Social Service Financing

• The CEC is the main document the state uses to authorize federal and state funds be paid to counties (Admin programs)

• Funding is to reimburse Counties for Costs Paid (Cash Basis)

• Advances are based on estimates made by the state, usually based on past history of spending.
Social Services financing is regulated by many agencies and regulations

- County Welfare Department Cost Allocation Plan
- OMB A-87 “Cost Principles for State, Local & Indian Tribal Governments”
- CFL’s and ACL’s
Fiscal Regulations

OMB A-87

Time Study

County Expense Claim

CWD CAP

Claim Instructions (CFLs)
OMB A-87

• Federal Provisions that outline principles in determining allowable costs.
  • Costs Required to Operate a Program
  • Fixed Assets
  • Space
  • Debt Expenses
  • Employee Morale Expenditures
What is a Cost Allocation Plan?

- A description of the procedures that are used in identifying, measuring and allocating costs incurred in support of all programs administered or supervised by the Department.

- Includes guidance for charging both labor and non labor costs
Why is the Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) Necessary?

• The Federal Government requires the use of a CAP to satisfy federal reporting and funding requirements.

• Costs not claimed in accordance with the approved CAP will be disallowed by the Federal government.

• Provides expenditure data for efficient welfare operation management.
CWD Statewide CAP

• Non Labor Costs
  • Client Services
  • Overhead –Direct Charge
  • Overhead –Spread
  • Start Up Costs
  • Fixed Assets
Overhead – Spread Costs

• **Support operating costs which:**
  
  • Typically have a department wide benefit to all programs, or
  
  • Cannot be direct charged to a function and/or program,
  
  • Will be distributed to the functions based on a ratio of total caseworker time study results.
Overhead Costs – Direct Charge

• County’s can also elect to directly charge to specific programs if:
  • A formal election is made with the State
  • County can identify and compile related costs.
  • Can apply methodology consistently across programs for specific type of expenditure
Start-Up and One time Only Costs

• Start-up/nonrecurring costs are one-time only costs incurred as a result of major program change, an expansion of an existing program or a major agency or when a county receives an augmentation or one-time receipt of new funds for a program.

• These costs can be direct charged to benefitting programs.
Fixed Assets

• Fixed assets must be depreciated and claimed over their useful life.
  • Furniture and Fixtures > $25k
  • EDP Hardware and Software >$5k
Importance of Time Studies and Costs Shifts

• Time Studies are the basis for:
  • Allocating Salary Costs to benefiting programs
  • Allocating Overhead based on the Spread Methodology
Importance of Time Studies and Costs Shifts

- Managing and Fully Staffing Programs can Save County Funds
  - Understand time study instructions so to Maximize funding while being in compliance
  - Use Health Related codes whenever valid
  - Reviewing and adjusting your SSTRP can increase flexibility in allocating costs
Importance of Time Studies and Costs Shifts

• Fully Staff Programs that have no County and Adequate Funding
## Overhead Cost Spread $2,000,000.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE's/Hours</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Overhead Cost Allocation</th>
<th>County Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalWorks</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.258065</td>
<td>$516,129.03</td>
<td>MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalFresh</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.154839</td>
<td>$309,677.42</td>
<td>MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>0.412903</td>
<td>$825,806.45</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Relief</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.045161</td>
<td>$90,322.58</td>
<td>$90,322.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.103226</td>
<td>$206,451.61</td>
<td>$30,967.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.025806</td>
<td>$51,612.90</td>
<td>MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3875</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>$121,290.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Generic Cost Spread  $2,000,000.00

### Increase Staffing in Medi-Cal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE's/Hours</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Overhead</th>
<th>County Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalWorks</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.233918</td>
<td>$467,836.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalFresh</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.140351</td>
<td>$280,701.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.467836</td>
<td>$935,672.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Relief</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.040936</td>
<td>$81,871.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.093567</td>
<td>$187,134.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.023392</td>
<td>$46,783.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4275 | 100% | $2,000,000.00 | $109,941.52 |

### Decrease Staffing in Medi-Cal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE's/Hours</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Overhead</th>
<th>County Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalWorks</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.272109</td>
<td>$544,217.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalFresh</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.163265</td>
<td>$326,530.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0.380952</td>
<td>$761,904.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Relief</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.047619</td>
<td>$95,238.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.108844</td>
<td>$217,687.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.027211</td>
<td>$54,421.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3675 | 100% | $2,000,000.00 | $127,891.16 |
SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING
Funding Components

• Federal Participation
• State Participation
• County Participation
• Realignment
Federal Funding

- The majority of our funding begins at the federal level.

- Federal program regulations describe the funding parameters that are to be used for each federal funding source.

- Federal fiscal year is October 1-Sept 30
State General Funding

- The State budget delineates how much State General funds will be available
  - State General Fund is used to draw down Federal dollars
  - There are also State only programs.
- State fiscal year is July 1- June 30
- Allocations letters delineates how much each County will receive.
Basics of Allocations

Assistance

• State and Federal funding for CalWORKs assistance costs are considered Entitlement programs (open ended) and not allocated to counties

• Foster Care and Adoptions Assistance programs are funded with Federal funds and 2011 Realignment

• IHSS is funded through Title XIX and moved to the new MOE model, making the State share vary
Basics of Allocations

Administration

• Allocations are made to the administrative side of the house with capped State funding streams.

• Allocations are reimbursed by the expenditures through CEC.

• Allocations are not controlled at the detail level.

• Allocations are only good for one fiscal year! **Use it or lose it.**
Each Allocation uses a different methodology/ies to develop County Specific Amounts

Usually outlined in Allocation Letter

Outlined in Annual Allocation Matrix developed by the CWDA FAAD’s workgroup

Explained in other CWDA publications.
1991 REALIGNMENT
There are two dedicated revenue sources to fund the programs:

- A one-half cent increase in the State sales tax
- An increase in vehicle license fees
1991 REALIGNMENT STRUCTURE - STATE

SALES TAX DISTRIBUTIONS

Sales Tax
Source: ½ cent Sales Tax

Sales Tax Base Account

- Mental Health Subaccount
  ($1.12 billion base funding from 2011 Realignment)

- Social Services Subaccount

Health Subaccount

- County Allocations

- Family Support Subaccount
  ($300 M in 2013-14)

CMSP Subaccount (Base Account)

- CMSP Growth Subaccount
  (1st call on Growth)

- Caseload Subaccount
  (2nd call on Growth; 4.027% plus 4.027% of caseload growth paid if over $20M)

Child Poverty and Family Supplemental Support Subaccount (Base is $0 in 2013-14)

General Growth (remaining Growth)

- Child Poverty & Family Supplemental Support

Sales Tax Growth Account
(Revenues in Excess of Base Payments)

Mental Health (approx. 40%)

Health (approx. 18.45%)

County Allocations

CalWORKs MOE b
(capped at $1.12 billion)

VLF/ST. Mental Health account is now funded with 2011 Realignment Revenues

If CalWORKs MOE has reached cap, funds in excess go to Mental Health
1991 REALIGNMENT STRUCTURE - STATE

VEHICLE LICENSE FEE DISTRIBUTIONS

Vehicle License Fee
Source: 74.9% Vehicle License Fees

VLF Base Account

Mental Health Subaccount a
($1.12 billion base funding from 2011 Realignment)

Social Services Subaccount

Health Subaccount

CMSP Subaccount (Base Account)

CMSP Growth Subaccount (2nd call on Growth; 4.027% plus 4.027% of caseload growth paid if over $20M)

Child Poverty and Family Supplemental Support Subaccount (Base is $0 in 2013-14)

County Allocations

CMSP (County Shares)

VLF Growth Account
(Revenues in Excess of Base Payments)

General Growth (remaining Growth)

a) Now goes to CalWORKs MOE, capped at a total $1.12 B combined VLF/ST. Mental Health account is now funded with 2011 Realignment Revenues

b) If CalWORKs MOE has reached cap, funds in excess go to Mental Health

Mental Health (approx. 40%)

Health (approx. 18.45%)

Child Poverty & Family Supplemental Support (remaining growth)
1991 Realignment Programs

- AB 8 County Health Services
- Local Health Services
- California Children’s Services
- Indigent Health
- CalWORKs
- Employment Services
- County Services Block Grant
- IHSS
- Foster Care
- CWS
- Adoptions
- County Stabilization Subvention
- County Juvenile Justice Subvention (AB90)
- Mental Health
- EPSDT
- Managed Care
### 1991 Realignment Program Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs Aid Payments</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs Eligibility</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare Services</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptions Assistance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs Employment Services</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Home Supportive Services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Services Block Grant</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30% total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Children’s Services</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50% total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CalWorks MOE Realignment

- AB 118 and ABX116

- The intent of this legislation is to limit the county’s share of cost to the amount of funds received in its CalWORKs MOE Subaccount.

- AB 85 will change the State share of MOE.
1991 REALIGNMENT STRUCTURE - STATE
SALES TAX DISTRIBUTIONS

Sales Tax
Source: ½ cent Sales Tax

Sales Tax Growth Account
(Revenues in Excess of Base Payments)

CMSP Growth
(2nd call on Growth; 4.027% plus 4.027% of caseload growth paid if over $20M)

General Growth
(remaining Growth)

Mental Health
(approx. 40%)

Health
(approx. 52%)

Social Services
(approx. 8%)

Post AB-85

Caseload Subaccount
(1st call on Growth)

CMSP Growth
(2nd call on Growth; 4.027% plus 4.027% of caseload growth paid if over $20M)

General Growth
(remaining Growth)

Mental Health
(approx. 40%)

Health
(approx. 18.45%)

Child Poverty & Family Supplemental Support
(remaining growth)
1991 REALIGNMENT STRUCTURE - STATE

VEHICLE LICENSE FEE DISTRIBUTIONS

Vehicle License Fee
Source: 74.9% Vehicle License Fees

VLF Growth Account
(Revenues in Excess of Base Payments)

CMSP Growth
(2nd call on Growth; 4.027% plus 4.027% of caseload growth paid if over $20M)

General Growth
(remaining Growth)

Mental Health
(approx. 40%)

Health
(approx. 52%)

Social Services
(approx. 8%)

VLF Growth Account
(Revenues in Excess of Base Payments)

CMSP Growth
(2nd call on Growth; 4.027% plus 4.027% of caseload growth paid if over $20M)

General Growth
(remaining Growth)

Mental Health
(approx. 40%)

Health
(approx. 18.45%)

Child Poverty & Family Supplemental Support
(remaining growth)
Flow of 1991 Realignment - Theory and Reality

“1991 Realignment Social Services (Sales Tax and VLF) – Full Funding Assertion”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1991 REALIGNMENT (SALES TAX AND VLF)</th>
<th>FULL FUNDING ASSERTION</th>
<th>8/22/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### IN THEORY
- Each year, the State Controller’s Office (SCO) publishes a base amount of realignment (equivalent to its prior year amount of realignment), plus growth for caseload, and possibly "general growth."
- The base amount plus the growth amount becomes the next year’s "base amount."
- These funds flow annually and are available to cover the county share of the 1991 Social Services Realignment programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>FY 06/07</th>
<th>FY 07/08</th>
<th>FY 08/09</th>
<th>FY 09/10</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
<th>FY 11/12</th>
<th>FY 12/13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1,638,646,354</td>
<td>1,732,860,104</td>
<td>1,838,249,556</td>
<td>1,943,222,110</td>
<td>1,987,394,879</td>
<td>1,987,481,703</td>
<td>2,021,120,258</td>
<td>13,148,974,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth (caseload)**</td>
<td>91,543,337</td>
<td>105,389,452</td>
<td>104,972,554</td>
<td>44,172,769</td>
<td>86,824</td>
<td>33,638,535</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>379,803,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth (general)</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The "base" amount in FY 06/07 ($1.6 billion) is the actual base amount for COSD from SCO website.
**Note: These are the actual statewide caseload growth amounts, per CDSS and SCO.

### IN REALITY
- The flow of realignment revenue (sales tax and VLF) is based on the economy and not tied directly to costs.
- Realignment has not worked over the past years and has forced counties to manage resources available.
- The data demonstrates that it can take over five years to receive owed caseload growth.
- Even when caseload growth is paid, there is no "re-payment" for the years it was owed but not paid.
- The FY 12/13 base amount is still less than the FY 06/07 Realignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>FY 06/07</th>
<th>FY 07/08</th>
<th>FY 08/09</th>
<th>FY 09/10</th>
<th>FY 10/11*</th>
<th>FY 11/12**</th>
<th>FY 12/13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1,638,646,354</td>
<td>1,629,011,635</td>
<td>1,420,042,920</td>
<td>1,365,852,335</td>
<td>1,365,852,335</td>
<td>1,475,796,532</td>
<td>1,724,575,703</td>
<td>10,619,771,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth for 06/07</td>
<td>17,138,152</td>
<td>39,480,983</td>
<td>91,543,337</td>
<td>65,908,469</td>
<td>65,908,469</td>
<td>91,543,337</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>260,985,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth for 07/08</td>
<td>39,480,983</td>
<td>104,972,554</td>
<td>105,389,452</td>
<td>104,972,554</td>
<td>104,972,554</td>
<td>105,389,452</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>314,828,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth for 08/09</td>
<td>104,972,554</td>
<td>44,172,769</td>
<td>44,172,769</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>44,172,769</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>44,172,769</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth for 09/10</td>
<td>44,172,769</td>
<td>86,824</td>
<td>86,824</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>86,824</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>86,824</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth for 10/11</td>
<td>86,824</td>
<td>33,638,535</td>
<td>33,638,535</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>33,638,535</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>33,638,535</td>
<td>pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth (general)</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
<td>2,670,413*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base compared to 06/07:
- (29,443,284.99) (238,411,999.60) (292,602,584.32) (178,715,416.61) pending $11,002,251,717

*The growth payments listed as received for FY 10/11, were actually paid Sept 27, 2011 (in FY 11/12)
**The growth payments listed as received for FY 11/12, were actually paid 10/18/2012 (FY 12/13)

### VARIANCE BETWEEN THEORY AND REALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>FY 06/07</th>
<th>FY 07/08</th>
<th>FY 08/09</th>
<th>FY 09/10</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
<th>FY 11/12</th>
<th>FY 12/13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base loss/gain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(103,848,470)</td>
<td>(418,206,636)</td>
<td>(577,369,775)</td>
<td>(621,542,544)</td>
<td>(513,685,172)</td>
<td>(296,544,556)</td>
<td>(2,529,197,153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>(74,405,185)</td>
<td>(405,389,452)</td>
<td>(104,972,554)</td>
<td>(44,172,769)</td>
<td>(113,799,344)</td>
<td>(101,415,237)</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>(33,725,379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>(74,405,185)</td>
<td>(209,237,922)</td>
<td>(523,179,190)</td>
<td>(621,542,544)</td>
<td>(507,743,200)</td>
<td>pending</td>
<td>(330,269,934)</td>
<td>(2,562,922,531)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2011 REALIGNMENT
2011 Realignment

- Instead of State General fund allocations, Counties will receive a % of 2011 realignment funding.

- Increased risk to Counties if sales tax and VLF do not materialize
Local Revenue Fund 2011
State Structure for FY 2012-13

Local Revenue Fund 2011
$5,889,795,000

Mental Health Account
(1991 Mental Health Responsibilities)
$1,120,551,024
  - County Intervention Support Services Subaccount
  - Protective Services Subaccount (63% or up to capped allocation) $1,640,400,000
  - Behavioral Health Subaccount (37% or up to capped allocation) $964,500,000
    - Women and Children’s Residential Treatment Special Account (subset of BH Subaccount) $5,104,000

Support Services Account
$2,604,900,000
  - Trial Court Security Subaccount (34.2% or up to capped allocation) $496,429,000
  - Community Corrections Subaccount (58% or up to capped allocation) $842,900,000
  - Enhancing Law Enforcement Activities Subaccount $489,900,000
  - Enhancing Law Enforcement Activities Growth Special Account (Residual VLF revenue above the capped allocation) $0

Law Enforcement Services Account
$1,942,633,000
  - District Attorney and Public Defender Subaccount (1% or up to capped allocation) $14,600,000
  - Juvenile Justice Subaccount (6.8% or up to capped allocation) $98,804,000
    - Juvenile Reentry Grant Special Account $5,453,000
    - Youthful Offender Block Grant Special Account $93,351,000
  - Juvenile Justice Growth Special Account (10%) $7,759,884

Sales and use Tax Growth Account
(Excess revenues above base allocations)
$221,710,976
  - Law Enforcement Services Growth Subaccount (35%) $77,598,842
    - Trial Court Security Growth Special Account (10%) $7,759,884
    - Community Corrections Growth Special Account (75%) $58,199,131
      - Juvenile Justice Growth Special Account (10%) $7,759,884
        - District Attorney & Public Defender Growth Special Account (5%) $3,879,942
  - Support Services Growth Subaccount (65%) $144,112,134
    - Protective Services Growth Special Account (40% for CWS and 42% general) $118,215,184
  - Behavioral Health Services Growth Special Account (13%) $18,691,344
    - Mental Health Subaccount (5%) $7,205,607
State Structure for Support Services for FY 2012-13

Local Revenue Fund 2011
$5,889,795,000

Support Services Account
$2,604,900,000

- Protective Services Subaccount
  (63% or up to capped allocation)
  $1,640,400,000

- Behavioral Health Subaccount
  (37% or up to capped allocation)
  $964,500,000

  - Women and Children’s Residential Treatment Special Account
    (subset of BH Subaccount)
    $5,104,000

Sales and Use Tax Growth Account
(Excess revenues above base allocations)
$221,714,976

Support Services Growth Subaccount
(65%) $144,112,134

- Protective Services Growth Special Account
  (40% for CWS and 42% general)
  $118,215,184

- Behavioral Health Services Growth Special Account
  (13%) $18,691,344

- Mental Health Subaccount
  (5%) $7,205,607
County Local Revenue Fund 2011

Support Services Account

Support Services Reserve Subaccount
(Local option – subject to direction of BOS)

Protective Services Subaccount
Adoptions
Adult Protective Services
Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention & Treatment (CAPIT)
Child Welfare Services
Foster Care

Behavioral Health Subaccount
Drug Court
Drug Medi-Cal
Nondrug Medi-Cal
Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis & Treatment (EPSDT)
MH Managed Care

County Women and Children’s Residential Treatment Services Special Account

Ability to transfer up to 10% of the lesser subaccount between these Subaccounts
2011 Realignment Programs

- Foster Care
- CWS
- Adoptions
- Adult Protective Services
- Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention & Treatment (CAPIT)
- Women and Children’s Residential Treatment
- Drug Medical
- Nondrug Medical
- Drug Court
- Mental Health

- EPSDT
- Managed Care
- Law Enforcement
  - Trial Court Security
  - District Attorney and Public Defender
  - Juvenile Justice
  - Community Corrections
  - Local Public Safety Subventions
Impact of 2011 Realignment to 1991 Sharing Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare Services</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptions Assistance</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptions Eligibility</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Protective Services</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, &amp; Treatment (CAPIT)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERSECTION OF REALIGNMENT PROGRAMS
Intersection of Realignment Programs

1991 Realignment
- AB 8 County Health Services
- Local Health Services
- California Children’s Services
- Indigent Health
- CalWORKs
- Employment Services
- County Services Block Grant
- In-Home Supportive Services
- County Stabilization Subvention
- County Juvenile Justice Subvention (AB90)

2011 Realignment
- Adult Protective Services
- Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention & Treatment (CAPIT)
- Women and Children’s Residential Treatment
- Drug Medical
- Nondrug Medical
- Drug Court
- Law Enforcement
  - Trial Court Security
  - Juvenile Justice
  - District Attorney and Public Defender
  - Community Corrections
  - Local Public Safety Subventions

Shared
- Foster Care
- CWS
- Adoptions
- Mental Health
- EPSDT
- Managed Care
Things to Consider

• Several Years of Growth Adjustments
• $200 million - CWS
• CWS Augmentation
• Base Restoration
Opportunities & Possibilities

• LOOK FOR THE INTERSECTIONS

• LOOK AT CURRENT PROGRAMS

• Possibility?: SB-163 Wrap-Around Services

• Possibility?: Katie A.

• Possibility?: Preventative Services
Enhancing Program Resources to Benefit Service Outcomes
Enhancing Program Resources to Benefit Service Outcomes

CWDA - learn from each other about Creative Program Financing

- County Expense Claim (CEC)
- Braided Funding Partnerships
- Leveraging Public/Private Funds
- Realignment Funding

- Best Model = County’s unique needs
- Creative Financial Models can be shared, improved and changed to support individual County goals
Creative Financial Modeling - Process & Documentation

• Leadership Vision & Mission (why)
• Customer Needs (what)
• Service Design & Accounting Model (how)
  • Program Management; Fiscal Lead
  • Flow Chart Funding to Services
  • Braid Funds, Match Model or other
  • Cost Plan Documentation (contract, pin codes, payment methods, budget design, reporting, monitoring, audit plan)
• Outcomes Tracking & Reporting: Did we achieve a better service outcome? (What if?)
Opportunities within the County Expense Claim (CEC)

- Access to Open-ended Federal Funding
  - Health-Related Title XIX for CSBG, IHSS, CWS
  - Title IV-E for CWS, FC
  - Examples: Public Health Nurses and/or Mental Health Clinicians in Adult/Children’s Services

- Internal Braiding
  - SSI Advocacy supported by CSBG Health Related
  - Linkages supported by CWS and/or CalWORKs
**SSI Advocacy Model**

- **Vision/Mission:** Enhance access to health care. Reduce County General Fund Costs.

- **Customer Needs:** Many GA customers are disabled and eligible for SSI.

- **Service Design & Accounting Model:** GA Case Management time refocused to include SSI Advocacy. SSI advocacy time is eligible to CSBG code 114.

- **Outcomes:** Improved access to health care; SSI financial assistance is ongoing
  - FY 2011-2012 ROI is $1.63
  - FY 2012-2013 11% reduction in GA caseload
Vision/Mission: Linkages ensure the best services are provided to children and families.

Customer Needs: Support for residential and sober living environment services.

Service Design & Accounting Model: Close relationship between program and fiscal staff. Client lists reviewed by FSS for StanWORKs funds first. Coordinated Case Plan.

Outcomes: Necessary services are provided to the clients that need them at the lowest county cost producing maximum county cost avoidance.
- FY 2012-2013 reflects 32% utilization of StanWORKs funds for CWS “linked” cases
Braided Funding Partnerships

• Partnership to combine resources with other entities to serve a common customer population
• Contract/MOU based agreements
  • define the model
  • governance
  • resource contributions
  • Fiscal Lead
• Can include multiple public and/or private entities
• Example:
  • Differential Response with Children & Families Commission and local CBO Family Resource Centers
Differential Response

- **Vision/Mission:** Improved Safety Net for Children at risk of abuse and neglect in our community
- **Customer Needs:** Family Resource Centers to provide family support services at the community/neighborhood level.
  - A response to every Child Welfare referral to ensure children are safe (CWS) and families have access to services (FRC/CWS)
- **Service Design & Accounting Model:**
  - Stakeholder process developed three pathways for response to ER calls
  - FRC’s since 2005: prevention; early intervention & support
  - Cost reimbursed services for children 0-5 is from Prop 10; 6 and above is Prevention Funding.
- **Outcomes:** Families are supported and safe in communities
  - Reduce incidents of child abuse & maltreatment; Increase positive social support
  - Reduce repeat child maltreatment reports; Increase family resilience capacity
Differential Response

Stanislaus County Family Resource Center Partnership
FY 2013/2014

Children and Families Commission
Funds services for families with children 0-5

Seven (7) Geographically located Family Resource Centers

Community Services Agency
Funds services for families with children over the age of 5

Prop 10
Children and Families Commission
$1,559,357

State CAPIT
$165,980

State OIP
$93,318

Federal PSSF
$240,702

Community Services Agency
$500,000
Leveraging Public/Private Funds

• Partnership to combine resources with other entities
  • “local match” to access Federal/State program funds
  • provide a specific service or serve a specific customer population

• Contract/MOU based agreements to define the model, governance, resource contributions and Fiscal Lead
  • Can include multiple public and/or private entities

• Federal Funding Matrix- Allowable Usage of Local Match Funds

• Examples:
  • Sober Living Environment Services
  • Family Justice Center
Sober Living Environment Services

- **Vision/Mission:** Break the cycle of drug/alcohol dependency and restore families so children can remain safely at home
- **Customer Needs:** Access to Sober Living Environment Services
  - Economic Environment
  - CWS allocation unattainable due to lack of local match
  - CWS budget reductions; lost services & resources
  - Significant Impact to families and children
- **Service Design & Accounting Model:**
  - Concerned Citizens: Offer of private contributions as local match
  - Board of Supervisors commitment
  - Establishment of Non-profit & Public –Private partnership
- **Outcomes:** Over $3 million accessed in total CWS funding. Staffing restored; improved case management; Capacity has grown; 60 families each month avoid OHP
Sober Living Environment Services

Stanislaus County
Sober Living Environments Partnership
FY 2013/2014

[Diagram showing financial breakdown]

- CWS Fed/St/Co* – $775,894
- CalWORKs Fed/St – $377,731
- County Match* – $232,768
- Sober Living Environments – $1,153,625
- Nirvana – 9 beds for $169,950 Contract (All CWS Funded) Facility for Fathers
- Valley Recovery Resources – 49 beds for $983,675 Contract ($605,943 CWS & $377,732 CalWORKs) Facility for Mothers

*Contracted local match contributions by each contractor are donated in support of these sober living environment contracts. Match contributions are equivalent to 30% local match requirement for costs claimed to CWS funding. County match is 30% of CWS funds. Local match provided by existing contractors consists of vendor private pay revenue and vendor local fundraising revenue.
Leveraging Donor Funds for Child Welfare Services

Fiscal Year 2011-2012

- **Base Budget**
  - $2 M Local Match
  - $10.3 M Available

- **Optimum Budget**
  - $12.3 M Minimum Mandate
  - $298,000 Partnerships
  - $145,000 Gap
  - $1.3 M Additional Basic Allocation
  - $1.9 M - $3.3 M Augmentation Funds

$12.3 million + $14 million = $15.9 M - $17.3 M
Family Justice Center

• **Vision/Mission:** One-stop center offering help and hope for victims and survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse and elder abuse.

• **Customer Needs:** Services to meet the individual needs of victims.

• **Service Design & Accounting Model:**
  • Stakeholder process began with DA as lead; now Non Profit
  • CSA operates the Child Advocacy Center or “CAIRE Center” co-located within the FJC
  • Model leverages CWS funding where applicable, braids with other Government agencies and provides local match through a three way agreement between Social Services, Sheriff & FJC

• **Outcomes:** Safety Plans for 297 adults; Services/Support for 881 children; CAIRE Interviews for 252 children
Family Justice Center

Stanislaus County
Child Abuse Interview, Referral, and Evaluation (CAIRE) Center
Family Justice Center (FJC)
Sheriff’s Office (SO)
FY 13/14

CSA
CWS ER
CAIRE Grant
25% Facility Fee
100% Sheriff Deputy

FJC
Grants/Foundations;
Contribution to SO
($65,316)

SO
County General Fund to
CSA = Local Match

CAIRE
$490,100

FJC Services total
$800,000 annually

Casework & Support
$102,617
Facility Fee
$190,156
DTP Support Staff
$65,616
Sheriff Deputy
$122,711
CAIRE Grant
$9,000
Opportunities with Realignment Funding

- Flexibility varies by County based on Accounting Structure
- Deferred revenue may allow for multi-year planning
- Sales tax dollars provide opportunities for non-fed match for the realigned programs
- Most flexibility lies in the programs that are both 1990-1991 and 2011 realigned
- Evolving opportunities as more becomes known
Enhancing Program Resources to Benefit Service Outcomes

• Creative Financial Models can be shared, improved and changed to support individual County goals for the best service outcomes.

• New opportunities in the future......