

ALLOCATION MATRIX FY 10/11

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
Children Services	1) Foster Parent Training and Recruitment CFL 09/10 - 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training funds are allocated based on the average number of children placed in out-of-home care, excluding group homes; foster family agencies; and probation. Recruitment funds are allocated based on average monthly number of children in out-of-home placement, excluding probation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use CWS/CMS data as reported by counties. Adjusted for Title IV-E waiver counties. Funds were adjusted to insure that each county received a minimum of \$1,741 or 87% of their prior year allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusted for Title IV-E waiver counties issued separately. 	Calendar Year 2008
	2) Independent Living Program CFL -09/10-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation is based on one quarter of the revised FFY 07 allocation plus three quarters of the estimated FFY 2008 grant less funding for State operations. A reduction was made to the grant amounts based on the CWS reduction in the governors budget \$37,732 minimum floor was established. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1/2 funds distributed using each county's percentage share to the statewide total of age 0-17 from the 2000 census. 1/2 distributed using each county's share of statewide total children in poverty from 1997 census. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject to Federal Grant appropriation. General fund portion is frozen. 	
	3) Transitional Housing Program-Plus (THP-Plus) ACL 09-73	<p>The following methodology was developed to achieve the initial \$5 million reduction and a portion of the additional CWS reduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The \$5 million reduction, with the exception noted below, was distributed to counties on a percent to total basis Any new county with a request that was above two beds received funding for half of their bed request and were excluded from the initial reduction The additional CWS reduction to THP-Plus was applied on a percent to total basis for all counties <p>, Counties are reminded that they may use their THP-Plus funds to cover these costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 52 counties participating in THP-Plus for FY 2009/10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of approved beds by each counties approved rate 	

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>4) Supportive and Therapeutic Program (STOP) CFL 09/10-27</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's total number of FR and PP open CWS cases and Probation open placements during the last three year. 50% distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's FY 2008/089 expenditures up to each county's allocation, excluding overmatch. 9 counties with no STOP plan receive no allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caseload is from CWS/CMS extract reports. Expenditures are taken from the CEC claim. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2008/09
	<p>5) State Family Preservation Permanent Transfer (update for 2009-10 pending) CFL 08/09-01</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counties are required to match the funds at the nonfederal-sharing ratio of the 70% State and 30% County. County specific allocations calculated by Estimates branch and distributed via CFL by CFAB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Estimates. Only 15 counties participating as of Fiscal Year 07-08. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This allocation is distributed to counties that submit an annual plan to the state. Federal Title IV-E, nonfederal, and federal Title XIX funding levels based on 01/02 expenditure data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No data collected.
	<p>6) Adoptions Program Basic Costs CFL 10/11-08</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Adoptions Program allocation is based on county specific unit cost calculation from FY 01/02, which was multiplied by each county's performance agreement full-time equivalents to determine each county's individual allocation. Outcomes allocation was distributed based on each county's percent to total 2010-11 Adoptions Program Basic allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County performance agreement with CDSS for # of adoptions per worker per year. This is multiplied by a unit cost based on FY 2001-2002 actual expenditures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Specific 	

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>8) Group Home Monthly Visits</p> <p>CFL 10/11-32</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The in-state portion of the allocation is distributed based on 50% of each county's percent to total of the 56 counties' actual GHMV expenditures as claimed on the CEC for most recent 4 quarters. The remaining 50% is distributed based on each county's percent to total of the 56 counties' supervised group home placements extracted from CWS/CMS for calendar year 2009. The out-of-state portion of the allocation is distributed based on each county's percent to total of the 56 counties' out of state placements extracted from CWS/CMS for calendar year 2009. Methodology is the same as probation There is a minimum floor of \$1000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenditures are taken from the CEC claim. Caseload is from CWS/CMS extract reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Non-Waiver Counties</u> - For each fiscal year, the in-state costs for 10 visits are calculated using the in-state GH caseload for two hours per visit times the hourly rate of a social worker (\$72.60). An additional two hours are calculated for the in-state, out-of-county placements at the hourly cost of a social worker. The out-of-state costs for ten visits are calculated using the out-of-state GH caseload divided by two cases per visit for 12 hours per visit times the hourly rate of a social worker. Per Diem and travel costs are added for each out-of-state visit. <u>Waiver Counties</u> - FY 10/11 base amounts for IVE waiver counties are \$3.9M federal and \$4.2M general fund. (CFL 10/11-47) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% - September 2009 - June 2010 50% - Calendar year 2009 FFY 2003-FFY 2005
	<p>9) CHILD WELFARE SERVICES (CWS)</p> <p>a) <i>CWS Basic Calculation</i></p> <p>CFL 10/11-46</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined using the unit cost developed in each county's final FY 2001/02 Proposed County Administrative Budget (PCAB) multiplied by the number of justified FTEs generated by projected caseload. An adjustment has been made so no counties are funded at less FTE's than the prior year. The caseload was used in conjunction with the workload standards to arrive at a justified number of FTEs per month, which was then expanded to include supervisors at 7:1 supervisory ratio. The workload standards are as follows: ER = 15.8, ER Assessment = 320.0, FM = 35.0, FR = 27.0, PP = 54.0. Direct Costs and System Support Staff Shifts in Attachment II of CFL are adjusted to balance to each county's Total CWS Basic Allocations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caseload from CWS/CMS Based on the various budget and allocation adjustments that were made to CWS Basic and Emergency Assistance (EA) Case Management (CM) in prior years, the allocation methodology for these components no longer provides an adequate distribution to each county. As a one time adjustment, CDSS and CWDA agreed to allocate the funding differences between prior year and current year for CWS Basic on a percent to total of each county's FY 09/10 Basic and EA CM allocations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frozen PCAB unit cost from 2001-2002. State Estimates Unit projects county specific caseload trend lines for all 4 components using 36 months of data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Data Sources

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	b) <i>Specialized Care Incentive and Assistance Program (SCIAP)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on each county's proportionate share of the total CalWORKs/Foster Care Family Home (including relatives and non-related legal guardians) and Foster Family Agency certified home placements. There is a minimum floor of \$1,000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As reported on the CA 237 -FC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar year 2009
	c) <i>Federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 - Loss of FFP</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on each county's percent to total of Foster Care children in state hospitals or medical facilities over 30 days. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar year 2009
	d) <i>CWS/CMS System Support Staff</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to statewide total of FY 2008-09 CWS/CMS System Support Staff expenditures. Costs are shared according to California's federally approved CAP, which allocates costs to all benefiting CWS programs based on statewide county worker time study hours. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on PC 536 expenditures in the CEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2009/10

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	e) <i>Minor Parent Investigations & Minor Parent Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Minor Parent Investigations (MPI) component funds the investigations that will be performed by CPS; and the Minor Parent Services (MPS) component assumes that a percentage of minor parents (mostly those at 17 years of age) will be allowed to form their own assistance units. There is a minimum floor of \$658 in total funds for MPI and a minimum floor of \$2,858 in total funds for MPS for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly average of cases approved as reported on the Stat 45 Cal-Learn Teen Parent Monthly Status Report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar year 2008
	f) <i>Foster Care Infant Rate - SB 500</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds are distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's Foster Care Caseload. There is a minimum floor of \$150 in total funds for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA-237 FC, Part B, Line 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 hours SW time to develop plan multiplied by the number of non-dependant infant cases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar year 2008
	g) <i>CWS/CMS Staff Development</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation (excluding the Northern Training Lab Consortium (NTLC) and remaining small counties) was calculated by multiplying each county's percentage to the statewide total of the number of User ID's in each county as of June 2009. The allocation for NTLC counties and remaining small counties was based on the hold harmless amount from the FY 2000-01 appropriation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on actual workstation User ID's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on estimated # of users to be trained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As of June 2009

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	h) <i>LiveScan and Background Checks</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Relative Home/Guardian Home Placements from CWS/CMS. There is a minimum floor of \$2,000 in total funds for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	i) <i>Relative Home Approvals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Relative Home/Guardian Home Placements from CWS/CMS. There is a minimum floor of \$1,000 in total funds for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	j) <i>Multiple Relative Home Approvals & Grievance Review for Relative Home Approvals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Relative Home Placements from CWS/CMS. There is a minimum floor of \$1,000 in total funds for each county for Multiple Relative Home Approvals and a minimum floor of \$100 in total funds for each county for Grievance Review for Relative Home Approvals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	k) <i>County Self-Assessment & System Improvement Plan (SIP)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The funds were distributed using each county's average cost of a social worker (01-02 PCAB unit cost) and allocating a 1/4 of an FTE to the small and very small counties, 1/2 of an FTE to the medium counties, and one FTE to the large counties. A percent to total of each county's total cost of the allocated FTEs was used to allocate the total funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01-02 PCAB unit cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	l) <i>Data Requirement for New Activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on each county's Family Maintenance, Family Reunification and Permanent Placement caseloads, by calculating a cost-per-hour rate based on each county's average cost of a social worker, and assuming an average of one hour per case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01-02 PCAB unit cost CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Year 2009/10
	m) <i>Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating counties were allocated \$5,000 to reimburse the travel and per diem costs of social workers traveling from other counties to participate in the reviews. Those counties participating in probation reviews received \$3,000 to reimburse the travel and per diem cost of probation officers traveling from other counties. The remaining allocation was distributed based on each participating county's percent to statewide total of their budgeted FY 2010/11 unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01-02 PCAB unit cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	n) <i>Statewide Standardized Training</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's budgeted FTEs multiplied by the county specific unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01-02 PCAB unit cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2009/10

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	<i>o) AB 408 Child Relationships</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average monthly caseload of children in foster care aged 10 years and older in group homes more than 6 months. There is a minimum floor of \$5,000 in total funds for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	<i>p) Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each County's average monthly actual Kin-GAP caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kin-GAP Avg. monthly caseload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	<i>q) Caregiver Court Filing - SB -1667</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to e total of each County's average Foster Family Home and Relative Home caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2010/11
	<i>r) Criminal Records Check for Family Reunification - AB1774</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each County's budgeted Family Reunification caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	<i>s) Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of the Foster Care Act of 2006</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's average monthly Out-of-State Children caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2010/11
	<i>t) Gomez v. Saenz Court Case</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's projected social worker caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	u) <i>Adam Walsh Child Protection Safety Act</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average relative placements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	v) <i>PAARP Savings (Providing Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average Permanent Placement caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2009/10
	w) <i>Foster Care SSI/SSP Application - AB 1331</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's out-of-home placements caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2009/10
	x) <i>Health Benefit Determination - AB 1512</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average out-of-county placement caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	y) <i>Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Dual Agency Foster Care caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	z) <i>Personalized Transition Plan (P.L. 110-351)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Total Children in Foster Care (ages 16-20) caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	aa) <i>Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Foster Family Agency and Out of State placements, Foster Family Home (excluding Foster Family Agency and Group Home), and Children in Out of Home Placements (out of county) welfare supervised caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2009/10
	bb) <i>Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Minors Turning 17 in Out-of-Home Placement caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	<i>cc) Increase Relative Search and Engagement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Non-relative Guardian/Non-relative Non-guardian placements and Non-relative home placements for kids 16 and older. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	<i>dd) Increase Family Case Planning Meetings to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Exits from Foster Care Reunified caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	<i>ee) Kin-GAP Dual Agency - CWS Savings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's New Out of Home placements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2009
	10) CWSOIP Augmentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counties will be required to report in their annual SIP update how the CWSOIP funds were used to support their SIP outcomes. Distributed based on each county's percent to total of budgeted FTEs as displayed on Attachment II of CFL. There is a minimum floor of \$100,000 in total funds for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determined by State Budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	11) CWS Augmentation Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on the individual county's percent to total of budgeted FTEs as displayed in Attachment II of CFL. There is a minimum floor of \$100,000 in total funds for each county. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on CWS Basic caseload

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	12) CWSOIP/11 County Pilot CFL 10/11-06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In accordance with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) recommendation, the funds have been distributed based on the following methodology: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 11 pilot counties receive the same level of CWS DR, SA, and PYS funding as in FY2007-08. Seventy-five percent of each county's FY 2010-11 CWSOIP allocation is held at the same level as in FY2009-10, and twenty-five percent of the funds have been distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's FY 2009-10 CWSOIP Augmentation allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	13) Emancipated Youth Stipends CFL 10/11-40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In accordance with CWDA recommendation, the EYS funds are distributed according to the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of the funds were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's total number of foster care children 18 years and older exiting Child Welfare and Probation during the last three calendar years, based on data from the CWS/CMS. 50% of the funds were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's FY 2008-09 expenditures for the EYS Program as reported on the CEC. Only expenditures up to each county's FY 2008-09 allocation were used. \$1,000 minimum allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar years 2007, 2008, 2009 FY 2008-09

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	14) Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (KIN-GAP) Program CFL 10/11-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of funds were distributed based on actual Kin-GAP expenditures for FY 2009-10 as reported by counties on the CEC. 50% of the funds were distributed based on FY 2009-10 actual Kin-GAP caseload as reported by the counties on the Assistance Claim. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 800 4F and 4G Person Count (Fed & Non-Fed) CEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kin-GAP administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected case months by the monthly administrative costs per case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2009-10
	15) CWSOIP/11 County Pilot CFL 10/11-06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$1,000 minimum floor. In accordance with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) recommendation, the funds have been distributed based on the following methodology: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 11 pilot counties receive the same level of CWS DR, SA, and PYS funding as in FY2007-08. Seventy-five percent of each county's FY 2010-11 CWSOIP allocation is held at the same level as in FY2009-10, and twenty-five percent of the funds have been distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's FY 2009-10 CWSOIP Augmentation allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	16) FOSTER CARE CFL 10/11-18 a) Foster Care Admin (Basic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior calendar year Foster Care caseload from the FC- 237 minus the prior calendar year Kin-Gap caseload. Waiver counties excluded from allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FC 237, Part B, Line 8 and CA-800 KG Person Count (Fed & Non-Fed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01 adjusted for caseload growth 	
	b) AAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAP funds are allocated using each county's percent to total average monthly caseload from the most recent 12 months. (5/09-4/10) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persons counts from Assistance Claim as provided by Accounting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures. 	

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	<i>c) FC Staff Development</i>	FC Staff Development allocation is calculated by multiplying each county average percent to the 4 most recent quarters Foster Care Staff Development expenditures and average FC FTE's for the same time period. (06/09 Qtr. -03/10 Qtr.) An adjustment was made to the allocation to fund the state share of costs for staff training among the 38 counties of the Inter- County Policy and Planning Committee which contracts with the University of California, Davis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year
	<i>d) Emergency Assistance Foster Care (EA/FC)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual county allocations were calculated by multiplying the percent to total ratio of SGF expenditures for the 4 most recent quarters to the statewide total available funding.(06/09 Qtr.-03/10 Qtr.) Expenditures exceeding the SGF allocations will be shifted to county share. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data (PC 223) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for administrative activities performed by CWD staff are based upon actual expenditures and adjusted for caseload growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most recent 4 quarters
	<i>e) Foster Care Reforms</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution was based on the percent to statewide total of a counties average monthly caseload for CY2009 from the FC237. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 237 - FC, Part B, Line 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects an estimated savings due to the reduction of annual FC eligibility redeterminations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CY2009
	<i>f) Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments (PAARP)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the savings associated with having private agency provide placement to children with special needs. The distribution was based on the percent to statewide total of each county's average monthly caseload for Permanent Placement from the most recent 12 months (5/09-4/10), as provided by the Child Welfare Data Analysis Bureau 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child Welfare Data Analysis Bureau 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	g) Caseload Reduction *	This premise reflects the savings based on caseload reduction in the FC program. The distribution was based on the percent to total ratio of each county's average monthly caseload change from calendar year (CY) 2008 to CY 2009 from the FC 237. Only counties with caseload reduction are included in this premise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CY 2008 to CY 2009
	h) KIN-GAP Dual Agency Foster Care Savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects a proposed amendment to the Kin-GAP program statute which would allow children receiving the AFDC-FC rate under WIC section 11464 while in FC to be eligible for that rate when the children transition into the Kin-GAP program. The distribution is based on a percent to total of each county's actual Kin-GAP caseload for CY 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 237 - FC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CY 2009
	17) Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds Program CFL 10/11-37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The total is distributed to participating counties (excluding waiver counties) based on relative placement caseload from CWS/CMS. <p>Amounts differ depending on caseload thresholds.</p> <p>a. 500+ \$35,071 b. 100 to 499 \$12,005 c. Less than 100 \$3,751</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 2010 CWS/CMS Placement Data - Most Current Month Available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$624,000 State GF plus Federal draw. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year
	18) Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program (PSSF) CFL 10/11-02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of allocation is allocated to each county based on their proportionate share of the total number of children 0 to 17 years of age. The remaining 50% is allocated based on county's proportionate share of the number of children in poverty. Minimum allocation \$10,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Census Bureau 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject to Federal grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0-17 - Calendar Year 2009 Poverty - Calendar Year 2008

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	19) Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Program (CAPIT) CFL 10/11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per the County Welfare Directors Association's recommendation, individual county allocations were based on each county's existing three-year plan and will remain the same through FY 2011-12. Counties must provide a 10% cash or in-kind match. Minimum Grant \$60,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
Adults	<p>20) In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS)</p> <p>CFL 10/11-34</p> <p>a) Quality Assurance (QA)</p> <p>b) Advisory Committee</p> <p>c) IHSS County Employer Of Record</p> <p>d) IHSS Plus Option</p> <p>e) Provider Enrollment Statement Form</p> <p>f) Anti-Fraud Initiative County Investigation</p> <p>g) Anti-Fraud Initiative Related Activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it was determined that the FY 2010-11 IHSS Basic allocation would be based on each county's FY 2009-10 IHSS Basic total funds allocation. The additional appropriated funds above the FY 2009-10 Basic allocation were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of caseload and caseload growth above the FY 2009-10 IHSS Basic allocation. Each county's actual Title XIX usage rate was based on the four quarters of expenditures (March 2009 to December 2009). \$4.8 million GF distributed based on each county's proposed number of QA Social Workers multiplied by their FY 2001-02 Unit Cost and \$6.3 million GF based on each county's paid IHSS cases. The \$1.6 million GF share has been distributed equally to the participating counties and has been included in the total allocation. A total of \$128,000 GF has been included for Participating counties (Alpine, Tuolumne) \$215,000 GF was distributed to counties based on the percent to total of their average monthly paid cases and included in the total allocation. \$1.2 million GF was distributed based on a percent to statewide total using unduplicated new provider caseload count. \$3.5 million GF was distributed based on a percent to statewide total of costs for fraud staff. \$304,000 GF was distributed based on a percent to statewide total using an unduplicated new provider caseload count. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CMIPS Management Reports CEC The GF share was calculated at 70 percent of the nonfederal share of the program. PC 003 captures costs associated with QA activities and is tracked against the total IHSS allocation. PC 023 captures costs associated with the IHSS Advisory Committees and is tracked against the total IHSS allocation. Please refer to CFL No. 08/09-10, dated August 8, 2008, for additional information related to IHSS Advisory Committee costs. PC 743 captures costs associated with the IHSS Anti-Fraud initiative and is tracked against the total IHSS allocation. PC 739 and PC 743 captures costs associated with the IHSS Anti-Fraud initiative Related Activities and is tracked against the total IHSS allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SW unit cost is held at \$60.55 per hour. The standard hours per case are 11.58, including five minutes for completing the emergency contact and emergency back-up plan form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most recent twelve months (June 2009 to May 2009)
Fiscal Year 10/11 Allocation Matrix			17 of 32		6/21/2012

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	

	<p>21) Adult Protective Services (APS) CFL 10/11-05</p> <p>County Services Block Grant (CSBG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology used to distribute the APS GF allocation of \$45,147,000 is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sixty-five percent is distributed based on each county's percent to the total statewide population estimate of those over age 65. Thirty-five percent is distributed based on each county's percent to the total statewide disabled adult population ages 18-64. Each county is guaranteed a minimum allocation of \$100,000. A total of \$9,799,000 GF is provided for CSBG Basic and NMOHC costs. The individual county share of the CSBG Basic allocation remains at the same level as the FY 2007-08 CSBG Basic allocation. The individual county share of the NMOHC allocation was calculated based on each county's percent to the statewide total of NMOHC expenditures for calendar year 2009. Funds were adjusted to ensure a minimum floor of \$50. Also see WIC 13003 and 13004. for certain expenditure limitations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Census Data SSI/SSP Caseload Data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocation Same as Allocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most recent Census Data 7/1/2009 March-10
--	---	--	--	--	--

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	<p>22) CalWORKs Single Allocation:</p> <p>CFL 10/11-10</p> <p>a) <i>Eligibility Administration</i></p> <p>i) CaWORKs Eligibility Administrative Basic</p> <p>ii) Work Verification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the administrative costs for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. FY 2000-01, established the base from which future year costs are established. Adjustments for caseload changes and other factors are made during each subvention process. This premise provides an ongoing allocation to counties to comply with enhanced documentation and verification of work participation data mandated by the federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005. Statewide estimates are the staff costs needed to implement the requirement by federal law. In prior budget cycles, costs were based on actual expenditures plus caseload growth. Funding has been held to the Appropriation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended by CWDA, the base allocation was calculated using 100% of each county's FY 2009-10 Eligibility allocation with the Wilson Fish Administration augment excluded. This "base" was compared against the corresponding components budgeted for FY 2009-10 to determine the funding "growth". The "growth" was allocated based on a percent-to-total of each county's average monthly caseload growth from calendar year 2008 to calendar 2009. Counties with no or negative growth are held harmless to their FY 2009-10 Eligibility allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01, CA 237, Part B, Line 8a Federal CalWORKs Characteristic Survey (Q5) data 	<p>January 2009 to December 2009 compared to Jan. 2008 to Dec. 2008.</p>

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) <i>Be Vu v. Mitchell</i> iv) Safety Net Costs v) Staff Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This premise reflects the local assistance costs associated with translating forms for CalWORKS and CalFresh • <u>Safety Net Admin. Costs</u>: Funding has been held to the Appropriation. • Estimate is based on FY 2008-09 expenditures. 	The amount for FY 2009-10 was held to the Appropriation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEC Data • CA 237 • CEC Data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most current available data vi) Staff Development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vii) Public Assistance (PA) to Non-Assistance (NA) Shift viii) Prospective Budgeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs are calculated by increasing the base funding by the anticipated CalWORKS caseload growth of 10.6% and then adding the common intake costs to the total. • In addition to this amount, CalWORKS is reduced by 1/3 of initial eligibility projected costs. See: "Medi-Cal Services Eligibility/Common Costs" 100% of this reduction is removed from Federal TANF funding. • The net savings of prospective budgeting administrative costs are to reflect the implementation a Quarterly Reporting /Prospective Budgeting (QR/PB) system to replace the monthly reporting/retrospective budgeting system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CA 237, Part B, Line 8a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFA 256, Part A, Line 1A • CA 237, Part B, Line 8a • CA 237 (Line 8a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most recent fiscal year. • Most current available data

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	ix) Recent Noncitizen Entrants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the cost of providing aid to Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs). The administration costs are based on actual expenditures with the projected caseload adjustment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admin costs are based on actual expenditures from July 2008 to June 2009 adjusted for projected caseload growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 800L and CA 800M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 2008 to April 2009
	x) Medi-Cal Services Eligibility/Common Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the savings associated with common cost claiming, shifting eligibility costs from the CalWORKs Program to the Medi-Cal Program. Statewide estimates are computed as follows. 1. Compute the % of Prior Expenditures Code 615 over Total CalWORKs Eligibility costs. 2. Multiply above % by estimated total estimate eligibility costs by reflecting caseload growth, divide by 3. 1/3 of costs are transferred to DHCS to be funded via Medi-Cal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 237, Part B, Line 8a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data - Program Code 615 CA 237, Part B, Line 8a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Fiscal Year
	xi) Four Percent Grant Reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the implementation of a four percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the CalWORKs program. It is computed by multiplying the average monthly number of cases expected to lose eligibility by the average monthly cost per case. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01 adjusted for caseload changes CA 237, Part B, Line 8a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current caseload data available
	b) WTW Employment Services				
	i) CalWORKs Employment Services Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the services and administrative costs for the CalWORKs Services Basic Program. Funded at prior year level and adjusted for caseload changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended by CWDA, the Employment Services component received a net shift of \$39,024,000 from Child Care to enable counties to ramp their employment services back up. The increase was based on each county's percent to total of their 2009-10 Employment Services Allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01 adjusted for caseload changes WTW 25/25a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base Year 2000/01 Most current available data

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	ii) Reduction in Employment Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the Budget action to reduce the CalWORKs program funding for employment services (\$161.5 million) and child care(\$215.3 million) commensurate with the Budget Act of 2009-10 (Assembly Bill-AB X3 10). 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Act of 2009-10 (Assembly Bill-AB X3 10).
	iii) Recent Noncitizen Entrants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the cost of providing aid to Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs). The costs for services were held to the Appropriation. 			
	iv) 60-Month CalWORKs Time Limit Savings & Safety Net Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These premises reflect the net savings associated with recipients who will reach their 60-month CalWORKs time limit and will no longer be eligible to receive assistance, and costs associated with providing services to recipients who have timed out of the CalWORKs program. Total CalWORKs service costs are based on actual expenditures for CY plus caseload growth 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC data <u>Time Limit Savings</u>: % of WDTIP Caseload Projected to Receive Employment Services CEC Expenditures divided by WTW 25/25a (WTW 25/25a Line 30 (Subtract Lines 8 and 20)) CEC Codes - 109,233,257,451,621, 622,633,682,683,685 & 686. <u>Safety Net Costs</u> - WTW 25/25a Line 36 <u>CEC Expenditure Codes</u> - 687 & 689 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current available data
	v) Base Veto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the Governor's Veto of \$60 million from the CalWORKs' Single Allocation reflected in the 2008 Budget Act. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fixed Amount 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2008 Budget Act
	vi) Welfare Reform/Work Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects costs associated with the Welfare Reform Proposal, which includes increased work requirements for participants. Pursuant to AB 1808, the Budget includes \$90 million in federal FANF block grant funds for the CalWORKs program to assist counties in improving their work participation rate (WPR). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q5 Data and WTW 25/25a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recent FY

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	c) <i>Cal-Learn</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case Management, Ancillary, Transportation and Bonuses are budgeted based on a derived per unit cost from the available prior year actual expenditures & projected caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were distributed based on each county's average monthly Cal-Learn caseload for most recent CY as reported on the Teen Parent Monthly Status Report (STAT 45) as a percentage of the average monthly caseload statewide, adjusted for a minimum allocation of \$1,000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stat 45. CEC Expenditure Codes - 26,27,28,432,617,630,640,641,649 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recent Calendar Year
	d) <i>CalWORKs Child Care</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the cost for Stage One Child Care to the CalWORKs program families who are working or participating in work activities while on aid, former CalWORKs recipients who are unable to transfer to Stage Two due to the lack of available slots, and eligible teen parents participating in the Cal Learn program. The Stage One child care services costs are calculated by multiplying the caseload by the cost per child multiplied by 12 months. The Stage One child care administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the services costs by the administrative ratio. The administrative ratio is calculated based on the actual administrative expenditures compared to services expenditures for most current CY 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended by CWDA, the base allocation was calculated using 100% of each county's FY 2009-10 Child Care allocation. This "base" was compared against the corresponding components budgeted for FY 2010-11 to determine the net adjustment. The net adjustment includes a shift to Employment Services and was calculated based on a percent-to-total of each county's FY 2009-10 Child Care allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The projected monthly caseload is based on a regression analysis of actual caseload reported on the CW115 and CW115a county reports (Cell 10) CEC data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current Calendar Year (CY). Most current Calendar Year (CY).
	ii) Reduction in Child Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the Budget action to reduce the CalWORKs program funding for employment services (\$161.5 million) and child care (\$215.3 million) commensurate with the Budget Act of 2009-10 (Assembly Bill-AB X3 10). 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Act of 2009-10 (AB X3 10)
	iii) Safety Net Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The child care costs are calculated by increasing the prior year child care costs by the projected Safety Net caseload growth. 			

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	iv) Recent Noncitizen Entrants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the cost of providing aid to Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs). It is computed based on the actual child care costs for Recent Noncitizen Entrants of most current CY multiplying the percentage of persons that are non-TANF eligible 			
	v) Child Care Health and Safety Requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects costs associated with the Trustline Registry and the Self-Certification process. The costs are computed based on actual expenditures plus update/projected caseload growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data(PC 901 & 902) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications provided by CCL DOJ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current Calendar Year
	vi) CalWORKs State One Child Care Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the amount of Temporary assistance for Needy families (TANF) program funds established in reserve to be used for Stage One California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program child care. The costs are updated to reflect a five percent holdback for Stage One Child Care. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended by CWDA, CalWORKs Stage One Child Care Reserve was distributed based on a percent-to-total of each county's FY 2008-09 Child Care allocation. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 2008.

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>23) Substance Abuse & Mental Health Allocation</p> <p>CFL 10/11-10</p>	<p>Fifty percent of each program's funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average monthly caseload for FY 2009-10, as reported on the CalWORKs Cash Grant Caseload Movement Report (CA 237 CW).</p> <p>□ The remaining fifty percent of each program's funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's FY 2009-10 expenditures for MH and SA as reported on the County Expense Claim. Only expenditures up to each county's FY 2009-10 allocation were used.</p> <p>An adjustment was made to ensure that all counties were held harmless to their most recent four quarters expenditures for each program, excluding those expenditures that exceeded the allocation.</p> <p>Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC), specifically WIC Section 11325.71(a), allows counties to redirect funds for FY 2010-11 from their CalWORKs MH and SA allocations to the Single Allocation to fund other CalWORKs employment services that are necessary for individuals to participate in Welfare-to-Work activities and vice versa. Section 11325.71, permitting transfers between the CalWORKs MH and SA allocations and the CalWORKs Single Allocation, is due to sunset on June 30, 2011.</p> <p>CalWORKs Single Allocation funds may be utilized to cover additional expenses; however, only services that are non-medical may be funded from the Single Allocation. Transfers from the Single Allocation to MH or SA, if necessary, will occur during the close-out process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caseload Data--FY 2009-10 CA 237 CW, Part B, Line 8 • CEC Data (Combined Expenditures) - MH (PC 625) and SA (PC628) - FY 2009-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WTW 25/25A Lines 27 and Line 28 • CEC Codes 628 & 625 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2009-10

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	24) (SB) 1569 Aid and services for noncitizen victims of Human Trafficking , Domestic Violence, and other serious crimes (update for 2009-10 pending) CFL 10/11-13	Allocation has two categories and counties have flexibility to spend across program areas and activities if needed. 1. SERVICES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CalWORKs Services - \$736,000 GF allocated to CalWORKs Services. Funds were distributed on a percent to statewide total. CalWORKs Child Care- \$1,759,000 GF allocated to CalWORKs Child Care. Funds were distributed on a percent to statewide total. Trafficking and Crime Victims Assistance Program (TCVAP) -\$77,000 GF allocated to counties for TCVAP. Funds are allocated based on the number of refugees on aid in each eligible county who currently receives federal Refugee Social Services funds. 2. ADMINISTRATION: \$148,000 allocated for CalWORKs and CFAP administrative costs. Funds for CFAP were allocated based on a percent to statewide total average monthly caseload.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data used in the allocation process was obtained from the most recent Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System Report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment services costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of cases utilizing the service by the cost per case. The one-time administrative cost associated with adding the adult to the existing CalWORKS case is calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of new adult by the cost per case. The child care costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of children by the cost per child. 	
	25) CALFRESH (CF) (formerly known as Non-Assistance Food Stamp Admin Allocation) a) CALFRESH Administrative Basic CFL 10/11-29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% hold harmless to prior year allocation (including mid-year augmentation), or 100% hold harmless to prior year expenditures. Remaining funds of \$59,895,289 were distributed by caseload growth. 	Caseload growth: Calculate the average monthly caseload FY 08/09 over FY 09/10 Caseload Data: DFA 296: 8a NAFS Pure Fed cases (Box 34) plus 68% of 8b NAFS Fed/State Combined (Box 39). Add all monthly cases together and divide by 12. Compare 09/10 to FY 08/09 to get growth. Growth \$ were allocated based on a % to total of increased cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caseload projected based FY 08/09

Formatted: Font color: Custom Color(0,102,0)

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>b) <i>Public Assistance (PA) to Non-Assistance (NA) Shift</i></p> <p>NOTE: Allocations did not allocate PA/NA shift. This was part of CALFRESH (CF) basic methodology.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimates: 1. The Base CalWORKs Eligibility Estimate is first adjusted for the Administrative Premises. The reduced amount is then multiplied by a ratio developed by comparing expenditures for codes 614, 618 and 663 over the total cost of all eligibility activities. This amount represents the amount of projected costs attributable to the above 3 codes. This amount is then multiplied by the PACF to CalWORKs Caseload Ratio (DFA 256, Part A, Line 1A over CA 237CW, Part B, Line B) and multiplied by 50% to shift eligibility costs for CF to this allocation. In addition to this amount 1/3 of initial eligibility costs are shifted to CalFRESH using the following methodology: 1. The % of prior expenditures, code 615 over Total CalWORKs Eligibility Costs. 2. Multiply above % by estimated total eligibility costs, divide by 3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 256, Part A, Line 1A CA 237, Part B, Line 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected CF caseload: DFA 256, Part A, Cells (4), (5), (11), (12). Caseload adjusted to remove impact to CW Safety Net and Transitional Benefits, and for non-reporting counties. Projected PACF caseload: CA 237, Part B, Line 8, DFA 256, Part A, Cells (1), (2), (9), (10). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimates: FY 2008/09 Case Data Allocation: FY 2008/09 Case Data
	<p>c) <i>CalFRESH - Prospective Budgeting</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Savings associated with the implementation of Quarterly reporting/prospective budgeting. Savings were distributed according to county-specific methodology. Allocations were adjusted to hold small counties harmless from these saving; no savings were distributed to those counties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 256, Part A, Line 1B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected CalFRESH Caseload: DFA 256, Part A, Cells (4), (5), (11), (12). Caseload adjusted to remove impact to CW Safety Net and Transitional benefits, and for non-reporting counties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caseload projected based FY 08/09
	<p>d) <i>CalFRESH - California Food Assistance Program (CFAP)</i></p> <p>For eligible noncitizens</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average monthly CalFRESH caseload (Intake & Continuing) for most recent CY as reported on the DFA 296 (Lines 4b, 4c, 7a, and 8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 296 (Lines 4b, 4c, 7a, and 8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projected CalFRESH caseload: DFA 256, Part A, Cells (3), (6), (10), (12), (13) & (14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 06/2009 - 12/2009

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	e) <i>CalFRESH - Legacy System Savings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects the net savings that counties will realize following their conversion from outdated legacy systems to their new automated systems. Savings are county specific and based on data received by Statewide Project Consortiums. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on each county's annualized Legacy System cost as collected through extensive surveys and communications with the counties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2003/04 and 2004/05 - Could not verify the dates. Per subvention binder key data/assumptions based on information received from the Consortia.
	f) <i>CalFRESH - Simplification Options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflects the impact to county administrative costs associated with the implementation of options designed to simplify the <i>CalFRESH</i> Program. Funds were distributed based on a % to total of each county's average monthly <i>CalFRESH</i> caseload for the prior CY as reported on the DFA 296. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 296, Part B, Line 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 296, Part B, Line 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2006- Could not verify the dates. Per subvention binder key data/assumptions based on information received from the Consortia.
	26) Food Stamp Employment and Training Allocation (FSET) a) <i>FSET - 100% Federal funds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's Intake & Continuing Food Stamp caseload for prior CY. The 100% funds exclude the holdback for State operations and workers compensation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 296 - Intake and continuing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local assistance costs identified in the proposed FSET program State Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocations: Based upon proposed State Plan for FFY 2010 25% of FFY the SFY begins and 75% of FFY the SFY ends
	b) <i>FSET - Administrative Overmatch funds and Participant Reimbursement funds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amounts of administrative overmatch and participant reimbursement were based on plans submitted by each participating county. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local assistance costs identified in the proposed FSET program State Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocations: Based upon proposed State Plan for FFY 2010 25% of FFY the SFY begins and 75% of FFY the SFY ends

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
Medi-Cal Not updated from FY 10/11	27) Medi-Cal a) Staff Development and EDP Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHS collects data from counties annually through the "Medi-Cal County Administrative Budget Plan". The plan utilizes expenditures data from 07/08 County Administrative Claim in conjunction with MEDS eligibility data for the same period to establish ratios of eligible to workers to establish a productivity standard. The productivity standard is used as a guideline to determine staffing levels. Productivity standards are recalculated each year. All calculations are then compared to the information submitted to the State by Counties via the Medi-Cal Admin Budget Worksheet as a reasonability test. These cases are developed using past CEC information. DHS uses the past CEC claims for most expenditure data. They analyze the Medi-Cal expenditure trend information from the last 6 quarters as well as the information from the most recent 2 quarters, September and December <i>Note: Normally Staff Development Costs are not funded below the level received in the prior year.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data - Expenditures Meds eligible CNI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Actual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	b) Line Staff Salary and Benefit Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Staff Salary Costs (Salary and Benefits), DHS uses the higher of the average monthly compensation as reported on the Medi-Cal Admin Budget worksheet or what was approved in the County's prior year allocation times CNI. Current year CNI was 3.75%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	C) Number of Line FTE's (Line Workers and Supervisors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To determine the number of FTE's Medi-Cal will fund, DHS analyzes the County's previous 18 month average eligible's data compared to the previous 6 month average eligible's data. The months would be the most recent months with statistically reliable data, so in March it would be July-December. This caseload data is then computed to FTE's based on the individual County's performance standards distributed in the Medi-Cal Admin Budget Worksheet. Adjustments to this calculation may be made based on further explanation/justifications received as part of the Medi-Cal Admin Budget Worksheet. 	•	•	•
	d) Clerical FTE's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To determine the number of Clerical FTE's that will be funded, DHS compares what is asked for to a standard assumption that Counties should have not more than one clerical staff to every 4 EW's. This is as a rough estimate; counties have the ability to request more and make their "compelling argument". 	•	•	•
	e) Administrative FTE's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To determine the number of Clerical FTE's that will be funded, DHS compares what is asked for to a standard assumption that Counties should have not more than one clerical staff to every 6 EW's. This is as a rough estimate; counties have the ability to request more and make their "compelling argument". 	•	•	•
	f) Clerical and Administrative Salary and Benefit Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Staff Salary Costs (Salary and Benefits), DHS uses the higher of the average monthly compensation as reported on the Medi-Cal Admin Budget worksheet or what was approved in the County's prior year allocation times CNI. Current year CNI was 3.75% 	•	•	•

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	g) Allocated Operating Support Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These cases are developed using past CEC information. DHS uses the past CEC claims for most expenditure data. They analyze the Medi-Cal expenditure trend information from the last 6 quarters as well as the information from the most recent 2 quarters 	•	•	•
	h) Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System (MEDS) security agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small counties received \$45,100 based on the average developed from a 19-county DHCS survey. Medium/Large counties received \$831,000 based on the average developed from a 19-county DHCS survey. LA received \$1 million Counties that submitted a detailed estimate for the survey were adjusted to receive priority for the amount estimated if higher than the average. Remaining funds were allocated with one pool of funds for the Twenty Small Counties and one for the remaining medium and large-sized counties. Those counties which were unable to provide information as part of the original process were advised they would probably not have their requests met in total for the FY 2008-09 allocation, but that they would then be given priority in FY 2009-10, the second year of the project. 	•	•	•
	i) DRA Citizenship Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> %-to-total of the base. 	•	•	•
			•	•	•

