

ALLOCATION MATRIX FY 08/09

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
Children Services	1) Foster Parent Training and Recruitment CFL 08/09-16	<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. No county receives less than prior year allocation. Data Collection Period: Calendar Year 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusted for Title IV-E waiver counties issued separately. 	Calendar Year 2007
	2) Independent Living Program CFL -08/09-03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation is based on one quarter of the revised FFY 06 allocation plus three quarters of the estimated FFY 2007 grant less funding for State operations. \$40,000 minimum floor remains unchanged. 	<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 08-62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing counties received 98.8 percent of their 2007/2008 allocation amount to allow for inclusion of new counties this fiscal year. New counties received 50 percent of their requested allocation amount for FY 2008/09. <p>Please Note: The total allocation amount does not fully fund the number of beds approved for FY 2008/2009. Start-Up Costs because of the rapid growth in THP-Plus, counties were given a start-up allocation in FY 2007/08. This fiscal year counties will not receive a separate allocation for start-up costs. However, counties may use their THP-Plus funds to cover these costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 46 counties participating in THP-Plus for FY 2008/2009. Number of beds for continuing counties remained at the FY 2007/2008 amount (see ACL 07-38, dated October 18, 2007). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of approved beds by each counties approved rate 	

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>4) Supportive and Therapeutic Program (STOP)</p> <p>CFL 08/09-27</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 2007/08 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"> Calendar years 2005-2007 FY 2007/08
	<p>5) State Family Preservation Permanent Transfer</p> <p>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</p> <p>CFL 08/09-13</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 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)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	<p>7) Community Care Licensing For Foster Family Homes and Day Care Homes</p> <p>CFL 08/09-22</p> <p>Greshner v. Anderson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The funds have been distributed using each county average monthly FFH caseload (calendar year), and divided by workload standard of 257 facilities per month per full-time equivalent (FTE). This resulted in the number of justified staff required to license this category of facility. A worker to supervisor ratio of 6.35:1 was then applied. The total FTE is multiplied by the individual county's actual FFH unit cost. FFH recruitment is based on each counties average monthly case in FR and PP for most recent calendar year for children under 18 using data from US Census Bureau. Funds were allocated on a percent to total basis according to FFH caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caseload from LIC 181 CEC (Unit Cost Calculation) Recruitment - FR/PP data from CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The estimate is developed by determining the number of FTE's based on an updated FY 07-08 average caseload of 7,436. Estimate is derived from FTEs multiplied by the FY 02/03 average statewide unit cost of \$125,663. The total State estimate includes an additional \$877,764 (the 05/06 funding level) for recruitment only. Then, an additional \$3,632,926 in federal spending authority is added to the estimate. The additional fed authority is based on a 3-year average of actual expenditures. Based on actual expenditure data from FY 05/06, the sharing ratio is 41.3% federal and 58.7% State GF for FY 07/08.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar year 2007
	<p>8) Group Home Monthly Visits</p> <p>CFL 08/09-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The in-state portion of the allocation is distributed based on 50% of actual expenditures for most recent 4 quarters. 50% is distributed based on supervised group home placements. The out-of-state portion of the allocation is distributed based on each county's percent to the statewide total of out of state placements extracted from CWS/CMS. 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 07/08 base amounts for IVE waiver counties are \$4.0M federal and \$11.9M general fund. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% - June 2007 - March 2008 50% - Calendar year 2007

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>9) CHILD WELFARE SERVICES (CWS)</p> <p>a) <i>CWS Basic Calculation</i></p> <p>CFL 08/09-31</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 	<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"> 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. Group home placements are excluded. 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"> The estimate equals 5% of the Foster Family Home budgeted GF expenditures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar year 2007
	c) <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. This component assumes that a percentage of minor parents (mostly those under 17 years of age) will be allowed to form their own assistance unit. Minimum of \$658 for MPI and \$2,858 for MPS Cases are converted to dollars using the formula of 4 hours of investigation plus 1 hour of travel times the CWS unit cost. 	<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 2007

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

	d) <i>CWS/CMS System Support Staff</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The base amount estimate was based on FY 2007-08 Appropriation. The allocation was distributed based on a percent to statewide total of FY 2007-08 SSS expenditures coded to PC 536 in the CEC 	<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 2007-08
	e) <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 % to the statewide total of the number of User ID's in each county as of June 2008. 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"> Data as of June 2008
	f) <i>LiveScan and Background Checks</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocated based upon a percentage 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"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2007

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

	<i>g) 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"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2007
	<i>h) Multiple Relative Home Approvals & Grievance Review for Relative Home Approvals</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based upon a statewide % 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 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"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2007
	<i>i) County Self-Assessment & System Improvement Plan (SIP)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These funds were distributed based on methodology from CWDA. The funds were distributed using the county's average cost of a social worker (see "c"), and allocating a 1/4 FTE to the small and very small counties, 1/2 of an FTE to medium counties, and one FTE to large counties. A % to total cost of each county's total cost of the allocated FTEs was used to allocate the \$10.1 million. 	<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
	<i>j) Data Requirement for New Activities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The funds were distributed using each county's Family Maintenance, Family Reunification and Permanent Placement caseloads, calculating a cost per hours 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 2007-08
	<i>k) Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating counties each received \$5,000 for social worker travel cost and \$3,000 for probation officer travel cost. The remaining allocation was based on % to total of their budgeted FY 2008-09 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

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

	l) <i>AB 408 Child Relationships</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These funds are distributed based on a percent to total of each county's avg. monthly caseload of children in FC aged 10 years and older in a group Home more than 6 months. There is a minimum floor of \$5,000 in total funds per 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 2007
	m) <i>Improving Adoptions Outcomes Savings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Savings were distributed based on a percent to statewide allocation total to those counties that received a FY 08-09 Adoptions Basic Allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 08-09 Adoptions Basic Allocation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Allocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	n) <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. Allocation adjusted to ensure a minimum floor of \$150. (SW cost per hour @ \$72.60 x 2 hours rounded up) 	<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 2007
	o) <i>Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Savings were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each County's Kin-GAP avg. monthly 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 2007
	p) <i>Caregiver Court Filing - SB -1667</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were calculated by using 1/10 of the counties' Foster Family and Relative Home caseloads multiplied by 1/4 of the avg. SW cost per hour, and then multiplied by 2 hearing per year. Funds were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each County's average Foster Family 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 2007/08

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
				ESTIMATES		
	q) <i>Criminal Record Check for Family Reunification - AB1774</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were calculated by multiplying the Family Reunification caseload by the cost of criminal records check (\$32 DOJ background check + \$16 DOJ application fee + \$24 FBI background check). Funds were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each County's average 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"> FY 2007/08 	
	r) <i>Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of the Foster Care Act of 2006</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were calculated by using the out-of-state caseload multiplied by 15.5 hours per case and then multiplied by avg. SW cost per hour. Funds were distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each County's average monthly out-of-state 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 2007/08 	
	s) <i>Statewide Standardized Training</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed on a percent to total of each county's budgeted FTE's multiplied by the county specific unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
	t) <i>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"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2007/08 	
	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"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2007 	
	v) <i>PAARP Savings (Providing Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Savings distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average PP (Permanent Placement) caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2007 	

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S)	
				ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	w) <i>AB 1331 Foster Care SSI/SSP Application</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's out-of-home placement caseload. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2007/08
	x) <i>AB 1512 Health Benefit Determination</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"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2007/08
	y) <i>AB 2985 Foster Youth Identity Theft</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's New/Existing children age 16+ in Foster Care. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWS/CMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calendar Year 2007
	10) Augmentation to Child Welfare Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation was based on prior year appropriation adjusted by GF availability. Distributed based on a percent to total of each county's "Budgeted FTE's" as displayed on Attachment II of CFL, with a minimum floor of \$100,000 in total funds. 	<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
	11) 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 a percent to total of each county's "Budgeted FTE's" as displayed on Attch. II of CFL, with a minimum floor of \$100,000 in total funds. 	<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

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

	12) CWSOIP/11 County Pilot	<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 FYs 2006-07 and 2007-08. One hundred percent of each county's FY 2008-09 CWSOIP allocation is held at the same level as in FY 2007-08. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 		
	13) Emancipated Youth Stipends CFL-08/09-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% 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 years. 50% distributed based on a percent to statewide total of each county's FY 2007/08 expenditures up to each county's allocation, excluding overmatch. \$1,000 minimum floor. 	<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"> Calendar Years 2004-2007 FY 2007-08
	14) Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (KIN-GAP) Program CFL 08/09-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% Kin-Gap caseload as reported on the CA 800 claim. 50% is actual expenditures for the same time period reported in the CEC. \$1,000 minimum floor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 800 KG 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"> Prior Calendar Year

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
15)	FOSTER CARE CFL 08/09-15 &15E a) <i>Foster Care Admin (Basic)</i>	<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year
	b) <i>AAP</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AAP funds are allocated using each county's percent to total average monthly caseload form the most recent 12 months. (4/06-3/07) 	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year
	c) <i>FC Staff Development</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FC Staff Development allocation is calculated by multiplying each county average percent to the 4 most recent quarters Foster Care expenditures and average FTE eligibility workers for the same time period. 	<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"> Most recent 4 quarters
	d) <i>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. Expenditures exceeding the TANF 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
	e) <i>FC SSI?SSP Application</i>	<p>The distribution was based on the percent to statewide total of each county's average monthly caseload of Out of Home placement for kids 16 $\frac{1}{2}$ and older from the most recent 12 months (6/07-5/08), as provided by the Child Welfare Data Analysis Bureau.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child Welfare Data Analysis Bureau 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most recent 12 months (6/07-5/08)

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	f) <i>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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CA 237 - FC, Part B, Line 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The estimate assumes a 20 percent reduction in continuing caseload eligibility costs as a result of reducing the re-determination requirement from every 6 months to every 12 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year
	g) Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments (PAARP)	<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 (6/07-5/08), 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"> Most recent 12 months (6/07-5/08)
	h) <i>Improving Adoption Outcomes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative premise associated with increase in foster care exits. Savings are distributed to the counties that receive Adoptions program funding, based on each county's percent to total of the Adoptions allocation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculated by multiplying the average cost per case by case by projected case months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	i) <i>Legacy Savings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative premise those certain counties will realize following conversion from out-dated legacy systems to new automated systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each county's most recent annualized Legacy Systems costs for fiscal year 04-05. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None
	j) KIN-GAP Program Savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The distribution is based on a percent to total of each county's actual Kin-GAP caseload. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligibility worker savings of \$57.12 per case per month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the FC program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Calendar Year
	16) Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds Program CFL 08/09-06	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 500+ \$46,750 b. 100 to 499 \$16,000 c. Less than 100 \$5,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 2008 CWS/CMS Placement Data - Most Current Month Available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$1 million State GF plus Federal draw. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 2008

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	
	17) Promoting Federal Family Preservation and Support Program (PSSF) CFL 08/09-04	<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"> Prior Calendar Year
	18) Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Program (CAPIT) CFL 08/09-07	<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 for the next three FYs (FY 2009-10 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"> None

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
Adults	<p>19) In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) CFL 08/09-23</p> <p>a) Quality Assurance (QA)</p> <p>b) Advisory Committee</p> <p>c) PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it was determined that the FY 2008-09 IHSS Basic allocation would be based on each county's FY 2007-08 IHSS Basic total funds allocation. Caseload Growth" includes SIP growth and is distributed 50% based on caseload (caseload X workload standard X 2001-02 unit cost) and 50% based on caseload growth (caseload growth X workload standard X 2001-02 unit cost). Each county's actual Title XIX usage rate was based on the most recent four quarters of expenditures. Minimum floor of \$1000. distributed as follows: \$4.8 million GF based on each county's proposed number of QA Social Workers multiplied by their FY 2001-02 Unit Cost and \$6.7 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. distributed to counties based on the percent to total of their average monthly paid cases and has been included in the total allocation. 	<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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cases multiplied by 11.5 hours divided by a workload standard of 1,778 hours = FTEs for each county Each county is allocated a minimum of a .5 FTE Social Worker. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2007-08

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES		DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
Self Sufficiency	20) Adult Protective Services (APS) CFL 08/09-21 County Services Block Grant (CSBG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology used to distribute the APS GF allocation of \$45,149,000 is as follows: • 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 \$9,843,000 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 2007. 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Allocation • Same as Allocation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most recent Census Data 7/1/2005 • March-07

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

	<p>21) CalWORKs Single Allocation:</p> <p>CFL 08/09-34</p> <p>a) <i>CW Eligibility & Employment Services Administrative Cost:</i></p> <p>i) Eligibility Basic Reduction</p> <p>ii) Employment Services Basic Reduction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended by CWDA, the base allocation was calculated using 100% of each county's FY 2007-08 Eligibility and Employment Services allocation. This "base" was compared against the corresponding components budgeted for FY 2008-09 to determine the funding "growth". The "growth" was calculated prior to the \$60 million base veto and allocated based on a percent-to-total of each county's combined FY 2007-08 Eligibility and Employment Services allocation adjusted to reflect restoration of the \$16 million Fraud Recovery Incentive reduction. Reflects a \$20.6 million reduction to the Single Allocation for FY 2008-09. The reduction was split into two components: \$8.1 million that represents 100% of each county's actual unspent Fraud Recovery and Performance incentive and \$12.5 million remaining reduction was distributed to all counties on a percent to total of each county's combined FY 2007-08 Eligibility and Employment services allocation and will be restored after the notification process required by the Budget Act has been completed. The \$60 million base veto distribution was calculated based on a percent-to-total of each county's combined FY 2007-08 Eligibility and Employment Services allocation adjusted to reflect restoration of the \$16 million Fraud Recovery Incentive reduction. 			
--	--	---	--	--	--

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

iii)

iv)

v)

-
-
-

--

--

--

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

	vi) Work Verification	•		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$11.1 million for additional county administration activities associated with increased documentation and verification requirements resulting from the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. Funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's combined FY 2007-08 Eligibility and Employment services allocation, adjusted to reflect restoration of the \$16 million Fraud Recovery Incentive reduction. 	
	vii) Estimate for the CW Eligibility Allocation:	.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate for the Eligibility Allocation was built based on the following premises: CalWORKs Administrative Costs - Basic, Caseload Adjustment, Staff Development, Restore CalWORKs Administrative Costs, Single Allocation Reduction, Safety Net Admin Costs, Be Vu vs. Mitchell, PA to NA Shift, Medi-Cal Services Eligibility, Administrative Cap Adjustment, Homeless Assistance, Minimum Wage Increase, County MOE Adjustment, and Prospective Budgeting 	
	viii) Estimate for the Employment Services Allocation:			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate for the WTW allocation was built based on the following premises: Employment Services Basic Costs, Staff Development, Recent Non-Citizens Cal Learn, Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts, Homeless Assistance, Safety Net Services, Emergency Freeze Response, and CalWORKs Resources, and \$60 Million Base Veto. 	

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	b) Eligibility Administration i) CalWORKs Eligibility Administrative Basic ii) 60-Month CalWORKs Time Limit Savings & Safety Net Costs iii) Staff Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate is based on calendar year 2006 expenditures. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01, CA 237 Line 8a <u>Net Time Limit Savings</u>: Net Time Limit caseload from WDTIP and Safety Net caseload from CA 237 multiplied by savings per case per year. <u>Safety Net Costs</u>: Total CalWORKs admin costs are multiplied by the ratio of SN cases to the total AF cases. CEC Data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation - most recent calendar year Most current available data Calendar year 2007
	iv) Public Assistance (PA) to Non-Assistance (NA) Shift v) Prospective Budgeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 PAFS to CalWORKs Caseload Ratio (DFA 256, Part A, Line 1A over CA 237, Part B, Line B) and multiplied by 50% to shift eligibility costs for FS to that allocation. 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. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 256, Part A, Line 1A CA 237, Part B, Line 8 CA 237 (Line 8a) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocations - most recent calendar year. Most current available data

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	vi) 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 eligibility costs, divide by 3. 1/3 of costs are transferred to DHS to be funded via Medi-Cal. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data - Program Code 615 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior Fiscal Year
	c) <i>WTW Employment Services</i> i) CalWORKs Employment Services Basic ii) Caseload Decline iii) Staff Development iv) Single Allocation Adjustment v) Welfare Reform/Work Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This premise reflects the services and administrative costs for the CalWORKs Services Basic Program. This premise reflects costs associated with the Welfare Reform Proposal, which includes increased work requirements for participants. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01 adjusted for caseload changes WTW 25 and 25a, total of item 30, 31, and 32 (monthly average) CEC Data Fixed Amount Q5 Data and WTW 25/25a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base Year 2000/01 Most recent 4 quarters Most Recent 4 Quarters Most Recent FY

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S)	
				ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	vi) 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. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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.
	d) Cal-Learn	<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. 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, Sum of line 3, line 8a, and line 8b 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stat 45, Sum of line 3, line 10a and b, line 11, line 13 and line 14. CEC Expenditure Codes - 26,27,28,432,617,630,640,641,649 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recent Calendar Year

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

	<p>e) <i>CalWORKs Child Care</i></p> <p>i) Stage One Child Care Allocation</p> <p>ii) Hold Harmless Adjustment</p> <p>iii) Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts</p> <p>iv) Safety Net Costs</p> <p>v) Child Care Health and Safety Requirements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute BASIC amount (\$575.5 million) on a percent-to-total basis using each county's 2007-08 Child Care expenditures. Expenditures shall include Child Care expenditures claimed to Child Care Capacity Building (PIN 906). (Program codes 036, 053, 054, 453, 688, 692, 811, 900, 903, 906, 909, 912); adjustments made to ensure a floor of \$25,000. At the request of CWDA, the methodology used to distribute funds for Child Care includes a hold harmless adjustment based on the FY 2007-08 total CalWORKs Single Allocation (inclusive of rollover funds) or FY 2007-08 expenditures, whichever is less. The hold harmless adjustment was \$5.6 million. The hold harmless adjustment was based on the total shortfall of 14 counties falling below the hold harmless base of either the FY 2007-08 total CalWORKs Single Allocation (inclusive of rollover funds) or FY 2007-08 expenditures (less rollover funds), whichever is less. The \$5.6 million hold harmless adjustment was funded by reducing all 58 counties based on the percent-to-total of each county's FY 2008-09 Stage One Child Care Services allocation. Funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's child care expenditures for the most recent FY. The costs were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's estimated number of cases that will reach the 60-month time limit. Data used in this methodology was obtained from MEDS. Funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's most recent FY expenditures for Self-Certification and Trustline. An adjustment was made to ensure that each county receives a minimum allocation of \$2,000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Data - (PC 036, 053, 054, 453, 811, 900, 903, 906, 909, 912) Medical-Cal Eligibility Data System CEC Data - (PC 901 & 902) 	<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) Applications provided by CCL and DOJ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most recent 4 quarters. FY 2007-08 FY 2007-08. FY 2007-08
--	---	--	--	---	--

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	22) Substance Abuse & Mental Health Allocation CFL 08/09-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fifty percent of each program's funds were distributed based on a Substance Abuse and Mental Health percent to total of each county's average monthly caseload for calendar year 2007, as reported on the CalWORKs Cash Grant Caseload Movement Report (CA 237 CW); and; The remaining fifty percent of each program's funds were distributed based on a Substance Abuse and Mental Health percent to total of each county's FY 2007-08 expenditures for MH and SA as reported on the County Expense Claim. Only expenditures up to each county's FY 2007-08 allocations were used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caseload Data--CY 2006 CA 237 CW, Part B, Line 8 CEC Data (Combined Expenditures) - MH (PC 625) and SA (PC628) - Jun 06-Mar 07 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WTW 25/25A Lines 27 and Line 28 CEC Codes 628 & 625 	
	23) (SB) 1569 Aid and services for noncitizen victims of Human Trafficking , Domestic Violence, and other serious crimes CFL 08/09-32	<p>Allocation has two categories and counties have flexibility to spend across program areas and activities if needed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SERVICES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CalWORKs Services - \$548,000 GF allocated to CalWORKs Services. Funds were distributed on a percent to statewide total. CalWORKs Child Care- \$2,129,000 GF allocated to CalWORKs Child Care. Funds were distributed on a percent to statewide total. Trafficking and Crime Victims Assistance Program (TCVAP) -\$370,000 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. ADMINISTRATION: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$64 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"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 2008.

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	24) Non-Assistance Food Stamp Admin Allocation (NAFS) a) <i>NAFS Administrative Basic</i> <i>CFL 08/09-25</i>	<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 are distributed based on percent-to-total caseload growth 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCAB 2000/01 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY 2007-08
	b) <i>Public Assistance (PA) to Non-Assistance (NA) Shift</i> NOTE: The Methodology used by Allocations does not follow the methodology used to develop the Statewide Budget.	<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 PAFS 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 FS to this allocation. In addition to this amount 1/3 of initial eligibility costs are shifted to Food Stamps 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. The Allocations Division calculates each Counties prior year PAFS/CalWORKs Caseload Ratio and applies this amount to each Counties Total Eligibility Allocation. A percent to total ratio is developed using these County specific amounts. This ratio is applied to the total amount estimated for allocation purposes. The amount of this shift is allocated 50% Federal, 35% State and 15% County. Only the State Share is allocated. 	<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 NAFS 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 PAFS caseload: CA 237, Part B, Line 8, DFA 256, Part A, Cells (1), (2), (9), (10). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimates: FY 2006/07 Case Data Allocation: FY 2006/07 Case Data

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	DATA SOURCE(S)		
			ALLOCATIONS	ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	c) <i>NAFS - Prospective Budgeting</i>	<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 NAFS 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 on full FY 06/07 and 07/08 (includes data available at May revise)
	d) <i>NAFS - California Food Assistance Program (CFAP)</i> For eligible noncitizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds were distributed based on a percent to total of each county's average monthly NAFS 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 NAFS caseload: DFA 256, Par A, Cells (3), (6), (10),(12), (13) & (14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10/06-1/07
	e) <i>NAFS - 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
	f) <i>NAFS - 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 Food Stamp Program. Funds were distributed based on a % to total of each county's average monthly NAFS 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
	25) 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 include the usual holdback for State Operations and Workers Comp. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFA 296 - Intake and continuing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved 5 year FSET Program State Plan, which covers 2002 through 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25% of FFY the SFY begins and 75% of FFY the SFY ends

ALLOCATION CATEGORIES	SPECIFIC ALLOCATION	METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATION	ALLOCATIONS	DATA SOURCE(S) ESTIMATES	DATA COLLECTION PERIODS
	<p>b) <i>FSET - Administrative Overmatch funds and Participant Reimbursement funds</i></p>	<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"> Approved 5 year FSET Program State Plan, which covers 2002 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocations: Based upon State Plan 25% of FFY the SFY begins and 75% of FFY the SFY ends
	<p>26) Medi-Cal</p> <p>a) Staff Development and EDP Costs</p>	<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 eligibles 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 eligibles CNI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CEC Actuals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most recent 6 quarters

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

	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%. 	•	•	•
	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". 	•	•	•

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

