Court Appointed Special Advocates of Travis County (CASA)*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of the Teen Advocacy program is to provide advocacy and life skills to foster children ages 14 years and older who are preparing to age out of the child welfare system and need stability and resources to become independent adults.* Desired Outcome: Clients will demonstrate improved life skills
Target population	*Children living in Austin/Travis County who are 14 years old or older and who have open cases in the child welfare courts in Travis County. Children who have no income or income below 250% of the poverty line. CASA proposes to use the Orders of Appointment issued by the Travis County judges who appoint CASA to serve as guardian ad litem for children and youth as the documentation for client eligibility.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$65,837.00*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 10% of program funding.*
Community need basis	*Mental Health- Austin Public Health Community*

	Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) , Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency meets performance goals set for the program and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*

Reasons for recommendation	*The agency utilizes its funding effectively and consistently achieves its established performance goals.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*CASA of Travis County recruits, screens, trains, and provides professional supervision to community volunteers who serve as guardians ad litem—court-appointed advocates for the best interests of children and youth who have experienced abuse or neglect. When Child Protective Services becomes involved due to allegations of maltreatment, judges appoint CASA to offer informed recommendations that support each child's safety, stability, and long-term well-being. For teens, the instability, loss, and trauma associated with involvement in the child protection system can be especially overwhelming. CASA's Teen Advocacy and Permanency Project focuses on providing these youth with stability, security, and a sense of future possibility during a highly challenging period in their lives.* *This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*High-Quality Behavioral Health Services*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Easterseals Central TX, Inc*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Easter Seals Central Texas (ESCT) Child Development Program is a unique, inclusive preschool, serving children 6 weeks to 6 years of age. ESCT believe in providing a positive approach to learning. Highly trained staff members take high-quality childcare to the next level by providing evidence-based strategies, scientifically designed, and proven to promote optimal development in all domains.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals and demonstrate improved life skills as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*ESCT will serve children ages 6 weeks to 6 years old who are residents of Austin or Travis County who are 1) living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level or 2) are children with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities and the caregiver/parent.*
Geography	*Austin or Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$169,823*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 65% of program budget; other funders*

	unknown
Community need basis	*Economic Stability: Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses childcare as a key aspect of Economic Stability (CHA pp 62-64, 151-152). The needs addressed by this contract were also identified in the Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP); ESCT staff participates in the following community groups aimed at addressing racial disparities: One Voice Central Texas Public Policy Committee, Reentry Roundtable, Early Childhood Intervention Consortia, and the Coalition of Texans with Disabilities.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*1*
Coverage adequacy	*1*
Coverage rationale	*Majority of zips are not low-income areas*
Geographic adequacy	*1*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*

Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*The agency will be placed on a corrective plan with a possible reduction in funding for FY27.*
Reasons for recommendation	*Consistently misses goal of clients served due to staff turnover, location of the facility and*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Unknown*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Funding can be shifted to more effective mental health programs and the program can work to increase clients served that is more aligned to their actual ability*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Currently, and for the last few years, the agency has had a variance of -30% - -80% of client served goal.* *This program's evidence-based practices include the Walden Model; Board-Certified Behavior Analyst processes; Applied Behavior Analysis; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Access to Reproductive Healthcare
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	El Buen Samaritano Episcopal Mission
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Provides outreach in the form of community events, health fairs, and partnerships coupled with comprehensive family planning education, information and referrals. Facilitates confidential client-centered counseling and education, as well as closed-loop referrals to reproductive health and preventive health services; navigating and accessing birth control (including emergency contraception and vasectomies; patient education; reproductive health counseling.
Target population	Data from El Buen's social determinants of health (SDOH) assessments indicate that the individuals served experience extensive SDOH challenges including food insecurity, economic instability, mental health issues, barriers to education, affordable/safe housing, and transportation.
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$64,799
Payment structure	Reimbursement of eligible expenses
Co-funders (if known)	City funds 100% of program
Community need basis	Economic Stability. Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158). Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in The City of Austin Commission for Women 2019 Budget Recommendation, National Institute for Reproductive Health's 2017 Local Reproductive Freedom Index.
Associated City or Regional	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP),*

Plans	*City of Austin 2022 GRACE Act, Council Member Fuentes 2022 Budget Rider, Council Member Ellis 2022 Budget Rider*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Program provides reproductive health education, counseling, contraception access, and coordinated referrals that many would otherwise be unable to obtain.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Program typically exceeds goals, currently seeing higher number of returning clients which has pushed output below goal. Agency has established additional partner sites for outreach, planning, and services to boost numbers.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No, due to political climate. Eliminating this program would significantly widen health inequities, reduce access to preventive care, and leave high-need communities without reliable pathways to reproductive and clinical health services.

Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	This program would improve access to reproductive and preventive healthcare for Austin/Travis County residents. Community Health Workers would expand education, counseling, and navigation support, giving clients clearer pathways to contraception options, emergency contraception, and cancer screenings.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include Client – Centered Counseling and Education, Motivational Interviewing, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Rundberg Food Access & Equity Program
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	El Buen Samaritano Episcopal Mission
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Place-based initiative with the goal of providing access to food and support services Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Social Services Health Equity Programs.
Target population	Participants living, working, or going to school in the Rundberg area.
Geography	Rundberg area, defined as the area in North Austin bounded by Braker Lane to the north, Highway 183 and North Lamar to the south, Metric Blvd to the west, and Cameron/Dessau Road to the east.
FY26 contract amount	$90,000
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	None, City is 100% of program funding.
Community need basis	Food Security - The Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on food insecurity and access as a key social determinant of health. The City of Austin and Go Austin/Vamos Austin's 2021 initiative, which partnered with social services organizations, clinical partners, community leaders, and residents, identified needs in the Rundberg area addressed by this contract.
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Program is successfully meeting outcomes in an underserved area of Austin. This is one of two APH funded contracts specifically dedicated to the Rundberg area
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Unknown
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*N/A*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.

- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*LiveWell ViveBien*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Equidad ATX, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Program will address social determinants of health in priority underserved communities in the Austin/Travis County area. This funding is intended to augment, not replace, investments in food access programs and equitably cover a critical gap between resources and community needs.*
Target population	*Underserved communities in the Austin/Travis County area. Creedmoor, and hybrid at Del Valle* *-Del Valle HS (78617)* *-Creedmoor Community Center (78610)* *-Turner-Roberts Recreation Center in Colony Park (78724)* *- prioritizing Austin's Eastern Crescent, particularly communities in Northeast and Southeast Austin*
Geography	*Austin / Austin's Eastern Crescent area*
FY26 contract amount	*$63,000.00*
Payment structure	*Activity - Deliverable*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) – Economic stability, Food security* *Investments in food access programs, prioritizing Austin's Eastern Crescent, particularly communities in Northeast and Southeast Austin*

Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*1*
Coverage adequacy	*1*
Coverage rationale	*Equidad partners, in conjunction with their primary food distributor, the Central Texas Food Bank (CTFB), support the mobile ecosystem and continues to serve the three inaugural communities: • Del Valle High School (Del Valle- 78617) • Creedmoor Community Center (Creedmoor- 78610) • Turner-Roberts Recreation Center (Colony Park- 78724).*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Recommendation is for new vendor or to end program due to unproven deliverables.*
Reasons for recommendation	*Equidad partners, in conjunction with their primary food distributor, the Central Texas Food Bank (CTFB), are completing the service.* *There are concerns related to Cruising Kitchens*

	partnership since program is having legal and reorganization issues. Equidad does not provide food services but instead supports CTFB. *The retired and retrofitted Cap Metro bus that Equidad anticipated Cruising Kitchens using is still not operational.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*CapMetro Bus that was provided to the organization is still not operational.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Yes, Central Texas Food Bank could continue its Eastern Crescent agreement. Since November 2022, the Food Bank has been distributing food to three target communities using its tractor-trailer, in a market style as opposed to drive through and pre-boxed groceries.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Equidad notes within their claims that CTFB completes distribution of food from CTFB vehicle(s). Equidad has not been able to produce operational retired and retrofitted Cap Metro Bus since 2020, upwards of six (6) years.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Go live on an operational retired and retrofitted Cap Metro Bus by September 15, 2026. This target has moved six times in two years.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Counseling for Seniors
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Family Eldercare
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Improve or maintain clients' mental health functioning. Through the Counseling program, Licensed Clinical Social Workers provide individual in-home or virtual therapy. Desired Outcome: Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Adults aged 55 and over with mental health care needs or individuals who are Medicaid or Medicare-eligible that are unable to access counseling services in the community due to lack of mobility, lack of transportation, lack of access, and/or lack of funds.
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$64,914.00
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown. City is 15% of the total program budget.
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental health/substance use Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Data from UT Austin Texas Aging and Longevity Consortium projects, 2016 City of Austin Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, Office of the City Auditor 2022 audit report, *City Services to Older Adults*, Austin's Commission on Aging 2025 Budget Recommendation, 2025 Austin Older Adult Quality of Life Study
Associated City or Regional	*CHA/Austin Public Health Community Health*

Plans	*Improvement Plan (CHIP) , 2016 City of Austin Age Friendly Austin Action Plan*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Program has historically spent all funds and provided counseling services in accordance with their goals.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if	*N/A*

applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services; Principles of Trauma Informed Care; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) for serving people experiencing chronic homelessness, people with co-occurring disorders, older adults with serious mental illness, people with substance use disorders, and other relevant populations. Acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT), Critical Time Intervention (CTI), Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), Motivational Interviewing (MI), cognitive-behavioral interventions, and trauma-informed practices such as Seeking Safety*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Financial Advocacy
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Family Eldercare
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Ensure clients' essential needs, such as food, housing, healthcare, and clothing, are consistently met through effective and timely management of their monetary benefits. Prioritizes protecting clients from financial abuse, neglect, and exploitation with a target of maintaining zero incidents of confirmed financial harm among clients annually. Desired Outcomes Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Older adults with low-income and adults with disabilities who are at heightened risk of financial exploitation, homelessness, and institutionalization in Austin/Travis County. Core clients include individuals aged 65+, those living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), and people with physical, cognitive, or mental health conditions that interfere with their ability to manage finances independently.
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$93,317.00
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Source unknown. City is 24% of total program budget.
Community need basis	Financial literacy and assistance addressed as part of Eco. Stability Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) CHA pp 46-58. The following sources also highlight community needs for this program’s services: 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, 2022 Office of the City Auditor audit report City Services

	to Older Adults, Austin’s Commission on Aging Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Recommendation
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action, 2025 Austin Older Adult Quality of Life Study

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	This is the only agency funded through APH social services to provide this service. Agency regularly fully expends funds and meets goals.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Unknown
Service improvements or gaps	N/A

expected if this recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program operates under strict federal regulations established by the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). These agencies designate Family Eldercare as a trusted representative payee or fiduciary based on the organization's proven knowledge of older adults and adults with disabilities, and its ability to manage financial resources in a way that prioritizes client safety, housing, and stability.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Mobile Markets and Home Delivery*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Farmshare Austin*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Increase access to affordable healthy food in neighborhoods facing the four most common food access barriers in the Austin area; low proximity to healthy food retail, low household income, few mobility options, and a lack of healthy food available nearby.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will have access to affordable healthy food at different access points as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Focuses particularly on Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) recipients and individuals at or below 200% Federal Poverty Level.*
Geography	*Mobile Market operates in locations that are economically disadvantaged around the Eastern Crescent of Austin and Travis County; Fresh for Less serves Austin and Travis County's Eastern Crescent:*
FY26 contract amount	*$272,344*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 27% of program funding; other funders unknown*
Community need basis	*Food Security: Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a*

	key social determinant of health. Services provided by this contract are also highlighted as key needs within the following: 2023 APH Basic Needs Community Survey, 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Program directly addresses the most significant food access barriers in Austin's Eastern Crescent by providing reliable, affordable access to fresh,*

	nutrient-dense produce and pantry items for households with low income, SNAP participants, and individuals experiencing mobility challenges. Offers consistent, community-based food access points that allow customers to choose the items and quantities that best meet their needs. The program strengthens the resilience of the local food system, supports healthier eating patterns, and reaches neighborhoods historically underserved by traditional food retail. Maintaining funding ensures that residents continue to benefit from dependable, weekly access to healthy food and that critical gaps in the region's food access network remain filled. Additionally, agency continues to meet performance goals within variance and spends down funds.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Program overperforms.* *Evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Food Access and Benefit Enrollment
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Foundation Communities Inc
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	The goal of this program is to increase food access for Foundation Communities (FC) residents and Austin community members specifically underserved and hard-to-reach communities, as well as destigmatizing the food pantry experience overall.
Target population	Residents of the City of Austin or Travis County who are either living at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level. Our food pantries operate under the direction of the Central Texas Food Bank (CTFB) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) guidance. FC is required to collect income information and data when serving clients.
Geography	Austin/Travis County. FC currently operates 24 food pantries across area, properties are specifically situated in neighborhoods experiencing higher levels of poverty and food insecurity.
FY26 contract amount	$65,742
Payment structure	Reimbursement of eligible expenses
Co-funders (if known)	No other funders on program, City is 100%
Community need basis	Food Security. Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in 2023 APH Basic Needs Community Survey, 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6- Access.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	3
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	The program is needed to provide reliable access to fresh produce, dry goods, proteins, and dairy, while also helping clients enroll in essential benefits like Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Women Infant Children (WIC), and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), all of which reduce hunger and improve household stability.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Agency is struggling with outcome measure, stating that they are seeing misinformation about benefits causing issues, longer wait times for enrollment interviews, and problems hearing back from clients to verify benefits enrollment. Government shutdowns and problems at the federal level have also contributed to the issue.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	It would cause a strain on other resources. This is a direct resource for residents at the FC communities.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this	Keeping this program ensures consistent food access, stronger community stability, and increased enrollment in nutrition benefits. It

recommendation is adopted	strengthens local food security infrastructure, provides culturally respectful and accessible distribution models, and positions resources directly within the neighborhoods most affected by poverty. Leading to healthier families, reduced crisis situations, and greater overall community well-being.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	The program's evidence-based practices includes provision of food that meets American Heart Association guidelines and the USDA'S Dietary Guidelines for Americans 2020-2025, and implementation of National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	PSH Behavioral Health Program
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Foundation Communities Inc
Focus Area	Behavioral Health
Services description and desired outcomes	The goals of the project are to: a) coordinate services to make it easier for participants to receive quality behavioral health services from an array of community partners, b) provide early intervention and treatment for those who suffer from mental illness, substance misuse, or co-occurring psychiatric and substance use disorder and/or chronic physical health conditions, c) improve housing retention and decrease reoccurring homelessness among participating individuals Clients will maintain housing due to receiving essential services and mental health status improves as measured on a standardized assessment
Target population	This program serves formerly homeless, unaccompanied individuals residing in Foundation Communities (FC) 7 supportive housing communities who have been diagnosed with two or more of the following: mental health disorders, substance use disorders, and/or chronic physical health conditions. All clients have incomes below 200% of the federal poverty level.
Geography	Austin/Travis County (FC’s 7 supportive housing communities)
FY26 contract amount	$202,500
Payment structure	Reimbursement of eligible expenses
Co-funders (if known)	City funds 48.27% of program. 51.73% other funders.
Community need basis	Mental Health. The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community

	Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	3

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Without this program, residents would lose access to behavioral health treatment, crisis support, and housing-stability services, leading to higher relapse rates, increased emergency room use, and greater risk of returning to homelessness.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None – agency typically has high enrollment rates and exceeds goals.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	This program delivers onsite, high-intensity Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) within Foundation Communities' supportive housing

	locations. This is something traditional outpatient providers and partner agencies are not structured to replace.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Keeping the program ensures stable housing, better quality of life, reduced emergency system usage, and stronger continuity of care through coordinated onsite behavioral health services.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Tax Centers*
Department	*Austin Public Health (APH)*
Vendor/Provider	*Foundation Communities Inc.*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Community Tax Center Continuation Program (CTCCP) provides low-income clients with resources and strategies to make the transition out of poverty and become self-sufficient. The program provides tax preparation services for federal income taxes for low-income clients, supporting those who are eligible for Earned Income Tax Credits (EITC) and/or Child Tax Credits to receive or maintain them. The desired outcome is that clients will obtain or maintain public benefits*
Target population	*Households eligible for EITC. The EITC is a refundable credit for working individuals and couples, particularly those with children, and the benefit amount depends on taxpayer income and number of children. The program follows the Internal Revenue Services (IRS) guidelines and Area Median Family Income (MFI) for eligibility.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County – Foundation Communities properties*
FY26 contract amount	*$123,792*
Payment structure	Input – Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*City of Austin (APH) funds 10.24% of this program. Other funders are unknown.*
Community need basis	*Needs addressed by this contract were highlighted*

	in APH Community Health Assessment, which identifies economic stability as a key social determinant of health. *These needs were also highlighted in 2023 APH Basic Needs Community Survey, 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and University of Texas Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin ArcGIS data*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*APH Community Health Assessment*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	4
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*This program provides free IRS compliant tax preparations to low-income households who often*

	cannot afford commercial tax services. It supports earned income tax credit (EITC)/child tax credit (CTS) and serves as an entry point into financial stability services.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Agency has stated they were having issues with changes in demographics making less people eligible for the EITC. Leading to a smaller percentage of enrolled clients being able to obtain that benefit. Agency continues to meet or exceed their Output goal.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*APH only funds 10% of program so other providers could potentially absorb those costs*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Maintaining the program ensures accurate, free and accessible tax preparation for low-income families.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include Prosperity Now's Taxpayer Opportunity Network and Volunteer Income Tax Assistance practices, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services* *Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Girl Connect +*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*GENaustin*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of this program is to reach girls in statewide Girl Connect programming, to increase their self-efficacy, with at least 75% of girls served demonstrating: increased confidence; increased creativity and critical thinking skills; increased positive communication, collaboration, pro-social bonding with peers, leaders, and role models; and increased coping skills.* *Desired Outcomes* *Clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level specifically girls in grades 3rd through 12th who attend Title I schools in Austin/Travis County.*
Geography	*The Daffan, Hornsby Bend, Dove Springs, Rundberg, and South Austin areas are mostly served through the program.*
FY26 contract amount	*$178,968*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 33% of total funding.*
Community need basis	*Mental Health/Substance Use - The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused*

	entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey .*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The program is currently on track to surpass the goal by 80%-100%. However, in previous years, the data for the program, from subgrantees, wasn't obtained, resulting in the program technically not meeting its outcome goals that were required by the city. This is mostly due to limitations of the school district and new rules around sharing student information with external partners.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*

Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has spent their budget fully each program year and met or exceeded their performance output goals.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*We could adjust the goals to not have the agency continuously surpass them at a faster rate each program year.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Vendor has created a different mechanism for tracking outcomes this year to not rely on school district data.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*The program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Asian Pacific Islander Health Navigation
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Get Up Project
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Improve access to high-quality healthcare for low-income residents in the Greater Austin area. The model of care is designed to address financial, cultural, and linguistic barriers to accessing medical and wraparound case management services. Desired Outcome: Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Asian Pacific Islander residents with low income
Geography	Greater Austin area
FY26 contract amount	$135,000
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown. City is unreported portion of income. Staff are currently updating budget documents.
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158)
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)

Scores

Field	Entry

Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Maintain funding so that the agency can continue providing services to meet community needs. Get Up Project consistently meets their goals and spends all funds.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Unknown
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If funding is maintained, agency will continue to provide services to meet community needs.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	This program’s evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.

- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***School-Based Community Programs***
Department	*Austin Public Health - SSAU*
Vendor/Provider	*Girl Scouts of Central Texas (GSTX)*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*School-Based Community Programs in Travis County* *Discovery Girls, which provides Girl Scout programming with an emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM), to girls in grades K-8;* *Gamma Sigma, which engages girls in grades 6-12 in leadership, advocacy, community service, and college readiness.* *Tech Girls, which provides hands-on STEM programming to girls in grades 6-12.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will demonstrate improved life skills*
Target population	*Girls between the ages of 5 and 18 who attend Title I elementary, middle, and high schools in Austin, Del Valle, and Manor Independent School Districts (ISD) where at least 40% of the students are eligible for free or reduced lunch.*
Geography	*Austin, Del Valle, and Manor ISD*
FY26 contract amount	*$91,800.00*
Payment structure	*Input - Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 68% of funding.*

Community need basis	*Mental Health - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.* *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency fell slightly in meeting performance goals. GSCTX relied on teachers to administer year-end surveys, but burnout and high turnover led to fewer completed surveys than in previous years. To improve reporting, GSCTX has implemented a new tracking system that requires surveys and recorded hours before funding is released. Agency serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry

Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The program has provided over 5100 service hours to school aged girls in Austin, Manor and Del Valle ISD, and ran out of funding due to previous cuts.* ***The agency*** *utilizes its funding effectively and achieves most of its established performance goals, despite funding deficits.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Girl Scouts of Central Texas will provide high-quality youth development programming to economically disadvantaged girls, grades K-12, through GSCTX School-Based Community Programs. School-Based Community Programs aim to bring programming directly to the places girls already are. The program curriculum offers girl-led, hands-on, and collaborative activities in a supportive, single-gender environment and focuses on leadership, community service, post-secondary readiness, and advocacy education.* *This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Behavioral Health for Children in Foster Care - 2026*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Helping Hand Home for Children, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Assist children to overcome past trauma or serious emotional difficulties, gain a sense of trust in others, build on strengths to develop self-confidence and resilience, and to support them in adapting healthy behaviors to successfully transition back to a family setting, which could be an adoptive home, reunification with family, or a foster home.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals.*
Target population	*The target population to be served consists of children in foster care with severe emotional and behavioral problems resulting from abuse and neglect. The program serves children ages 4 to 13.*
Geography	*Clients in programs serving victims of violence are not subject to residency or income requirements. The children served are victims of violence.*
FY26 contract amount	*$114,576*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, City funding is 23.76% of budget, other funders provide 76.24% of funding*

Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) Mental Health.* *Needs addressed by this contract were also addressed in Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Program provides a very specialized service (residential treatment to children in foster care) therefore there are no other providers within the City that provide this kind of service to children.*

Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Residential treatment to children in foster care provided in the City. There is no other program like this.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This agreement with Helping Hand Home for Children, Inc., provides funding to provide behavioral health services for children to overcome past trauma or serious emotional difficulties and gain a sense of trust in others. Their employees provide treatment to traumatized children and help them move to a healthy family setting.* *This program's evidence-based practices include Trust-Based Relational Intervention; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's practices for Peer Support, Crisis Care, Telehealth, Cultural Competency, and Prevention; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*ATX Peace Community Violence Intervention*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Jails to Jobs*
Focus Area	*Violence Prevention*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Collaboration with Jail to Jobs and Life Anew. Community Violence Intervention, providing street outreach, case management, conflict mediation, and community engagement to individuals at highest risk of being a victim of or perpetrating gun violence.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will demonstrate improved life skills.*
Target population	*Primarily to those aged 18 to 40 who are involved in, or at high risk of entering, the cycle of violence. Some participants will be those recently released from correctional or detention facilities who are in the process of transitioning back to their neighborhoods and communities in the City of Austin and/or Travis County.*
Geography	*Rundberg/Georgian Acres and Pleasant Valley/Riverside neighborhoods along with other high-risk areas identified by the ATXPeace team, Office of Violence Prevention (OVP), and other supporting data on evolving hot spots in Austin.*
FY26 contract amount	*$1,170,000*
Payment structure	*Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of funding*

Community need basis	*Mental Health. The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in FBI 2022 Uniform Crime Report, US Census Bureau 2020 American Community Survey, Reimagining Public Safety (RPS) Taskforce 2021 Mid-Year Recommendations Report*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Program is designed to proactively and reactively reduce violence in targeted crime locations within the City of Austin and Travis County.*

Documented performance concerns (if any)	*1 oversight in Performance from Monitoring. Agency is meeting performance goals and spending down funding.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Youth Anew*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Life Anew, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides behavioral development, counseling, mentorship, academic tutoring, soft skills development, and domestic violence prevention services to youth. Works with youth to reduce incidents where youth inflict harm on themselves and others in the community and provides early prevention by identifying and addressing root causes of harmful behavior by youth and redirects behavior to reduce the incidents of harm caused by the youth to themself and others.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will demonstrate improved life skills.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% the Federal Poverty Level specifically ages 5 to 24 who are residents of Austin/Travis County.*
Geography	*Mostly reporting in the Daffan Lane and Dove Springs areas of Austin.*
FY26 contract amount	*$558,000*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding.*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health/Substance Use*

Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*4*
Coverage rationale	*Agency is not on track to meet Output or Outcome goals that were set at the start of the contract. The main hurdle for the lapse in coverage is the new House Bill 12 that requires parent consent forms and elongates the process for the program to serve youth.*
Geographic adequacy	*4*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*This is one of a few programs that support and teach restorative justice practices and work to address the root causes of harmful behavior.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Performance should be monitored this program year since the agency is not on track to meet goals set, even with reduction. This is due to new House Bill 12.*

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Safe Gun Storage Saves Lives*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Lock Arms for Life*
Focus Area	*Violence Prevention*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides education on the importance of safely securing firearms and distributes gun locks to the public.* *Desired Outcome: reduce gun violence in Austin and Travis County by increasing awareness and access to safe storage of weapons*
Target population	*Individuals, Institutions, including education, health care, public health, and public safety groups.*
Geography	*Travis County/Central Texas*
FY26 contract amount	*$162,000*
Payment structure	*Activity (delivery of services)*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health; FBI 2022 Uniform Crime Report, US Census Bureau 2020 American Community Survey, RPS Taskforce 2021 Mid-Year Recommendations Report*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Lock Arms for Life developed various tools and conducted community outreach targeting youth, and young adults in the Austin Travis County area. As part of Lock Arms for Life's outreach program, they also provided gun locks for the community at hosted events.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*

Notes and supporting evidence	*Guidance from a Task Force on Gun Violence to reduce gun violence in Austin and Travis County Lock Arms for Life's goal is provide outreach to the target community to increase awareness about safe storage of weapons. The program works with the Office of Violence Prevention to create transformational programming aimed at reducing violence.* *This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Home Delivered Meals
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Meals on Wheels & More, Inc.
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	Combats food insecurity, reduces malnutrition, and improves social and emotional well-being through safety checks and access to programs that support independent living. Daily hot meals delivered helping clients with limited mobility or who struggle with preparing a meal. Desired Outcome: Individuals will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Older adults and individuals with disabilities who need assistance preparing quality meals.
Geography	Travis and Williamson counties
FY26 contract amount	$164,914
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown, City is 2% of program funding
Community need basis	The Community Health Assessment has an entire section dedicated to mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in the 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, 2022 Office of the City Auditor audit report City Services to Older Adults, and Austin’s Commission on Aging Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Recommendation, 2025 Austin Older Adult Quality of Life Study

Associated City or Regional Plans	Community Health Assessment/Community Health Improvement Plan, 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 6 Access

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	This is new contract as of FY25-26, awarded via solicitation. The agency is expected to meet their goals.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	New contract, on pace to meet their goals. Only one other agency funded by APH social services provides food access tailored to older adults' needs.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this	N/A

recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Meals provided through this program are designed to meet the specific dietary needs of older adults and individuals with disabilities and are overseen by a Registered Dietitian Nutritionist (RDN). The program conducts a Mini-Nutritional Assessment (MNA) with each client. The agency is partnering with Factor Health, a platform based at Dell Medical School at the University of Texas at Austin that tests and scales programs that improve health and are delivered outside the clinic, in people's lives. Another recent research partnership was with Texas State University's Anthropology department assessed how this me. al delivery program reduces social isolation. This research demonstrated that interactions with volunteers make our clients feel less lonely safer in their homes because of this program's deliveries.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Community Art & Scene It!*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Mexic-Arte Museum*
Focus Area	*Violence Prevention*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provide services to identified schools and students through three programs: El Mero Muro: Murals in School program, amArte, and Screen It!* *Desired Outcome: Programs cultivate safe, creative spaces of self-expression and self-discovery while fostering restorative environments for young people, offering an effective and more affordable alternative to detention and police-centered crime prevention for youth in Austin and Travis County.*
Target population	*The Mexic-Arte Museum seeks to engage in restorative justice/practices through collaboration with Austin ISD's Restorative team, who will provide training, support, and aid MAM staff to identify schools with higher numbers of at-risk youths.*
Geography	*Working with the AISD Restorative team, Mexic-Arte will provide services to identified schools and students.*
FY26 contract amount	*$135,000*
Payment structure	*Activity (delivery of services)*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Mental Health. The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental*

	health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in FBI 2022 Uniform Crime Report, US Census Bureau 2020 American Community Survey, RPS Taskforce 2021 Mid-Year Recommendations Report
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency completes all deliverables and uses all funding available.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Minor late reporting. No other compliance issues noted.*

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	LGBTQIA+ Mental Health Services
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Out Youth
Focus Area	Health Equity
Services description and desired outcomes	Provide Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, Questioning, Intersex, Asexual (LGBTQIA+) identified school-aged clients with free or low-cost individual counseling services - Expand individual counseling services to elementary and middle school-aged LGBTQIA+ youth by training staff in Play Therapy - Increase Caregiving support groups to serve new families with an LGBTQIA+ youth in their care. Desired Outcome Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Queer identified clients
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$92,186
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown, City is 56% of total program funding
Community need basis	Prioritizes LGBTQ+ populations, a mental health priority listed in the Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA). The CHA has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed by this contract were highlighted in the Austin Strategic Direction 2023, APH 2021 Behavioral Health Community Listening Sessions, 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2019 Texas Statewide Behavioral Health Strategic Plan Update

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	2

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Continued funding for this program is essential because it expands access to affordable, competent behavioral health services for queer youth, a population that often faces significant barriers to affirming mental health care. The program delivers no-cost individual and group counseling, increases specialized therapeutic support through staff training in Play Therapy, and provides caregiver support groups that strengthen family understanding and resilience. Sustaining funding ensures that vulnerable young people and their caregivers receive developmentally appropriate, identity-affirming counseling that promotes emotional well-being, reduces mental health risks, and fills a critical gap in services available to queer youth in Austin/Travis County. This is one of only two mental health service contracts funded by APH specifically for these priority populations. Agency has spent down their funding and met their goals in their past program years.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include: Suicide Assessment Five-Step Evaluation and Triage developed by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, guidelines established by the American Psychiatric Association. The curriculum content has been developed using a research-supported Minority Stress Model as well as Guidelines for Psychological Practice with LGBTQ Clients published by the American Psychological Association. Therapy modalities include Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Acceptance and Commitment Therapy; positive psychology; *Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing;* and counseling approaches recommended by the Central Texas Trauma-Informed Care Consortium; The Multiple Dimensions of Cultural Competence 3 dimensions to enhance cultural competency (cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, and cultural skills)

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Life-Saving Mental Health Services*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Out Youth*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provide LGBTQIA+ identified school-aged clients with free or low-cost individual counseling services - Expand individual counseling services to of elementary and middle school-aged LGBTQIA+ youth by training staff in Play Therapy - Increase Caregiving support groups to serve new families with an LGBTQIA+ youth in their care.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals and demonstrate improved life skills as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*School-aged youth (ages 5-11) who identify as queer in Austin/Travis County*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$53,320*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 28% of program funding, other funders make up 72% of funding*
Community need basis	*Mental Health(MH): Prioritizes LGBTQ+ populations, a MH priority listed in the Community Health Assessment (CHA).* *Services provided by this contract are highlighted*

	as key community needs in Integral Care's FY23 annual Health Disparities Report Card, Austin Public Health's 2023 community survey on services to LGBTQIA+ communities, The City of Austin's 2021 LGBTQIA+ Quality of Life Study,
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/CHIP; AISD Social Emotional Learning Partner Planning Committee, Kids Living Well, Trauma-Informed Care Consortium of Central Texas, City of Austin LGBTQ Quality of Life Advisory Commission*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*3*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Continue funding while requiring a six-month performance improvement plan or decrease performance goal to align with capacity*
Reasons for recommendation	*Continued funding for this program is essential because it expands access to affordable, competent behavioral health services for queer youth ages 5–11, a population that often faces significant barriers*

	to affirming mental health care. The program delivers no-cost individual and group counseling, increases specialized therapeutic support through staff training in Play Therapy, and provides caregiver support groups that strengthen family understanding and resilience. Sustaining funding ensures that vulnerable young people and their caregivers receive developmentally appropriate, identity-affirming counseling that promotes emotional well-being, reduces mental health risks, and fills a critical gap in services available to queer youth in Austin/Travis County. This is one of only two mental health service contracts funded by APH specifically for these priority populations.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Had not met goal of those served due to legislative changes and fears about affirming care services*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Affirming mental health services will continue during a challenging political landscape*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	*Clinicians follow the Suicide Assessment Five-Step Evaluation and Triage developed by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), informed by practice guidelines established by the American Psychiatric Association (APA).* *School-based services facilitators need to either have a clinical license (LPC, LPC-, LPC-S, LMFT, LMFT-A, or LCSW) or be pursuing a license as a counseling intern. The curriculum content has been developed using a research-supported Minority Stress Model as well as Guidelines for Psychological Practice with LGBTQ Clients published by the APA.* *Therapy modalities include Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT), positive psychology, EMDR, and counseling approaches recommended by the Central Texas Trauma-Informed Care Consortium (TICC), The Multiple Dimensions of Cultural Competence (MDCC)'s 3 dimensions to enhance cultural competency (cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, and cultural skills).*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**HIV45637 - General Fund HIV-PT – 2025**
Department	HIV Resources Administration
Vendor/Provider	Project Transitions, Inc
Focus Area	HIV Services
Services description and desired outcomes	Project Transitions provides transitional housing recuperative for people living with HIV. The General Fund account pays for housing navigation and transitional to permanent housing. Desired outcomes: Prevent homelessness for people living with HIV by providing services that will help them achieve permanent housing.
Target population	*People living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS)*
Geography	*Austin Transitional Grant Area (TGA)*
FY26 contract amount	*$101,477*
Payment structure	Input - Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	*None*
Community need basis	*Housing security.* Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158). Austin Public Health General Funds are used to help meet maintenance of effort requirements of Ryan White Part A federal funds.
Associated City or Regional	*Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment*

Plans	*(CHA)/Austin Public Health Community Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), The Austin Area HIV Planning Council FY (Fiscal Year) 2024-2025 Part A allocation model and data evaluation plan.* *HRSA'S Policy Clarification Notice (PCN) #16-02: Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services: Eligible Individuals & Allowable Uses of Funds. Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services Report (RSR)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	Project Transitions effectively and consistently demonstrates outstanding performance in meeting the needs of people with HIV in need of housing and provides essential services that are necessary and valued within the Austin community. This contract is

	used annually to show Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for the HRSA Ryan White A grant.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*None*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Continue to service those needing assistance that live with HIV/AIDS*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	Shortage of housing, and housing assistance. This program's evidence-based practices include: Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) Standards 4, 5, 6, and 7 are current Federal requirements for all recipients. Austin Area HIV Planning Council's Ryan White Part A Service Standards. HRSA'S HIV/AIDS Bureau Clinical Quality Management Policy Clarification Notice 15-02

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Solid Ground+*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Saffron Trust Women's Foundation*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Saffron Trust helps women and families navigate a complicated system of social, health, and economic programs in the City of Austin. By advocating for this population's access to programs and services that address the social determinants of health, Saffron Trust can make a systemic impact on overall health and economic stability for these families.*
Target population	*Women and families, particularly women of color and their families.*
Geography	*Austin / Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$32,500.00*
Payment structure	*Activity*
Co-funders (if known)	*N/A*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) – Economic Stability*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Unknown*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Advocating on behalf of this population for access to programs and services that address the social determinants of health, Saffron Trust can make a systemic impact on overall health and economic stability for these families.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*n/a*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*n/a*
Notes and supporting	*This program’s evidence-based practices include*

evidence	*National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Whole Body Mental Health Services +*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Samaritan Center for Counseling & Pastoral Care Inc*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Increase access to trauma-informed and equitable behavioral health services for low-income adults, children, and families in Austin/Travis County. The objective is clients will experience an improved mental health status after receiving services.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals whose mental health status as measured on a standardized assessment improves as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*People living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level in Austin/Travis County are the target population. Individuals served are struggling with problems such as depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), abuse, trauma, and addiction.*
Geography	*78701, 78702, 78704, and the Eastern Crescent of Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$77,625*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 79.5% of program budget; other funders unknown*

Community need basis	*Mental Health: The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health. Needs addressed in this contract were also highlighted by City of Austin 2018 Opioid Resolution; Austin/Travis County 2019 Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs, Needs Assessment; Council Member Casar 2020-2021 Budget Amendment for Substance Use Continuum of Care*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP); Samaritan Center participates in One Voice Central Texas, Suicide Prevention Coalition, Central Texas Veteran Services Coalition, Central Texas Challenge to Prevent Veteran Suicide, and Austin Chamber of Commerce.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*

Reasons for recommendation	*Continued funding for this program will provide accessible, trauma-informed behavioral health services to low-income children, adults, and families who often face significant barriers to care. Sustaining funding ensures that vulnerable populations in Austin/Travis County continue receiving comprehensive, culturally responsive, and affordable mental health services that are critical to their stability and long-term wellbeing. Additionally, agency continues to meet performance goals within variance and spends down funds.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Unknown*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Agency meets goals within variance and spends down funds.* *This program's evidence-based practices include: cognitive behavioral therapy, dialectical behavioral therapy, solution-focused therapy, eye movement desensitization and reprocessing, emotion freedom technique, trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy, motivational interviewing, psychodynamic therapy, interpersonal therapy, and Theraplay. Other effective interventions include: acceptance and commitment therapy, trust based relational intervention, somatic experiencing, mentalization, synergetic play therapy, play therapy, and sand tray therapy, National Harm Reduction Coalition Harm Reduction Principles, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Children Who Have a Parent Incarcerated***
Department	*Austin Public Health-SSAU*
Vendor/Provider	*Seedling Foundation*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provide trained adult mentors to students who have an incarcerated parent, providing stable, long-term relationships for the students, help them develop and maintain positive attitudes towards school. Outcomes are increases in school engagement, personal development skills, and persistence.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will progress to the next academic level*
Target population	*Students impacted by parental incarceration ages 5-18 who attend a Travis County school. Seedling will serve students attending schools which meet these requirements*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County – Austin Independent School District (AISD), Del Valle ISD, Austin Achieve Public Schools*
FY26 contract amount	*$110,481.00*
Payment structure	*Input - Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% funding*
Community need basis	*Mental Health- Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social*

	determinant of health. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency meets performance goals set for program and serve the demographics that they intend to within their goals. Due to the closing of some AISD Title 1 schools more mentors are needed to serve the target population.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The Seedling Mentor Program strengthens resiliency, supports social-emotional learning, and promotes positive school engagement for children with an*

	incarcerated parent through innovative, research-based, school-based mentoring. The program's goal is to help students build resilience by fostering close, consistent relationships with trained adult mentors who serve as stable, caring role models. These relationships support improvements in self-regulation, self-efficacy, and school connectedness. Seedling provides trained mentors who offer long-term, reliable support and help students cultivate positive attitudes toward school. Core program outcomes include increased school engagement, personal development, and persistence. *The agency utilizes its funding effectively and consistently achieves its established performance goals.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Sickle Cell Navigation Services*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Sickle Cell Texas Marc Thomas Foundation*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides education on sickle cell disease and/or trait, treatment options for those with the disease and/or trait, case management, navigation and referrals to other providers and resources to stabilize the health and wellbeing of the individuals with sickle cell disease and/or trait and the family as a whole.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level specifically population carrying the sickle cell trait.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County area with a majority of clients living in the Dove Springs and Pflugerville areas.*
FY26 contract amount	*$349,710*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability – Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158).*

Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA-Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin City Council Resolution 20150507-027*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*4*
Performance results	*2*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Targets specific population*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*2*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*The agency has been on and off with corrective action plans. Once corrective action plans are completed and temporary improvements are noted, similar issues arise again.*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has had multiple contractual infractions resulting in unallowed costs and lack of true client assessment.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*The program has experienced compliance concerns, including inflated performance reporting, unallowable costs billed to the City, ineligible clients served, and multiple corrective action plans. Following review and discussion, direction was provided to continue the agreement in FY27 with*

	intensive enhanced monitoring, including monthly check-ins and performance evaluations to closely assess compliance, performance, and progress toward established outcomes. APH Contract Compliance staff will provide a quarterly update on this contract.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*The recent monitoring is being finalized, and we anticipate issuing another corrective action plan and requiring repayment. The department will look to resolicit these needed services.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Prevent Violence by Intervention and Education Program*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Sunrise Community Church*
Focus Area	*Violence Prevention*
Services description and desired outcomes	*One on one client crisis intervention, de-escalation, conflict resolution, relationship and trust building, peer support, life coaching, and case management. Additional services include cultivating community partnerships and participating in violence prevention events and meetings to help grow the community's strategies for decreasing violence related to or as a precursor to experiencing homelessness.* *Desired Outcome* *Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals.*
Target population	*Sunrise prioritizes individuals and households who are experiencing homelessness. Sunrise offers services with the low barrier, equitable access. Homelessness may present concurrently with clients who have been victim to violence and/or trauma, have a criminal background, and/or are causing a public disturbance.*
Geography	*Hub location in 78745*
FY26 contract amount	*$58,500*
Payment structure	*Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 100% of program funding*

Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health, Housing Stability, Economic Stability. FBI 2022 Uniform Crime Report, US Census Bureau 2020 American Community Survey, RPS Taskforce 2021 Mid-Year Recommendations Report*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*3*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*This agreement provides 100% of funding to the program. The Hub location provides Day Center services including humanitarian aid, meals, medical and mental health care, mail services, and showers.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Agency has met some of their performance goals, however not all.*

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Double Up Food Bucks Austin*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Sustainable Food Center, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Basic Needs*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Increase food access by operating Double Up Food Bucks (DUFB) at two Sustainable Food Centers-managed farmers' market sites, partner farmers' market sites, and partner mobile market sites; and providing culturally rooted and linguistically diverse community engagement, outreach, and promotion for the Double Up program.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals enrolled in Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) or Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) will have increased food access as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Participation in DUFB is based on enrollment in SNAP or WIC nutrition programs.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$87,196*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 31% program budget; other funders make up 69% of program budget*
Community need basis	*Food Security: CHA addresses Food Insecurity and Access as a key social determinant of health.*

	Services provided by this contract were also highlighted as a community need within 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/CHIP; Austin / Travis County Food Policy Board's Food Access Working Group, Austin Travis County Food Plan – Goal 4 Preparedness, Goal 6 Access, Goal 8 Pro Climate/Pro Health*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*4*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Program directly expands healthy food access for low-income Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Women Infants Children (WIC)*

	participants by doubling the value of their benefits at farmers' markets and mobile markets across Austin/Travis County. Sustained funding will enable consistent operation, expansion to partner sites, improved customer support, and ongoing evaluation. Additionally, agency continues to meet performance goals within variance and spends down funds.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Program meets goal within variance.* *This program's evidence based practices include nutrition Incentive Program Training, Technical Assistance, Evaluation, and Information (NTAE) best practices; National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Substance Misuse Mobile*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Texas Harm Reduction Alliance*
Focus Area	*Behavioral Health*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Decrease fatal overdoses in Travis County and expand peer recovery coaching staff, increasing the amount of People Who Use Drugs (PWUD) who have access to overdose prevention/response supplies and education.* *Desired Outcome: Individuals will make progress toward their treatment plan goals as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*Individuals who use drugs and are experiencing homelessness in the Austin/Travis County area. There is prioritization of people who are 1) at high risk of overdose or 2) at high risk of transmission of HIV (Human Immunodeficiency Virus) and/or HCV (Hepatitis C Virus).*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$615,676*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*City is 62% of program funding, other funders make up 38%*
Community need basis	*Mental Health - The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.*

Associated City or Regional Plans	*THRA participates in several community-planning activities including ECHO Permanent Supportive Housing navigation group, outreach meetings run by the Homeless Strategy Office, meetings with the Travis County Substance Use Disorder Planning process; the Austin Area Opioid Workgroup; the Austin Recovery Oriented System of Care (ROSC); the Travis County Community Legal Services group; and the East Cesar Chavez Neighborhood Association.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	*Continued funding for THRA delivers, peer-led harm reduction and recovery support to people who use drugs and are experiencing homelessness. THRA's mobile clinic, drop-in center, and outreach teams provide consistent access to recovery coaching,*

	treatment linkage, wound care, basic needs, and housing navigation. Program is designed to improves health outcomes, increase safety, and fill major gaps in the community's response to substance use and homelessness. Additionally, agency continues to meet performance goals within variance and spends down funds.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Decrease in fatal overdoses*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include Clinical Management for Behavioral Health Services; Screening, brief intervention, and referral treatment model; National Harm Reduction Coalition Harm Reduction Principles, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services; Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Public Benefits & Housing
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Texas RioGrande Legal Aid Inc
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	Texas RioGrande Legal Aid's (TRLA) Public Benefits & Housing program is to improve the self-sufficiency of low-income clients by providing legal and other professional services for those who are threatened with loss of housing and/or public benefits. Desired Outcome Clients will obtain public benefits and housing as a result of receiving services through this Health Equity Social Service Contract.
Target population	Residents of Austin and Travis County who fall at or below current FPL % stated in the Exhibit A.3 of the City of Austin's Client Eligibility Requirements and who face overwhelming barriers to housing or access to public benefits that threaten family stability and overall self-sufficiency. Population will include individual adults, families, seniors, people with disabilities, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, and anyone who faces a housing or public benefits challenge.
Geography	Austin/Travis County Area
FY26 contract amount	**$146,704.00**
Payment structure	Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)
Co-funders (if known)	Other funding
Community need basis	Community need for these services were highlighted within the Community Health Assessment (CHA)/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP) - Housing Security; 2023 APH Basic Needs

	Community Survey; 2023 US Census Bureau QuickFacts for Travis County, TX; Travis County Commissioners Court 2022 Voting Packet; City of Austin and UT Dell Medical School's 2021 Central Texas Check-In Survey, 2022 City of Austin Arcgis data
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/CHIP

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	**Maintain**
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	It is recommended that this agency continue to be funded as it plays a crucial role in Austin/Travis County assisting clients with barriers to housing or access to public benefits that threaten family stability and overall self-sufficiency who faces a housing or public benefits challenge. Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Agency has also met/exceeded its outcomes and city outputs to serve clients over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to meet it

	performance for FY26 contract cycle.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	**n/a**
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	**No**
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	n/a
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	**n/a**
Notes and supporting evidence	Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Agency has also met/exceeded its outcomes and city outputs to serve clients over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to meet it performance for FY26 contract cycle. This agency plays a crucial role in Austin/Travis County assisting clients with barriers to housing or access to public benefits that threaten family stability and overall self-sufficiency who faces a housing or public benefits challenge. This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and Principles of Trauma Informed Care.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Rebekah Baines Johnson (RBJ) Senior Center of Excellence
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	The Austin Geriatric Center Inc
Focus Area	Economic Stability
Services description and desired outcomes	Provide services that improve self-reported health indicators and social connection for older adults living in RBJ properties, The Lady Bird and The Rebekah. Desired Outcome Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	Residents of RBJ and older adults living in the neighborhood with incomes at or below 250% of the federal poverty level.
Geography	Residents of RBJ and older adults living in the neighborhood, largely 78702 zip code
FY26 contract amount	$93,316
Payment structure	Reimbursement
Co-funders (if known)	None, the City is 100% of Program Funding
Community need basis	Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158). Basic needs addressed as part of Economic Stability CHA pp 46-58. Other sources that highlight needs addressed by this program include: 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan, 2022 Office of the City Auditor audit report City Services to Older Adults Austin's Commission on Aging Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Recommendation, Austin Older Adult Quality of Life Study 2025
Associated City or Regional	CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan

Plans	(CHIP), 2016 Austin City Council's Age Friendly Austin Action Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	New contract, on pace to meet their spending and performance goals
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A

Notes and supporting evidence	This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care. UT School of Nursing conducts the RBJ Health Needs Assessment instrument, which incorporates evidence-based questionnaires including Psychological Wellbeing Scale and Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey. Evidence-based interventions also include Matter of Balance Fall Prevention, Chronic Conditions Self-Management, and piloting Food as Medicine programming. This programs Service Coordination practices are recommended by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the American Association of Service Coordinators. These services are credited with reducing pre-mature institutionalization of older adults and improving health outcomes.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Literacy to Life+*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*The Austin Theatre Alliance*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Enhance social equity and future economic opportunities for underserved students in Travis County primarily at schools with a high percentage of economically disadvantaged youth. Improve student's social and emotional learning skills, particularly self-awareness, social awareness, and relationship skills. Increase student's self-efficacy and confidence in their own (and their peers') creative writing abilities. Enhance each school campus's culture regarding writing and creativity.* Desired Outcome clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge
Target population	*Third grade students in schools with a high percentage of disadvantaged youth. Students attending school districts in Travis County*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$141,792.00*
Payment structure	*Input - Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 56.84% of funding*
Community need basis	*Mental Health - The Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social*

	determinant of health. *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The agency consistently meets its established performance goals and effectively serves the target demographics outlined in its program objectives.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*This program is an eight-week residency program for third graders. The core focus of this language arts residency is to provide students with the tools and*

	creative confidence to compose original fictional narratives, empowering them to embrace their ideas and hone their storytelling abilities. By acting out stories and using movement to create characters, students discover new ways to express themselves. The agency is spending its funding fully and meets its performance goals.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program is an eight-week residency program for third graders. The core focus of this language arts residency is providing students with the tools and creative confidence to compose their own original fictional narratives, empowering them to embrace their ideas and hone their storytelling abilities. By acting out stories and using movement to create characters, students discover new ways to express themselves.* *This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Bridge to Safety**
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	The SAFE Alliance
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	Program operated under the agency's SAFEline (crisis hotline, text and chat), to prevent future victimization of survivors of sexual and domestic violence, human trafficking, and exploitation and/or child abuse - mitigating the need for emergency shelter and/or law enforcement involvement. The objective is to increase immediate safety. Desired Outcome: Clients residing in shelter program will receive case management services and will receive assisted transition from homelessness into housing.
Target population	Serves women, youth and men who have experienced rape, domestic or sexual violence, child abuse and human trafficking and exploitation.
Geography	Austin/Travis County Area
FY26 contract amount	**$117,000.00**
Payment structure	***Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)***
Co-funders (if known)	Other sources makes up 89.5% of program funding
Community need basis	Community Health Assessment (CHA) has an entire section dedicated to mental health as a key social determinant of health. This is also echoed in the City of Austin 2018 Opioid Resolution; Austin/Travis County 2019 Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs, Needs Assessment; Council Member Casar 2020-2021 Budget Amendment for Substance Use Continuum of Care
Associated City or Regional	CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), City of Austin

Plans	2018 Opioid Resolution

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	n/a
Reasons for recommendation	It is recommended to maintain this program prevent future victimization of survivors of sexual and domestic violence, human trafficking, and exploitation and/or child abuse
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*n/a*
Vendor improvement plan (if	N/A

applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Agency has also met/exceeded its outcomes and city outputs to serve clients over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to meet it performance for FY26 contract cycle. This program's evidence-based practices include Cognitive behavioral therapy, National Harm Reduction Coalition Harm Reduction Principles

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Domestic Violence Shelter**
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	The SAFE Alliance
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	Agency provides short-term shelter and supportive services to survivors of domestic violence that increase safety, connection, healing, empowerment, and stabilization, allowing domestic violence survivors and their children to leave a dangerous situation and move to a safe environment. Desired Outcome: Clients will receive case-management and assistance with transition from homelessness into housing.
Target population	Child and adult victims of domestic violence (and possibly other forms of violence/abuse).
Geography	Austin/Travis County Area
FY26 contract amount	$2,000,000
Payment structure	***Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)***
Co-funders (if known)	Other Funding makes up 10% of program budget
Community need basis	Community Health Assessment (CHA): Housing Security Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in Commission on Women 2020 Recommendation; Ending Community Homeless Coalition 2020 report; 2019 Austin/Travis County Continuum of Care report; 2018 Texas State Plan: Availability of Services at Texas Family Violence Programs,
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), 2019 Austin/Travis County Continuum of Care report, 2018 Texas State Plan: Availability of Services at Texas Family Violence Programs

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	unknown
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	It is recommended to maintain this contract. Although this agency has underperformed in the number of clients served there are external factors including survivors staying in shelter longer due to ongoing barriers to safe housing, reducing the number of households that can be served each quarter. Large family sizes, limited housing options, lack of childcare, and increased Child Protective Services (CPS) involvement have delayed exits.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*n/a*

Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Although agency did not meet some outcomes and city outputs to serve clients over the last 2 contract cycles and are unlikely to meet performance for FY26 contract cycle, there are external factors including survivors staying in shelter longer due to ongoing barriers to safe housing, reducing the number of households that can be served each quarter. Large family sizes, limited housing options, lack of childcare, and increased CPS involvement have delayed exits. This program plays a vital role in the Austin/Travis County Area providing shelter and supportive services to survivors of domestic violence that increase safety, connection, healing, empowerment, and stabilization. This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*ER – Prevention and Support*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*The SAFE Alliance*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Increased personal safety, healthy relationships, and school success among vulnerable students in local middle and high schools. The Expect Respect program offers support groups and counseling assistance to youth exposed to violence.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge.*
Target population	*Residents living at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level specifically students in grades 3rd through 12th who have experiences violence or abuse at home.*
Geography	*Students served are mostly from the Manor, East Austin, South Austin, and Rundberg areas.*
FY26 contract amount	*$188,384*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown, City is 16% of total program funding*
Community need basis	*Mental Health/Substance Use - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.* *Needs addressed by this contract were also*

	highlighted by City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to meet performance goals set for programming and serves the demographics that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has spent down their funding and exceeded their goal expectations.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Output performance goals are not being met currently but are usually met in the past. This year has been impacted due to Texas Law Senate Bill 12, a law requiring parents/guardians to opt in to the*

	program, creating a barrier to students that need the program and can't request consent from parents.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	**Victim Services**
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	The SAFE Alliance
Focus Area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	Agency provides safety and support services to people in Austin and Travis County who have experienced rape, sexual abuse, and/or domestic violence. The program meets victims' immediate needs for safety; helps them manage the trauma they have experienced; and supports their efforts to build healthy, self-sufficient lives free of violence. Desired Outcome: Clients residing in shelter will receive case management services and assisted with transition from shelter into housing.
Target population	SAFE serves adults and children who have experienced rape, domestic or sexual violence, child abuse, human trafficking, and exploitation.
Geography	Austin/Travis County Area
FY26 contract amount	**$967,975.00**
Payment structure	***Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses)***
Co-funders (if known)	Other sources makes up 81.4% of program funding, 19.6% funding goes through APH
Community need basis	Mental health and economic stability - The Community Health Assessment (CHA) has sections focused entirely on mental health and economic stability as key social determinants of health.
Associated City or Regional Plans	CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin City Council Resolution 20150507-027

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	N/A
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	n/a
Reasons for recommendation	It is recommended to maintain this program prevent future victimization of survivors of sexual and domestic violence, human trafficking, and exploitation and/or child abuse
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting	Agency has been able to spend all funding over the last 2 contract cycles

evidence	and is on target to spending all funding for the FY26 contract cycle. Agency is on track to meet/exceed current program goals for 25/26. This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Alliance for African American Health in Central Texas
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*The University of Texas*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Alliance for African American Health in Central Texas Health Program goals are increased awareness of and engagement in existing health-promotion programs, provide support to sustain engagement in healthy lifestyle behaviors, demonstrate impact of our health promotion program through biometric measures and self-assessments, and reduce risk for chronic disease within among high-risk populations.* Desired Outcome: Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts
Target population	*Adults18 years or older - Resident of Austin and/or Travis County, including unincorporated areas - Willingness to commit to the following program requirements: - Completing a baseline and quarterly assessment - Quarterly and/or monthly measurements: height/weight; waist circumference blood glucose level/HgA1C; blood pressure - Working with a coach to provide an update regarding progress toward goal*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$105,879.00*

Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*CIty is 100% of program funding*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability- Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158)*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin City Council Resolution 20150507-027*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	4
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency provides a unique opportunity for older adults in the community with training and resources that support their wellness goals and encourage increased physical activity. These services empower*

	participants to improve their overall well-being and lead healthier, more active lifestyles. *Agency utilizes their funding fully and fell slightly below target output goals, however exceed outcomes goals.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*The agency fell slightly below its target performance goals; however, it exceeded expectations in key outcome areas. In response, the agency has refined its organizational structure and processes to better align with performance objectives and ensure continued progress in the coming years.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*AMEN*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*The University of Texas*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*To reduce health disparities among African American (AA) communities through a multilevel, church-based mental health and wellness program. The goal of this initiative is to create an effective and sustainable health and wellness program within African American churches and to increase awareness and reduce stigma of mental health. Create an effective and sustainable integrated health and wellness program within the Travis County area that addresses the mind-body-spirit connection and reduces negative perceptions of health. Build new linkages between faith leaders, community organizations/leaders and academic partners to promote access to safe, culturally relevant health care and social resources. Offer training, education, resources to community to improve health and well-being* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will who complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge.* *Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts*
Target population	*18 years of age or older; residents of Austi/Travis County*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*

FY26 contract amount	*$160,816.00*
Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*None. City is 100% of funding.*
Community need basis	*Mental Health - The CHA has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Community Health Assessment/Community Health Improvement Plan CHA/CHIP, Austin City Council Resolution 20150507-027*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*4.*
Coverage rationale	*Agency meets performance goals and sometimes exceeds set for program. Agency fell slightly below target goals for outcomes for the program . They serve the demographics that they intended to within their goals. Agency has restructured process to meet performance goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	3
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*

Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*The agency will modify methods for collecting post-program surveys to increase client follow-up and post-program reporting.*
Reasons for recommendation	*Agency has implemented a process to improve performance by increasing follow-up and client point of contact as described above. Recommend allowing time to correct the performance using this new method.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Program performed slightly below goal but has restructured the service delivery process to increase outputs.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*The agency provides mental and emotional support to community members through partnerships with faith-based organizations, helping adults achieve effective and sustainable integrated health and wellness. In addition, the agency promotes equitable access to safe, culturally relevant health and social resources that strengthen overall well-being and community resilience.* *This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Mama Sana/Vibrant Women Maternal Equity Program*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*The University of Texas*
Focus Area	*Health Equity*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Improve birth outcomes and maternal/infant health among vulnerable communities of color in Austin by addressing the unique barriers faced by low-income African American and Latina women. Objectives: Provide culturally congruent prenatal and birth support services. Improve access to care. Improve the quality and relevance of care. Increased satisfaction with pregnancy, birth, and early motherhood experiences.* *Desired Outcome:* *Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts.*
Target population	*This project focuses on women. Due to the extremely high incidences of negative outcomes in Austin/Travis County for mothers and infants, as well as the disproportionately high number of pregnant women, Mama Sana/Vibrant Woman (MSVW) focuses efforts on making the program more culturally sensitive and contextually relevant to pregnant women.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$368,050.00*

Payment structure	*Reimbursable*
Co-funders (if known)	*None. City is 100% of funding*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability-Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections (CHA pp 46–58; 158)*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin City Council Resolution 20150507-027*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to exceed performance goals for outcomes – City Business Plan. They served the demographics that they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*NA*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency provides culturally congruent prenatal and birth support services to address the*

	significantly high rates of negative maternal and infant health outcomes in Austin/Travis County. These services promote safer, more equitable care and strengthen the overall well-being of mothers, infants, and families in the community. *Agency is within -1% variance for Output and exceeded their outcome goals last year and is currently on track to do the same this year*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***La Escuelita Program***
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Todos Juntos Learning Center*
Focus Area	*Early Childhood*
Services description and desired outcomes	*All children enrolled in the program will have their educational needs met so that they are able to successfully integrate into public Pre-K and Kindergarten programs. Children enrolled in the program will have measurable improvements to their language skills within 12 months of enrollment. Desired Outcomes All children enrolled in the program will have their educational needs met so that they are able to successfully integrate into public Pre-K and Kindergarten programs. Children enrolled in the program will have measurable improvements to their language skills within 12 months of enrollment.* Desired Outcome: Clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge
Target population	*English Language Learners who are primarily the children of immigrants and refugees. Most of the people served (approximately 95%) are Latino/a/e. All program participants live in households with low income. Most reside in south and southeast Austin.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*
FY26 contract amount	*$546,705*

Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 44% of funding*
Community need basis	*Economic Stability - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses child- care as a key aspect of Economic Stability (CHA pp 62-64, 151-152).* *Additionally, APH's 2023 Early Childhood Community Survey, the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee 2022 Recommendation and the Early Childhood Council 2022 Recommendation, City of Austin 2023 Strategic Direction all highlighted the needs for these services.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP), Austin-Travis County Success By 6 Coalition Plan, Texas Prenatal to Age 3 Collaborative, GenATX Plan*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*The Agency* utilizes full funding every year. Ag*ency fell slightly short of its performance goals due to new federal policies that affected the immigration status of clients served. Despite this challenge, the agency exceeded its outcome measures and successfully reached the target demographics outlined in its program goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency serves English Language Learners, primarily children of immigrants and refugees, with approximately 95% identifying as Latino/a. All participants come from low-income households, mostly residing in south and southeast Austin. The children served are those from immigrant and refugee families engaged in any Todos Juntos programs.* *Agency spends their funding fully and meets overall performance goals.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*The program's evidence-based practices include Research-based curricula, dual-generation services, wrap-around supports, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services, Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Quality Care for Children Overcoming Homelessness*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*VinCare Services of Austin Foundation dba Saint Louise House*
Focus Area	*Early Childhood*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of this program is for children to overcome their experience of homelessness and make educational and social emotional gains through the fostering of successful caregiving and employment success for their single mothers living at Saint Louise House (SLH). The objectives are that mothers will achieve at least one long-term goal and school-age children served will advance to the next academic level. This program provides agency partnership with families as equals, working intentionally and simultaneously with children and their mothers together. Through this program, families participating in the SLH Supportive Housing Program will receive support for accessing high-quality childcare, parental education, and family-oriented wraparound and support services. Childcare and parenting education needs as well as the need for additional support for children are assessed for every family at their initial child-centered case management meeting.* *Desired Outcome* *Clients will who progress to the next academic level*
Target population	*This program will serve single mothers and their children with low-income participating in the SLH*

	Supportive Housing Program. All have experienced homelessness, and all enter the program with incomes under 250% of the federal poverty guidelines. To enter the Supportive Housing Program, heads of household must have verifiable income, the ability to establish electricity in their name, the ability to work or go to school, and the willingness to participate in case management.
Geography	*78704*
FY26 contract amount	*$86,640.00*
Payment structure	*Input*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City funds 31.19%*
Community need basis	Economic Stability- Community Health Assessment (CHA) addresses child care as a key aspect of Economic Stability (CHA pp 62-64, 151-152). Additionally, APH's 2023 Early Childhood Community Survey, the City of Austin Joint Inclusion Committee 2022 Recommendation, the Early Childhood Council 2022 Recommendation, *City of Austin 2023 Strategic Direction* highlighted needs addressed through this contract.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/CHIP, Austin-Travis County Success By 6 Coalition Plan, Texas Prenatal to Age 3 Collaborative, GenATX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency continues to exceed performance goal and serve families for up to 4 years. They maintain consistency in meeting goals and serve the demographics they intend to within their goals.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not

the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency supports the community by helping families obtain stability with personalized services in a safe environment for up to 4 years.* *Agency continually meet/exceed program goal and fully spend all of their funding every year*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Evidence based service model aligns with the Center for the Developing Child at Harvard University's principles for improving outcomes for children and families and implements National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services and Principles of Trauma Informed Care.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Based on your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	AIDS Services Austin (ASA)
Department	Austin Public Health
Vendor/Provider	Vivent Health
Focus Area	HIV Services
Services description and desired outcomes	ASA provides services for people with HIV (PWH) are HIV primary and specialty medical care, dental care, behavioral health care (psychotherapy and psychiatry), pharmacy, food pantry, nutritional education and counseling, plus a range of social services that include case management, housing assistance, and transportation services. GF- Early Intervention Services (EIS): HIV testing to help the unaware learn their status and receive referrals to HIV care and treatment services if found to be HIV-infected. Referral Serves. Access and linkage to HIV care and treatment services. Non-Medical Case management (NMCM): client-centered activities for people living with HIV focused on improving access to core medical and support services. Housing Navigation: Assisting living with HIV find appropriate housing. Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Services Contracts
Target population	People living with HIV
Geography	Travis, Hays, Caldwell, Bastrop, and Williamson Counties
FY26 contract amount	$285,38

Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown
Community need basis	The Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment/Community Health Improvement Plan (CHA/CHIP) addresses healthcare access as a key aspect of Economic Stability throughout all relevant sections. The Austin Area HIV Planning Council FY 2024-2025 Part A allocation model and data evaluation plan. Austin Public Health General Funds are used to help meet maintenance of effort requirements of Ryan White Part A federal funds.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Community HA/CHIP, HIV Planning Council- The Austin Area HIV Planning Council FY 2024-2025 Part A allocation model and data evaluation plan. - HRSA'S Policy Clarification Notice (PCN) #16-02: Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services: Eligible Individuals & Allowable Uses of Funds. -Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Services Report (RSR)"

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	*N/A*
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed.

Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain current funding level for FY27.
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	AIDS Services of Austin-Vivent Health consistently demonstrates strong performance in meeting the needs of people living with HIV and provides comprehensive, essential services that are well-established and valued within the Austin community. This contract is used annually to show Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for the HRSA Ryan White A grant. This is the only program funded to provide these specific services.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	No concerns currently
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A or Not known
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	This program’s evidence-based practices include: HRSA’S HIV/AIDS Bureau Clinical Quality Management Policy Clarification Notice 15-02; Austin Area HIV Planning Council’s Ryan White Part A Service Standards; Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) Standards 4, 5, 6, and 7 are current Federal requirements for all recipients

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.

- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Community-Based Counseling***
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Youth and Family Alliance*
Focus Area	*Health Equity - LGBTQ*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The program seeks to serve LGBTQIA2S+ youth and young adults (16-26) who have experienced complex trauma related to family conflict, homelessness and housing instability, systems involvement, intimate partner violence, and systemic discrimination to improve their life skills and social supports for improved mental resiliency and long-term stability.* *Desired outcomes: Improve clients' life skills and social support for improved mental resiliency. Clients whose Coping or Resiliency score increased from intake to close/most recent assessment. Clients report increased feelings of hope from intake to close. Clients report stronger support systems Clients improve long-term stability. Clients report reduced psychological distress from trauma.* *Clients will achieve healthy outcomes as a result of receiving services through Health Equity Social Service Contracts*
Target population	*Queer youth and young adults from ages 16-26 with a history of trauma and mental health challenges residing in Austin/Travis County who are at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level.*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*

FY26 contract amount	*$134,061.35*
Payment structure	*Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 46.62% funding*
Community need basis	*Community Health Assessment (CHA) - Mental Health - Prioritizes communities of color, and LGBTQ+ populations, which are Mental Health priorities listed in the CHA. Sources that highlight these services as a key community need include: City of Austin's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Quality of Life Advisory Commission's 2023 recommendation, Integral Care's FY23 annual Health Disparities Report Card, Austin Public Health's 2023 community survey on services to LGBTQIA+ communities, The City of Austin's 2021 LGBTQIA+ Quality of Life Study,*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA/CHIP - Community Health Improvement Plan, The City of Austin's 2021 LGBTQIA+ Quality of Life Study*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The agency consistently meets its established performance goals and effectively serves the target demographics outlined in its program objectives. Agency utilizes full funding every year.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency supports young people in building positive relationships within their communities and engaging in advocacy and collective action to address systemic factors that may contribute to trauma and mental health challenges. Strengthening self-advocacy and collective advocacy skills is an important part of the healing process. The agency also develops individualized service plans that outline each client's goals, strengths, and aspirations, and identify strategies to enhance hope, coping skills, resiliency, and reduce psychological distress.* *The agency utilizes its funding effectively and consistently achieves its established performance goals. This is one of only two mental health service contracts funded by APH specifically for these priority populations*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Community-Based Counseling uses Integrative Treatment of Complex Trauma for Adolescents (ITCT-A), an evidence-informed treatment model developed at the University of Southern California Adolescent Trauma Training Center. ITCT-A was developed with support from the US Substance Abuse and Health Services Administration National Child Traumatic Stress Network (SAMHSA NCTSN) and is endorsed by SAMHSA as an effective treatment modality for young people who have experienced complex trauma.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Youth Education and Development*
Department	*Austin Public Health*
Vendor/Provider	*Youth and Family Alliance*
Focus Area	*Youth Development*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Strengths-based, trauma-informed services in a Positive Youth Development (PYD) framework to help youth pursue and achieve goals and reach their full potential.* *Primary goals supported through the program include helping youth: 1. complete secondary education, 2. navigate post-secondary and career opportunities, 3. build community connections and supportive relationships, 4. increase life skills, and 5. develop parenting skills.* *Desired Outcomes:* *Clients will complete an educational program and demonstrate improved knowledge*
Target population	*Youth who experience homelessness, trauma, mental health challenges, involvement with foster care and juvenile justice, or early parenting - Children and youth (5-18) and youth (16-21) in pursuit of a diploma or High School Education who reside in Austin/Travis County and have household incomes below 250% of the federal poverty level. In addition, LifeWorks will provide services to older transition-age youth (up to age 26). Youth ages 16-26 who: -are enrolled in LifeWorks classes to pursue their GED or other high school equivalency*
Geography	*Austin/Travis County*

FY26 contract amount	*$353,695.00*
Payment structure	*Input - Reimbursement*
Co-funders (if known)	*Unknown. City is 51.31% funding.*
Community need basis	*Mental Health - Austin Public Health Community Health Assessment (CHA) has a section focused entirely on mental health as a key social determinant of health.* *Needs addressed by this contract were also highlighted in City of Austin Strategic Direction 2023, 2021 Austin Public Health Community Youth Services Listening Sessions and Community Survey*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*CHA, Austin Public Health Community Health Improvement Plan (CHIP)*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*Agency meets performance goals set for programs and serves the target population they intend to within their goals*. Agency utilizes full funding every year.
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation	*Maintain*

(Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*N/A*
Reasons for recommendation	*The agency provides comprehensive youth development services—including workforce development, counseling, and housing support—to help young people pursue and achieve their educational goals. Students experiencing homelessness, transitioning out of foster care or juvenile justice, or facing mental health challenges receive the support they need to overcome barriers and succeed academically.* *The agency spends its funding fully and meets its performance goals and sometimes exceeds its outputs.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*N/A*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*N/A*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*N/A*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*N/A*
Notes and supporting evidence	*This program's evidence-based practices include the Five C's of Positive Youth Development, Features of Positive Youth Development, National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services Principles of Trauma Informed Care*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Homelessness Strategy and Operations (AHSO)

9 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Cold Weather Shelter Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Austin Area Urban League
Focus area	Emergency Cold Weather Shelter
Services description and desired outcomes	The Cold Weather Shelter program is designed to provide staffing at the City 's emergency shelters and embarkation centers as well as procuring, organizing, and distributing supplies and meals for persons residing in Cold Weather Shelter (CWS) locations during qualifying weather events. The CWS program should create pathways for unsheltered individuals & families to connect to housing and support services provided by community providers working in the homelessness response system.
Target population	Households in need of shelter during extreme overnight cold weather events
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$1,225,338.00
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	2
Coverage adequacy	5

Coverage rationale	CWS operations scale to meet the need up to the 300-client threshold. Once this threshold is reached, the operations is declared an emergency and Austin Emergency Management assumes control of cold weather sheltering.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	HSO already resolicited the agreement.
Reasons for recommendation	A new solicitation was launched to incorporate new program guidelines. Council will vote on the RCA in the coming weeks.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	While some community organizations provide cold weather sheltering, none can offer this service to the scale of HSO and AEM.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	One key tenant of the new solicitation is that it covers a range of emergency weather events – not just cold weather. This means the City may have access to support during floods, heat, etc.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	BSS Plus RRH Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Caritas of Austin
Focus area	Rapid Rehousing
Services description and desired outcomes	The goal of the Best Single Source Plus (BSS+) program is to provide Rapid Rehousing (RRH) support for the Austin/Travis County community. BSS+ is a collaborative program comprised of Austin/Travis County non-profits. All participating partners provide RRH services to households (individuals and families) that are experiencing literal homelessness and/or fleeing domestic violence with no resources to obtain stable, permanent housing. The two overarching goals of the program are to move clients into housing as quickly as possible and to provide stabilization support, so clients are able to live with long-term housing stability.
Target population	Households experiencing homelessness
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$948,546.46
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4

Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	The Austin-Travis County CoC needs more Rapid Rehousing units to meet the full demand. According to ECHO's 2025 State of the HRS Report, Austin-Travis County needs to create 1,700 new RRH units (plus other investments in new shelter beds, Permanent Supportive Housing, and minimal housing assistance) over the next decade to effectively end homelessness.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Resolicit at the same funding level with revised performance requirements
Reasons for recommendation	Existing RRH agreements have different program designs and service qualities. Sunsetting existing agreements and soliciting new ones would ensure all agreements have the same program standards.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Findings from HSO's reviews of RRH agreements show varying levels of program design, delivery, and quality. There is little consistency across existing RRH programs.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	There are several organizations in Austin that can deliver RRH services, which is why staff recommend a solicitation and not a direct award.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Resoliciting will have improved outcomes for the populations served by ensuring a consistent, evidence-based program delivery across service providers. Uniform standards will also ease staff workload, particularly for contract managers who assess performance. Clear -and uniform standards will also help grow public trust of HSO programs, because the public will be able to more easily understand how evaluations occur and which vendors are performing well.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Open Doors to Homeless Immigrants Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Casa Marianella
Focus area	Rapid Rehousing
Services description and desired outcomes	Open Doors to Homeless Immigrants is designed as a comprehensive, individualized program to help Austin immigrants move from homelessness to stable housing and stable income. It is a long-term, wrap-around program that will ensure clients are first safely housed in shelter or rentals, provided with the necessities of life and full supportive services, provided assistance and financial supports to move into affordable housing and aided throughout as they transition to long-term housing and stability.
Target population	Migrant families experiencing homelessness
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$323,850
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	The Austin-Travis County CoC needs more Rapid

	Rehousing units to meet the full demand. According to ECHO's 2025 State of the HRS Report, Austin-Travis County needs to create 1,700 new RRH units (plus other investments in new shelter beds, Permanent Supportive Housing, and minimal housing assistance) over the next decade to effectively end homelessness.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Resolicit at the same funding level with revised performance requirements
Reasons for recommendation	Existing RRH agreements have different program designs and service qualities. Sunsetting existing agreements and soliciting new ones would ensure all agreements have the same program standards.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Findings from HSO's reviews of RRH agreements show varying levels of program design, delivery, and quality. There is little consistency across existing RRH programs.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	There are several organizations in Austin that can deliver RRH services, which is why staff recommend a solicitation and not a direct award.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Resoliciting will have improved outcomes for the populations served by ensuring a consistent, evidence-based program delivery across service providers. Uniform standards will also ease staff workload, particularly for contract managers who assess performance. Clear -and uniform standards will also help grow public trust of HSO programs, because the public will be able to more easily understand how evaluations occur and which vendors are performing well.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Rehousing Aging Adults Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Family Eldercare, Inc.
Focus area	Rapid Rehousing
Services description and desired outcomes	Family Eldercare Rehousing Aging Adults (RAA) will transition enrolled clients from homelessness into permanent housing and provide case management, Peer Support, and other services to support their housing stability.
Target population	Households experiencing homelessness
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$959,934
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	The Austin-Travis County CoC needs more Rapid Rehousing units to meet the full demand. According to ECHO's 2025 State of the HRS Report, Austin-Travis County needs to create 1,700 new RRH units (plus other investments in new shelter beds, Permanent Supportive Housing, and minimal housing assistance) over the next

	decade to effectively end homelessness.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Resolicit at the same funding level with revised performance requirements
Reasons for recommendation	Existing RRH agreements have different program designs and service qualities. Sunsetting existing agreements and soliciting new ones would ensure all agreements have the same program standards.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Findings from HSO's reviews of RRH agreements show varying levels of program design, delivery, and quality. There is little consistency across existing RRH programs.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	There are several organizations in Austin that can deliver RRH services, which is why staff recommend a solicitation and not a direct award.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Resoliciting will have improved outcomes for the populations served by ensuring a consistent, evidence-based program delivery across service providers. Uniform standards will also ease staff workload, particularly for contract managers who assess performance. Clear -and uniform standards will also help grow public trust of HSO programs, because the public will be able to more easily understand how evaluations occur and which vendors are performing well.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Rapid Rehousing for Vulnerable Populations Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Family Endeavors, Inc.
Focus area	Rapid Rehousing
Services description and desired outcomes	To assist households experiencing homelessness to exit homelessness as quickly as possible by securing and maintaining permanent housing.
Target population	Households experiencing homelessness
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$465,678
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	The Austin-Travis County CoC needs more Rapid Rehousing units to meet the full demand. According to ECHO's 2025 State of the HRS Report, Austin-Travis County needs to create 1,700 new RRH units (plus other investments in new shelter beds, Permanent Supportive Housing, and minimal housing assistance) over the next decade to effectively end homelessness.

Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Resolicit at the same funding level with revised performance requirements
Reasons for recommendation	Existing RRH agreements have different program designs and service qualities. Sunsetting existing agreements and soliciting new ones would ensure all agreements have the same program standards.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Findings from HSO’s reviews of RRH agreements show varying levels of program design, delivery, and quality. There is little consistency across existing RRH programs.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	There are several organizations in Austin that can deliver RRH services, which is why staff recommend a solicitation and not a direct award.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Resoliciting will have improved outcomes for the populations served by ensuring a consistent, evidence-based program delivery across service providers. Uniform standards will also ease staff workload, particularly for contract managers who assess performance. Clear -and uniform standards will also help grow public trust of HSO programs, because the public will be able to more easily understand how evaluations occur and which vendors are performing well.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	CityACT Expansion Combined Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Integral Care
Focus area	Mental health services
Services description and desired outcomes	The goal of this program is to provide individualized intensive community based services utilizing the principles of an Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) Team. The goal is to provide these services to adult individuals who have experienced chronic homelessness and have a disabling condition, including persistent mental illness, co-occurring substance use disorder, and/or medical issues so they can obtain and/or maintain housing to achieve wellness and recovery.
Target population	Individuals with chronic homelessness and a disabling condition.
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$1,012,620.00
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	3
Coverage rationale	A recent Meadows Mental Health Policy Institute found 950

	high needs individuals who may qualify for this program's services.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	CMO has determined that this contract would remain the same amount, but it will be repurposed to support the No Wrong Door Initiative.
Reasons for recommendation	Focusing this agreement on No Wrong Door will ensure 13 Integral Care case managers are supporting clients in this new initiative.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	N/A
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Integral Care is the Mental Health Authority for Austin-Travis County.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Dedicating case managers to No Wrong Door will free-up APD resources that are currently dedicated to NWD. It will also ensure mental health experts are working directly with the most severe mental health clients.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Mobile Outreach and Housing Navigation Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Sunrise Community Church
Focus area	Homeless Street Outreach
Services description and desired outcomes	Consistent with Council Resolution No. 20260723-068, HSO will use the HOPE Fund to contract with Sunrise for in-depth homeless outreach services to two populations within the IH-35 - Oltorf area: (i) individuals experiencing unsheltered homelessness and (ii) families experiencing homelessness who have children enrolled in local schools. The desired outcomes are (i) reducing unsheltered homelessness in the area near the new South Austin Housing Navigation Center, and (ii) maintain housing and student enrollment for families that are at-risk of or experiencing homelessness in neighborhoods near the new navigation center. The previous version of this agreement, funded through the City's General Fund, focused on delivering homeless outreach services citywide.
Target population	Former: Unhoused individuals citywide. New: See "Services Description and Desired Outcomes" text box above.
Geography	Former: Citywide; New: Neighborhoods near the intersection of IH-35 and Oltorf.
FY26 contract amount	FY26: $150,000. FY27: $250,000
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	None.

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5

Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	The staffing model will ensure robust coverage in the new geographic focus area.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Reduce General Fund to $0 since this is moving to the HOPE Fund.
Reasons for recommendation	Moving funding source to the HOPE Fund
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Rapid Rehousing Youth Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Youth and Family Alliance (LifeWorks)
Focus area	Rapid Rehousing
Services description and desired outcomes	LifeWorks Rapid Rehousing Program houses youth, ages 18-24, in scattered-site RRH apartments and provides comprehensive supportive services.
Target population	Youth and young adults experiencing homelessness
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$609,383
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	The Austin-Travis County CoC needs more Rapid Rehousing units to meet the full demand. According to ECHO's 2025 State of the HRS Report, Austin-Travis County needs to create 1,700 new RRH units (plus other investments in new shelter beds, Permanent Supportive Housing, and minimal housing assistance) over the next decade to effectively end homelessness.

Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Resolicit at the same funding level with revised performance requirements
Reasons for recommendation	Existing RRH agreements have different program designs and service qualities. Sunsetting existing agreements and soliciting new ones would ensure all agreements have the same program standards.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Findings from HSO’s reviews of RRH agreements show varying levels of program design, delivery, and quality. There is little consistency across existing RRH programs.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	There are several organizations in Austin that can deliver RRH services, which is why staff recommend a solicitation and not a direct award.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Resoliciting will have improved outcomes for the populations served by ensuring a consistent, evidence-based program delivery across service providers. Uniform standards will also ease staff workload, particularly for contract managers who assess performance. Clear -and uniform standards will also help grow public trust of HSO programs, because the public will be able to more easily understand how evaluations occur and which vendors are performing well.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE).

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Workforce Development Program
Department	Homeless Strategies and Operations
Vendor/Provider	Youth and Family Alliance (LifeWorks)
Focus area	Workforce Development
Services description and desired outcomes	The LifeWorks Workforce Development program supports youth in securing employment and achieving career goals through an evidence-based model that integrates job search assistance, education, and mental health services. By rapidly connecting youth to competitive work and providing individualized, on-the-job support, the program aims to improve employment outcomes, strengthen mental health stability, and reduce returns to homelessness.
Target population	Youth experiencing homelessness
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$55,574
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	Youth homelessness in Austin-Travis County grew by 300% over the last three years. This massive growth

	necessitates a scale-up of services focused on youth/young adult homelessness.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Transition this contract to Austin Economic Development.
Reasons for recommendation	AED is the city's leader in workforce development programs. They are better suited to evaluate performance and identify programmatic changes to improve outcomes for program participants.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Having this contract managed under AED's expertise will improve program quality by incorporating direct oversight from subject matter experts in the workforce development field. It can also help ensure the program is aligned with business needs in Austin-Travis County.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Economic Development (AED)

17 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Grant for Technology Opportunities Program (GTOPs)*
Department	*Austin Economic Development*
Vendor/Provider	*13-20 vendors are selected annually with funding*
Focus Area	*City-wide*
Services description and desired outcomes	*GTOPs is a grant program that funds digital equity work in the community. Projects usually focus on device access, internet access, or digital skills training supporting the portions of the community that experience the highest barriers to digital access.*
Target population	*Portions of the Austin population that have the highest barriers to digital access, including: immigrants and refugees, individuals with disabilities, individuals with low literacy levels, justice impacted individuals, low-income individuals, older adults, people with language barriers, racial or ethnic minorities, rural residents, unemployed individuals, unhoused individuals, and veterans and their families*
Geography	*City of Austin*
FY26 contract amount	*$400,000*
Payment structure	*Other*
Co-funders (if known)	*Varied*
Community need basis	*GTOPs funds 14+ unique community projects each year. There is no singular rationale or basis that will fit all projects, but it is valuable to note that this*

	grant directly funds priorities identified by the community and the grant has a 1:1 match requirement, meaning the City's investment is at least doubled.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan, 2023 Austin/Travis County Digital Needs Assessment*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*4*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The grant covers many different contracts, but grantees are generally successful in providing support within the scopes of their contracts.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*5*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Reasons for recommendation	*GTOPs is a unique program to the region. There is no other consistent sources of annual grant dollars supporting digital equity. If the City does not fund GTOPs there will be no replacement for it. GTOPs does, at minimum, double the City's dollars by a required 1:1 match, allowing the City to enhance the*

	resources in the community going towards digital equity and access.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None.*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*None.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Recommendation is for no changes, so none.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*None*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Funding Structure: There are three funding pathways for FY26. Two are structured to have one up front pre-payment equal to half the award and a second payment at the project mid-point that is contingent on successful progress. The third pathway is a micro-award that is fully paid up front. The latter pathway is being retired as of this cycle. Performance based program time-outs are also being adopted for the next cycle.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Opportunity Austin
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Chamber of Commerce
Focus Area	
Services description and desired outcomes	Engages Opportunity Austin to support innovation, investment, workforce development, and liviability across the Austin region.
Target population	Business and Industries
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$175,000
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	Memberships, sponsorships, grants
Community need basis	
Associated City or Regional Plans	

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*NA (Sole Source)*
Performance results	*NA (Sole Source)*
Coverage adequacy	*NA (Sole Source)*
Coverage rationale	*NA (Sole Source)*
Geographic adequacy	*NA (Sole Source)*

City role necessity	*NA (Sole Source)*
Leverage	*NA (Sole Source)*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Cut by $50,000
Reasons for recommendation	
Documented performance concerns (if any)	Performance Deliverables are currently undefined. CoA has sought to collaborate with OA on rescoping of Contract to focus on Business Retention and Expansion efforts, both domestic and internationally.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Expected impacts to recommended service cuts would be loss of deliverables associated with Marketing and Workforce Development. Workforce Development is addressed through other existing Social Service Agreements. The City contract provides approximately 3% of the vendors annual operating revenues, which are chiefly provided through private sector memberships and sponsorships.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Expected impacts to recommended service cuts would be loss of deliverables associated with Marketing and Workforce Development. Some of this work is duplicative with other Social Service Agreements more directly targeted to Workforce Development. Contract should be maintained and refocused for local, domestic, and international Business Retention and Expansion efforts primarily.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	***Community Technology Access Lab Management Services***
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	*Austin Free-Net*
Focus Area	Digital Equity Services
Services description and desired outcomes	*This contract provides access to free digital skills training to the Austin community to enable full participation in our modern digital society.*
Target population	*General Public*
Geography	*City-wide*
FY26 contract amount	*$300,000*
Payment structure	*Other*
Co-funders (if known)	*None*
Community need basis	*This contract and activity align with the 2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan, aligns with national best practices described by the National Digital Inclusion Alliance, supports Austin's status as a NDIA Digital Inclusion Visionary Trailblazer, and provides access to digital skills required by nearly every job, as described in the 2023 National Skills Coalition report on digital skills which showed that 92% of all jobs require digital skills.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan, 2023 Austin/Travis County Digital Equity Needs Assessment*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*4*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*The whole Austin population is a viable target for digital skills training, and furthermore, the City has a vested interest in ensuring that the whole population can access the City's digital resources. The reach of this contract is limited by funding, and therefore the range of topics able to be taught, the number of training sessions, and the number of training delivery sites are constrained by funding. More funding would increase reach.*
Geographic adequacy	*3*
City role necessity	*4*
Leverage	*2*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Reasons for recommendation	*The services provided by this contract are the flagship digital skills training resources that the City currently provides to ensure that it's residents can interact with digital City resources and the greater digital world. There is certainly the potential for more funding to have a greater impact, but staff are not prepared to make that case in the timeline provided.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*Of the 13 performance measures tracked within this contract, three fell significantly behind target in the*

	last fully completed term. However, two of these three items were expected and were intentionally offset by significantly higher performance targets on other measures. Specifically, there is a longstanding trend post-COVID that participation in physical computer labs have not returned to pre-COVID levels. The measures tracking computer lab participation are therefore expectedly low. However, the number of clients being served via digital skills training are performing significantly higher than contracted targets as the City and the contractor have agreed to prioritize training over lab participation.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*There are other organizations providing digital skills training, but there are no other organizations who have a specific focus on interacting with the City of Austin digital resources and providing in-person support at City facilities. Other entities also will have no necessity to focus on Austin residents.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*The recommendation includes no change in funding level at this time, so no service improvements are anticipated. The current funding level is a minimum level of service, so the gaps that currently exist will remain.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*There is an ongoing effort to use this contract to draw more leveraged funding to support the contracted activity. These efforts are ongoing.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Funding structure is monthly reimbursements of demonstrated expenditures.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Adult Education & Literacy
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Austin ISD
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Opportunities for non-English speaking Austin residents to enhance their workforce readiness through adult education and the four domains of literacy: reading, writing, speaking, and listening
Target population	Non-English speaking Austin residents
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$254,880
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin’s most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.

Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin’s Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Recommend maintaining funding so Austin Independent School District (AISD) can continue its Adult English as a Second Language (ESL) program for Austin residents who are not yet proficient in English. The project will help participants improve the four key areas of literacy reading, writing, speaking, and listening, which are important for everyday life, employment, and participation in the community. AISD will expand access to ESL instruction by increasing the number of available classes from 11

	to 15 and organizing classes based on students' English language proficiency levels. This will allow students to receive instruction that better matches their current skill level and provides an appropriate level of challenge and support. The program will measure student progress through post-testing to determine whether students have made measurable literacy gains. Overall, this recommendation will increase access to English language education, provide more targeted instruction, and help non-English-speaking Austin residents strengthen the language skills they need to become more workforce ready.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If this recommendation is adopted, AISD will be able to serve more students by increasing ESL classes and providing classes based on language proficiency. This will increase access to services, support student literacy gains, and maintain teaching positions needed to provide the additional classes.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It started October 1, 2024 (FY25) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	On-Ramp to Employment
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Austin Voices for Education and Youth
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Opportunities for unemployed and underemployed adults to complete adult education classes and receive wraparound supports through Austin Independent School District Family Resources Centers.
Target population	Unemployed and underemployed adults
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$108,000
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin’s most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.

Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin’s Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	2
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Recommend maintaining funding so that Austin Voices for Education and Youth can continue offering opportunities for unemployed and underemployed adults to complete adult education classes and receive wraparound supports through Austin Independent School District Family Resources Centers.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No

Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It began April 1, 2024 (FY24) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Workforce Readiness for Adults
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Easter Seals – Central Texas
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Support for autistic/neurodivergent adults by enhancing their social skills and well-being, facilitating informed career choices, and equipping them with essential skills and formative workplace experiences.
Target population	Autistic/neurodivergent adults
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$239,040
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.

Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin’s Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	2
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Recommend maintaining funding so Easter Seals can continue to support autistic/neurodivergent adults by enhancing their social skills and well-being, facilitating informed career choices, and equipping them with essential skills and formative workplace experiences.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No

Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	N/A
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It began April 1, 2024 (FY24) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Ready to Work+
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Goodwill Centex
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Support for individuals with barriers to career advancement including those with criminal backgrounds, lack of education, housing insecurity, disabilities, and other barriers.
Target population	Adults with barriers to career advancement
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$685,996
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional	Austin's Hire Local Plan

Plans	

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Recommend maintaining funding so Goodwill can continue to support individuals with barriers to career advancement including those with criminal backgrounds, lack of education, housing insecurity, disabilities, and other barriers.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this	N/A

recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It began April 1, 2024 (FY24) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	JtoJ Workforce Development
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Jail to Jobs d/b/a Nineveh Ministries
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Mentor-based employment with wraparound care for justice-involved individuals including vocational training and job placement for formerly incarcerated individuals.
Target population	Justice-involved individuals
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$81,000
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional	Austin's Hire Local Plan

Plans	

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	2
Leverage	5

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Recommend maintaining funding so Jail to Jobs can continue to provide mentor-based employment with wraparound care for justice-involved individuals including vocational training and job placement for formerly incarcerated individuals.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this	N/A

recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It began April 1, 2024 (FY24) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	A Seat at the Table
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Latinitas
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Opportunities for adults in underserved Austin communities to receive digital literacy and professional development training through its Padres Digitales and Google Certificates programs.
Target population	Adults in underserved Austin communities
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$90,000
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional	Austin's Hire Local Plan

Plans	

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	3

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	Recommend maintaining funding so Latinitas can continue to provide opportunities for adults in underserved Austin communities to receive digital literacy and professional development training through its Padres Digitales and Google Certificates programs.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps	N/A

expected if this recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It began April 1, 2024 (FY24) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Literacy Partners Workforce Collaboration
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Literacy Coalition of Central Texas
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Provides youth with individualized employment, education, and support services to help them obtain and maintain employment, pursue career goals, and overcome barriers to stability. Services include career planning, job searches, resume and application assistance, interview preparation, and on-the-job support, with connections to mental health and housing resources as needed. Expected outcomes include improved competitive employment and job retention, increased mental health stability through connections to appropriate services, and greater housing stability with fewer returns to homelessness.
Target population	Non-English speaking Austin residents
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$637,751
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through

	Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin's Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A

Reasons for recommendation	We recommend maintaining/renewing the LifeWorks Workforce Development program because it provides comprehensive, youth-centered employment support that helps participants obtain and retain employment while addressing barriers to long-term stability. The program directly supports the contract goals by improving employment outcomes, connecting youth to mental health resources when needed, and promoting housing stability. Continued funding will allow LifeWorks to maintain these critical services and support youth in achieving greater employment, independence, and overall stability.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	No significant service gaps are expected if the LifeWorks Workforce Development program is maintained and renewed. Continued funding will allow LifeWorks to sustain employment, mental health, and housing support for youth while continuing to strengthen job placement, job retention, and connections to community resources.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It started October 1, 2024 (FY25) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Magic Quality Investment Project program*
Department	*Austin Economic Development*
Vendor/Provider	*Mainspring Schools*
Focus Area	*Family and Social Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goals of the Mainspring Magic Quality Improvement program are to expand the training and professional development opportunities for teachers; to increase recruitment and retention through greater levels of job satisfaction; to deepen the skills of Mainspring staff as educators and vital members of the community; to reduce adverse behaviors in Mainspring's pre-k classrooms; and to meet the challenges of Mainspring's mission and model more fully.*
Target population	*Child Care providers at Mainspring schools who provide care for children ages 0-5*
Geography	*City-wide*
FY26 contract amount	*$61,200*
Payment structure	*Activity: Monthly invoices for training expenses*
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Community need basis	The Heckman Equation “Lifecycle Benefit of an Influential Early Childhood Program (13% ROI)” The Life-cycle Benefits of an Influential Early Childhood Program research paper.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*They have provided trainings for 102 childcare providers by conducting Conscious Discipline trainings in partnership with Child Inc.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	
Reasons for recommendation	*This contract has provided trainings to most eligible providers. Staff need to explore remaining capacity to determine if maintaining services are necessary. Additionally, these services may be provided through United Way and funded by Raising Travis County funds.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Partial. Budget and Narrative shows that 45.55% comes from other funding sources for this program.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this	*Staff will need to confirm if services are provided and funded by RTC efforts.*

recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	*2-12 month renewal options and 1-6 Month Renewal Option remain until contract end date of 3/31/29.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Black Mothers program; RISE*
Department	*Austin Economic Development*
Vendor/Provider	*Rise Child Development Center, Inc. / The Rise Center Of Liberation In Early Childhood Education*
Focus Area	*Family and Social Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*RISE will provide free or low-cost, short-term, culturally congruent, high-quality drop-in childcare, for Black mothers in Central Texas for children 6 weeks through age 5. The purpose of this program is to address the lack of access to affordable and reliable childcare. By providing mothers with childcare when they need it the most, they will be able to engage in activities that will help them secure economic and financial security including but not limited to working remotely or engaging in online training or educational programs.*
Target population	*Black mothers with children 0-5.*
Geography	*City wide*
FY26 contract amount	*$122,514.30*
Payment structure	*Other: Monthly invoices for cost of services provided.*
Co-funders (if known)	*none*
Community need basis	The Heckman Equation “Lifecycle Benefit of an Influential Early Childhood Program (13% ROI)” The Life-cycle Benefits of an Influential Early Childhood Program research paper.
Associated City or Regional	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Plans	

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*2*
Coverage adequacy	*This program seeks to provide as needed drop in childcare for Black Mothers who are involved with programing and services provided by Black Mamas Village.*
Coverage rationale	*This program has had to operate at shorten hours due to funding cuts. They report being full with mothers who repeatedly access care which is not captured in performance measures.*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Modify*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Increase funding to pre-FY26 10% cut levels*
Reasons for recommendation	*As a result of the funding cuts the program had to close for several during the fourth quarter of FY 26 thus being unable to continue to serve the 77 mothers, and 94 children who had utilized the program through 7/31/2026 and unable to serve any additional mothers and children.*
Documented performance	*Is not meeting the unduplicated client performance*

concerns (if any)	*measures, due to repeat client usage, and being forced to close due to lack of funding during Q4. Will offer services again 10/1/2027*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No. Currently only childcare provider offering drop in care at Black Mamas village. Drop in care services are not eligible for Raising Travis County (RTC) funds.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Returning funding to original levels would help the program remain open throughout the entire fiscal year.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Vendor is adjusting how they staff childcare workers and expects to have less overhead moving into new fiscal year as they move away from contracting childcare workers to staff and move to having permanent staff at the childcare center.*
Notes and supporting evidence	This is a unique service in the childcare ecosystem. The Heckman Equation “Lifecycle Benefit of an Influential Early Childhood Program (13% ROI)” The Life-cycle Benefits of an Influential Early Childhood Program research paper.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Gateway
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Skillpoint Alliance
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Skillpoint Alliance provides short-term, career-focused vocational training in HVAC, plumbing, electrical, and manufacturing to help low-income individuals quickly prepare for employment. Through its Rapid Employment Model, participants can complete training in 4–5 weeks, with evening options available for select programs. Expected outcomes include recruiting and training individuals from the target population, assisting graduates in securing employment paying at least $15 per hour, and connecting skilled-trade graduates with apprenticeship opportunities to support long-term career growth and economic stability.
Target population	18 years or older, have a family income at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Income Guidelines, are interested in vocational education to increase their wages and self-sufficiency, Skillpoint will prioritize serving individuals who meet the criterion above and identify as Black, Indigenous, or a Person of Color (BIPOC).
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$135,000
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome

Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin's Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation	Maintain

(Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	We recommend maintaining/renewing Skillpoint Alliance because it provides short-term, accessible vocational training that helps low-income individuals quickly gain skills for in-demand careers. The program supports participants through training, job placement, and apprenticeship opportunities, helping them secure stable employment, increase earning potential, and achieve greater economic stability.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If this recommendation is adopted, Skillpoint Alliance will continue providing low-income residents with accessible vocational training, job placement assistance, and pathways to apprenticeships in high-demand skilled trades. These services will help participants gain employment, increase their earning potential, and build long-term economic stability.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It started October 1, 2024 (FY25) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Employment Services
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	The Arc of the Capital Area
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Opportunities for non-English speaking Austin residents to enhance their workforce readiness through adult education and the four domains of literacy: reading, writing, speaking, and listening.
Target population	This program serves individuals who are of hiring age, who have IDD, and are actively seeking integrated employment opportunities offering sustainable wages.
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$54,639
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None.
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin’s most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income

	general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin’s Hire Local Plan.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	We recommend maintaining/renewing funding for The Arc of the Capital Area because the program provides individualized support and vocational services that help individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities achieve greater independence and secure competitive, integrated employment. Continued funding will help participants build skills, reduce reliance on government support, and become more self-sufficient, contributing members of the community.

Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	No significant service gaps are expected if funding is maintained. Continued funding will allow The Arc to sustain individualized employment and vocational support, while providing opportunities to strengthen services and help more individuals achieve greater independence and self-sufficiency.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It started October 1, 2024 (FY25) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Adult Education
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Todos Juntos Learning Center
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	The Adult Education Program's goal is to support immigrants as they learn English, integrate into our community, improve workplace skills, obtain employment, and be able to contribute to the overall financial support of economically independent households. - Objective 1: 70% or more of ESL learners will advance to the next level of ESL class within 12 months. - Objective 2: 76% or more of job skill training program participants will increase or improve their basic digital skills.
Target population	English Language Learners. Most of the people served (approximately 95%) are Latino/a. Nearly all program participants live in households with low income. Most reside in south and southeast Austin and/or Travis County. Income eligibility requirements, 250% of the Federal Poverty.
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	$178,315
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	None
Community need basis	The goal of **workforce readiness services** is to provide qualifying individuals with the skills needed to gain and maintain employment. Through Workforce Readiness services individuals can

	cultivate the foundational skills to gain employment in some of Austin's most in-demand industries. Services are often long-term services provided to individuals ages 16 and older. Typically, individuals entering workforce readiness programming have not obtained a high school diploma and/or are not fluent English speakers. Workforce Readiness Services provides services to the low-income general population in Austin and Travis County.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin's Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	We recommend maintaining/renewing funding for

	the Adult Education Program because it provides English language and job skills training that helps immigrants integrate into the community, improve employability, and achieve greater economic independence. The program’s measurable goals for ESL advancement and improved digital skills demonstrate a clear focus on participant progress and workforce readiness.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If funding is not maintained, the program may face reduced capacity to provide ESL and job skills training, resulting in fewer opportunities for immigrants to improve English proficiency, digital skills, employment readiness, and economic independence.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It started October 1, 2024 (FY25) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*5-year Interlocal w Workforce Solutions for QC3*
Department	*Austin Economic Development*
Vendor/Provider	*Worksource Greater Austin Area Workforce Board / Workforce Solutions Capital Area Workforce Board*
Focus Area	*Child & Youth*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The goal of the QC3 to increase the capacity of affordable and accessible high-quality childcare for families in Austin and Travis County. This goal is accomplished through the following core QC3 programs:* *Child Care Program Supports: To increase the accessibility of high-quality childcare services for income eligible families by supporting the Texas Rising Star Program framework.* *Premium Pay Stipends for Child Care Teachers (Jeannette Watson Wage Supplements): ensure that childcare teachers have opportunities for professional development through scholarships and stipends as they pursue credentials or a degree in the early childhood field.* *Continuity of Child Care Service: provide a temporary bridge for families who face disruption of childcare or as a starting scholarship when CCDF funding is unavailable.*
Target population	*Licensed Child Care programs, providers, low income families, children 0-12.*
Geography	*City Wide*

FY26 contract amount	*$1,006,389.00*
Payment structure	*Other: Monthly invoices for childcare seats, activities, annual childcare provider stipends for providers with (CDA, Associates, Bachelors, or masters degrees)*
Co-funders (if known)	*Travis County*
Community need basis	The Heckman Equation “Lifecycle Benefit of an Influential Early Childhood Program (13% ROI)” The Life-cycle Benefits of an Influential Early Childhood Program research paper.
Associated City or Regional Plans	

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*2*
Coverage rationale	*Workforce solutions has several thousand children on the waitlist for childcare scholarships. Funding from this contract goes towards paying for gap funding childcare scholarships for those whose parents may have fallen out of compliance to allow brief time to become compliant, as well as providing stipends for childcare workers themselves. These services are unique from the childcare seats funded through Raising Travis County (RTC) funds and they are not eligible for the County funds considering it provides bridge gap funding and those not within compliance to ensure kids do not drop from childcare access.*
Geographic adequacy	*City Wide*
City role necessity	*3*
Leverage	*3*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a

narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	
Reasons for recommendation	*This program provides ensures the continuity of care for child children 0-12 at their current childcare programs in Austin/Travis County by creating temporary bridge funding for those who would have been terminated as a result of Federal Child Care Development Fund funding rules. Annual stipends to promote the retention of qualified professionals in the field. Promotes childcare programs becoming accredited with state TRS accreditation or national accreditations that improve the quality of care being provided.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Partial. Travis county funds 41% of the program.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	The Heckman Equation “Lifecycle Benefit of an Influential Early Childhood Program (13% ROI)” The Life-cycle Benefits of an Influential Early Childhood Program research paper.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Workforce Development+
Department	Austin Economic Development
Vendor/Provider	Youth and Family Alliance d/b/a Lifeworks
Focus Area	Workforce Readiness
Services description and desired outcomes	Provide integrated employment, education, and mental health support to help youth secure employment and pursue career goals. LifeWorks' employment specialists' partner with youth to identify employment goals, conduct job searches, write resumes, submit applications, and prepare for interviews. At youths' request, employment specialists communicate directly with employers to provide on-the-job support. Rapid employment and a youth-centered approach increase youth engagement and job retention rates.
Target population	Youth and young adults (ages 16-26) residing in Austin/Travis County who are at or below 250% of the FPL.
Geography	Austin/Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$860,949
Payment structure	Activity and Outcome
Co-funders (if known)	Unknown
Community need basis	This recommendation is based on the strong alignment between LifeWorks' proposed activities and the grant's goals: improving competitive employment outcomes, supporting mental health recovery and stability, and reducing returns to

	homelessness. Funding this program would support a comprehensive approach that helps youth not only obtain employment but also address the underlying challenges that can affect long-term employment and personal stability.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin’s Hire Local Plan

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	Cannot identify either.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	This program provides youth with individualized support to obtain and maintain employment while also addressing barriers that can impact long-term

	stability. LifeWorks helps youth identify career goals, search for jobs, develop resumes, complete applications, prepare for interviews, and, when needed, provides on-the-job support by working with employers. The program also connects youth to mental health and housing resources when needed, supporting their overall stability and ability to remain engaged in employment. Maintaining this program directly supports the contract's goals of improving employment outcomes, promoting mental health recovery and stability, and reducing returns to homelessness. Continued funding will allow LifeWorks to provide consistent, youth-centered services that help youth achieve greater employment and personal stability.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	No significant service gaps are expected if the recommendation to maintain the LifeWorks Workforce Development program is adopted. Continued funding will allow LifeWorks to maintain employment, mental health, and housing support for youth and provide consistent assistance throughout their transition to and retention of employment. Ongoing coordination with community resources and employers will also help address individual barriers and support continued improvement in employment and stability outcomes.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Public Health solicited and executed this contract. It started October 1, 2024 (FY25) and was transferred to Austin Economic Development starting October 1, 2024 (FY25).

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Police Department (APD)

5 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner Services
Department	Austin Police
Vendor / Provider	Brave Alliance Mission
Focus area	Basic Needs
Services description and desired outcomes	The purpose of this contract is to provide sexual assault nurse examiner services to survivors of sexual assault who have report to Austin Police and want a SAFE at the time of the survivor's report or earliest survivor availability. This contract is the only existing agreement the City has for sexual assault nurse examiner services. Sexual Assault is an under reported crime and for the last several years, APD has been diligently working to build trust within the sexual assault survivor community. We believe that through this work we will see an increase in reporting over time and an increased need for forensic medical examination funding.
Target population	Survivors who report to Austin Police of a sexual assault.
Geography	Central Texas Region
FY26 contract amount	$78,000
Payment structure	Deliverable
Co-funders (if known)	N/A

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5

Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	This contract is the only existing agreement the City has for sexual assault nurse examiner services.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	4
Leverage	4

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	The purpose of this contract is to provide sexual assault nurse examiner services to survivors of sexual assault who have report to Austin Police and want a SAFE at the time of the survivor's report or earliest survivor availability. This contract is the only existing agreement the City has for sexual assault nurse examiner services. Sexual Assault is an under reported crime and for the last several years, APD has been diligently working to build trust within the sexual assault survivor community. We believe that through this work we will see an increase in reporting over time and an increased need for forensic medical examination funding.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None documented.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No, This contract is the only existing agreement the City has for sexual assault nurse examiner services.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Sexual Assault is an under reported crime and for the last several years, APD has been diligently working to build trust within the sexual assault survivor community. We believe that through this work we will see an increase in reporting over time and an increased need for forensic medical examination funding.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Police and Brave Alliance Mission are in year one of an up to 5 year agreement.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.

- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Reimbursement of expenses related to the protection of abused children
Department	Austin Police
Vendor / Provider	Center for Child Protection
Focus area	Child & Youth
Services description and desired outcomes	The services provided under this contract are legally required by Texas state law. Texas Family Code § 264.4061 mandates that the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) refer cases to a Children's Advocacy Center (CAC) for a multidisciplinary team (MDT) response in all reports of child sexual abuse or fatalities with surviving children. The Center for Child Protection (CCP) serves as the critical hub for the MDT. Texas Family Code § 264.4061(b) mandates that forensic interviews be conducted in accordance with the center's protocol to ensure high-quality, legally sound evidence while minimizing trauma to the child. CCP 56A.303 mandates law enforcement is required to refer sexual assault victims for forensic medical examinations. The CCP provides the child-friendly, non-hospital environment necessary to fulfill the non-acute forensic mandate and a place where the child is familiar with through the forensic interview and post interview counseling services. The CCP is the sole provider of forensic interviews in Travis County. It serves as the co-located hub where APD, TCSO, CPS, the District Attorney's Office, and medical professionals from the CARE Team coordinate cases daily. No other City contract provides the specific MDT framework required to conduct the joint investigations mandated by Texas Family Code § 264.4061. Based on performance data from Oct 2024 – Sept 2025, the CCP served 897 children and 710 caregivers at the point of forensic interview. A reduction would jeopardize access for roughly 296 children annually, potentially forcing them to recount trauma multiple times to different investigators (in violation of state law in some instances). Additionally, the Crisis Counselor Program (formerly Family Advocates) provided support to 957

	adults. A reduction would leave these caregivers without essential guidance during the criminal justice process.
Target population	Youth and support survivors
Geography	Travis County
FY26 contract amount	$443,276.00
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	N/A

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	The contract adequately serves the population in need of its services.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	3
Leverage	3

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	N/A
Reasons for recommendation	The services provided under this contract are legally required by Texas state law. Texas Family Code § 264.4061 mandates that the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) refer cases to a Children's Advocacy Center (CAC) for a multidisciplinary team (MDT) response in all reports of child sexual abuse or fatalities with surviving children. The Center for Child Protection (CCP) serves as the critical hub for the MDT. Texas Family Code § 264.4061(b) mandates that forensic interviews be conducted in accordance with the center's protocol to ensure high-quality, legally sound evidence while minimizing trauma to the child. CCP 56A.303 mandates

	law enforcement is required to refer sexual assault victims for forensic medical examinations.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None documented.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No, a funding reduction to this contract would shift the burden of forensic interviewing, medical coordination, and victim advocacy to the City, for which APD have neither the specialized facilities nor the budget to adequately absorb.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Maintained annual funding of this contract would allow for continued support of services legally required by Texas state law.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Police and Center for Child Protection are currently in year two of an up to five year agreement.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Direct financial assistance to victims of crime & trauma
Department	Austin Police
Vendor / Provider	Court Appointed Special Advocates of Travis County
Focus area	Child & Youth
Services description and desired outcomes	The contract is for the Court Appointed Special Advocates of Travis County Inc dba CASA of Travis County to provide direct financial assistance to people most affected by violence in the community, specifically child victims of neglect and abuse and their relatives and caregivers. The program focuses on providing financial assistance to support children who have experienced abuse or neglect and who are at risk of losing stable placements; to support relative and fictive kin placements to keep children who have experienced abuse or neglect with their own families and communities; and to support family preservation in which domestic violence was the cause of intervention.
Target population	Child victims and their relatives and caregivers affected by abuse, neglect, or domestic violence
Geography	Central Texas Region
FY26 contract amount	One-time funds were added to the Fiscal Year 2022 budget to support this contract. There are no FY26 funds allocated.
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	N/A

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry

Evidence strength	4
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	3
Coverage rationale	This contract exhausted its one-time funds in December 2025.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	1
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Reasons for recommendation	There is an ongoing need to support survivors of domestic violence through direct financial assistance. During 10/01/24 – 09/30/25 program period, a total of 114 requests were fulfilled totaling $30,401 in direct financial assistance with 68% being to support basic needs, 17% for transportation costs, 12% for housing expenses, and 3% for family / kinship stabilization.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None documented.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Yes, there are a number of alternative government and nonprofit organizations that could provide direct financial assistance to the target population.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Maintained funding would allow for continued support of direct financial assistance to survivors of domestic violence.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	This contract exhausted FY22 one-time funding in December 2025.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Mental Health Services for APD, AFD, and ATCEMS Employees
Department	Austin Police
Vendor / Provider	The University of Texas at Austin
Focus area	Behavioral Health
Services description and desired outcomes	This contract provides a unique function that is not replicated elsewhere within the City's system. This is currently the only contract that provides priority access for APD/AFD/ATCEMS employees to psychiatric services at Dell, which is an essential resource for individuals experiencing acute mental health crises and for continuity of care following emergency response interactions. In addition, the contracted psychiatrist provides ongoing consultation and support to APD, ATCEMS, and AFD psychologists and peer support teams on a weekly basis. That consultation plays an important role in supporting responder wellness, case consultation, and coordinated behavioral health response efforts across public safety agencies. In addition to facilitating psychiatric evaluations and medication management, the contract supports rapid coordination of psychiatric referrals; specialized mental health education for first responders; training for psychiatry residents on first responder culture; ongoing consultation on complex behavioral health cases; and monthly reporting and program evaluation. Together, these services create an integrated behavioral health partnership that extends well beyond traditional psychiatric referral services.
Target population	APD, AFD, and ATCEMS Employees
Geography	City of Austin
FY26 contract amount	$31,673
Payment structure	Reimbursable

Co-funders (if known)	N/A

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	5
Coverage rationale	The contract currently serves the population in need of its services. Although the contract does not require quantitative performance metrics, Dell has consistently provided services beyond the contractual scope through expanded educational programming, enhanced interdisciplinary collaboration, specialized consultation, and continued development of an integrated first responder behavioral health model.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	5
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	Funding may increase by up to three percent annually.
Reasons for recommendation	Funding modifications should account for cost of living adjustments and other ordinary increases in contractor personnel and operating costs.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None documented.
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	No, this is currently the only contract that provides priority access for APD/AFD/ATCEMS employees to psychiatric services, which is an essential resource for individuals experiencing acute mental health crises and for continuity of care following emergency response interactions.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Increase in annual funding will allow continued improvements in outcomes related to meaningful mental health support and educational and wellness resources for police officers, firefighters and EMS personnel including

	wellness events, educational lectures, specialized clinical education, and collaborative case consultation.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	N/A
Notes and supporting evidence	Austin Police and UT Dell Medical School are currently in the beginning stages of negotiations on a new up to 5-year agreement scheduled for execution in early FY27.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Harm Reduction Therapy Services
Department	Austin Police
Vendor / Provider	Young Women's Christian Association of Greater Austin
Focus area	Violence Prevention
Services description and desired outcomes	The contract is for the Young Women's Christian Association of Greater Austin (YWCA) to provide healing modality services to individuals impacted by violence and trauma. The YWCA uses the funds to broaden choices of available healing modalities to address the community's diverse mental health needs. They offer somatic experiencing, eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR), trust based relational interventions, and narrative therapy. In addition, the YWCA offer body-based modalities such as yoga therapy, acupuncture, Qigong, Tai Chi, sound therapy, as well as integrate harm reduction therapy. YWCA partners with licensed professionals such as counselors, clinicians, therapists and social workers are fully trained in providing these specialized services. The funding also supports training for social service providers, educators, emerging therapists, and social workers to remain updated on the most current information on harm reduction.
Target population	Individuals impacted by violence and trauma
Geography	Central Texas Region
FY26 contract amount	One-time funding from the Budget Stabilization Reserve Fund in budget fiscal year 2022. There are no FY26 funds allocated.
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	N/A

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	3
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	3
Coverage rationale	This contract exhausted one-time funding in September 2024.
Geographic adequacy	5
City role necessity	1
Leverage	1

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Reasons for recommendation	There is an ongoing need to support survivors of domestic violence through healing modalities to address the community's diverse mental health needs. The following are key performance metrics from 10/01/23 - 09/30/24 of the program. Individual, couple, or family mental health services: 19 higher than anticipated requests for services from people who presented with suicide ideation, family history of suicide, experiences of domestic violence and/or sexual assault, and requesting integrative therapies such as somatic and art. Number served through Mindful movement classes: 69, 16 participants were served in movement classes utilizing yoga for regulation and activation; 8 were served in a movement class utilizing boxing and kickboxing. 15 participants were served in movement class utilizing boxing and kickboxing; 1 was from out of county so not counted here. 10 of the participants were served at the Marshalling Yard, a shelter for people who are unhoused. Harm reduction and Decriminalization Trainings Number of people trained: Staff and interns attended a training on Harm Reduction 201 (part 2) provided by Lisa Medina to expand beyond previous trainings. 8 new staff and interns participated in Harm Reduction 101 training during orientation. Provided Harm Reduction 101 for clinical care. 10 staff and 11 community members attended this training.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None documented.

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Yes, there are a number of alternative nonprofit organizations that could provide healing modality services to the target population.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Maintained funding would allow for continued support of mental health services to survivors of domestic violence.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	This contract exhausted one-time funding in September 2024.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Small and Minority Business Resources (SMBR)

3 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Outreach and Technical Assistance
Department	Austin Small and Minority Business Resources
Vendor / Provider	Asian Contractors Association
Focus area	Equity and Inclusion
Services description and desired outcomes	This Contractor offers services to Asian small business owners working in the Construction and Construction-related industry. These contracts are targeted for reduction since Contractors' scopes of work have been reduced and contracts were amended in response to a recent audit.
Target population	Asian small business owners working in Construction and Construction-related fields.
Geography	Austin Metropolitan Area
FY26 contract amount	$150,000
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	None

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	1 – We are not aware of any outside evidence
Performance results	3 – The Contractors have been inconsistent in their ability to perform
Coverage adequacy	5 – Contractor coverage area is the Austin MSA.
Coverage rationale	The City's MBE/WBE program, which the contract

	supports, covers the five county area of the MSA.
Geographic adequacy	5 – These Contractors serve the Austin metro area
City role necessity	5 – The organization relies heavily on City funding.
Leverage	1 – City funding stands alone.

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	These contracts were updated in July 2026 in response to the audit linked below. Based on the reductions to the Scopes of Work, the contract amount was reduced from $150,000 to $100,000 per contract term.
Reasons for recommendation	Reductions were made based on audit findings. SMBR staff are able to provide some services provided by Contractors in the past.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	An audit of SMBR was completed in October 2025 that included recommendations related to this contract: Austin_SMBR_Program_October_2025.pdf
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	SMBR staff are providing some of the services that were previously assigned to the Contractors.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Reduced scopes were adopted in June-July 2026 and there are no gaps in service that have been identified to date.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Outreach and Technical Assistance
Department	Austin Small and Minority Business Resources
Vendor / Provider	Business Resource Consultants (BRC), agent of Austin Area Black Contractors Association (ABCA)
Focus area	Equity and Inclusion
Services description and desired outcomes	This Contractor offers services to African American small business owners working in the Construction and Construction-related industry. These contracts are targeted for reduction since Contractors' scopes of work have been reduced and contracts were amended in response to a recent audit.
Target population	African American small business owners working in Construction and Construction-related fields.
Geography	Austin Metropolitan Area
FY26 contract amount	$150,000
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	None

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	1 – We are not aware of any outside evidence
Performance results	3 – The Contractors have been inconsistent in their ability to perform
Coverage adequacy	5 – Contractor coverage area is the Austin MSA.

Coverage rationale	The City's MBE/WBE program, which the contract supports, covers the five county area of the MSA.
Geographic adequacy	5 – These Contractors serve the Austin metro area
City role necessity	5 – The organization relies heavily on City funding.
Leverage	1 – City funding stands alone.

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	These contracts were updated in July 2026 in response to the audit linked below. Based on the reductions to the Scopes of Work, the contract amount was reduced from $150,000 to $100,000 per contract term.
Reasons for recommendation	Reductions were made based on audit findings. SMBR staff are able to provide some services provided by Contractors in the past.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	An audit of SMBR was completed in October 2025 that included recommendations related to this contract: Austin_SMBR_Program_October_2025.pdf
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	SMBR staff are providing some of the services that were previously assigned to the Contractors.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Reduced scopes were adopted in June-July 2026 and there are no gaps in service that have been identified to date.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Outreach and Technical Assistance
Department	Austin Small and Minority Business Resources
Vendor / Provider	US Hispanic Contractors Association de Austin
Focus area	Equity and Inclusion
Services description and desired outcomes	This Contractor offers services toHispanic small business owners working in the Construction and Construction-related industry. These contracts are targeted for reduction since Contractors' scopes of work have been reduced and contracts were amended in response to a recent audit.
Target population	Hispanic small business owners working in Construction and Construction-related fields.
Geography	Austin Metropolitan Area
FY26 contract amount	$150,000
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	None

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	1 – We are not aware of any outside evidence
Performance results	3 – The Contractors have been inconsistent in their ability to perform
Coverage adequacy	5 – Contractor coverage area is the Austin MSA.
Coverage rationale	The City's MBE/WBE program, which the contract

	supports, covers the five county area of the MSA.
Geographic adequacy	5 – These Contractors serve the Austin metro area
City role necessity	5 – The organization relies heavily on City funding.
Leverage	1 – City funding stands alone.

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Modify
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	These contracts were updated in July 2026 in response to the audit linked below. Based on the reductions to the Scopes of Work, the contract amount was reduced from $150,000 to $100,000 per contract term.
Reasons for recommendation	Reductions were made based on audit findings. SMBR staff are able to provide some services provided by Contractors in the past.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	An audit of SMBR was completed in October 2025 that included recommendations related to this contract: Austin_SMBR_Program_October_2025.pdf
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	SMBR staff are providing some of the services that were previously assigned to the Contractors.
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Reduced scopes were adopted in June-July 2026 and there are no gaps in service that have been identified to date.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Community Court (CC)

8 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Expanded Mobile Crisis Outreach Team (EMCOT)*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center— Integral Care*
Focus Area	*Crisis Response Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Expanded Mobile Crisis Outreach Team (EMCOT) is a mental health first response team for the City of Austin. They assist with de-escalation, diversion from jail, diversion from emergency rooms, and providing clients with connection to appropriate community-based care.*
Target population	*Individuals in crisis; Individuals with severe mental/behavioral health; Unhoused/Homeless individuals*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$5,351,262*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*EMCOT strengthens the community by providing a specialized mental health first-response team that can safely de-escalate crises, divert individuals away from jail and emergency rooms, and connect them to appropriate community-based care. By offering specialized intervention and triage to appropriate services, the program reduces strain on law enforcement and emergency departments while*

	improving outcomes for residents experiencing mental health crises.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*The EMCOT contract should not be decreased because it supports a critical component of Austin's behavioral health crisis response system, including the capacity to provide 24/7 mobile crisis services. Reducing funding could compromise service availability and responsiveness at a time when the City continues to rely on EMCOT to divert individuals experiencing behavioral health crises from law enforcement, emergency departments, and the criminal justice system.*

Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No. The EMCOT team is made up of an interdisciplinary team of qualified and specialized professionals that includes City of Austin employees. An elimination of program funding would mean an elimination to City of Austin employees positions and their crisis response capacity.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*EMCOT provides essential mental health crisis response that directly reduces pressure on police, jails, and emergency rooms and they will be able to continue to do so if the program is maintained.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Road to Recovery*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin-Travis County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Center— Integral Care*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides homeless individuals with high acuity, often with tri-occurring diagnosis: mental health, chronic medical, and substance use diagnoses access to in-patient, out-patient, and transitional housing treatment services. Care provided to clients include individual treatment planning, psychotherapeutic and pharmacologic support services, rehabilitative skills training, case management, peer support services and other services for individuals with co-occurring substance use and behavioral health disorders.*
Target population	*Substance-use and substance-dependent individuals; Unhoused/Homeless individuals*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$550,000*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*This program meets community needs by providing high-acuity homeless individuals with integrated*

	mental health, medical, and substance use treatment across residential, outpatient, and transitional settings. Through coordinated services like individualized treatment planning, medication support, skills training, case management, and peer support, it stabilizes vulnerable residents, reduces crisis system use, and improves overall public health and safety.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*Contracted services are an essential part of Austin Community Court's operations, not standalone programs. They provide specialized housing,*

	behavioral health, substance use, and other services that are integrated with the Court's case management and clinical services. Reducing these contracts directly reduces the Court's ability to meet client needs and effectively serve people experiencing homelessness.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*The program provides Austin Community Court clients and case managers with designated treatment beds that would not be available without this funding. If the program ended, those treatment options would be lost, leaving case managers with fewer resources to support clients' substance-use needs and making it much harder to connect them to appropriate care.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Austin Community Court would continue to make referrals to a treatment program that has continuously shown positive outcomes for their clients.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Sobering Center Program*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Austin-Travis County Sobriety Center Local Government Corpor*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services; Crisis Response Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Sobering Center is a 24/7 facility that provides a safe environment for publicly intoxicated individuals to sober up and, when appropriate, provides a bridge to recovery. It aims to enhance public health and public safety by providing an alternative to the emergency room and jail.*
Target population	*Unhoused/Homeless individuals; Individuals under the influence of substances; Substance-use/Substance dependent individuals*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$3,012,750*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*The Sobering Center provides a safe, medically equipped and supervised place for publicly intoxicated individuals to sober up without involving jails or emergency rooms. By offering a 24/7 alternative to these over-burdened systems, it protects public safety, reduces unnecessary arrests and ER visits, and connects people to recovery services when appropriate.*

Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*The Sobering Center contract should not be decreased because it provides a critical alternative to jail and emergency departments for individuals experiencing acute intoxication. Reducing funding could limit the City's ability to safely divert individuals from higher-cost systems, while also reducing access to stabilization, assessment, and connections to appropriate behavioral health, substance use, and other supportive services.*
Documented performance	*n/a*

concerns (if any)	
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No. The Sobering Center is funded through city and governmental programs and would not be able to sustain operations without this funding due to it directly funding staff salaries, facility, and resources.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Continuing the Sobering Center ensures the city maintains a safe, effective alternative to jail and emergency rooms for publicly intoxicated individuals. It reduces unnecessary arrests and ER visits, and provides a pathway to recovery for people who need support.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Peer-based Recovery Support*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Communities for Recovery*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides peer-based recovery support for individuals with substance use disorders or co-occurring mental health conditions. The program connects people in recovery with certified peer recovery support specialists who offer one-on-one coaching, group support, and recovery wellness planning to strengthen motivation and build recovery capital. The contract includes a full-time, in-house peer specialist dedicated to Community Court to ensure consistent support for justice-involved clients.*
Target population	*Individuals with substance-use disorders*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$266,174*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*Provides peer recovery support services to Austin Community Court clients through case manager referrals, as well as all of Austin's unhoused*

	population through walk-in access and community events. These services help reduce case manager workload by offering dedicated recovery support, allowing case managers to focus on other complex client needs and co-morbidities.
Associated City or Regional Plans	Austin, TX

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	5
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*Contracted services are an essential part of Austin Community Court's operations, not standalone programs. They provide specialized housing, behavioral health, substance use, and other services that are integrated with the Court's case management and clinical services. Reducing these*

	contracts directly reduces the Court's ability to meet client needs and effectively serve people experiencing homelessness.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*None*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*No. This agency has limited funding and is reliant on external partners to fund staff and resources for the program.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Austin Community Court clients and case managers will continue to offer substance-use peer support services for their clients, which will also alleviate case managers work load so they can focus on other presenting co-morbidities*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Permanent Supportive Housing*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Family Eldercare, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides 46 permanent supportive housing units annually through a scattered-site model for Austin Community Court clients who meet HUD's definition of chronic homelessness. The program delivers intensive housing case management for individuals with complex needs and focuses on seven core outcomes: sustained housing stability, satisfaction with services and housing, improved overall health, increased income or employment, progress in education, and "Move On" readiness for those who achieve independence and no longer require intensive support.*
Target population	*Unhoused/Homeless individuals*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$1,050,000*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*This program supports community needs by*

	providing stable housing and intensive case management to individuals experiencing chronic homelessness. By helping residents stabilize their lives, improve health, increase income, and build long-term independence, the program reduces reliance on emergency services and contributes to a safer, healthier, and more stable community.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*Contracted services are an essential part of Austin Community Court's operations, not standalone programs. They provide specialized housing, behavioral health, substance use, and other services*

	that are integrated with the Court's case management and clinical services. Reducing these contracts directly reduces the Court's ability to meet client needs and effectively serve people experiencing homelessness. The program helps chronically homeless individuals stabilize their housing, improve health, and build long-term independence.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Program is a service that the non-profit, Family Eldercare, offers upon funding availability. This contract funding allows for program to exist by paying for housing case management staff and program resources.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*45+ households who currently rely on permanent supportive housing and intensive case management would lose stable housing and the services that help them manage complex needs. Many would likely return to homelessness or unstable living situations, increasing their reliance on emergency shelters, hospitals, and crisis systems.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Representative Payee Services and SOAR Application Assistance*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Family Eldercare, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*Provides SOAR application assistance and representative payee services to Austin Community Court clients through referrals. SOAR application support helps clients apply for federal benefits which aims to increase income and promoting financial stability through assisting them in the application process that can otherwise take more than six months without a specialist. Payee services offer structured financial management for clients who need assistance with budgeting, preventing financial exploitation, and ensuring bills and essential expenses are paid consistently.*
Target population	Individuals with disabilities; Older individuals without stable income or financial management capability
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$138,000*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*

Community need basis	*SOAR specialists are needed because they help clients navigate a complex federal benefits process, significantly improve approval rates, and speed up access to income and healthcare supports. Their assistance is especially critical for people experiencing homelessness or dealing with serious mental health or substance use issues who would struggle to complete applications on their own.* *Representative payee services are helpful because they ensure that people who struggle to manage their own money have their essential expenses paid safely and consistently. A payee helps with budgeting, prevents financial exploitation, and makes sure funds are used for housing, food, healthcare, and other basic needs. This support promotes financial stability and protects vulnerable individuals from harm.*
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*Program has successfully completed applications for Community Court clients in FY26 and ongoing funding will allow for agency to continue to offer application assistance services for future clients. It will also continue the current clients enrolled in Representative Payee services and opportunity for newly awarded SOAR applicants to enroll the services as well to ensure financial self-efficacy.*
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*Program is a service non-profit Family Eldercare offers upon funding availability. This contract funding allows for program to exist by paying for trained staff and program resources.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Austin Community Court clients and case managers will continue to have access to Repetitive Payee & SOAR Application services for their clients, which will also alleviate case managers' workload so they can focus on other presenting co-morbidities*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Permanent Supportive Housing*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*Foundation Communities*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The program provides about 20 permanent supportive housing units each year for Austin Community Court clients, offering financial assistance and case management to help them maintain stable housing. All units are located within Foundation Communities properties, ensuring convenient access to public transportation, healthcare services, and essential amenities.*
Target population	*Unhoused/Homeless individuals*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$433,000*
Payment structure	***Reimbursement agreement:*** *Providers are reimbursed for allowable costs incurred to deliver services, with performance measures and reporting requirements included in the agreement. Payment is based on documented expenses, not specific outcomes.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*This program supports community needs by providing stable housing and community case management to individuals experiencing chronic homelessness. By helping residents stabilize their lives, improve health, develop employment and financial skills, and build long-term independence,*

	the program reduces reliance on emergency services and contributes to a safer, healthier, and more stable community.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*Contracted services are an essential part of Austin Community Court's operations, not standalone programs. They provide specialized housing, behavioral health, substance use, and other services that are integrated with the Court's case management and clinical services. Reducing these contracts directly reduces the Court's ability to meet client needs and effectively serve people*

	experiencing homelessness. The program helps chronically homeless individuals stabilize their housing, improve health, and build long-term independence.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*The program operates only when contract funding is available, which pays for a set number of beds reserved specifically for Austin Community Court clients at Foundation Communities properties. If funding ends, those allocated beds would no longer be supported for Community Court clients, thus eliminating dedicated housing options for individuals who rely on this program for stability.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*~20 households who currently rely on permanent supportive housing and community case management would lose stable housing and the services that help them manage complex needs. Many would likely return to homelessness or unstable living situations, increasing their reliance on emergency shelters, hospitals, and crisis systems.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract/Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract/grant. This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract/grant should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting a specific reduction target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could absorb it, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Contract/Grant Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	*Re-entry Roundtable*
Department	*Austin Community Court*
Vendor/Provider	*The Other Ones Foundation, Inc.*
Focus Area	*Homeless Services*
Services description and desired outcomes	*The Roundtable is a collaborative entity that utilizes The Other Ones Foundation as its fiscal sponsor. The Committee includes 15 members representative of the key constituencies the Roundtable seeks to engage, including persons impacted by the criminal legal system, including individuals, victims, families and communities impacted by the criminal legal system, representatives of criminal legal institutions, organizations and individuals engaged in providing services and/or advocating for issues that impact reentry, and advocates addressing issues that intersect with the reentry population such as homelessness, workforce development, behavioral health and violence prevention.*
Target population	*Individuals within the judicial system; Unhoused/Homeless individuals*
Geography	*Citywide*
FY26 contract amount	*$50,000*
Payment structure	***Deliverable agreement:*** *Payment is tied to specific, documented products, activities, or milestones completed within an agreed timeframe.*
Co-funders (if known)	*n/a*
Community need basis	*The Reentry Roundtable is essential because it brings together the diverse voices and expertise needed to address the complex challenges faced by people returning from the criminal legal system. By*

	including individuals with lived experience, victims, families, service providers, advocates, and representatives from criminal justice institutions, it creates a coordinated, community-driven approach to improving reentry outcomes. This collaboration helps the city reduce recidivism, strengthen support systems around housing, employment, behavioral health, and violence prevention, and ensures that policies and services reflect the real needs of those most affected.
Associated City or Regional Plans	*Austin, TX*

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	*5*
Performance results	*5*
Coverage adequacy	*5*
Coverage rationale	*5*
Geographic adequacy	*5*
City role necessity	*5*
Leverage	*1= City funding stands alone.*

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Coverage adequacy and Performance results together are the performance standard applied to this contract: whether the service is closing the gap between documented need and what is currently funded, and whether the vendor is delivering as agreed. Score Coverage adequacy against the population this contract is intended to serve, not the entire focus area: a contract that covers only part of the need can still score well if other known services cover the remainder, or if the contract intentionally targets a narrower population because of specific risk factors, geography, or eligibility criteria. Use Coverage rationale to state which of these applies.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	*Maintain*
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*n/a*
Reasons for recommendation	*Contracted services are an essential part of Austin*

	Community Court's operations, not standalone programs. They provide specialized housing, behavioral health, substance use, and other services that are integrated with the Court's case management and clinical services. Reducing these contracts directly reduces the Court's ability to meet client needs and effectively serve people experiencing homelessness.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	*n/a*
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	*There is no alternative funding for the Re-Entry Roundtable program. Maintaining this contract ensures that reentry efforts stay aligned with Austin's priorities, standards, and community needs. It allows the City to directly oversee coordination among partners, maintain accountability, and ensure funds are used effectively to reduce recidivism.*
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	*Continuation of this program means the City will maintain a coordinated-collaborative network of community partners that continues to offer effective reentry support system that helps reduce recidivism and strengthened community resources within Austin.*
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Equity and Inclusion (AEI)

1 agreement

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Equity Minigrant Program
Department	Austin Equity and Inclusion
Vendor / Provider	*Multiple subrecipients*
Focus area	Community Need / Economic Mobility
Services description and desired outcomes	Established in 2018, the Mini-Grant Fund was created to support smaller organizations whose goals align with City priorities, while centering community's needs. For FY26, the fund centered on advancing Immigrant and Refugee Services to better meet the needs of current residents. This was identified as a priority through community feedback and the current implications on our immigrant population. Although the specific award recipients change each year, our commitment to responding to community needs remains constant. The process is designed to adapt based on what we continue to hear from residents, the funding goes to grassroots and smaller organizations to provide direct client services. To bridge gaps effectively, it is our goal to offer structured opportunities, resources, and sustained support that foster long-term growth. This funding source also prioritizes first time awardees in lieu of ongoing funding.
Target population	Immigrant and Refugee populations (subject to change based on community need)
Geography	Full Purpose Austin
FY26 contract amount	290,000
Payment structure	Deliverable
Co-funders (if known)	

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	5
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	3
Coverage rationale	5
Geographic adequacy	4
City role necessity	5
Leverage	2

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	
Reasons for recommendation	Maintaining the current Mini-Grant Fund would preserve reliable, flexible support for immigrant and refugee communities and strengthen service continuity for the grassroots organizations that serve them. With funding stability, more organizations can sustain culturally responsive programs, respond quickly to emerging community needs, and plan proactively rather than diverting time and capacity toward securing replacement funds. This continuity allows services to remain accessible during a period of heightened uncertainty related to immigration policy and the broader rollback of equity-focused initiatives. Keeping the fund whole would also reinforce the city's commitment to equity and signal institutional support at a moment when communities are looking for reassurance. Grassroots and emerging organizations—often operating with minimal infrastructure—would retain a dependable mechanism for piloting new approaches, expanding engagement, and addressing gaps that larger systems may overlook. In short, maintaining the funding would improve service stability, strengthen community trust, and enable organizations to deliver more consistent, responsive, and community-centered support.
Documented performance concerns (if any)	

Other provider capacity to absorb the service	N/A
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	If adopted, service improvements for AEI include: the ability to award more organizations, the ability to further advertise the mini grant program, and the ability to further build and enhance relationships with community members and community organizations for involvement in other City initiatives and programs; service improvements for community organizations include: expanding culturally responsive programming, increasing outreach efforts, extending operating hours, operationalizing responsive and proactive initiatives, etc.
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	
Notes and supporting evidence	In alignment with the current reduction in social service funding, AEI decreased Mini-Grant awards from $290,000 to $200,000. This significantly limited the number of organizations we were able to support. Out of approximately 80 applicants this year, we awarded 8 grants, meeting only about 10% of the identified community need.

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

Austin Parks and Recreation (APR)

2 agreements

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	AISD Literacy First
Department	Austin Parks and Recreation
Vendor / Provider	Austin Independent School District
Focus area	Youth Literacy
Services description and desired outcomes	K-2 reading / writing tutoring program for roughly 300-350 EMVT Title I students. Provides additional related support including facility access, transportation, marketing assistance.
Target population	Title I Students
Geography	Four campuses (Allison, Ortega, Sanchez, and Zavala)
FY26 contract amount	$100,000
Payment structure	Deliverable
Co-funders (if known)	None

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	4
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	3
Coverage rationale	4
Geographic adequacy	3

City role necessity	4
Leverage	3

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*
Reasons for recommendation	Successful program with positive results
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Unknown
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Some reduction in students served
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	NA
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.

FY26-27 Social Service Contract / Grant Decision Sheet

Complete one sheet per contract.

This form is used to recommend whether each social services contract should be maintained, modified, or reduced for FY27. Base your recommendation on the level of need for the service in the community, not on meeting any specific savings target.

If a vendor is underperforming but the need for this type of service is real and no other provider could take it on, the preferred recommendation is to modify the contract (for example, by resoliciting it) rather than reduce it.

Return the completed sheet to Austin Budget & Organizational Excellence (ABOE) ***as soon as possible, and no later than 3pm, Wednesday, September 9***.

Contract Summary

Field	Entry
Contract name	Capital Area Council of Governments Contract for Older Americans Act Activities (Senior Congregate Meal Program)
Department	Austin Parks and Recreation
Vendor / Provider	The Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG)
Focus area	Senior Meals
Services description and desired outcomes	Serves lunch meals to adults 60 years+ at eight City of Austin locations. Works in collaboration with the senior transportation program help senior citizens successfully age in place.
Target population	Seniors 60+ years of age
Geography	Citywide
FY26 contract amount	367134
Payment structure	Reimbursable
Co-funders (if known)	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

Payment structure options: Input (reimbursement of eligible expenses) · Activity (delivery of services) · Output (completion of program) · Outcome (change in client condition) · any option may be paired with a performance incentive.

Scores

Field	Entry
Evidence strength	4
Performance results	4
Coverage adequacy	2
Coverage rationale	3

Geographic adequacy	3
City role necessity	5
Leverage	3

Score fields 1-5 and add notes where applicable.

Determination

Field	Entry
Funding recommendation (Maintain / Modify / Reduce)	Maintain
Direction and magnitude (if Modify)	
Reasons for recommendation	This is a grant
Documented performance concerns (if any)	None
Other provider capacity to absorb the service	Not identified
Service improvements or gaps expected if this recommendation is adopted	Reductions in # of meals served
Vendor improvement plan (if applicable)	NA
Notes and supporting evidence	*Click or tap here to enter text.*

- **Maintain:** keep the contract at its current funding level.
- **Modify:** change the funding level, model, or vendor, for example by resoliciting, while continuing to fund the service.
- **Reduce:** decrease funding, up to and including elimination, because need is genuinely low or the service duplicates another City-funded or partner program.