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This paper provides an explanation for the formula used to allocate the balance of Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) funding appropriated under the CARES Act that were not previously allocated. The allocation of $2.96 billion uses a formula targeted toward communities with high fractions of homeless – both sheltered and unsheltered – and those at the most risk for homelessness. It also takes into account economic and housing market conditions by making a modest adjustment for jurisdictions with very high market rents. One of the most at-risk groups for transmission of coronavirus are homeless individuals.

At the end of this paper is a chart showing both Round 1 and Round 2 ESG CARES Act Allocation amounts.

*Background*

Congress has provided $4 billion for the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) program for local governments to use to:

“prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, among individuals and families who are homeless or receiving homeless assistance and to support additional homeless assistance and homelessness prevention activities to mitigate the impacts created by coronavirus”

*Initial Allocation of $1 billion*

HUD allocated $1 billion of ESG funding in the first week after the President signed the bill under the traditional ESG formula. The traditional ESG formula was effective at making an allocation quickly, however it only targets modestly well to homeless and has no targeting to places with high rates of unsheltered homeless. That is because the ESG formula is allocated using the CDBG formula – designed to target to community development need - which only has a modest relationship to where homelessness needs are most severe.

Using statistics, the correlation between the ESG per capita grant amount and the per capita rate of homelessness is 0.359. There is a relationship, but it is not as strong as we would like (a correlation of 1.000 is a perfect correlation) to make a targeted allocation of the most funds to the places that will need the funds the most. And the ESG per capita grant amount has a -0.051 correlation with the rate of unsheltered homelessness, which means it has no targeting at all toward the unsheltered homeless challenges.

*Targeted Allocation of $2.96 billion*

The Department has committed $40 million of the appropriated funds to technical assistance to recipients of ESG to build capacity and facilitate speedy implementation.

The remaining $2.96 billion is to be allocated under a formula:

“for the benefit of unsheltered homeless, sheltered homeless, and those at risk of homelessness, to geographical areas with the greatest need based on factors to be determined by the Secretary, such as risk of transmission of coronavirus, high numbers or

rates of sheltered and unsheltered homeless, and economic and housing market conditions as determined by the Secretary”

In response to this Congressional direction, the Department has developed an allocation formula that targets to the homeless and those at risk of homelessness, adjusting slightly upward for high cost places.

The variables for targeting to homeless and at risk of homelessness are1:

* **Share of all homeless.** Total Homeless Count from the 2019 Point-in-Time count, which is the sum of sheltered and unsheltered homeless. 50 percent weight.
* **Share of unsheltered homeless.** This double counts with the all homeless variable above but provides additional funding to help with places with particularly high number and percent of unsheltered homeless. 10 percent weight.
* **Share of at risk for homelessness – Total Very Low-Income (VLI) Renters.** A community’s rate of very low-income renter households, defined as total very low-income renter households divided by all households in the community, has a 0.506 correlation with per capita homeless counts. This variable is particularly good at capturing the poorer communities in every metro area where an economic downturn is likely to have the most at-risk for homelessness. It, however, is not necessarily capturing the places with the greatest unsheltered homeless risk. 15 percent weight.
* **Share of at risk for unsheltered homelessness – VLI renters overcrowded or without kitchen or plumbing.** To get at risk for unsheltered homelessness we need to also capture economically strong places with an at-risk population. In economically strong places, very low-income renters are making ends meet through overcrowding. The percent of very low-income renters that are overcrowded or without complete kitchen and plumbing correlates

1 The first two homeless count variables are based on 2019 Point-In-Time homeless count data that have been adjusted from the Continuum-of-Care geographies they are collected to the Emergency Solutions Grant geographies. Source: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3031/pit-and-hic-data-since-2007/> . The second two variables are from a special tabulation of 5-year American Community Survey (ACS) data available at this site: <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>

at 0.562 with unsheltered homeless (but does not correlate well with overall homelessness). That is, it is capturing a different risk group for homelessness. 25 percent weight.

Each of these variables is adjusted to take into account local housing and economic circumstances. Specifically, each variable is adjusted upward for housing costs. To calculate this, if the 1-bedroom Fair Market Rent in a jurisdiction is 10% above the national average fair market rent (weighted on the specific variable), then we increased the value of the variable by 10% before calculating a community’s share of the overall need on that variable. Non-entitled areas are all calculated using their unadjusted counts, and no areas receive a downward adjustment. We cap the increase at 20 percent to lessen the impact of high-cost outliers.

The language in the statute notes that the formula may take into account “risk of transmission of coronavirus” in determining the formula. Coronavirus cases have been recorded in every US State and territory. The evidence has also shown that being homeless appears to increase an individual’s risk of transmission of coronavirus where there is community spread. By having this formula allocate toward homeless needs, it is also allocating toward the risk of transmission of coronavirus.

Finally, most of these data are not available for insular areas (Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Northern Marianas), so insular areas receive 0.2 percent of the funding and receive their same proportional shares as they received under the 2020 ESG allocation.

The chart below shows how well this formula’s per capita allocation correlates with the different dimensions of need. The resulting formula, as you would expect given that it uses homelessness and the other need variable below as their core variable, is a per capita allocation that has a 0.941 correlation with per capita homelessness rates and 0.771 correlation with per capita unsheltered homeless rates.

**Correlations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Proposed CARES  Act ESG Formula  per capita |
| Overall homelessness rate per capita | .941\*\* |
| Sheltered homeless rate per capita | .647\*\* |
| Unsheltered homeless rate per capita | .771\*\* |
| Percent homes occupied by VLI renters | .564\*\* |
| Percent of VLI renters overcrowded or without complete kitchen or plumbing | .466\*\* |
| 1-Bedroom Fair Market Rent | .515\*\* |

**CARES Act ESG-COVID Recovery Round 2 and Round 1 Allocation Amounts**



|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| AL | Birmingham | $2,710,962 | $1,778,614 | $4,489,576 |
| AL | Mobile | $1,319,253 | $719,662 | $2,038,915 |
| AL | Montgomery | $1,258,634 | $504,662 | $1,763,296 |
| AL | Jefferson County | $1,485,652 | $706,121 | $2,191,773 |
| AL | Alabama State Balance | $13,860,804 | $9,376,200 | $23,237,004 |
| AK | Anchorage | $3,774,024 | $521,193 | $4,295,217 |
| AK | Alaska State Balance | $4,142,143 | $914,566 | $5,056,709 |
| AZ | Glendale | $2,997,188 | $749,455 | $3,746,643 |
| AZ | Mesa | $4,052,229 | $1,130,003 | $5,182,232 |
| AZ | Phoenix | $19,212,248 | $4,975,762 | $24,188,010 |
| AZ | Tempe | $1,790,686 | $506,269 | $2,296,955 |
| AZ | Tucson | $5,562,939 | $1,667,776 | $7,230,715 |
| AZ | Maricopa County | $2,815,627 | $905,900 | $3,721,527 |
| AZ | Pima County | $2,284,682 | $892,476 | $3,177,158 |
| AZ | Arizona State Balance | $16,373,488 | $5,950,572 | $22,324,060 |
| AR | Arkansas State Balance | $15,978,848 | $7,808,010 | $23,786,858 |
| CA | Anaheim | $8,700,250 | $1,279,072 | $9,979,322 |
| CA | Bakersfield | $3,465,304 | $1,125,407 | $4,590,711 |
| CA | Berkeley | $5,840,486 | $808,117 | $6,648,603 |
| CA | Chula Vista | $4,260,354 | $693,583 | $4,953,937 |
| CA | El Monte | $5,157,737 | $520,314 | $5,678,051 |
| CA | Escondido | $3,934,624 | $552,803 | $4,487,427 |
| CA | Fontana | $1,723,436 | $619,569 | $2,343,005 |
| CA | Fresno | $8,845,443 | $2,103,510 | $10,948,953 |
| CA | Garden Grove | $3,635,163 | $602,486 | $4,237,649 |
| CA | Glendale | $3,104,861 | $569,417 | $3,674,278 |
| CA | Irvine | $2,927,391 | $558,059 | $3,485,450 |
| CA | Long Beach | $13,496,694 | $1,846,866 | $15,343,560 |
| CA | Los Angeles | $167,431,509 | $16,167,303 | $183,598,812 |
| CA | Modesto | $3,360,962 | $567,410 | $3,928,372 |
| CA | Moreno Valley | $1,743,153 | $630,838 | $2,373,991 |
| CA | Oakland | $19,288,175 | $2,275,917 | $21,564,092 |
| CA | Ontario | $1,584,528 | $552,724 | $2,137,252 |
| CA | Oxnard | $4,492,650 | $762,355 | $5,255,005 |
| CA | Pasadena | $3,372,793 | $608,269 | $3,981,062 |
| CA | Pomona | $6,135,460 | $629,131 | $6,764,591 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| CA | Riverside | $3,126,622 | $968,672 | $4,095,294 |
| CA | Sacramento | $10,205,871 | $1,453,941 | $11,659,812 |
| CA | Salinas | $5,814,926 | $617,245 | $6,432,171 |
| CA | San Bernardino | $3,422,960 | $1,019,997 | $4,442,957 |
| CA | San Diego | $22,796,116 | $3,598,334 | $26,394,450 |
| CA | San Francisco | $43,605,003 | $5,501,459 | $49,106,462 |
| CA | San Jose | $32,836,839 | $2,683,479 | $35,520,318 |
| CA | Santa Ana | $11,598,442 | $1,727,403 | $13,325,845 |
| CA | Stockton | $6,041,201 | $1,008,903 | $7,050,104 |
| CA | Alameda County | $5,146,924 | $622,410 | $5,769,334 |
| CA | Contra Costa County | $9,283,441 | $1,390,138 | $10,673,579 |
| CA | Fresno County | $3,371,431 | $846,921 | $4,218,352 |
| CA | Kern County | $4,744,645 | $1,446,317 | $6,190,962 |
| CA | Los Angeles County | $62,445,943 | $6,605,000 | $69,050,943 |
| CA | Orange County | $4,992,579 | $772,352 | $5,764,931 |
| CA | Riverside County | $6,352,897 | $2,212,793 | $8,565,690 |
| CA | Sacramento County | $11,878,700 | $1,747,452 | $13,626,152 |
| CA | San Bernardino County | $6,401,870 | $2,192,210 | $8,594,080 |
| CA | San Diego County | $7,070,083 | $1,257,717 | $8,327,800 |
| CA | San Joaquin County | $4,326,957 | $818,545 | $5,145,502 |
| CA | San Luis Obispo County | $6,296,591 | $563,034 | $6,859,625 |
| CA | San Mateo County | $5,144,656 | $799,531 | $5,944,187 |
| CA | Sonoma County | $6,598,916 | $564,000 | $7,162,916 |
| CA | Stanislaus County | $3,891,785 | $698,717 | $4,590,502 |
| CA | California State Balance | $271,730,986 | $43,990,603 | $315,721,589 |
| CO | Aurora | $4,171,770 | $864,424 | $5,036,194 |
| CO | Colorado Springs | $5,097,279 | $887,124 | $5,984,403 |
| CO | Denver | $9,042,223 | $2,059,400 | $11,101,623 |
| CO | Colorado State Balance | $25,884,522 | $7,363,152 | $33,247,674 |
| CT | Bridgeport | $1,690,527 | $980,921 | $2,671,448 |
| CT | Hartford | $1,987,972 | $1,065,679 | $3,053,651 |
| CT | New Haven | $1,509,315 | $1,137,914 | $2,647,229 |
| CT | Waterbury | $1,158,248 | $644,210 | $1,802,458 |
| CT | Connecticut State Balance | $12,591,306 | $8,159,579 | $20,750,885 |
| DE | Wilmington | $1,142,202 | $647,693 | $1,789,895 |
| DE | New Castle County | $1,582,960 | $690,366 | $2,273,326 |
| DE | Delaware State Balance | $1,527,664 | $807,114 | $2,334,778 |
| DC | District Of Columbia | $23,124,727 | $4,602,197 | $27,726,924 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| FL | Hialeah | $2,698,307 | $829,510 | $3,527,817 |
| FL | Miami | $6,132,699 | $1,633,034 | $7,765,733 |
| FL | Orlando | $1,846,707 | $670,317 | $2,517,024 |
| FL | St Petersburg | $2,902,139 | $539,562 | $3,441,701 |
| FL | Tallahassee | $1,878,411 | $561,203 | $2,439,614 |
| FL | Tampa | $3,009,506 | $963,359 | $3,972,865 |
| FL | Broward County | $3,048,655 | $824,621 | $3,873,276 |
| FL | Collier County | $2,476,642 | $707,128 | $3,183,770 |
| FL | Jacksonville-Duval County | $6,011,963 | $1,905,803 | $7,917,766 |
| FL | Hillsborough County | $6,054,897 | $2,129,659 | $8,184,556 |
| FL | Lee County | $1,818,474 | $923,372 | $2,741,846 |
| FL | Manatee County | $2,135,435 | $567,783 | $2,703,218 |
| FL | Marion County | $1,550,489 | $582,834 | $2,133,323 |
| FL | Miami-Dade County | $10,715,429 | $3,888,572 | $14,604,001 |
| FL | Orange County | $5,016,437 | $2,024,224 | $7,040,661 |
| FL | Palm Beach County | $5,830,483 | $1,941,176 | $7,771,659 |
| FL | Pasco County | $3,810,934 | $834,545 | $4,645,479 |
| FL | Pinellas County | $3,997,774 | $739,117 | $4,736,891 |
| FL | Polk County | $2,054,711 | $1,073,500 | $3,128,211 |
| FL | Sarasota County | $1,872,211 | $508,541 | $2,380,752 |
| FL | Seminole County | $1,183,769 | $591,952 | $1,775,721 |
| FL | Volusia County | $1,904,452 | $556,455 | $2,460,907 |
| FL | Florida State Balance | $65,511,297 | $20,384,797 | $85,896,094 |
| GA | Atlanta | $10,965,024 | $2,163,228 | $13,128,252 |
| GA | Augusta-Richmond County | $1,831,311 | $539,590 | $2,370,901 |
| GA | Macon-Bibb County | $1,014,779 | $565,638 | $1,580,417 |
| GA | Savannah | $2,103,711 | $693,166 | $2,796,877 |
| GA | Clayton County | $1,674,553 | $780,931 | $2,455,484 |
| GA | Cobb County | $2,284,556 | $988,062 | $3,272,618 |
| GA | De Kalb County | $3,818,678 | $1,593,790 | $5,412,468 |
| GA | Fulton County | $1,955,204 | $574,624 | $2,529,828 |
| GA | Gwinnett County | $3,319,598 | $1,619,024 | $4,938,622 |
| GA | Georgia State Balance | $29,498,276 | $15,920,176 | $45,418,452 |
| HI | Honolulu | $22,370,813 | $2,429,569 | $24,800,382 |
| HI | Hawaii State Balance | $8,466,976 | $1,567,697 | $10,034,673 |
| ID | Idaho State Balance | $11,446,141 | $3,828,517 | $15,274,658 |
| IL | Chicago | $30,488,553 | $23,712,993 | $54,201,546 |
| IL | Cicero | $784,688 | $520,731 | $1,305,419 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| IL | Evanston | $419,890 | $546,424 | $966,314 |
| IL | Peoria | $795,903 | $535,321 | $1,331,224 |
| IL | Rockford | $1,157,575 | $636,693 | $1,794,268 |
| IL | Cook County | $5,812,142 | $3,049,979 | $8,862,121 |
| IL | Du Page County | $2,483,604 | $1,031,548 | $3,515,152 |
| IL | Lake County | $1,520,868 | $777,472 | $2,298,340 |
| IL | Will County | $973,315 | $503,772 | $1,477,087 |
| IL | Illinois State Balance | $24,712,992 | $18,159,983 | $42,872,975 |
| IN | Evansville | $941,088 | $790,410 | $1,731,498 |
| IN | Fort Wayne | $1,157,870 | $598,952 | $1,756,822 |
| IN | Gary | $1,093,079 | $997,166 | $2,090,245 |
| IN | Hammond | $649,003 | $635,393 | $1,284,396 |
| IN | Indianapolis | $7,122,695 | $2,792,797 | $9,915,492 |
| IN | South Bend | $787,585 | $759,783 | $1,547,368 |
| IN | Indiana State Balance | $18,411,073 | $13,566,621 | $31,977,694 |
| IA | Des Moines | $2,081,414 | $1,108,334 | $3,189,748 |
| IA | Sioux City | $734,379 | $503,317 | $1,237,696 |
| IA | Iowa State Balance | $11,318,794 | $9,574,948 | $20,893,742 |
| KS | Kansas City | $1,707,698 | $683,879 | $2,391,577 |
| KS | Topeka | $1,478,106 | $559,469 | $2,037,575 |
| KS | Wichita | $2,450,744 | $850,376 | $3,301,120 |
| KS | Kansas State Balance | $9,168,649 | $5,683,703 | $14,852,352 |
| KY | Lexington-Fayette | $3,226,490 | $710,986 | $3,937,476 |
| KY | Louisville-CDBG | $5,430,961 | $3,390,700 | $8,821,661 |
| KY | Kentucky State Balance | $14,526,981 | $8,877,469 | $23,404,450 |
| LA | Baton Rouge | $1,654,617 | $955,859 | $2,610,476 |
| LA | New Orleans | $4,594,009 | $3,818,324 | $8,412,333 |
| LA | Shreveport | $1,055,184 | $564,476 | $1,619,660 |
| LA | Jefferson Parish | $1,593,050 | $756,079 | $2,349,129 |
| LA | Louisiana State Balance | $12,026,377 | $8,608,217 | $20,634,594 |
| ME | Portland City | $1,004,425 | $573,734 | $1,578,159 |
| ME | Maine State Balance | $7,832,189 | $4,796,255 | $12,628,444 |
| MD | Baltimore | $9,143,757 | $6,571,738 | $15,715,495 |
| MD | Anne Arundel County | $1,313,638 | $611,269 | $1,924,907 |
| MD | Baltimore County | $3,996,350 | $1,230,869 | $5,227,219 |
| MD | Montgomery County | $4,847,976 | $1,438,797 | $6,286,773 |
| MD | Prince Georges County | $4,944,919 | $1,523,903 | $6,468,822 |
| MD | Maryland State Balance | $10,739,230 | $4,031,452 | $14,770,682 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| MA | Boston | $23,348,669 | $5,195,210 | $28,543,879 |
| MA | Cambridge | $2,268,869 | $787,948 | $3,056,817 |
| MA | Fall River | $1,275,287 | $866,031 | $2,141,318 |
| MA | Lawrence | $1,138,406 | $526,348 | $1,664,754 |
| MA | Lowell | $2,610,376 | $632,876 | $3,243,252 |
| MA | Lynn | $4,004,861 | $751,083 | $4,755,944 |
| MA | New Bedford | $1,576,274 | $805,424 | $2,381,698 |
| MA | Newton | $905,007 | $578,393 | $1,483,400 |
| MA | Quincy | $1,237,584 | $550,900 | $1,788,484 |
| MA | Somerville | $632,359 | $750,831 | $1,383,190 |
| MA | Springfield | $3,951,604 | $1,160,338 | $5,111,942 |
| MA | Worcester | $2,715,383 | $1,327,821 | $4,043,204 |
| MA | Massachusetts State Balan | $27,939,981 | $16,474,052 | $44,414,033 |
| MI | Dearborn | $505,688 | $577,297 | $1,082,985 |
| MI | Detroit | $9,124,129 | $10,458,172 | $19,582,301 |
| MI | Flint | $1,263,443 | $1,178,500 | $2,441,943 |
| MI | Grand Rapids | $2,039,593 | $1,120,648 | $3,160,241 |
| MI | Lansing | $1,282,028 | $608,455 | $1,890,483 |
| MI | Saginaw | $795,509 | $644,300 | $1,439,809 |
| MI | Genesee County | $913,288 | $553,817 | $1,467,105 |
| MI | Kent County | $1,111,219 | $532,303 | $1,643,522 |
| MI | Macomb County | $801,422 | $541,486 | $1,342,908 |
| MI | Oakland County | $2,033,828 | $1,155,293 | $3,189,121 |
| MI | Washtenaw County | $1,794,203 | $643,403 | $2,437,606 |
| MI | Wayne County | $1,295,238 | $1,651,276 | $2,946,514 |
| MI | Michigan State Balance | $22,253,746 | $17,313,093 | $39,566,839 |
| MN | Duluth | $1,252,530 | $719,669 | $1,972,199 |
| MN | Minneapolis | $9,697,637 | $3,349,493 | $13,047,130 |
| MN | St Paul | $5,943,414 | $2,049,510 | $7,992,924 |
| MN | Dakota County | $1,537,643 | $571,921 | $2,109,564 |
| MN | Hennepin County | $3,577,788 | $878,034 | $4,455,822 |
| MN | St Louis County | $948,615 | $578,797 | $1,527,412 |
| MN | Minnesota State Balance | $15,253,281 | $7,590,148 | $22,843,429 |
| MS | Jackson | $1,444,552 | $575,228 | $2,019,780 |
| MS | Mississippi State Balance | $10,423,120 | $8,171,221 | $18,594,341 |
| MO | Kansas City | $5,048,969 | $2,296,434 | $7,345,403 |
| MO | St Louis | $4,391,329 | $5,432,145 | $9,823,474 |
| MO | St Louis County | $3,187,544 | $1,703,217 | $4,890,761 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| MO | Missouri State Balance | $18,747,277 | $9,584,276 | $28,331,553 |
| MT | Montana State Balance | $6,742,481 | $2,524,355 | $9,266,836 |
| NE | Lincoln | $2,320,897 | $557,024 | $2,877,921 |
| NE | Omaha | $4,214,066 | $1,392,755 | $5,606,821 |
| NE | Nebraska State Balance | $5,025,953 | $3,482,410 | $8,508,363 |
| NV | Las Vegas | $8,357,531 | $1,537,579 | $9,895,110 |
| NV | North Las Vegas | $3,071,445 | $580,710 | $3,652,155 |
| NV | Reno | $3,579,927 | $670,428 | $4,250,355 |
| NV | Clark County | $12,264,384 | $2,333,003 | $14,597,387 |
| NV | Nevada State Balance | $6,179,560 | $1,648,731 | $7,828,291 |
| NH | Manchester | $1,810,236 | $540,034 | $2,350,270 |
| NH | New Hampshire State Balan | $4,797,314 | $3,209,928 | $8,007,242 |
| NJ | Camden | $1,226,497 | $723,110 | $1,949,607 |
| NJ | Jersey City | $3,540,297 | $1,682,731 | $5,223,028 |
| NJ | Newark | $5,458,961 | $2,162,428 | $7,621,389 |
| NJ | Paterson | $2,356,424 | $689,534 | $3,045,958 |
| NJ | Trenton | $1,197,016 | $831,962 | $2,028,978 |
| NJ | Bergen County | $3,222,784 | $2,748,124 | $5,970,908 |
| NJ | Camden County | $1,414,818 | $732,928 | $2,147,746 |
| NJ | Essex County | $2,974,183 | $1,574,441 | $4,548,624 |
| NJ | Hudson County | $1,486,554 | $602,817 | $2,089,371 |
| NJ | Middlesex County | $1,699,999 | $589,645 | $2,289,644 |
| NJ | Monmouth County | $1,772,793 | $752,907 | $2,525,700 |
| NJ | Morris County | $1,493,359 | $587,279 | $2,080,638 |
| NJ | Union County | $1,990,737 | $1,369,186 | $3,359,923 |
| NJ | New Jersey State Balance | $27,263,010 | $11,453,383 | $38,716,393 |
| NM | Albuquerque | $6,659,248 | $1,364,214 | $8,023,462 |
| NM | New Mexico State Balance | $8,795,819 | $4,140,483 | $12,936,302 |
| NY | Albany | $1,805,790 | $1,011,583 | $2,817,373 |
| NY | Binghamton | $506,439 | $577,638 | $1,084,077 |
| NY | Brookhaven Town | $2,250,095 | $672,466 | $2,922,561 |
| NY | Buffalo | $2,942,601 | $4,152,910 | $7,095,511 |
| NY | Islip Town | $2,018,093 | $611,328 | $2,629,421 |
| NY | Mount Vernon | $1,304,856 | $503,041 | $1,807,897 |
| NY | New York | $331,859,870 | $50,507,036 | $382,366,906 |
| NY | Niagara Falls | $424,384 | $699,724 | $1,124,108 |
| NY | Rochester | $2,858,628 | $2,444,707 | $5,303,335 |
| NY | Schenectady | $994,996 | $671,793 | $1,666,789 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| NY | Syracuse | $1,749,868 | $1,470,976 | $3,220,844 |
| NY | Tonawanda Town | $360,334 | $500,262 | $860,596 |
| NY | Troy | $643,423 | $539,890 | $1,183,313 |
| NY | Utica | $486,089 | $743,966 | $1,230,055 |
| NY | Yonkers | $2,952,400 | $1,038,286 | $3,990,686 |
| NY | Erie County | $680,472 | $825,690 | $1,506,162 |
| NY | Monroe County | $934,597 | $556,766 | $1,491,363 |
| NY | Nassau County | $10,647,918 | $4,250,155 | $14,898,073 |
| NY | Onondaga County | $805,594 | $607,576 | $1,413,170 |
| NY | Orange County | $1,343,670 | $533,307 | $1,876,977 |
| NY | Westchester County | $4,169,699 | $1,073,114 | $5,242,813 |
| NY | New York State Balance | $28,791,380 | $21,730,655 | $50,522,035 |
| NC | Charlotte | $6,866,990 | $1,765,572 | $8,632,562 |
| NC | Durham | $2,060,285 | $602,383 | $2,662,668 |
| NC | Greensboro | $1,880,847 | $675,621 | $2,556,468 |
| NC | Raleigh | $3,503,113 | $950,338 | $4,453,451 |
| NC | Winston-Salem | $2,047,257 | $660,748 | $2,708,005 |
| NC | Wake County | $1,709,995 | $626,800 | $2,336,795 |
| NC | North Carolina State Bala | $35,948,234 | $18,423,179 | $54,371,413 |
| ND | North Dakota State Balanc | $3,468,739 | $1,673,841 | $5,142,580 |
| OH | Akron | $1,828,930 | $1,840,393 | $3,669,323 |
| OH | Canton | $820,051 | $783,834 | $1,603,885 |
| OH | Cincinnati | $4,156,549 | $3,495,228 | $7,651,777 |
| OH | Cleveland | $5,494,002 | $6,409,548 | $11,903,550 |
| OH | Columbus | $8,102,095 | $2,150,555 | $10,252,650 |
| OH | Dayton | $1,860,397 | $1,745,634 | $3,606,031 |
| OH | Lakewood | $474,086 | $601,062 | $1,075,148 |
| OH | Springfield | $601,061 | $560,655 | $1,161,716 |
| OH | Toledo | $2,626,090 | $2,249,248 | $4,875,338 |
| OH | Youngstown | $657,102 | $1,062,917 | $1,720,019 |
| OH | Cuyahoga County | $1,726,594 | $1,204,362 | $2,930,956 |
| OH | Franklin County | $1,870,630 | $595,590 | $2,466,220 |
| OH | Hamilton County | $1,862,722 | $1,009,176 | $2,871,898 |
| OH | Montgomery County | $1,256,495 | $584,510 | $1,841,005 |
| OH | Ohio State Balance | $26,006,617 | $21,324,293 | $47,330,910 |
| OK | Oklahoma City | $5,928,669 | $1,475,283 | $7,403,952 |
| OK | Tulsa | $4,116,095 | $1,035,562 | $5,151,657 |
| OK | Oklahoma State Balance | $12,234,915 | $5,743,528 | $17,978,443 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| OR | Portland | $14,401,261 | $2,578,424 | $16,979,685 |
| OR | Clackamas County | $2,528,172 | $646,045 | $3,174,217 |
| OR | Washington County | $2,214,134 | $662,721 | $2,876,855 |
| OR | Oregon State Balance | $49,430,143 | $6,748,493 | $56,178,636 |
| PA | Allentown | $992,811 | $684,045 | $1,676,856 |
| PA | Erie | $1,081,520 | $931,503 | $2,013,023 |
| PA | Harrisburg | $1,026,444 | $578,217 | $1,604,661 |
| PA | Lancaster City | $809,254 | $503,203 | $1,312,457 |
| PA | Philadelphia | $22,293,192 | $12,976,572 | $35,269,764 |
| PA | Pittsburgh | $2,258,787 | $4,193,562 | $6,452,349 |
| PA | Reading | $1,426,367 | $773,693 | $2,200,060 |
| PA | Scranton | $622,150 | $813,479 | $1,435,629 |
| PA | Allegheny County | $3,107,999 | $4,157,814 | $7,265,813 |
| PA | Beaver County | $685,630 | $984,814 | $1,670,444 |
| PA | Berks County | $1,051,989 | $707,893 | $1,759,882 |
| PA | Bucks County | $1,400,101 | $634,572 | $2,034,673 |
| PA | Chester County | $2,220,667 | $764,283 | $2,984,950 |
| PA | Delaware County | $1,161,173 | $1,100,183 | $2,261,356 |
| PA | Lancaster County | $1,573,181 | $854,500 | $2,427,681 |
| PA | Luzerne County | $681,192 | $1,226,697 | $1,907,889 |
| PA | Montgomery County | $1,606,408 | $976,638 | $2,583,046 |
| PA | Northampton County | $709,925 | $637,234 | $1,347,159 |
| PA | Washington County | $696,610 | $1,055,755 | $1,752,365 |
| PA | Westmoreland County | $839,293 | $1,041,331 | $1,880,624 |
| PA | York County | $1,061,680 | $640,548 | $1,702,228 |
| PA | Pennsylvania State Balanc | $19,930,907 | $19,920,655 | $39,851,562 |
| RI | Pawtucket | $624,909 | $548,676 | $1,173,585 |
| RI | Providence | $1,846,439 | $1,521,038 | $3,367,477 |
| RI | Woonsocket | $499,750 | $399,231 | $898,981 |
| RI | Rhode Island State Balanc | $3,275,621 | $2,478,855 | $5,754,476 |
| SC | Charleston County | $890,215 | $535,900 | $1,426,115 |
| SC | Greenville County | $1,935,622 | $804,966 | $2,740,588 |
| SC | Horry County | $1,551,515 | $622,221 | $2,173,736 |
| SC | Lexington County | $1,203,878 | $542,372 | $1,746,250 |
| SC | South Carolina State Bala | $18,346,818 | $8,745,852 | $27,092,670 |
| SD | South Dakota State Balanc | $5,554,958 | $2,199,893 | $7,754,851 |
| TN | Knoxville | $2,221,592 | $513,272 | $2,734,864 |
| TN | Memphis | $6,018,137 | $2,014,017 | $8,032,154 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| TN | Nashville-Davidson | $8,489,679 | $1,549,066 | $10,038,745 |
| TN | Tennessee State Balance | $22,438,703 | $11,148,024 | $33,586,727 |
| TX | Arlington | $2,977,176 | $991,890 | $3,969,066 |
| TX | Austin | $10,859,249 | $2,354,866 | $13,214,115 |
| TX | Brownsville | $1,964,765 | $819,241 | $2,784,006 |
| TX | Corpus Christi | $1,864,176 | $803,100 | $2,667,276 |
| TX | Dallas | $16,651,199 | $4,453,269 | $21,104,468 |
| TX | El Paso | $3,964,248 | $1,902,228 | $5,866,476 |
| TX | Fort Worth | $6,070,529 | $2,202,959 | $8,273,488 |
| TX | Garland | $2,004,381 | $648,962 | $2,653,343 |
| TX | Houston | $21,649,868 | $7,252,552 | $28,902,420 |
| TX | Irving | $2,420,874 | $678,434 | $3,099,308 |
| TX | Laredo | $2,552,555 | $1,130,386 | $3,682,941 |
| TX | Lubbock | $1,385,225 | $632,362 | $2,017,587 |
| TX | San Antonio | $12,950,577 | $3,902,645 | $16,853,222 |
| TX | Bexar County | $1,859,901 | $696,845 | $2,556,746 |
| TX | Brazoria County | $1,125,985 | $526,152 | $1,652,137 |
| TX | Dallas County | $1,726,123 | $667,003 | $2,393,126 |
| TX | Fort Bend County | $1,384,930 | $936,303 | $2,321,233 |
| TX | Harris County | $7,999,883 | $4,077,193 | $12,077,076 |
| TX | Hidalgo County | $4,242,374 | $2,229,055 | $6,471,429 |
| TX | Montgomery County | $1,310,985 | $775,483 | $2,086,468 |
| TX | Tarrant County | $2,734,655 | $844,131 | $3,578,786 |
| TX | Texas State Balance | $64,537,937 | $33,254,679 | $97,792,616 |
| UT | Salt Lake City | $2,946,449 | $1,040,462 | $3,986,911 |
| UT | Salt Lake County | $2,381,057 | $751,093 | $3,132,150 |
| UT | Utah State Balance | $9,479,075 | $4,633,641 | $14,112,716 |
| VT | Vermont State Balance | $4,424,450 | $2,334,607 | $6,759,057 |
| VA | Norfolk | $2,292,639 | $1,328,583 | $3,621,222 |
| VA | Richmond | $1,954,273 | $1,351,959 | $3,306,232 |
| VA | Roanoke | $894,995 | $525,434 | $1,420,429 |
| VA | Virginia Beach | $1,389,918 | $606,131 | $1,996,049 |
| VA | Fairfax County | $6,581,782 | $1,699,586 | $8,281,368 |
| VA | Henrico County | $1,154,186 | $508,566 | $1,662,752 |
| VA | Prince William County | $2,423,373 | $791,662 | $3,215,035 |
| VA | Virginia State Balance | $20,601,553 | $10,375,562 | $30,977,115 |
| WA | Seattle | $26,485,029 | $2,829,807 | $29,314,836 |
| WA | Spokane | $3,362,228 | $991,359 | $4,353,587 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STA** | **NAME** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 2  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Round 1  Allocation** | **ESG CARES Act  Combined  Amounts  Round 1 and  Round 2** |
| WA | Tacoma | $2,809,518 | $759,366 | $3,568,884 |
| WA | King County | $11,139,409 | $964,066 | $12,103,475 |
| WA | Pierce County | $3,328,051 | $908,579 | $4,236,630 |
| WA | Snohomish County | $4,782,535 | $914,410 | $5,696,945 |
| WA | Washington State Balance | $46,343,357 | $9,748,945 | $56,092,302 |
| WV | Huntington | $559,361 | $538,314 | $1,097,675 |
| WV | West Virginia State Balan | $7,166,583 | $5,690,597 | $12,857,180 |
| WI | Madison | $2,318,388 | $572,541 | $2,890,929 |
| WI | Milwaukee | $5,763,381 | $4,785,445 | $10,548,826 |
| WI | Racine | $649,751 | $574,928 | $1,224,679 |
| WI | Wisconsin State Balance | $19,761,322 | $12,723,269 | $32,484,591 |
| WY | Wyoming State Balance | $2,901,686 | $1,153,541 | $4,055,227 |
| AS | American Samoas | $796,914 | $269,228 | $1,066,142 |
| GU | Guam | $2,630,542 | $888,696 | $3,519,238 |
| MP | Northern Mariana Islands | $815,225 | $275,414 | $1,090,639 |
| PR | Bayamon Municipio | $1,005,178 | $672,662 | $1,677,840 |
| PR | Caguas Municipio | $658,415 | $516,886 | $1,175,301 |
| PR | Carolina Municipio | $777,012 | $546,069 | $1,323,081 |
| PR | Ponce Municipio | $975,723 | $726,203 | $1,701,926 |
| PR | San Juan Municipio | $3,892,454 | $2,137,879 | $6,030,333 |
| PR | Puerto Rico State Balance | $14,951,925 | $12,479,000 | $27,430,925 |
| VI | Virgin Islands | $1,677,320 | $566,662 | $2,243,982 |

**TOTAL $2,960,000,000 $1,000,000,000 $3,960,000,000**