City of Sacramento
Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight
Commission Report
915 I Street Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cityofsacramento.org

File ID: 2026-00272   2/5/2026

Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission Follow-Up Log

File ID: 2026-00272

Location: Citywide

Recommendation: Pass a **Motion** approving the Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission Follow-Up Log.

Contact: Rene Kausin, Program Manager, (916) 808-6157, rkausin@cityofsacramento.org, Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment Department

Presenter: None

Attachments:
1-Description/Analysis
2-Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission Follow-Up Log

Description/Analysis
Issue Detail: Like other City commissions and committees, the Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission maintains, as a standing item, a follow-up log to organize and track items that may be considered in the future. The follow-up log details each item and gives an estimate of when staff expects to bring the item back to the Commission. Commission members are welcome to add items to the log during each meeting.

Policy Considerations: None.

Economic Impacts: None.

Environmental Considerations: None.

Sustainability: None.

Commission/Committee Action: None.

Rationale for Recommendation: None.

Financial Considerations: None.

Local Business Enterprise (LBE): None.

Item #	Subject Matter	Requested by:	Meets Which Powers & Duties (Scope) of Commission	Commission Priority (High, Medium, Low)	Dated Added to Log	Scheduled To Be Heard (Future Meeting Date or TBD)	Notes / Status
	What is the subject or topic and specific request for follow up?	Which Commissioner(s) requested this follow up item?	How does this request meet the scope of the Commission? Align with powers & duties as described in forming docs (i.e. city code, bylaws, resolution, etc.)	What is the priority of the Commission?	What was the meeting date this request was made?	What is the meeting date when this request will be brought back to Commission for consideration?	Provide a status of the request prior to each meeting. Note date request was completed then move to Completed Requests tab.
1	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Requested research for 80/12 to ensure GBI will not affect any benefit that participants are receiving.	Chair Ruelas-Mares	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Complete	The GBI NOFO released in December 2026 required optional benefit counseling and benefit waiver assistance for GBI program participants as part of the scope of services. This provision in the NOFO should help protect participants from any potential negative impacts to their benefits from GBI program participation.
2	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Add an indicator to the Progress Reports for participants impacted by violence.	Commissioner Kravitz-Wirtz	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Complete	City Staff have added the requested indicator to the Quarterly Programmatic Reporting Template.
3	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Requested information on the process of editing the Strategic Investment Plan.	Chair Ruelas-Mares	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Complete	City staff will provide this information to the commission during the February 5, 2026 meeting.
4	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Add an indicator to the Progress Reports for participants impacted by violence.	Commissioner Kravitz-Wirtz	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Complete	City Staff have added the requested indicator to the Quarterly Programmatic Reporting Template.

Item #	Subject Matter	Requested by:	Meets Which Powers & Duties (Scope) of Commission	Commission Priority (High, Medium, Low)	Dated Added to Log	Scheduled To Be Heard (Future Meeting Date or TBD)	Notes / Status
	What is the subject or topic and specific request for follow up?	*Which Commissioner(s) requested this follow up item?*	*How does this request meet the scope of the Commission? Align with powers & duties as described in forming docs (i.e. city code, bylaws, resolution, etc.)*	*What is the priority of the Commission?*	*What was the meeting date this request was made?*	*What is the meeting date when this request will be brought back to Commission for consideration?*	*Provide a status of the request prior to each meeting. Note date request was completed then move to Completed Requests tab.*
1	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Requesting a map of impact areas and how fund goals are spread out with the funding.	Commissioner Kravitz-Wirtz	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	1-May-25	Pending	This request is pending with the Sacramento Children's Fund Staff, the City's GIS team and the evaluation firm hired as a result of the RFP for evaluation services.
2	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Requesting Violence Prevention present to the commission	Commissioner Williams	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	1-May-25	Pending	This request is pending with the Sacramento Children's Fund Staff and Violence Prevention.
3	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Requested joint meetings with SYC.	Commissioner Thomas	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Pending	City Staff is working with SYC to schedule a joint meeting in 2026.
4	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Requesting joint meetings with SYC to process editing of the SIP	Chair Ruelas-Mares	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Pending	City Staff is working with SYC to schedule a joint meeting in 2026.
5	Subject: Sacramento Children's Fund Planning and Oversight Commission request: Information on how to include priority funding for Native Americans in the SIP. How to avoid restrictions from prop 209.	Chair Ruelas-Mares	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	To prioritize funding goals for the Sacramento Children's Fund	6-Nov-25	Pending	This request is pending with the City Attorney's Office.

1. **Are fiscal sponsors allowed? Why not?**

A fiscal sponsor is typically used when an organization needs to "borrow" the tax-exempt status of another entity. The fiscal sponsor then provides fiduciary oversight, financial management, and/or other administrative services where the non-tax exempt entity is lacking in capacity.

While the City does allow fiscal sponsors for certain grant programs, fiscal sponsors are not permitted for Measure L funding. The language of Measure L, as adopted by the voters, limits who may receive Sacramento Children's Fund (SCF) money. Specifically, it states that "[m]oney in the Sacramento Children's Fund may only be used to engage *qualified organizations* to provide youth services…." (City Charter, § 120 (d)(1) [emphasis added]).

The Measure language narrowly defines "qualified organizations" to include only "a public entity (including the city through its offices and departments) or any organization exempt from taxation under United States Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(3)" (City Charter, § 120 (a)(12)).

Based on these restrictions, an entity that is not a public entity or 501(c)(3) cannot apply to be an SCF grant recipient. Nor can SCF money be awarded to a collaboration in which one of the applicant parties is not a public entity or 501(c)(3). However, two 501(c)(3) entities who wish to work together may apply as a collaborative applicant.

2. **Can you please describe what qualifies as experience implementing a GBI or Universal Basic Income Program?**

Per the Request for Proposals, the organization applying for funding must have at minimum of one year of experience administering a Guaranteed Basic Income or Universal Basic Income program. In order to meet this requirement, the entity applying or one of the entities applying in a collaborative application must have directly administered a guaranteed or universal basic income program for a minimum of one year in the last five years. Qualifying programs include programs that provide direct cash assistance to participants and include, at minimum, a structured recruitment and enrollment process for participants. Qualifying programs need not be income programs directed specifically to children or youth. The entity applying must have been responsible for administering this program; it is not sufficient to have program staff with experience administering a GBI or UBI program on behalf of a different organization.

3. **The 25% advance – is that %25 of the 3 year budget or the first year? Are we allowed have a variation in spending per year or does it need to be approximately uniform (1.6 million per year)? Is the 1.6 million for planning or a cap on expenditures per year?**

The City will advance up to 25% of grant funds for the first year of the agreement upon initial grant agreement execution. The advance amount will depend on the first year budget amount, according to the grant budget agreed upon during contract negotiations. As long as the grantee has demonstrated satisfactory performance in the previous year, the City will advance up to 25% of grant funds for each subsequent year according to the budget in the executed agreement *(see NOFO pg. 10).* The entity applying may distribute funding in the budget as they see fit, in alignment with their proposed grant program. The $1.6 million dollars is not a yearly expenditure cap.

Per the NOFO, applicants must submit a proposed budget for the entire term of the grant, up to five years. A yearly budget breakdown will be required upon applicant selection during the contract negotiation process and included in the grant agreement (*see NOFO pg. 18*). For the purposes of budget planning, please note that the total benefits payments should not be less than 40% of the total program budget, and administrative/indirect costs shall not exceed 10% (for 501(c)(3) applicants) or 15% (for collaborative applicants) of the total program budget (*see NOFO pg. 29*). Applicants should also keep in mind that proposed budgets will be scored based on whether the funding request is reasonable and administrative costs are fair and balanced in comparison to the amount of funding disbursed to participants.

4. **Do the participants need to receive their 2 years of GBI prior to June 2029 (end of 3 year period)? Meaning, enrollment for the first 3 years would need to cut off at least by June 2027.**

No, participants do not need to receive the minimum of two years of GBI payments prior to June 2029. Applicants may plan to continue enrollment and GBI payments throughout the life of the 5 year grant.

5. **Can you clarify whether there are any requirements or expectations regarding participant drop-out and re-engagement, or if these policies are left to the applicant's program design? Specifically, the RFP notes that "participants who will age out or drop out during the two-year benefit period are only eligible to participate until their 25th birthday." If a participant temporarily disengages (e.g., incarceration or loss of contact), are there any requirements regarding how long funds must be held for potential re-engagement, or whether GI payments may resume upon re-enrollment**

There are no requirements outlined in the NOFO that dictate an applicant's approach to drop-out and re-engagement apart from the age requirement cut off of 25 years of age. The NOFO invites applicants to propose the best programming approach to re-engagement of previous participants based on their professional experience. The age limitation is taken directly from the voter approved Measure L.

6. **Since youth in foster care under the jurisdiction of Sacramento County may be placed outside of the county, or vice versa, are you open to including those youth?**

Yes, they would be considered eligible. Please refer to the Eligible Populations section of the NOFO (see pg. 6).

7. **Please clarify expectations regarding the evaluator's role, including scope, duration, and the extent to which evaluation should assess outcomes vs outputs beyond required reporting elements.**

The third party evaluator should conduct an evaluation of the GBI program participants for a minimum of the duration of the benefit period, and ideally up to six months after the benefits cease. The evaluation should include at a minimum the following required information outlined in the NOFO (see pg.6):

- Individuals referred to the GI program and their eligibility;
- Enrollment dates and drop-out dates, if applicable;
- For all individuals referred, demographic information which may include date of birth, gender identity, and race/ethnicity;
- Programmatic data; such as whether each recipient participated in benefits counseling and the dates that GI payments were disbursed.

The City will be available to collaborate with the selected applicant on further details of the evaluation during contract negotiation and start up phases of the grant.

8. **Under Reporting Requirements on page 12, participant surveys are mentioned. Can you please describe what you have in mind regarding frequency and focus?**

The Department of Youth, Parks and Community Enrichment often utilizes surveys as way to collect participant information and improve upon programming. Surveys may be used in the evaluation of the Sacramento Children's Fund to collect data as part of the evaluation. Surveys will be optional and conducted on an annual basis and/or at the beginning and end of services.

9. **What is the word limit for question 3 on page 21: "3) Describe organization and/or partner agencies have demonstrated experience working with youth between the ages of 16 and 24 who have previously exited foster care."?**

The word limit is 300 words for this question. Thank you.

10. What type of award do you plan on issuing, e.g., grant, cost reimbursement, firm fixed price?

The City will award a grant. The grant agreement will include a not to exceed amount. After submitting sufficient documentation demonstrating that any advance payment funds have been expended consistent with agreed upon budget, as outlined on pg. 9 of the NOFO, all invoicing will be on reimbursement basis.

11. Are there any caps/limitations within the budget besides the award ceiling?

Yes. Indirect costs are limited to a percentage of the total budget: 10% for 501 (c)(3) applicants and 15% for collaborative applicants. The total benefits payments should not be less then 40% of the total program budget.

12. According to the RFP, grants will be made aligned with the Sacramento Children's Fund Strategic Investment Plan. In that plan, it states: "The SCF Commission recommends multi-year grant funds be dedicated to support one or more grantees to provide guaranteed cash transfer programming for current or former foster youth ages 18-24." In the Notice of Funding Opportunity it indicates the city wants to enroll youth ages 16-24 in the eligbility criteria section. Should the age range for the GBI Program be 16-24 or 18-24?

The age range for the Sacramento Children's Fund GBI NOFO is 16-24 (see NOFO pg. 6), with the understanding that the majority of participants will likely be in the age range of 20-21 as they age out of the extended foster care system. The City did not wish to inadvertently exclude any eligible foster youth on the basis of age due to an unforeseen or unlikely scenario and thus has expanded the eligible age range to 16-24.

13. We see that the City of Sacramento is requesting employee time sheets to substantiate grant implementation fee spending. As our employees are salaried, will you accept once monthly accounting of staff time spent on projects (time study) in lieu of the time sheets?

The City will work with you to collect appropriate backup documentation. The City can accept monthly timesheets or paycheck stubs as long as the documentation comes from a third party accounting or payroll platform.

14. Can you provide an example of how you would require grantees to provide geographic eligibility, specifically for the unhoused applicants and those whose prior residency was in the County of Sacramento?

Proof of geographical eligibility <u>includes but is not limited to</u>: proof of residency or prior residency in the County of Sacramento such a mail, bills, rental or lease agreement with their name or address; proof of enrollment in a school located in the County of Sacramento; self-attestation to residency or prior residency in the County of Sacramento.

15. Under the section about Fingerprinting/Criminal Background/Tuberculosis Checks, it specifies that would need to test for and document Tuberculosis status of all personnel. Does this only pertain to staff members working in person with the youth? Or would we need to provide this for even the staff who work remotely? Also, can you provide more details on how you approach the criminal/fingerprinting background check requirements for staff outside of the State of California?

The Fingerprinting and Criminal Background/Tuberculosis requirements are a part of the City's Grant Agreement Template, included as an appendix to this NOFO (see Appendix A, pg.7). Fingerprinting and Tuberculosis checks are only required for staff that work directly with the participants. Background checks are required for all staff, including staff working outside of California.