

JAG Grant

Priority Listing and Funding Recommendations for Plan Year 2025

<u>Rank Number</u>	<u>Scoring Rank</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant #</u>	<u>Requested Amount</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Foot Notes</u>
1	15	Capital Area Council of Governments	5046901	\$67,200.00	98.11	\$67,200.00	8
2	1	Capital Area Council of Governments	5043801	\$63,510.00	97.78	\$63,510.00	
3	2	Jarrell, City of	4993501	\$20,334.00	92.89	\$20,334.00	
4	3	Austin, City of	4958501	\$70,000.00	89.78	\$70,000.00	
5	4	Burnet County	5032401	\$41,225.60	88.44	\$41,225.60	
6	5	Austin ISD	4953101	\$51,367.50	88.33	\$20,547.00	4
7	6	Pflugerville, City of	4744302	\$72,287.50	87.89	\$72,287.50	4
8	7	Round Rock ISD	4934801	\$18,394.00	84.00	\$18,394.00	
9	8	Hays County	4993001	\$142,183.71	83.67	\$142,183.71	
10	9	MELJ Center	4782502	\$200,000.00	81.00	\$200,000.00	
11	11	Lockhart, City of	5018101	\$99,393.60	80.78	\$99,393.60	2
12	10	Del Valle ISD	5021901	\$449,701.65	80.89	\$449,701.65	
13	16	Pflugerville, City of	4963001	\$68,945.08	79.11	\$68,945.08	2,8
14	17	Hays County	4943001	\$53,487.00	74.89	\$53,487.00	8
15	12	Bertram, City of	4961301	\$81,972.76	62.33	\$0.00	1,2,6
16	13	Schulenburg, City of	5027701	\$121,563.00	60.33	\$0.00	1,2,6

17	14	Kyle, City of	4980201	\$69,599.97	56.00	\$0.00	1,2,6
----	----	---------------	---------	-------------	-------	--------	-------

The Rank Number indicates the order in which the applications are recommended to be funded in the amount indicated in the Recommended Funding column as long as funding is available. The Rank Number value for each application will be entered into the column of the same name in the eGrants portal used for reporting the priority listing and funding recommendations to the OOG.

The CJAC's scoring and funding recommendation to the Executive Committee take into account certain limitations included in the policy for Plan Year 2025 and other considerations determined by the CJAC. The footnotes included in the table indicate how each application was affected by these factors.

1. Did not attend Criminal Justice Grant Workshop
2. Did not submit Project Summary Sheet
3. CJAC moved to remove indirect costs from funding recommendation.
4. Application is a continuation project subject to decreasing funding ratio
5. Application is a progressed project
6. Application received a total final score lower than 70 points
7. Tie Breaker applied to application
8. Application is applicant's secondary project preference

VOCA Grant

Priority Listing and Funding Recommendations for Plan Year 2025

<u>Rank Number</u>	<u>Scoring Rank</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant #</u>	<u>Requested Amount</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Foot Notes</u>
1	1	Bastrop County Women's Shelter	2903007	\$361,565.54	95.00	\$361,565.54	
2	2	Highland Lakes Family Crisis Center Inc	1366823	\$465,812.83	93.60	\$465,812.83	
3	3	Hays County Women's Center	1366423	\$1,398,586.00	93.30	\$1,398,586.00	
4	4	Marble Falls, City of	5010101	\$14,177.60	90.40	\$14,177.60	7
5	5	The SAFE Alliance	1400524	\$1,972,580.40	90.40	\$1,808,092.00	3, 7
6	6	SAHELI dba Asian Family Support Services of Austin	2551012	\$1,730,021.93	87.50	\$1,580,606.89	3
7	7	Round Rock ISD	4935501	\$80,000.00	86.50	\$80,000.00	
8	8	Travis County	4426203	\$141,965.00	85.90	\$98,525.40	4,7
9	9	Helping Hand Home for Children	3633306	\$366,582.00	85.90	\$366,582.00	7
10	10	Austin Child Guidance Center	4942701	\$250,000.00	85.80	\$225,000.00	3
11	11	Volunteer Legal Services of Central Texas	4702502	\$94,155.43	84.70	\$88,555.43	3
12	12	Williamson County	4990501	\$33,330.00	83.50	\$33,330.00	
13	13	The Ecumenical Center	4228004	\$75,536.58	82.90	\$68,669.62	3
14	14	Red Oak Hope	4728302	\$314,392.00	82.50	\$314,392.00	

15	15	Williamson County Crisis Center dba Hope Alliance	2884907	\$715,221.83	81.90	\$715,221.83	2
16	16	Bluebird's Hope Inc	4994001	\$105,306.86	81.20	\$105,306.86	
17	17	The Settlement Home for Children	3947605	\$586,200.00	80.50	\$586,200.00	
18	18	Buda, City of	5113001	\$79,366.00	78.40	\$79,366.00	2
19	19	Del Valle ISD	5022901	\$324,120.00	78.30	\$324,120.00	
20	20	OnPurpose Enrichment of Austin	5010301	\$145,511.43	51.10	\$0.00	1,2,6
21	21	Austin, City of	2827409	\$592,328.00	41.30	\$0.00	5,6

The Rank Number indicates the order in which the applications are recommended to be funded in the amount indicated in the Recommended Funding column as long as funding is available. The Rank Number value for each application will be entered into the column of the same name in the eGrants portal used for reporting the priority listing and funding recommendations to the OOG.

The CJAC's scoring and funding recommendation to the Executive Committee takes into account certain limitations included in the policy for Plan Year 2025 and other considerations determined by the CJAC. The footnotes included in the table indicate how each application was affected by these factors.

1. Did not attend Criminal Justice Grant Workshop
2. Did not submit Project Summary Sheet
3. CJAC moved to remove indirect costs from funding recommendation.
4. Application is a continuation project subject to decreasing funding ratio
5. Application is a progressed project
6. Application received a total final score lower than 70 points
7. Tie Breaker applied to application
8. Application is applicant's secondary project preference

JJ Grant

Priority Listing and Funding Recommendations for Plan Year 2025

<u>Rank Number</u>	<u>Scoring Rank</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant #</u>	<u>Requested Amount</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Foot Notes</u>
1	1	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Texas	4211704	\$50,000.00	92.50	\$50,000.00	
2	2	The Arc of the Capital Area	4454203	\$83,992.70	90.00	\$76,357.00	3
3	3	American YouthWorks	4469103	\$23,662.13	76.17	\$17,341.79	1,2,3
4	4	Boys & Girls Club of Georgetown	5123901	\$45,000.00	72.25	\$45,000.00	1,2
5	5	Council on At-Risk Youth	3385108	\$52,000.00	70.08	\$52,000.00	1,2
6	6	Kids Write Good dba Austin Bat Cave	5074401	\$60,100.00	68.83	\$0.00	1,6
7	7	Manor ISD	5142901	\$707,600.00	29.38	\$0.00	5,6

The Rank Number indicates the order in which the applications are recommended to be funded in the amount indicated in the Recommended Funding column as long as funding is available. The Rank Number value for each application will be entered into the column of the same name in the eGrants portal used for reporting the priority listing and funding recommendations to the OOG.

The CJAC's scoring and funding recommendation to the Executive Committee take into account certain limitations included in the policy for Plan Year 2025 and other considerations determined by the CJAC. The footnotes included in the table indicate how each application was affected by these factors.

1. Did not attend Criminal Justice Grant Workshop
2. Did not submit Project Summary Sheet
3. CJAC moved to remove indirect costs from funding recommendation.
4. Application is a continuation project subject to decreasing funding ratio
5. Application is a progressed project
6. Application received a total final score lower than 70 points
7. Tie Breaker applied to application
8. Application is applicant's secondary project preference

TP Grant

Priority Listing and Funding Recommendations for Plan Year 2025

<u>Rank Number</u>	<u>Scoring Rank</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant #</u>	<u>\$ Requested</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Foot Notes</u>
1	1	Blanco ISD	4743202	\$16,386.06	93.36	\$15,321.08	4
2	2	Smithville, City of	5121301	\$24,900.00	90.91	\$24,900.00	
3	3	Austin ISD	4957701	\$105,397.00	87.18	\$99,696.00	3
4	4	Round Rock ISD	4935101	\$91,325.00	86.00	\$91,325.00	
5	5	Del Valle ISD	4741202	\$391,480.00	82.73	\$300,562.08	3,4
6	6	Austin, City of	4808702	\$374,863.42	82.09	\$321,550.38	4

The Rank Number indicates the order in which the applications are recommended to be funded in the amount indicated in the Recommended Funding column as long as funding is available. The Rank Number value for each application will be entered into the column of the same name in the eGrants portal used for reporting the priority listing and funding recommendations to the OOG.

The CJAC's scoring and funding recommendation to the Executive Committee take into account certain limitations included in the policy for Plan Year 2025 and other considerations determined by the CJAC. The footnotes included in the table indicate how each application was affected by these factors.

1. Did not attend Criminal Justice Grant Workshop
2. Did not submit Project Summary Sheet
3. CJAC moved to remove indirect costs from funding recommendation.
4. Application is a continuation project subject to decreasing funding ratio
5. Application is a progressed project
6. Application received a total final score lower than 70 points
7. Tie Breaker applied to application
8. Application is applicant's secondary project preference

VAWA Grant

Priority Listing and Funding Recommendations for Plan Year 2025

<u>Rank Number</u>	<u>Scoring Rank</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant #</u>	<u>\$ Requested</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Recommended Funding</u>	<u>Foot Notes</u>
1	1	Burnet County	4772902	\$57,054.00	86.91	\$45,643.20	4
2	2	Bluebird's Hope Inc	4999501	\$83,152.71	86.00	\$83,152.71	
3	3	Saheli dba Asian Family Support Services of Austin	4233904	\$306,958.30	85.55	\$279,681.45	3
4	4	Brave Alliance Mission	5113201	\$252,395.00	80.27	\$252,395.00	

The Rank Number indicates the order in which the applications are recommended to be funded in the amount indicated in the Recommended Funding column as long as funding is available. The Rank Number value for each application will be entered into the column of the same name in the eGrants portal used for reporting the priority listing and funding recommendations to the OOG.

The CJAC's scoring and funding recommendation to the Executive Committee take into account certain limitations included in the policy for Plan Year 2025 and other considerations determined by the CJAC. The footnotes included in the table indicate how each application was affected by these factors.

1. Did not attend Criminal Justice Grant Workshop
2. Did not submit Project Summary Sheet
3. CJAC moved to remove indirect costs from funding recommendation.
4. Application is a continuation project subject to decreasing funding ratio
5. Application is a progressed project
6. Application received a total final score lower than 70 points
7. Tie Breaker applied to application
8. Application is applicant's secondary project preference