# Table of Contents

## 101 – TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)/CALIFORNIA WORK OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO KIDS (CalWORKs) PROGRAMS

### 101 CalWORKs ASSISTANCE

General Fund Maintenance of Effort Adjustment ..... 1
Two-Parent Families (matches to Auxiliary Table). ..... 3
Basic Grants ..... 7
Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts ..... 11
2008 COLA ..... 15
2009 COLA ..... 17
CalWORKs Resources (AB 2466) ..... 19
CalWORKs Resources (AB 1078) ..... 23
Subsidized Employment (AB 98) ..... 25
Cal Learn Bonuses and Sanctioned Grants ..... 89
CalWORKs Safety Net Program ..... 69
Prospective Budgeting ..... 29
Recent Noncitizen Entrants ..... 37
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings ..... 143
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings 4% MAP Reduction ..... 41
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings 6% MAP Reduction ..... 43
Modified Safety Net ..... 45
Child Only Time Limits ..... 49
Six Percent Grant Reduction ..... 53
Self Sufficiency Review ..... 55
Four Percent Grant Reduction ..... 59
ARRA - Due to increased UIB ..... 61

### 101 CalWORKs SERVICES

Employment Training Fund ..... 65
CalWORKs Basic ..... 67
Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts ..... 11
CalWORKs Safety Net Program ..... 69
Substance Abuse Services ..... 73
Mental Health Services ..... 75
Mental Health/Substance Abuse for Indian Health Clinics ..... 77

## 101 CalWORKs SERVICES (CONTINUED)

CalWORKs Resources (AB 2466) ..... 19
CalWORKs Resources (AB 1078) ..... 23
Subsidized Employment (AB 98) ..... 25
County Performance Incentives ..... 79
Pay For Performance ..... 81
Effect of EDD Wagner-Peyser Reimbursement ..... 83
Recent Noncitizen Entrants ..... 37
Base Veto ..... 85
Modified Safety Net ..... 45
TANF Pass-Through for State Agencies ..... 87

## 101 TEEN PROGRAMS

Cal Learn ..... 89

## 101 CalWORKs - ADMINISTRATION

TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs - Basic ..... 93
Restore CalWORKs Administration Costs ..... 95
Single Allocation Reduction ..... 97
CalWORKs Safety Net Program ..... 69
Work Verification ..... 99
*Be Vu v. Mitchell* ..... *389*
Fraud Recovery Incentives ..... 103
PA to NA Fund Shift ..... 105
Medi-Cal Services Eligibility/Common Costs ..... 109
Administrative Cap Adjustment ..... 111
Court Cases ..... 113
State/County Peer Reviews ..... 115
Recent Noncitizen Entrants ..... 37
Research and Evaluation ..... 117
County Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Adjustment ..... 119
Prospective Budgeting ..... 29
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings ..... 143
Modified Safety Net ..... 45
Child Only Time Limits ..... 49
Six Percent Grant Reduction ..... 53
Self Sufficiency Review ..... 55

## 101 CalWORKs - ADMINISTRATION (CONTINUED)

Four Percent Grant Reduction ..... 59
ARRA - Due to increased UIB ..... 61

## 101 CalWORKs CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration ..... 121
Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts ..... 11
CalWORKs Safety Net Program ..... 69
RMR Impact to the 85th Percentile March 2009 ..... 125
RMR Impact to the 75th Percentile July 2009 ..... 127
Recent Noncitizen Entrants ..... 37
State-Only Cal Learn Child Care ..... 129
Child Care - Trustline ..... 131
Self-Certification ..... 135
Child Care Stage One/Two Holdback ..... 137
Tribal TANF ..... 139

## 101 KIN-GAP PROGRAM

Kin-GAP Basic Costs ..... 143
Kin-GAP Administration ..... 143
Kin-GAP Enhancements ..... 143
Kin-GAP Dual Agency Rate ..... 149
Kin-GAP Dual Agency Rate - Administration ..... 149
Dual Agency - Supplement to the Rate ..... 153
Subsidized Relative Guardianship (PL 110-351) ..... 159
Subsidized Relative Guardianship (PL 110-351) - Admin ..... 159
ARRA - Subsidized Relative Guardianship FMAP Increase ..... 211

## 101 FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

Title IV-E Child Support Collections ..... 161
Foster Family Home-Basic Costs ..... 163
Group Home-Basic Costs ..... 167
Foster Family Agency-Basic Costs ..... 171
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children Basic Costs ..... 175
Supplemental Clothing Allowance ..... 177
Title XX Foster Care ..... 179
Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements ..... 435
Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program (STEP) ..... 183

## 101 FOSTER CARE PROGRAM (CONTINUED)

Emergency Assistance Program -- Foster Care Welfare ..... 185
Kin-GAP Dual Agency Rate - Foster Care Savings ..... 149
Dual Agency - Supplement to the Rate ..... 153
Expansion ITFC Program (SB 1331) ..... 187
PAARP Savings ..... 565
Foster Care Overpayments ..... 189
Title IV-E Foster Parent Child Care Program ..... 191
SSI/SSP FC Application (AB 1331) ..... 193
Foster Care - Infant Rate (SB 500) ..... 199
Multi Treatment Foster Care Program Rates ..... 203
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings ..... 143
Education Stability ..... 205
Ten Percent Reduction GH, FFA, SED, SCA and SCI ..... 207
ARRA - FC FMAP Increase ..... 211

## 101 ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Basic Costs ..... 215
Dual Agency - Supplement to the Rate ..... 153
Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements ..... 435
PAARP ..... 565
ARRA - AAP FMAP Increase ..... 211

## 101 REFUGEE CASH ASSISTANCE

Basic Costs ..... 217
Four Percent MAP Reduction ..... 219
Six Percent MAP Reduction ..... 221

## 101 CALIFORNIA FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Emergency Food Assistance Fund ..... 223
California Food Assistance Program ..... 225
Expanded Categorical Eligibility Food Stamp Program ..... 229
Prospective Budgeting ..... 29
Face to Face Waiver ..... 375
Farm Bill of 2008 ..... 233
ARRA - Due to Increased UIB ..... 61
ARRA - 13.6% Benefit Increase ..... 237
Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569) ..... 239

## 101 CALIFORNIA FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CONTINUED)

CFAP Elimination ..... 245

## 111 - SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME/STATE SUPPLEMENTARY PAYMENT (SSI/SSP)/IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

## 111 SSI/SSP

Basic Costs ..... 247
Withhold Pass-Through of January 2009 Federal COLA ..... 249
Reduce SSI/SSP Grants by 2.3 Percent ..... 251
Reduce SSP Grant to MOE Floor ..... 253
2009 Federal COLA ..... 255
2010 Federal COLA ..... 257
2010 State COLA ..... 259
SSP Administration ..... 261
Interest for Delayed SSI/SSP Payments ..... 263
ARRA - SSI One-Time Payment ..... 265
SSI/SSP FC Application (AB 1331) ..... 193
California Veterans Cash Benefit Program ..... 267
ARRA - CVCB One-Time Payment ..... 265
SSI Extension (PL 110-328) - Impact to SSI/SSP ..... 269
Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) - Base Program ..... 271
CAPI - Extended Time Limit ..... 271
CAPI - Reduce SSI/SSP Grants by 2.3 Percent ..... 271
CAPI - Reduce SSP Grant to MOE Floor ..... 271
CAPI - SSI Extension (PL 110-328) ..... 271
Eliminate CAPI ..... 275
SSP MOE Eligible ..... 279

## 111 IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS)

Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs ..... 281
CMIPS and Associated Costs ..... 287
CMIPS Enhancements ..... 291
CMIPS II Contract Procurement ..... 293
Public Authority Administration ..... 297
PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits ..... 301
Reduce State Participation to $9.50 plus $0.60 Benefits until September 30th ..... 305
Reduce State Participation to Minimum Wage - October 1, 2009 ..... 309

## 111 IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS) (CONTINUED)

*Conlan*.....*313*
Limit IHSS to Recipients with FI Rank 4.0 and Above.....315
IHSS Anti-Fraud Initiative.....319
IHSS Cost Containment - Tiered FI.....323
ARRA - FMAP Increase.....211
Waiver Personal Care Services.....327
Waiver for Residual Program.....331
Title XIX Reimbursement (IHSS/CSBG/CWS).....333

## 111 IHSS ADMINISTRATION

Basic Costs.....337
PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefit.....301
County Employer of Record (AB 2235).....339
IHSS Court Cases.....341
IHSS Advisory Committees.....343
IHSS Quality Assurance.....345
Reduce IHSS County Admin.....347
Social Security Act Section 1915(j) - Administration.....349
Provider Enrollment Form.....351
Eligibility Income Adjustment.....353
Cap SOC Buyout Enrollment.....355
Limit SOC to Recipients with FI Sore 4.0 and Above.....357

# 141 - COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

## 141 FOSTER CARE

FC & NAFS Administrative Costs - Basic Costs.....359
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings.....143
Kin-GAP Dual Agency - Foster Care Savings.....149
STEP Eligibility.....183
PAARP Savings.....565
SSI/SSP FC Application (AB 1331).....193
Foster Care Reforms.....363
Emergency Assistance - Foster Care Welfare.....185
Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements.....435
Court Cases.....113

## 141 FOOD STAMPS ADMINISTRATION

Basic Costs ..... 359
Be Vu v. Mitchell - FS Admin ..... 389
Food Stamp Administrative Reduction (PL 105-185) ..... 365
Employment and Training Program ..... 367
California Nutrition Network ..... 371
UC Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan ..... 373
PA to NA Fund Shift ..... 105
Prospective Budgeting ..... 29
Face to Face Waiver ..... 375
NAFS Reduction ..... 379
ARRA - NAFS Admin ..... 381
Expand Categorical Eligibility Food Stamp Program ..... 229
FSNE Shift to CDSS ..... 383
ARRA - NAFS UIB ..... 61
Farm Bill of 2008 ..... 233
California Food Assistance Program ..... 225
CFAP - State-Only Program ..... 225
CFAP - Prospective Budgeting ..... 29
CFAP - Face to Face Waiver ..... 375
CFAP - Expand Categorical Eligibility ..... 229
CFAP - Farm Bill Act of 2008 ..... 233
CFAP - ARRA - Increased UIB ..... 61
CFAP Elimination ..... 245

## 141 REFUGEE CASH ASSISTANCE

Refugee Cash Assistance - Administration ..... 385

## 141 AUTOMATION UPDATES

Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts ..... 11
TANF Reauthorization ..... 387
*Be Vu v. Mitchell* ..... 389

## 141 AUTOMATION PROJECTS

SAWS Statewide Project Management ..... 393
SAWS - Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project ..... 395
Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) ..... 397
ISAWS Migration ..... 399

## 141 AUTOMATION PROJECTS (CONTINUED)

LEADER....401
LEADER Replacement....403
Welfare Client Data System (WCDS) - CalWIN....405
Consortium IV (C-IV) Implementation....407
SAWS/CCSAS Interface....409
CBARS....411
Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS)....413
Electronic Benefits Transfer Project M&O....415
Electronic Benefits Transfer Project Reprocurement....417

## 151 SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

## 151 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

Basic Costs....419
Federal Budget Bill - Loss of FFP....425
PAARP Savings....565
Augmentation to Child Welfare Services....427
CWS/CMS System Support Staff....429
Emergency Assistance Program - TANF & Case Management....431
Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings....143
Kin-GAP Dual Agency - CWS Savings....149
Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements....435
*Gomez v. Saenz....439*
Title XX Transfer to DSS....179
State Family Preservation....441
Promoting Safe and Stable Families....443
Independent Living Program....445
Extended Independent Living Program....447
Chafee Postsecondary Education and Training Vouchers....449
Transitional Housing for Foster Youth....451
STEP - Transitional Independent Living Plan Activity....183
Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends....453
Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers....455
Total Child Welfare Training Program....457
Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (Options for Recovery)....459
Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs....461
Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate....153

## 151 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES (CONTINUED)

Foster Parent Training and Recruitment ..... 465
Minor Parent Services and Investigations ..... 467
Foster Care - Infant Rate (SB 500) ..... 199
Kinship Support Services ..... 469
Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds ..... 471
CWS/CMS Staff Development ..... 473
CWS/CMS Ongoing M&O ..... 475
CWS/CMS WEB ..... 477
Child Health and Safety Fund ..... 479
Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP) ..... 481
Group Home Monthly Visits ..... 483
Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667) ..... 485
Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774) ..... 487
Background Checks ..... 489
Relative Home Approvals ..... 491
Multiple Relative Home Approvals ..... 493
Grievance Review for Relatives ..... 495
Live Scan Technology ..... 497
Health Services for Children in Foster Care ..... 499
Health Oversight and Coordination (PL 110-351) ..... 501
County Self-Assessment and SIP Development ..... 503
Federal Child & Family Services Review ..... 505
Program Improvement Plan Penalty ..... 507
Data Requirements for New Activities ..... 509
Peer Quality Case Reviews ..... 511
Child Fatality and Near Fatality PQCR's ..... 513
Statewide Standardized Training ..... 515
CWS Program Improvement Fund ..... 517
CWS DR, SA, and PYS ..... 519
CWS Outcome Improvement Project ..... 521
Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Care Act of 2006 ..... 523
Adam Walsh Child Protection & Safety Act of 2006 ..... 525
Child Relationships (AB 408 amended by AB 1412) ..... 529
Personalized Transition Plan (PL 110-351) ..... 533
Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340) ..... 535

## 151 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES (CONTINUED)

SSI/SSP FC Application (AB 1331) ..... 193
Health Benefit Determination (AB 1512) ..... 539
Foster Youth Identity Theft (AB 2985) ..... 541
Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits ..... 543
Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database ..... 545
Registered Sex Offender Check ..... 547
Increase Family Case Planning Meetings ..... 553
Notification of Relatives (PL 110-351)) ..... 555
Increase Relative Search and Engagement ..... 557
CWS Reduction ..... 559

## 151 ADOPTIONS PROGRAM

Basic Costs ..... 561
Older Foster Youth Adoption Project ..... 563
Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments (PAARP) ..... 565
Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment ..... 569
County Counsel Costs ..... 571
Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses ..... 573
Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP) ..... 575
Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746) ..... 577
Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340) ..... 535
Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of FC Act of 2006 ..... 523
Adam Walsh Child Protection & Safety Act ..... 525
Adoption Opportunity Grant ..... 579
Adoption Incentives (PL 110-351) ..... 581
Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements ..... 435

## 151 CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

County Third Party Contracts ..... 583
Federal Grants ..... 585
State Children's Trust Fund Program ..... 587

## 151 COUNTY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Basic Costs ..... 589
Adult Protective Services ..... 591
APS Contract for Training Curriculum and Services ..... 593
Reduce APS Program by 10 percent ..... 595

## 151 COMMUNITY CARE LICENSING

Foster Family Home-Basic Costs ..... 597
Family Child Care Home-Basic Costs ..... 599
Adam Walsh Child Protection & Safety Act of 2006 ..... 525
Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340) ..... 535
Title XX Funding ..... 179
Fee-Exempt Live Scan ..... 601
Registered Sex Offender Check ..... 547
Court Cases ..... 603

## 151 SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Other Specialized Services ..... 605
Eligibility/Extension of Dog Food Allowance ..... 607
Access Assistance/Deaf Program - Basic Costs ..... 609
Access Assistance/Deaf Program - Title XX Funding ..... 179
Access Assistance/Deaf Program - Reduce Services by 10 Percent ..... 609
Refugee Social Services ..... 613
Targeted Assistance ..... 615
Refugee School Impact Grant ..... 617

**153 - TITLE IV-E WAIVER** ..... 619

**TANF**
## OTHER DEPARTMENTS' TANF MOE ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES

Community Colleges Expansion of Services to TANF Eligibles ..... 627
CDE Child Care Programs ..... 629
State Disregard Payment to Families ..... 633
After School MOE ..... 637

## ADDITIONAL TANF/MOE

General Fund Maintenance of Effort Work Participation Rate Adjustment ..... 639
Total TANF Reserve ..... 641
ARRA - Emergency Contingency Fund ..... 643

**COST OF DOING BUSINESS** ..... 647

# General Fund Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

## DESCRIPTION:

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08, an adjustment has been made to reflect that California met the federal work participation rate (WPR) for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006. California is not expected to meet the federal WPR in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008. When the state meets this rate, the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) level falls from 80 percent to 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the WPR and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is $2.8 billion in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1996.

## METHODOLOGY:

To determine the General Fund (GF) MOE adjustment, projected state and county expenditures countable toward the MOE are compared to the state's MOE level. This determines the amount of expenditures necessary to meet the state's MOE level.

The specific methodology used to determine the GF MOE adjustment involves identifying projected California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) local assistance expenditures that are TANF-eligible and calculating their costs by total, federal, state, county, and reimbursement funds. Projected federal TANF expenditures for CDSS state support are then added to the total funds amount. Other state department or county expenditures for TANF eligibles, which meet the MOE requirements, are also added to the CDSS state and county TANF costs. This total is then compared to the state's MOE level. The amount of projected expenditures above or below the MOE level is shifted to or from federal TANF funds. The GF MOE adjustment does not change the total funding available.

Both the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY) projections include projected GF expenditures within other state departments that are assumed countable toward fulfilling the TANF MOE requirement. Separate premise descriptions for each of these items are provided in the "Estimate Methodologies" section of this binder.

## FUNDING:

The GF MOE adjustment transfers costs to meet the state's base MOE level. The transfer is offset by a corresponding reverse adjustment to federal TANF funds. There is no change in the total funds available.

# General Fund Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in the CY and the BY is due to a decrease in GF spending in the CalWORKs program as a result of Emergency Contingency Funds.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in the BY is due to a decrease in GF spending in the CalWORKs program as a result of budget balancing reductions.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | -1,094,510 | -1,080,343 |
| State | 1,094,510 | 1,080,343 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Two-Parent Families

## DESCRIPTION:

A two-parent family is defined as an assistance unit (AU) that includes two aided nondisabled, natural or adoptive parents of the same aided or Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment minor child (living in the home), unless both parents are aided minors and neither is the head-of-household. Beginning in October 1999, two-parent families were funded with state maintenance of effort (MOE) funds. However, as a result of the federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, all MOE funded programs providing assistance are subject to inclusion in the federal Work Participation Requirement (WPR) calculation. Therefore, effective October 1, 2006, California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) cash assistance, Welfare to Work (WtW) services, and administrative services for two-parent families are funded with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds. Child care services will continue to be funded with General Fund (GF) as these families must participate a minimum of 55 hours per week in WtW activities to be eligible for federally funded child care.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10553.
- The grant costs for two-parent families are based on the percentage of two-parent families in the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY) caseload projections.
- The employment services and Stage One child care costs for two-parent families are based on the most recent information.
    - The ratio for two-parents participating in the CalWORKs Mental Health program is 12.56 percent and 14.99 percent in the Substance Abuse program and is based on the most recent CalWORKs Welfare-To-Work Monthly Activity Report (WtW 25/25A) caseload information.

## METHODOLOGY:

The total cost or savings associated with two-parent families was determined by multiplying the appropriate percentage of two-parent families by the total cost or savings. Refer to the auxiliary table for the “Two-Parent Families” for more detailed information.

## FUNDING:

- CalWORKs grants for two-parent families are funded 97.5 percent TANF and 2.5 percent county funds.
- Administration and employment services are funded with 100 percent TANF.
- Child care is funded with 100 percent GF.

# Two-Parent Families

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

- The CY increase for CalWORKs grant costs is due to a higher CalWORKs projected caseload than used in the February 2009 Budget Bill.
- The CY services costs increase is due to an increase in the two-parent services' expenditures to the overall CalWORKs' expenditures ratio.
- The CY administrative costs decrease is due to the PA to NA fund shift. The CY child care costs have increased due to an increase in the cost per child and a higher CalWORKs projected child care caseload than used in the February 2009 Budget Bill.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

- The BY increase for CalWORKs grant costs is due to increased caseload. The BY increase for CalWORKs service costs is due to increased service caseload projected for the BY (See the Employment Services Basic for more detail).
- The BY increase in administrative costs is due to increased caseload. The BY increase in child care cost is due to the increase in the projected child care caseload from the CY to the BY.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 41,577 | 50,704 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 -** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Total** | Total | Total |
| Total | $476,175 | $557,778 |
| Federal | 440,181 | 519,442 |
| State | 27,553 | 28,410 |
| County | 8,441 | 9,926 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Two-Parent Families

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $337,637 | $397,045 |
| Federal | 329,196 | 387,119 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 8,441 | 9,926 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Services** | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $73,053 | $82,071 |
| Federal | 73,053 | 82,071 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 Admin. | 2009-10 Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $37,932 | $50,252 |
| Federal | 37,932 | 50,252 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Two-Parent Families

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 -** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **CalWORKs Stage One Child Care** | Child Care | Child Care |
| Total | $27,553 | $28,410 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 27,553 | 28410 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs – Basic Grants

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs of providing cash aid to eligible families. Basic costs have been adjusted to reflect the annual cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for Social Security (OASDI) benefits. The OASDI COLA increases the benefit level, reducing grant costs. The basic costs have also been adjusted for the impact of specific premises that are in the trend caseload but are also shown as separate premises. These adjustments are necessary in order to avoid budgeting the impact twice. This premise also includes an adjustment for Proposition L, which raised the minimum wage level for people working in San Francisco County.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11450.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, a total of 11,456,884 All Other Families (AF) personmonths and 1,902,375 Two-Parent (TP) personmonths are anticipated. For FY 2009-10, 13,192,653 AF personmonths and 2,472,067 TP personmonths are projected.
- For both the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY), AF cases consist of 2.34 persons and TP cases consist of 3.89 persons.
- Adjustments are made for the estimated costs of current premises which are already included in the base period. These premises include: “Cal Learn Bonuses,” “Cal Learn Sanctioned Grants,” “Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs).” Also, an adjustment is made for the costs associated with new tribes establishing Tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs.
- Costs are included for the Diversion Program. Based on the most recent California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Cash Grant Caseload Movement Reports (CA 237) and CalWORKs Expenditure Reports (CA 800D), the average monthly diversion caseload is estimated at 37 for the CY and 43 for the BY with an average cost per case of $2,581 for the both years.
- The estimated cost per person is based on an average of the actual cost per person from October 2008 to December 2008.
- The AF cost per person is $230.32 for the CY and the BY. The TP cost per person is $172.50 for the CY and the BY.
- The AF and TP basic costs are adjusted for the OASDI COLA. The Consumer Price Index (CPI)-W COLAs are 2.3 percent effective January 1, 2008, 5.8 percent effective January 1, 2009 and is projected to be -2.6 percent effective January 1, 2010. Due to the negative CPI there is assumed to be no impact to OASDI payments in January 2010.
- The OASDI COLA adjustment reflects the impact of the projected CPI COLAs on the average Social Security Benefits received by CalWORKs cases, resulting in a FY 2008-09 reduction in cash grants of $3,344,275 and a FY 2009-10 reduction of $6,493,369.
- Effective January 2005, Proposition L provides a minimum wage increase every January for San Francisco County based on the current CPI-U. This will result in approximately $23,154 in grant savings in FY 2008-09, and $102,413 in grant savings in FY 2009-10. Approximately 413 recipients in the CY and 462 in the BY will receive additional earnings. The CPI-U is 2.9 percent for Calendar Year 2009 and 2.7 for Calendar Year 2010.

# CalWORKs – Basic Grants

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The CY and the BY reflect a shift of funds from the RNE program associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF-eligible and are reflected in the separate RNE premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The personmonths are multiplied by the cost per person to determine AF and TP basic costs.
- AF and TP basic costs are reduced for the OASDI COLA adjustment.
- Diversion costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly caseload by the cost per case, and the annual Diversion costs are added to the basic grant costs.
- The total AF and TP basic costs are reduced by the amounts of the costs for "Cal Learn Bonuses," "Cal Learn Sanctioned Grants," "RNEs," new tribes establishing Tribal TANF programs, and Proposition L to reflect the basic grant costs.

## DATA COMPARISON CHART:

| **FY 2008-09** | AF | TP |
|---|---|---|
| Projected Personmonths | 11,456,884 | 1,902,375 |
| Projected Casemonths | 4,892,839 | 489,438 Persons Per Case |

| **FY 2009-10** | AF | TP |
|---|---|---|
| Projected Personmonths | 13,192,653 | 2,472,067 |
| Projected Casemonths | 5,649,876 | 635,570 Persons Per Case |
| | 2.34 | 3.89 |

## FUNDING:

The CY reflects a shift of funds from the RNE program associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF-eligible. These cases are funded with General Fund (GF) in this premise.

The funding in the CY is 96.28 percent TANF, 1.22 percent GF, and 2.5 percent county.

The BY reflects a shift of funds from TANF to state Maintenance of Effort (MOE). Due to a federal audit exception, TANF hardship cases will be funded with MOE instead of TANF funds effective July 1, 2009. In addition, the BY reflects the shift of RNE funds as noted above.

The funding in the BY is 90.47 TANF, 7.03 percent GF, and 2.5 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The caseload and persons per case have been updated using the most current available data.

The CalWORKs caseload was previously projected to increase 6.0 percent in the CY and 7.1 percent in the BY. The caseload is now projected to increase approximately 8.8 percent in the CY and 16.8 percent in the BY.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The caseload is projected to increase by 16.8 percent from the CY to the BY.

# CalWORKs – Basic Grants

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 448,523 | 523,787 |
| Average Monthly Persons | 1,113,272 | 1,305,393 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2,904,945 | $3,406,337 |
| Federal | 2,796,987 | 3,081,584 |
| State | 35,334 | 239,468 |
| County | 72,624 | 85,285 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact associated with Senate Bill (SB) 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004), and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Reauthorization premise associated with the implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006). The implementation of these two bills has significantly changed the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Welfare-to-Work (WTW) program from its original structure mandated by AB 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997). Changes to the CalWORKs WTW program were intended to further increase self-sufficiency and personal responsibility by increasing the number of individuals who work or participate in work-related activities while maintaining critical services, and to also meet the federal work participation rate (WPR) and other requirements in the federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005.

Pursuant to AB 1808, the Budget includes $90 million in federal TANF block grant funds for the CalWORKs program to assist counties in improving their WPR.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

SB 1104 implemented on December 1, 2004 and AB 1808 implemented on July 12, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 10533, 10534, 10540.6,10544, 11322.8, 11325.21.
- This premise assumed that some cases not previously participating/working would begin to do so and some cases would increase their level of participation.
- Recent data demonstrates an increase in the number of cases participating/working. However, the increased participation did not have an impact on federal WPR.
- The grant savings associated with increasing participation is assumed to be reflected in the CalWORKs expenditure trend.
- The child care costs attributable to cases increasing hours of participation are included in the trend child care caseload.
- Pursuant to AB 1808, the Budget includes an additional $90 million in federal TANF block grant funds for the CalWORKs program to assist the counties in improving their WPR. This estimate assumes full expenditure of the $90 million in employment services in the Current Year (CY) and assumes an additional $90 million in the Budget Year (BY).
- Based on information received from the Office of Systems Integration (OSI), the automation costs will be $1.6 million in the CY. These funds are to reprogram existing systems to implement the provisions of CalWORKs Previous Reform Efforts. The funding for the automation costs is 100 percent federal/TANF.

## METHODOLOGY:

- Pursuant to AB 1808, the Budget includes $90 million in employment services.
- Pursuant to information received from OSI, the budget includes $1.6 million to reprogram existing automation systems.

# Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts

## FUNDING:

- The funding is 100 percent TANF for both the CY and BY.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Although recent data reflects an increase in the number of cases participating/working, these cases are not achieving the required hours necessary to meet federal work participation requirements as projected in the prior subvention. The grant savings associated with increasing participation is assumed to be reflected in the CalWORKs trend and is reflected in the CalWORKs Basic Grants premise. The child care costs attributable to cases increasing hours of participation are included in the trend child care caseload and is reflected in the CalWORKs Stage One Child Care premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The reprogramming of existing systems to implement the provisions of CalWORKs Previous Reform Efforts will be completed in the CY.

## EXPENDITURES:

| **101 – CalWORKs Services** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Services | Services |
| Total | $90,000 | $90,000 |
| Federal | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 |

| **141-TANF Reauthorization** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **(AB 1808) – Automation** | | |
| Total | $1,581 | $0 |
| Federal | 1,581 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $91,581 | $90,000 |
| Federal | 91,581 | 90,000 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Maximum Aid Payment – 2008 COLA

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of adding a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) maximum aid payment (MAP). The COLA is based on changes determined by the Department of Finance in the California Necessities Index (CNI), which represents the weighted average change for food, clothing, fuel, utilities, rent, and transportation costs for low-income consumers. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11453, the 2008 MAP COLA has been suspended.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was to implement October 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 11453.
- The FY 2008-09 COLA has been suspended.
- Assuming the July 2008 CNI of 5.26 percent, the cost avoidance from suspending the COLA for FY 2008-09 is approximately $194 million annually (which includes the county share).

## METHODOLOGY:

No costs were budgeted for this premise due to suspension of the 2008 MAP COLA.

## FUNDING:

There is no funding due to the suspension of the 2008 MAP COLA.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Maximum Aid Payment – 2008 COLA

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Maximum Aid Payment – 2009 COLA

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of adding a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) maximum aid payment (MAP). The COLA is based on changes determined by the Department of Finance in the California Necessities Index (CNI), which represents the weighted average change for food, clothing, fuel, utilities, rent, and transportation costs for low-income consumers. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11453, the 2009 MAP COLA has been suspended.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was to implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 11453.
- The FY 2009-10 COLA has been suspended.
- Assuming the July 2009 CNI of 1.53 percent and the implementation of the May Revision reductions, the cost avoidance for suspending the FY 2009-10 COLA is approximately $52 million (includes the county share).

## METHODOLOGY:

No costs were budgeted for this premise due to the decision to suspend the COLA.

## FUNDING:

There is no funding due to the decision to suspend the COLA.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Maximum Aid Payment – 2009 COLA

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Resources (AB 2466)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 2466 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2006) which excludes the principal and interest of certain assets, such as 401(k) plans, 403(b) plans, Individual Retirement Accounts (IRA), 457 plans, 529 college savings plans, or Coverdell Education Savings Accounts (ESA), from being considered as property when redetermining eligibility for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) recipients. Prior to the passage of AB 2466, some of these accounts were excluded from consideration when determining applicant eligibility. This bill no longer allows for this exclusion and these resources will be considered when determining eligibility for new applicants.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11155.6.
- It is assumed that one percent of the cases that are discontinued due to excess resources will no longer be discontinued.
- Since 401(k) plans, 403(b) plans, IRA, 457 plans, 529 college savings plans, and Coverdell ESAs are now excluded from consideration for recipients, it is assumed the number of discontinuances will decrease by two cases per month.
- The average monthly recipient caseload is 25 for the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY).
- It is assumed that there will be a 0.5 percent increase in cases that are denied due to excess resources.
- It is assumed one new case per month will be denied for excess resources because these accounts are considered property for applicants.
- The average monthly applicant caseload is 13 in the CY and the BY.
- The average monthly grant per case is $536.
- The mid-quarter activities monthly cost per case is $8.63 and $24.95 for quarterly activities.
- The average monthly child care cost per child is $808. The utilization rate is 32.4 percent and the average number of children per case is 1.9.
- The intake cost per case is $197.75.
- The cost of employment services is anticipated to increase by 0.004 percent associated with cases that would have been discontinued from CalWORKs due to excess resources.

# CalWORKs Resources (AB 2466)

## METHODOLOGY:

**CalWORKs Grants**

The grant costs associated with cases that are no longer discontinued is offset by the grant savings associated with new denials due to excess resources. The net grant cost is approximately $80,000 in the CY and the BY.

**CalWORKs Services**

- The costs for administration, child care, and employment services programs are combined and are included in the services premise line.
- The net impact to administration costs associated with cases that are no longer discontinued and cases that are denied due to excess resources is approximately $5,000 in the CY and the BY.
- The net impact to employment services costs associated with cases that are no longer discontinued and cases that are denied due to excess resources is approximately $31,000 in the CY and the BY.
- The net impact to child care costs associated with cases that are no longer discontinued and cases that are denied due to excess resources is approximately $46,000 in the CY and the BY.

## FUNDING:

- The grant funding is 97.5 percent federal and 2.5 percent county.
- The services funding is shared 100 percent federal.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# CalWORKs Resources (AB 2466)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

**101-CalWORKs**
**Basic Grants**

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $80 | $80 |
| Federal | 78 | 78 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 2 | 2 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

**101-CalWORKs**
**Employment Services**

| | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $82 | $82 |
| Federal | 82 | 82 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# CalWORKs Resources (AB 1078)

## Description:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 1078 which modified some of the provisions included in AB 2466. Prior to the passage of AB 2466, certain investment accounts were excluded from consideration as resources when determining applicant eligibility for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) benefits. As a provision of AB 2466, these resources were no longer excluded when determining applicant eligibility. [Please see the separate premise description for CalWORKs Resources (AB 2466) for more details.] AB 1078 reversed this provision in AB 2466, resulting in the exclusion of these resources for determining applicant eligibility.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statutes: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11155.6.
- It is assumed that one new case per month will be granted CalWORKs due to the exclusion of certain investment accounts as resources.
- The average monthly grant cost per case is $536.
- The employment services utilization rate is 67.4 percent.
- The employment services caseload is expected to increase by 0.008 percent due to this premise.
- The employment services cost for the entire caseload is $771.5 million.
- Based on updated CalWORKs data, 32 percent of the AB 1078 caseload will utilize child care. There are an estimated 1.9 children per case. The average child care cost is $808 per month.

## METHODOLOGY:

**CalWORKs Grants**

- The grant cost is calculated by multiplying the number of cases by the cost per case. (Budget Year: 150 cases x $536 x 12 months).

**CalWORKs Services**

- The costs for administration, childcare, and employment services programs are combined and are included in the services premise line.
- The employment services cost is calculated by multiplying the anticipated 0.008 percent increase by the total caseload's employment services cost (0.008 percent x $771.5 million).
- The administration costs are calculated by multiplying the total casemonths by the administration cost per case, which includes the mid-quarter activities cost and the quarterly reporting cost (150 x $8.63 + 150 x $24.95).
- The child care costs are calculated by multiplying the number of children that will receive child care by the cost per child (150 cases x 67.4 percent services utilization x 32.4 percent child care rate x 1.9 children per case x $808).

# CalWORKs Resources (AB 1078)

## FUNDING:

CalWORKs grants are funded with 97.5 percent federal funds and 2.5 percent county funds.

Employment services costs are fund with 100 percent federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## Expenditures:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Assistance Payments** | 2008- 2009 Grant | 2009-2010 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $80 | $80 |
| Federal | 78 | 78 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 2 | 2 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Services** | 2008-2009 Services | 2009-2010 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $82 | $82 |
| Federal | 82 | 82 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Subsidized Employment (AB 98)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise provides funding to counties outside of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program single allocation to pay 50 percent of a CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work (WTW) participant's wage subsidy while participating in public or private sector subsidized employment pursuant to Assembly Bill 98 (Chapter 589, Statutes of 2007). The state's participation in the wage subsidy is limited to a maximum of six months for each WTW participant, up to 50 percent of the maximum aid payment for the family.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11322.63.
- The net cost of the program is approximately $4.5 million in the Current Year (CY) and $3.7 million in the Budget Year (BY). These costs only reflect the incremental increase associated with the additional state share of the subsidy payment, offset by associated grant savings. This estimate does not account for any increased costs associated with the establishment of additional subsidized employment slots. It is assumed that any additional costs of this program will be funded through the county CalWORKs single allocation.
- Based on an October 2008 survey of counties, it is assumed that approximately 313 monthly cases statewide will participate in public or private subsidized employment.
- This premise implemented in January 2008, allowed three months to secure subsidized employment slots, and began a six month phase-in in April 2008. The full 313 new monthly participants are assumed to have been achieved in September 2008.
- Based on Los Angeles County's employment training program, 23 percent or 73 participants will not complete the subsidized employment program. It is assumed that each group of participants will experience an attrition of 11.7 percent in the second month of the subsidized employment program. Another 11.7 percent will enroll in the program but will not complete the program due to various reasons.
- It is assumed the average wage subsidy cost is $723 per month per participant and the state's share of the subsidy is $362.
- Based on the Federal Fiscal Year 2007 CalWORKs Characteristics Survey (Q5) data, approximately two-thirds of individuals who are currently participating do so through work activities and the remaining one third participate in non-work activities.
- Without regard to the subsidized employment program, approximately two-thirds of individuals would have participated in employment and one-third in non-work activities.
- The cost of the subsidy is partially offset by grant savings for the one-third that would not have otherwise worked resulting in a net cost of $113.00 per case per month.
- Based on Los Angeles County's statistics from Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, 77 percent of subsidized employment cases, or 239 participants per month will fully complete the program. Of those that completed the program, 56 percent or 134 participants will enter unsubsidized employment with an average hourly wage of $9.28.

# Subsidized Employment (AB 98)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- It is assumed that approximately two-thirds of the population would have otherwise participated through work activities at an average of $8.00 per hour and assumes an average of 20 hours per week of unsubsidized employment
    - Of those that enter unsubsidized employment after completion of the subsidized work program, approximately two-thirds would have increased hourly earnings of $1.28 per hour and approximately one-third are newly employed, earning $9.28 per hour.
- The impact of Quarterly Reporting/Prospective Budgeting (QR/PB) results in a delay of grant savings due to employment (subsidized or unsubsidized). QR/PB assumes that one-third of individuals will be required to report earnings in the month employment is obtained, one-third in the second month after employment is obtained, and the remaining one-third in the third month after employment is obtained.
- This premise does not include additional costs for child care and other services. It is assumed that participants are using these services prior to entering subsidized employment.

## METHODOLOGY:

Beginning April 2008, the population assumed to participate in the subsidized employment program is phased in over a six-month period, with each group remaining in the subsidized employment program for six months. The Subsidized Employment population is divided into two groups; one that represents the grant savings and subsidized employment costs associated with the approximate two-thirds employment population, and one that represents the grant savings and subsidized employment costs associated with the one-third non-work population. The net cost is $4.5 million in FY 2008-09 and $3.7 million in FY 2009-10.

Wage Subsidy Cost

- Wage Subsidy costs associated with the approximate two-thirds employment population are $3.88 million in FY 2008-09 and $4.76 million in FY 2009-10.
- Wage Subsidy costs associated with the approximate one-third employment population are $2.09 million in FY 2008-09 and $2.57 million in FY 2009-10.

Grant Savings

- Wage Subsidy savings associated with the approximate two-thirds employment population are $0.07 million in FY 2008-09 and $0.55 million in FY 2009-10.
- Wage Subsidy savings associated with the approximate one-third employment population are $1.39 million in FY 2008-09 and $3.13 million in FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

The funding for the CalWORKs grant savings is 96.5 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), one percent General Fund (GF), and 2.5 percent county. The funding for the wage subsidy is 99 percent TANF and one percent GF.

# Subsidized Employment (AB 98)

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in net grant savings, services costs is associated with the completion of the caseload phase in, which began in April 2008.

## EXPENDITURES:

**(in 000's)**

| **101 – CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grants | Grants |
| Total | $-1,462 | -$3,676 |
| Federal | -1,410 | -3,547 |
| State | -15 | -37 |
| County | -37 | -92 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **101 – CalWORKs Services** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Services | Services |
| Total | $5,963 | $7,331 |
| Federal | 5,907 | 7,262 |
| State | 56 | 69 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Prospective Budgeting

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative savings and grant/coupon costs associated with implementing a quarterly reporting system using prospective budgeting in determining benefits based on projected income over a three-month period for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Food Stamps (FS), California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) and Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) programs.

Assembly Bill (AB) 444 (Chapter 1022, Statutes of 2002) required the replacement of the current monthly reporting/retrospective budgeting system with a Quarterly Reporting/ Prospective Budgeting (QR/PB) system for the CalWORKs program. This bill also required the state to adopt the QR/PB system in the FS program to the extent permitted by federal law, regulations, waivers and directives. The Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR) Section 273.21 requires states to determine FS eligibility using either a prospective or retrospective budgeting methodology consistent with the state's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program unless a waiver is granted by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Services (FNS).

Under the QR/PB system, recipients' eligibility and benefits for a three-month period are based on information provided on the Quarterly Eligibility Report Form (QR 7) and are determined using prospective budgeting and income averaging rules. Recipients have mandatory mid-quarter reporting requirements during the quarter. All CalWORKs recipients with earnings are required to report: income that exceeds the Income Reporting Threshold (IRT) which is the greater of the CalWORKs eligibility limit, or 130 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) for the family size; drug felony convictions; fleeing felon status; parole/probation violations; and address changes. FS recipients are only required to report address changes in mid-quarter. Certain non-assistance FS (NAFS) recipients are also required to report changes in work hours that could affect eligibility.

Recipients have the option to report changes that would result in increased grant/coupon benefits when they occur. To determine whether the change results in increased benefits mid-quarter, currently reported income and reasonably expected income for the rest of the quarter will be averaged for the current and the remaining months and subsequent benefits are adjusted accordingly.

Households that are currently not required to submit monthly reports may have their benefits determined on either a prospective or retrospective basis at the state agency's option, unless specifically excluded from retrospective budgeting.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The implementation of this premise varied by counties between November 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: 7 CFR Section 273.21(b), and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11265.1-11265.3 and 11450.1-11450.3.
- The California Department of Social Services received a USDA-FNS waiver approval to implement QR/PB for the FS program.

# Prospective Budgeting

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The estimated grant/coupon costs and administrative savings are based on comparing statistical information from the previous Monthly Retrospective Reporting Budgeting (MRRB) system to the current QR/PB reporting system.
- The Current Year (CY) costs and savings are based on 6,093,669 CalWORKs casemonths; 8,087,877 NAFS casemonths; and 121,738 CFAP casemonths.
- The Budget Year (BY) costs and savings are based on 7,040,957 CalWORKs casemonths; 9,809,582 NAFS casemonths; and 143,008 CFAP casemonths.
- It is assumed that 10.5 percent of the total NAFS/CFAP cases are currently subject to nonmonthly/change reporting based on the FS Characteristics Survey. The remaining cases, 7,246,738 NAFS cases and 108,956 CFAP cases in the CY; and 8,789,385 NAFS cases and 127,992 CFAP cases in the BY, are subject to quarterly reporting.
- Based on actual caseload and expenditure data, the cost for on-going activities for CalWORKs cases under monthly reporting was $42.75 per month per case and $25.01 per month per case for NAFS.
- The CalWORKs eligibility worker cost per hour is $57.57.
- Based on county time study data collected during October and November 2005, the amount of time needed for CalWORKs continuing case activities under QR/PB is 26 minutes per month at a cost of $24.95 per case.
- Based on county time study data collected during October and November 2005, the amount of time needed to process CalWORKs mid-quarter activities averages nine minutes per month per case at a cost of $8.63 per case.
- Based on county time study data collected during March 2005, the NAFS/CFAP on-going case activities under QR/PB are at a cost of $39.33 per case.
- Based on county time study data collected during March 2005, the NAFS/CFAP mid-quarter case activities under QR/PB are estimated to cost $28.23 per case.
- Mid-quarter administrative activities for CalWORKs and NAFS/CFAP cases include voluntary and mandatory mid-quarter reporting and county initiated contact.
- CalWORKs mid-quarter activities also include IRT reporting.
- The current cost for mailing a monthly report form to a recipient is $0.78. It is assumed that the cost for mailing the quarterly report is $0.78 per household/case.
- It is assumed that only one-third of the total CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP, and RCA cases will report each month under QR/PB. The remaining two-thirds of the cases will only report outside their normal quarterly report month in certain circumstances. Based on the CalWORKs Report on Reasons for Discontinuances of Cash Grant, (CA 253 CW), 8.73 percent of CalWORKs cases are discontinued each month, and 12.39 percent of the cases are discontinued due to income exceeding CalWORKs eligibility limits under MRRB. Under QR/PB some of these cases will experience a delay in being discontinued until their quarterly report month.

# Prospective Budgeting

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- CalWORKs recipients with unearned income only are exempt from mid-quarter reporting when their income exceeds the IRT. This group of recipients accounts for 0.55 percent of the CalWORKs caseload under MRRB. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will receive one month of additional benefits and 50 percent will receive two months of additional benefits before being discontinued when their quarterly report is filed.
- Due to the difference in income level between the CalWORKs eligibility limit and the IRT, it is assumed that 40.04 percent of the CalWORKs cases currently are discontinued due to excess earned income. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will receive one month of additional benefits and 50 percent will receive two months of additional benefits before being discontinued when a quarterly report is filed.
- Based on data from the Fraud Investigation Activity Report (DPA 266) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08, fraud cases account for 2.46 percent of total CalWORKs cases. Fifty percent of the cases will result in an overpayment for one month and 50 percent of the cases will result in a two-month overpayment. Based on fraud overpayment collection experience, it is assumed that 50 percent of the overpayments will be recovered after a six-month period.
- Based on the Employment Development Department wage data, prior to becoming ineligible due to excess income, the average CalWORKs case receives a grant of $206.50 and the average CFAP household receives a benefit of $85.00.
- Based on a county survey regarding Reduced Income Supplemental Payments (RISPs) applications, it is estimated that 2.72 percent of the total caseload will have decreased earnings and will report the decrease during the non-quarterly report months.
- Under monthly reporting rules recipients may receive supplemental payments equal to 80 percent of the grant increase. Under QR/PB, CalWORKs recipients will receive a grant adjustment equal to 100 percent of the grant increase associated with reported decrease in income. The average CalWORKs grant impact for cases that would report decreased income in non-quarterly report months is estimated at $116.67.
- CFAP cases will receive a supplemental payment equal to the increase; under monthly reporting, these cases do not receive a supplemental payment. The average CFAP benefit for cases that would report decreased income in non-quarterly report months is $53.03. Based on the CA 253, FY 2007-08, 0.86 percent of CalWORKs monthly cases would become ineligible for the following reasons: no eligible child, excess resources, and no deprivation. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will continue to receive one additional full month of the grant and 50 percent will continue to receive two additional months of the full grant before being discontinued.
- Based on data from the CA 253, FY 2002-03 reports, 4.73 percent of CalWORKs and CFAP cases were discontinued each month for not submitting a Monthly Eligibility Report (CW 7) under the monthly reporting system. It is assumed that 25 percent of these cases now delay discontinuance for one or two months under the quarterly reporting system. It is assumed that 50 percent of the remaining cases will continue to receive one additional full month of grant and 50 percent will continue to receive two additional full months of grant before being discontinued.

# Prospective Budgeting

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The average CalWORKs monthly grant is $539.57 based on the CA 800 CalWORKs expenditure reports for the period from July 2008 to September 2008.
- The average CFAP benefit per case is $$225.61 based on the DFA 256 Reportsthe period from October 2007 to June 2008.
- It is estimated that four CFAP cases per month in the CY and five CFAP cases per month in BY that otherwise would have discontinued due to income exceeding eligibility limits will not be discontinued until their quarterly report month. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will continue to receive one additional full month of grant and 50 percent will continue to receive two additional full months of grant before being discontinued.
- It is estimated that 26 CFAP cases per month in the CY and 31 CFAP cases per month in BY that would have otherwise had their benefits discontinued due to increased income will continue to receive additional benefits. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will continue to receive one month of increased benefits and 50 percent will continue to receive two additional months of increased benefits.
- The costs and savings under QR/PB are compared to MRRB. Assuming one-third of the income increases occur in each month, the result is one month of costs, one month of savings, and one month of no cost or savings to the CalWORKs and CFAP programs. The net effect is zero in those cases with increased income of all ranges of non-reporting.
- Based on a county survey, 4.47 percent of the NAFS/CFAP caseload will report a change of address, change in household composition, or shelter cost that will result in mid-quarter administrative activity. An additional 0.69 percent of the NAFS/CFAP caseload will be subject to a county initiated action during mid-quarter months.
- Effective October 1, 2008, Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWDs) are exempt from meeting the work requirements.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Administration**

- The CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP and RCA prospective budgeting administrative costs are calculated by adding the administrative costs to process the quarterly reports and mid-quarter changes.
- The CalWORKs administrative savings associated with continuing case activities under monthly reporting are calculated by multiplying the monthly continuing case cost by the total casemonths [CalWORKs BY: ($42.75 x 7,040,957)].
- The CalWORKs administrative costs associated with continuing case activities under QR/PB are calculated by multiplying the monthly continuing case cost by the casemonths of those required to report on a quarterly basis [CalWORKs BY: ($24.95 x 7,040,957)].
- The CalWORKs administrative costs to process mid-quarter changes are calculated by multiplying the casemonths by the cost per month [CalWORKs BY: ($8.63 x 7,040,957)].

# Prospective Budgeting

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- The NAFS and CFAP administrative savings associated with no longer processing monthly reports are calculated by multiplying the monthly cost to process a continuing case by the total casemonths [NAFS BY: ($25.01 x 8,789,385)].
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process quarterly reports are calculated by multiplying the quarterly cost to process a continuing case by the casemonths of those required to report on a quarterly basis [NAFS BY: ($39.33 x 8,789,385 x 33 percent)].
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process a change resulting in increased benefits are calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report their reduced earnings outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case [NAFS BY: (8,789,385 x 2.72 percent x $28.23)].
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process a change of address, change in household composition, or shelter costs during non-quarterly report months are calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report the changes outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case [NAFS BY: (8,789,385 x 4.47 percent x $28.23)].
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process a county initiated actions is calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report the changes outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case [NAFS BY: (8,789,385 x 0.69 percent x $28.23)].
- The CalWORKs, NAFS, and CFAP administrative cost to mail quarterly reports is calculated by multiplying the annual casemonths by one-third to determine the number of cases in a quarter; then multiplying by the mailing cost which is determined based on the monthly number of mid-quarter reports x $0.78 [NAFS BY: (8,789,385 x 33 percent x $0.78), for CalWORKs (BY: 7,040,957x 33 percent x $0.78)].
- The CalWORKs, NAFS, and CFAP administrative savings due to not mailing monthly reports is calculated by multiplying the number of cases reporting monthly by the mailing cost [NAFS BY: (8,789,385 x $0.78), for CalWORKs BY: (7,040,957 x $0.78)].
- CalWORKs grant and CFAP coupon costs associated with noncompliance cases who do not submit their monthly reports are calculated by multiplying the average monthly grant/coupon per case by the impacted casemonths, assuming 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant [CalWORKs BY: ($539.57 x 87,447 x 50 percent) + (($539.57 x 87,447 x 50 percent x 2)].
- CalWORKs grant and CFAP coupon costs associated with not discontinuing ineligible cases until the quarterly report month are calculated by multiplying the monthly average grant/coupon per case by the impacted casemonths, assuming 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant [CalWORKs BY: [($539.57 x 43 x 50 percent) + ($539.57 x 43 x 50 percent x 2)].

**Grants/Benefits**

- CalWORKs grant costs for not discontinuing cases with income over the CalWORKs eligibility limit but under the IRT until the quarterly report are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average grant per case assuming 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant [CalWORKs BY: ($206.50 x 653 x 50 percent) + ($206.50 x 653 x 50 percent x 2)].

# Prospective Budgeting

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- CalWORKs grant costs for those cases exempt from reporting when their income exceeds the IRT because they have unearned income only, are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the associated average grant per case, assuming 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant [CalWORKs BY: ($206.50 x 15,912 x 50 percent) + ($206.50 x 15,912 x 50 percent x 2)].
- CalWORKs grant costs for increasing the benefits of those cases reporting a decrease in income during mid-quarter months are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average grant increase of $116.67 [CalWORKs BY: ($116.67 x 191,299 x 50 percent) + ($116.67 x 191,299 x 50 percent x 2)].
- Overpayments for those cases that will not report income exceeding the IRT are calculated by multiplying the average grant per case by the impacted casemonths of those that will not report, assuming that 50 percent receive one additional monthly grant and 50 percent receive two additional monthly grants, and 50 percent of the overpayments will be recovered after a six-month period [CalWORKs in BY: [($206.50 x 36 x 50 percent) x 50 percent] + ($206.50 x 36 x 50 percent x 2 x 50 percent)].
- Under QR/PB CFAP coupon costs for not discontinuing cases with income over the eligibility limit are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average grant per case assuming 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant [CFAP BY: ($85.00 x (31 + 5) x 50 percent) + ($85.00 x (31 + 5) x 50 percent x 2)].
- CFAP coupon costs for those cases reporting a decrease in income during mid-quarter months are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average coupon increase [CFAP BY: ($53.03 x 3,477) + ($53.03 x 3,477 x 50 percent)].
- CFAP coupon costs for not decreasing benefits for cases that have an increase in income are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average increased coupon amount times two months [CFAP BY: ($53.03 x 3,477 x 2)].

## FUNDING:

### CalWORKs

- The funding for CalWORKs grants for the CY is 86.18 percent TANF, 11.32 percent General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county. For the BY, funding is 85.58 percent TANF, 11.92 percent GF, and 2.5 percent county.
- The funding for CalWORKs administration for the CY is 88.39 percent TANF, 11.61 percent GF and 2.5 percent county. The funding for the BY is 87.77 percent TANF and 12.23 percent GF.

### NAFS and CFAP

- For the CY and BY, the FS funding is 50 percent federal, 35 percent GF, and 15 percent county funds. CFAP costs are 100 percent GF with 21.01 percent being Maintenance of Effort eligible.

# Prospective Budgeting

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

**CalWORKs**

- The CY CalWORKs grant costs and administrative savings reflect an increase to the CalWORKs caseload over what was projected in the February 2009 Budget Bill.

**NAFS and CFAP**

- The increase in NAFS administrative savings and CFAP administrative savings and grant costs is associated with a higher than expected caseload growth.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

- The CalWORKs grant costs and administrative savings reflect an increase to the CalWORKs caseload over the CY.
- The BY increase in NAFS administrative savings and CFAP administrative savings and grant costs reflect an increase in projected caseload over the CY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $94,697 | $109,430 |
| Federal | 81,609 | 93,645 |
| State | 10,721 | 13,049 |
| County | 2,367 | 2,736 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 – CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | -$59,084 | -$68,268 |
| Federal | -52,223 | -59,919 |
| State | -6,861 | -8,349 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Prospective Budgeting

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – CFAP Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,107 | $1,163 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,107 | 1,163 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 – Food Stamp Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | -$74,399 | -$90,287 |
| Federal | -37,199 | -45,144 |
| State | -26,040 | -31,600 |
| County | -11,160 | -13,543 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141- CFAP Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | -$1,119 | -$1,315 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -1,119 | -1,315 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Recent Noncitizen Entrants

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing aid to Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs). The federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), Public Law 104-193, excluded most legal immigrants entering the United States (U.S.) after the date of enactment (August 22, 1996) from receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program benefits for the first five years they are in the country. PRWORA does provide exceptions for certain noncitizens:

1. Refugees, asylees, or those granted withholding of deportation for their first five years in the U.S.
2. Veterans, current military personnel, spouses and dependents.
3. Cuban-Haitian noncitizens: Cuban-Haitian entrants are eligible for Refugee Assistance and Refugee Education Assistance.

The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program continued aid to certain groups of noncitizens that became ineligible with the implementation of PRWORA. These include: (1) Parolees; (2) Conditional Entrants; (3) Legal Permanent Residents; (4) Permanently Residing in the United States Under Color of Law; and, (5) Battered Noncitizens.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in September 1996.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Based on the Calendar Year 2008 Summary Report of Assistance Expenditures (CA 800L and CA 800M), the projected average monthly persons that are not TANF eligible is 19,589 for the Current Year (CY) and 21,924 for the Budget Year (BY).
- The overall CalWORKs caseload is projected to increase by 9.0 percent in CY and 15.5 percent in BY.
- Based on Calendar Year 2008 CA 800L and CA 800M reports, the average grant per person is $156.83.
- Cal Learn Bonuses and Sanction grant costs for RNE recipients is projected to be $56,667 in the CY and $60,668 in the BY.
- Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) grant costs for RNE recipients is projected to be $42,382 in the CY and $76,500 in the BY.
- Based on claims from the counties for Calendar Year 2008, the administration cost for RNEs was approximately $7.7 million.
- The percentage of persons that are TANF eligible is 50.12 percent.
- The services costs are based on actual expenditure data from Calendar Year 2008.
- The funds associated with persons that are TANF eligible are reflected in the Basic premises for grants, childcare, and administration and employment services.

# Recent Noncitizen Entrants

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Of the total amount of $14.5 million for RNE employment services from FY 2007-08, $7.2 million are TANF eligible and are shifted to the "CalWORKs Basic" premise (refer to the CalWORKs Basic premise for more detailed information regarding services).
- For CalWORKs child care, the cost is 0.48 percent of the "CalWORKs Stage One Child Care" cost, which amounts to approximately $2.88 million in the CY and $3.17 million in the BY (refer to the CalWORKs Stage One Child Care premise for more detailed information). The percentage is based upon actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2008. Of the $2.88 million in CY, $1.4 million are TANF eligible and are shifted to the "CalWORKs Basic" premise. For BY, of the $3.17 million, $1.6 is TANF eligible and is shifted to the "CalWORKs Basic" premise.
- For Cal Learn, the RNE costs in the BY reflect 1.5 percent of the Cal Learn cost which is reflected in the "Cal Learn" premise. The percentage is based upon actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2008.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The grant costs were calculated by multiplying the projected monthly recipients by the average grant per person by 12 months (BY; 21,924 x 156.83 x 12 months). This total is then added to the Cal-Learn bonuses, sanctioned grants and Iraqi SIV grants.
- The administration costs for the RNEs are based on actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2008 that have been adjusted for projected caseload growth. Of the total costs, 50.12 percent represent federal households and remains in the CalWORKs basic Administration, funded with General Fund (GF). The remaining portion of RNEs is reflected in this premise.
- The child care costs for the RNEs is 0.48 percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2008. Of the 0.48 percent, 50.12 percent represent federal households and remains in the Stage One Basic Program, funded with GF. The remaining portion of RNEs is reflected in this premise.
- The services costs for the RNEs are based on actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2008. Of the total cost, 50.12 percent represent federal households and remain in CalWORKs Employment Services Basic, funded with GF. The remaining portion of RNEs is reflected in this premise.

## FUNDING:

The grant costs are funded with 95 percent GF and 5 percent county funds. The administrative costs, employment services, and child care costs are 100 percent GF. The total funding is countable toward the State's TANF maintenance of effort requirement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY increase in employment services and grant costs is due to an increase in the RNE caseload over what was projected in the prior subvention.

The CY decrease in RNE administrative costs is due to a decrease in ongoing eligibility expenditures. The BY increase in administrative costs is due to an increase in the RNE caseload.

There is no change in child care costs in the CY. The BY increase in child care costs is due to an increase in caseload.

# Recent Noncitizen Entrants

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in grants costs, administrative costs and employment services costs is due to an increase in the RNE caseload from the CY to the BY.

The increase in child care costs is due to an increase in caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $37,194 | $43,921 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 35,334 | 41,725 |
| County | 1,860 | 2,196 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Services** | 2008-09 County Services | 2009-10 County Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $7,214 | $7,654 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 7,214 | 7,654 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Recent Noncitizen Entrants

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):
(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 -** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **CalWORKs Administration** | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $4,217 | $4,993 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,217 | 4,993 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 -** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **CalWORKs Stage One Child Care** | Child Care | Child Care |
| Total | $1,390 | $1,554 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,390 | 1,554 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings - Four Percent MAP Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the erosion of savings associated with the implementation of a four percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. The savings results from children transferring from CalWORKs to the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program. Reducing the CalWORKs grant by four percent lowers the savings associated with this transfer.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes an implementation date of July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Statute needs to be enacted to implement this premise.
- Federal and nonfederal caseloads are based on actual cases reported on the CA 800 KG, Summary Report of Expenditures for the Kin-GAP Program, through December 2008.
- A State-Only Kin-GAP program is available for those cases that are not eligible for the CalWORKs program but would be eligible for the Kin-GAP program.
- It is assumed a total of one new state-only case per month will move from CalWORKs to Kin-GAP, beginning January 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.
- Savings to CalWORKs grants is based on new cases transferring from CalWORKs to Kin-GAP as a result of the enhanced benefits.
- CalWORKs grant savings of $359 per long term placement case each month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the CalWORKs programs. As a result of the four percent MAP reduction, this grant amount will now be $345 per long-term placement case each month.
- CalWORKs administrative savings will not be affected by this premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

The erosion of savings is calculated by multiplying the decrease in the average CalWORKs grant by the impacted caseload.

## FUNDING:

For State-Only Kin-GAP cases, grant costs are shared 50 percent GF and 50 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

# Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings - Four Percent MAP Reduction

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $2 |
| Federal | 0 | 1 |
| State | 0 | 1 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings - Six Percent MAP Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the erosion of savings associated with the implementation of a six percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. The savings results from children transferring from CalWORKs to the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program. Reducing the CalWORKs grant by six percent lowers the savings associated with this transfer.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes an implementation date of July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Statute needs to be enacted to implement this premise.
- Federal and nonfederal caseloads are based on actual cases reported on the CA 800 KG, Summary Report of Expenditures for the Kin-GAP program, through December 2008.
- A State-Only Kin-GAP program is available for those cases that are not eligible for the CalWORKs program but would be eligible for the Kin-GAP program.
- It is assumed a total of one new state-only case per month will move from CalWORKs to Kin-GAP, beginning January 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.
- Savings to CalWORKs grants is based on new cases transferring from CalWORKs to Kin-GAP as a result of the enhanced benefits.
- CalWORKs grant savings of $359 per long term placement case each month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the CalWORKs programs. As a result of the six percent MAP reduction, this grant amount will now be $337 per long-term placement case each month.
- CalWORKs administrative savings will not be affected by this premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

The erosion of savings is calculated by multiplying the decrease in the average CalWORKs grant by the impacted caseload.

## FUNDING:

For State-Only Kin-GAP cases, grant costs are shared 50 percent General Fund and 50 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

# Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings - Six Percent MAP Reduction

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $3 |
| Federal | 0 | 2 |
| State | 0 | 1 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Modified Safety Net

## DESCRIPTION:

Safety Net families are families who have exceeded their 60-month assistance time limit but continue to be eligible for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs). Currently in the program, a Safety Net family can receive aid for the eligible children (until these children reach 18 years of age) without having to participate in welfare-to-work activities. Aid to Safety Net families is not a requirement under federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and most states do not aid this population. Safety Net benefits are funded with General Fund (GF) dollars which are countable toward the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) in the TANF program. As a result of TANF Reauthorization, Safety Net families are now included in the federal work participation rate (WPR) calculation.

In order to move more CalWORKs families off aid and out of poverty, it is critical to encourage families' progress toward self-sufficiency by increasing their participation. This proposal would create an incentive for Safety Net families to fully participate, encourage self-sufficiency through participation, and help increase the WPR, bringing the state closer to meeting federal WPR requirements in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010.

The Modified Safety Net proposal creates an incentive for families to fully participate by rewarding working families who are fully participating in federally allowable work activities with continued maximum Safety Net benefits, while eliminating benefits for families that do not meet work participation requirements.

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions..

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 enactment of Legislation with an October 1, 2009 implementation date.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- In order to implement this proposal, statutory changes are required.
- Recipients who do not meet the WPR will be impacted by this policy change with the cases being discontinued effective October 2009.
- Based on trend projections from the CalWORKs Cash Grant Caseload Movement Report (CA 237) the Budget Year (BY) caseload is projected to be 52,011.
- The projected impact to the services caseload is based on the CalWORKs Welfare-To-Work Monthly Activity Report (WTW 25/25A).
- Based on the CalWORKs Characteristics Survey (Q5) data, it is assumed that 31 percent of the Safety Net caseload will meet the federal WPR through work and non-work related activities and will remain eligible for assistance.
- The average monthly grant for Safety Net cases that participate in work, but less than 17 hours a week is $433.

# CalWORKs Modified Safety Net

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The average monthly grant for Safety Net cases that do not work is $561.
- Based on Q5 data, 19 percent of the current Safety Net caseload works sufficient hours to meet the WPR.
- Based on Q5 data, 9 percent of the Safety Net caseload works more than 17 hours a week, but less than 30 hours a week.
- It is assumed that as a result of this program change, 70 percent of the 9 percent will increase their work hours to avoid being discontinued from the Safety Net program.
- Based on Q5 data, 11 percent of the Safety Net caseload are cases that work less than 17 hours a week. It is assumed that these cases will not increase hours sufficient to remain in the Safety Net program.
- Based on Q5 data, 2.27 percent of the Safety Net caseload are cases that participate in non-work activities and meet the WPR.
- Based on Q5 data, 3.88 percent of the Safety Net caseload are cases that participate in non-work activities and partially meet the WPR.
- It is assumed that as a result of this program change, 70 percent of the 3.88 percent will increase their hours to avoid being discontinued from the Safety Net program.
- Based on Q5 data, 54.9 percent of the Safety Net caseload are not participating in work activities and will not meet the WPR.
- The total number of cases expected to be discontinued for not meeting the WPR is 35,838 in the Budget Year (BY).
- Based on Q5 data, 67 percent of the current Safety Net cases receiving services will continue receiving services as a result of this policy change.
- The funding for services in the BY is projected to be $6,714,000.
- The funding for administration costs in the BY is projected to be $33,758,000.
- Based on actual expenditures from the county expense claims, the administration cost for Safety Net cases represents 11 percent of the total CalWORKs eligibility expenditures.

## METHODOLOGY:

- In the BY, grant savings are calculated by multiplying the projected Safety Net caseload that will discontinue due to this proposal by the cost per case.
- The employment services savings are calculated by subtracting the cost of Safety Net cases that will meet the WPR from the Safety Net services total.

# CalWORKs Modified Safety Net

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

The administration savings are calculated by subtracting the administration costs associated with the cases remaining on Safety Net from the BY total Safety Net administration costs.

## FUNDING:

The Safety Net savings associated with CalWORKs grants is 97.5 percent GF/MOE and 2.5 percent county funds. The Safety Net savings associated with employment services and administration are 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise assumes an October 1, 2009 implementation, therefore, costs are included in the BY only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 Grants | 2009-10 Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$172,554 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -168,240 |
| County | -0 | -4,314 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Services** | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$1,664 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -1,664 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Modified Safety Net

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 Admin. | 2009-10 Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$17,446 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -17,446 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Child Only Time Limit

## DESCRIPTION:

Under current California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) regulations, child only cases include eligible children of families whose adult parent/caregiver relative(s) are undocumented non-citizens, drug felons or fleeing felons, recipients of Social Security Insurance (SSI), or have reached their 60-month time limit. In these cases the adult parent/caregiver relative is ineligible for CalWORKs assistance or services, but the children receive aid until they reach age 18.

This proposal establishes a 60-month time limit on the receipt of aid for children whose parent or caretaker relative(s) is an undocumented non-citizen, a drug felon or a fleeing felon.

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 enactment of Legislation with an October 1, 2009 implementation date.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- In order to implement this proposal, statutory changes are required.
- Child-only cases where the unaided adult is an undocumented non-citizen, drug felon, or fleeing felon that have been on aid for 60 or more months will be impacted by this policy change with the first cases being discontinued effective October 2009.
- Based on trend projections from the CalWORKs Cash Grant Caseload Movement Report (CA 237) the Budget Year (BY) caseload is projected to be 586,746.
- Based on CalWORKs Characteristics Survey (Q5) information, 0.56 percent of the CalWORKs caseload are child only cases with a drug felon adult.
- Based on Q5 information, 0.03 percent of the CalWORKs caseload are child only cases with a fleeing felon adult.
- Based on Q5 information, 19.4 percent of the CalWORKs caseload are child only cases with an undocumented non-citizen adult.
- Based on Q5 and Medi-Cal Eligibility Data Systems (MEDS) data, approximately 40.56 percent of child only cases with an undocumented non-citizen, drug felon, or fleeing felon adult have been on aid for 60 or more months, resulting in approximately 47,621 cases affected by this policy change in the BY.
- The average monthly grant that these cases receive is $472.

# CalWORKs Child Only Time Limit

## KEY DATE/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The monthly administrative cost per case is $24.95 and the mid-quarter administrative cost equates to $8.63 per case per month.

## METHODOLOGY:

- In the BY, the discontinuance of 47,621 cases will result in grant savings of approximately $202 million.
- In the BY, the discontinuance of 47,621 cases will result in administrative savings of $14 million.

## FUNDING:

The funding for the CalWORKs grants is 97.5 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and 2.5 percent county funds. Funding for CalWORKs administration is 100 percent TANF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise assumes an October 1, 2009 implementation, therefore, costs are included in the BY only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **101-Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$202,105 |
| Federal | -0 | -197,052 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | -0 | -5,053 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Child Only Time Limit

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

### 101-Admin

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$14,392 |
| Federal | 0 | -14,392 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Six Percent Grant Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the implementation of an additional six percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. A four percent MAP reductions was included in the 2009-10 Budget Bill enacted February 20, 2009. However; due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, an additional six percent MAP reduction is included in the May Revision.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 enactment of Legislation with an October 1, 2009 implementation.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- In order to implement this proposal, statutory changes are required.
- The MAP levels for non-exempt and exempt Assistance Units (AUs) are reduced by six percent. The reduced MAP levels will be used to calculate the grant amount for CalWORKs recipients.
- Depending on the amount of grant each CalWORKs case currently receives, the actual percentage of reduction to their grant would be different. Based on CalWORKs Characteristic Survey (Q5) Data, the percentage of reduction to the CalWORKs average cost per case is approximately 6.9 percent.
- It is anticipated that an additional 3,067 CalWORKs cases will lose eligibility and become discontinued as a result of this MAP reduction. Administrative costs for mid-quarter activities are $8.63 per case per month and for quarterly activities are $24.95 per case per month.
- The net administrative savings is a result of cases that will discontinue due to excess income and the inclusion of mailings costs to provide notification to recipients of upcoming grant reductions.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The grant savings is calculated by multiplying the decrease in the average CalWORKs grant by the total CalWORKs caseload.
- The administrative savings from caseload reduction is calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of cases expected to lose eligibility by the average monthly cost per case.

## FUNDING:

The CalWORKs grants are 85.58 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funded, 11.92 percent General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county funded in the Current Year (CY) and in the Budget Year (BY).

The CalWORKs administrative savings/costs are 87.77 percent TANF funds and 12.23 percent GF in the BY.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

# Six Percent Grant Reduction

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise assumes an October 1, 2009 implementation, therefore, savings/costs are included in the BY only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 – CalWORKs (TANF) Grant Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $0 | -$145,938 |
| Federal | 0 | -124,887 |
| State | 0 | -17,402 |
| County | 0 | -3,649 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 101 – CalWORKs (TANF) Administrative Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $0 | -$697 |
| Federal | 0 | -612 |
| State | 0 | -85 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Self Sufficiency Review

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact associated with implementing a face-to-face self-sufficiency review requirement. Currently California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) recipients report quarterly on changes that may affect eligibility by sending a QR7 form to report on specific eligibility factors that have changed from the prior quarter, such as income, family composition, or property. This is primarily a paper review process. On an annual basis, the county re-determines eligibility where all eligibility factors are evaluated and major program requirements are reviewed with the client including time on aid and reporting rules.

Under this proposal, in addition to the QR7 process, at the six-month interval, a self-sufficiency review would be conducted by the county worker. This review would be conducted via a face-to-face interview and would assess what services or resources may be necessary for the aided adult(s) to increase their work participation hours or to remove the barriers that are preventing participation. For child-only cases, the review would determine what services or resources may be needed to reduce their dependence on public assistance. This review would be required for continued eligibility, but families where the aided adults are fully meeting work requirements or are working full-time would not be required to attend this self-sufficiency review. Non needy caretaker relatives of foster children are also excluded from this requirement.

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 enactment of Legislation and notification with an October 1, 2009 implementation date.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- In order to implement this proposal, statutory changes are required.
- The percentage of the total CalWORKs caseload meeting the federal work participation rates (WPR) is projected to be on average 13.17 percent from October 2009 through June 2010.
- This premise reflects the impacts of the Modified Safety Net, Child Only Time Limit, Four Percent Grant Reduction, and the Six Percent Grant Reduction premises that decrease the population subject to the face-to-face review (approximately 107,000 cases).
- It is assumed that the total caseload impacted will be phased in from October 2009 to December 2009. It is assumed that one-third of this caseload will be reviewed each month.
- It is anticipated that 5 percent of the cases that are subject to the review will discontinue for failing to complete the review.
- The average grant savings for cases that discontinue is projected to be $561 per month.
- The total CalWORKs caseload after considering the above items is on average 381,752 from October 2009 through December 2009.
- An administrative savings of $33.58 per case per month will result as cases discontinue due to not complying with the self-sufficiency review requirement.

# Self Sufficiency Review

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- It is assumed that it will take 30 minutes for an eligibility worker to complete the self-sufficiency review.
- The administrative cost to complete the self-sufficiency review is assumed to be $28.78 per 30 minute review.

## METHODOLOGY:

- CalWORKs grant savings are calculated by multiplying together the average monthly discontinued cases, the cost per case and the total number of months.
- CalWORKs administrative savings are calculated by multiplying together the average monthly discontinued cases, the cost per case and the total number of months.
- CalWORKs administrative costs are included for a 30 minute semiannual review for all cases subject to the self-sufficiency review.

## FUNDING:

The CalWORKs grant funding is 97.5 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding and 2.5 percent county funds.

The CalWORKs administrative funding is 100 percent TANF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise assumes an October 1, 2009 implementation, therefore, costs are included in the BY only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101-CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | -$0 | -$85,683 |
| Federal | -0 | -83,541 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | -0 | -2,142 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Self Sufficiency Review

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101-CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Administration | Administration |
| Total | $0 | $18,337 |
| Federal | 0 | 18,337 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Four Percent Grant Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the implementation of a four percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. This reduction is necessary to address the state's fiscal situation.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 implementation and is included in the 2009-10 Budget Bill enacted February 20, 2009 (SBX3 1).

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: W&IC sections 11450 and 11450.02.
- The MAP levels for non-exempt and exempt Assistance Units (AUs) are reduced by four percent. The reduced MAP levels will be used to calculate the grant amount for CalWORKs recipients.
- Depending on the amount of grant each CalWORKs case currently receives, the actual percentage of reduction to their grant would be different. Based on federal CalWORKs Characteristic Survey (Q5) Data, the percentage of reduction to the CalWORKs average cost per case is approximately 4.4 percent.
- It is anticipated that approximately 16,113 CalWORKs cases will lose eligibility and become discontinued as a result of this MAP reduction.
- Administrative costs for mid-quarter activities are $8.63 per case per month and for quarterly activities are $24.95 per case per month.
- The administrative savings is a result of cases that will discontinue due to excess income.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The grant savings is calculated by multiplying the decrease in the average CalWORKs grant by the total CalWORKs caseload.
- The administrative savings from caseload reduction is calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of cases expected to lose eligibility by the average monthly cost per case.

## FUNDING:

The CalWORKs grants are 85.58 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funded, 11.92 percent General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county funded in the Current Year (CY) and in the Budget Year (BY).

The CalWORKs administrative savings/costs are 87.77 percent TANF funds and 12.23 percent GF in the BY.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2008-09, mailing costs of $230,000 were included to provide notification to recipients of upcoming grant reductions.

For FY 2009-10, the estimate was updated to include the most recent caseload data available.

# Four Percent Grant Reduction

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Mailing costs are included in the CY only and the savings associated with the implementation of the MAP Reduction begin in the BY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 – CalWORKs (TANF) Grant Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $0 | -$132,915 |
| Federal | 0 | -114,176 |
| State | 0 | -15,491 |
| County | 0 | -3,248 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 101 – CalWORKs (TANF) Administrative Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $230 | -$6,493 |
| Federal | 202 | -5,699 |
| State | 28 | -794 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 – Due to Increased Unemployment Insurance Benefit

## DESCRIPTION:

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 is a multi-year, federal economic stimulus program. With respect to programs under the purview of the California Department of Social Services, the purposes of the funds are to:

- Preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery
- Assist those impacted by the recession
- Stabilize state and local government budgets

This premise reflects the impact to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Food Stamps (FS) and California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) associated with a $25 increase in weekly unemployment insurance (UI) benefits beginning April 1, 2009. The increase in benefits results in grant/benefit savings for CalWORKs and CFAP. This increase also results in administrative savings for CalWORKs, FS and CFAP where recipients lose eligibility as a result of the increase UI benefit.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Section 403© of the Social Security Act.
- The May 2009 Revise CalWORKs trend caseload is used to project the number of CalWORKs cases receiving UI benefits.
- Based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007 Food Stamp Characteristics Survey Data (Q5), approximately 1.66 percent of CalWORKs cases receive UI benefits.
- Based on FFY 2007 Q5 data, approximately 1.6 percent of CalWORKs recipients receive a grant of $108.25 or less.
- UI benefits are considered as unearned income in CalWORKs eligibility determination and will be deducted from the recipient's grant on a dollar-for-dollar basis.
- The maximum weekly UI benefit amount increase effective April 1, 2009 is $25. This results in a CalWORKs grant reduction of $108.25 per month ($25 x 4.33 = $108.25).
- The UI benefit increase effective April 1, 2009 will result a $48 reduction in FS/CFAP benefits. Therefore, FS/CFAP cases receiving less than $48 in benefits and also receiving UI will be discontinued.
- Based on FFY 2007 Q5 data, there are approximately 3,800 FS cases that will be removed from aid. The average weighted benefit amount received by these cases is approximately $24.
- FS cases receiving a benefit greater than $48 that also receive UI (approximately 33,600) will receive a $48 benefit reduction.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 – Due to Increased Unemployment Insurance Benefit

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Based on historical experience it is assumed that CFAP benefit and administration costs consist of approximately one percent of FSP costs.
- The CFAP Public Assistance Food Stamps costs (approximately 21 percent) are considered eligible expenditures for the state's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The CFAP Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) costs (approximately 79 percent) are not considered MOE eligible.
- There are 38 CFAP cases that will be removed from aid and 330 CFAP cases that will receive a $48 benefit reduction.
- Cases removed from aid result in administrative savings.
- It is assumed that the cost for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process NAFS continuing cases on a quarterly basis is $39.33 per case.
- It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- It is assumed that the administrative cost for an EW to process a mid-quarter report is $28.23.
- Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 includes three (3) months of the unemployment benefit increase and FY 2009-10 includes 12 months of the unemployment benefit increase.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The percentage of CalWORKs cases receiving UI benefits is applied to the total CalWORKs population to determine the number of CalWORKs cases receiving UI benefits. The estimated 9,765 cases receiving UI benefits is multiplied by the increased UIB of $108.25 per month for annual grant savings of approximately $12.6 million.
- Approximately 1.6 percent of the estimated 9,765 cases receiving UI benefits receive a grant of $108.25 or less per month. Therefore, approximately 156 cases per month will be discontinued as a result of the increased UIB resulting in annual administrative savings of approximately $421,000.
- CFAP benefit savings for the cases removed from aid are calculated by multiplying the number of cases (38) by the average benefit amount ($24), and then by the number of months in the year (three months in Current Year (CY) and 12 months in Budget Year (BY)).
- CFAP benefit savings for the cases receiving a benefit reduction are calculated by multiplying the number of cases (330) by the benefit reduction amount ($48), and then by the number of months in the year (three months in CY and 12 months in BY).
- CFAP administrative savings are calculated by multiplying the number of cases removed from aid (38) by the quarterly reporting and mid-quarterly reporting costs.

## FUNDING:

CalWORKs grants are funded with 97.5 percent General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county.

CalWORKs administrative services and CFAP are funded with 100 percent GF.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 – Due to Increased Unemployment Insurance Benefit

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FY 2009-10 reflects 12 full months of increased unemployment benefits.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 Grants | 2009-10 Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$1,817 | -$12,601 |
| Federal | -1,749 | -12,125 |
| State | -23 | -161 |
| County | -45 | -315 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Admin** | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$15 | -$421 |
| Federal | -15 | -413 |
| State | 0 | -8 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 – Due to Increased Unemployment Insurance Benefit

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

| **ITEM 101 - CFAP Grants** | 2008-09 Grants | 2009-10 Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$51 | -$204 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -51 | -204 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 - FS Admin** | 2008-09 Grants | 2009-10 Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$115 | -$694 |
| Federal | -58 | -347 |
| State | -40 | -243 |
| County | -17 | -104 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 - CFAP Admin** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$3 | -$11 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -3 | -11 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Employment Training Fund

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Employment Training Fund (ETF) amount used to offset the cost of providing employment services to recipients of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program.

ETF funds are derived from employer contributions and administered by the Employment Development Department. The ETF funds meet federal criteria to be counted toward the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise originally implemented July 11, 1994. No funding was appropriated for Fiscal Years (FY) 1997-98 through FY 1998-99. This premise reimplemented July 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

It is assumed $35 million will be available from the ETF in FY 2008-09. No ETF funds will be available in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

Once the total cost of providing CalWORKs employment services is calculated, it is reduced by the ETF amount appropriated to the California Department of Social Services by the Legislature.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with ETF funds, which are MOE countable.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

No ETF funds will be available in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$35,000 | 0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -35,000 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program Basic

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing employment and training services to individuals in the CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work (WTW) program. Employment services provided to WTW participants include a wide variety of work, educational, and training activities designed to assist individuals in obtaining and retaining employment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 15204.3(a), amended by Assembly Bill (AB) 1111, Senate Bill (SB) 1104, and SB 68.
- The base funding for CalWORKs Services Basic is $737.9 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.
- The employment services caseload has been increasing over the past several years, however this premise has not been adjusted due to the $90 million CalWORKs services augmentation approved in the 2006 Budget Act. The $90 million augmentation is equivalent of an increase in caseload of 12.2 percent over FY 2006-07.
- Based on FY 2006-07 employment services expenditures, one percent of FY 2006-07 expenditures is equivalent approximately $7.37 million.
- The FY 2008-09 employment services caseload is projected to grow 15.5 percent above the FY 2006-07 base caseload.
- The FY 2008-09 caseload exceeds the 12.2 percent by 3.3 percent resulting in additional funding of approximately $24.4 million dollars for the Current Year (CY).
- The FY 2009-10 caseload is projected to grow 33 percent above the FY 2006-07 base caseload resulting in an additional $128.9 million in Budget Year (BY).
- Staff development costs in FY 2008-09 are $6.6 million, based on FY 2007-08 actual expenditures.
- The Wagner-Peyser reimbursement amount is $2.7 million for the CY and the BY.
- Time limit savings are $161.1 million for the CY and the BY.
- The CalWORKs Services Basic expenditures for Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs) is $14.5 million in the CY and $15.3 million in the BY. Of this, $7.2 million for the CY and $7.7 million for the BY reflect the General Fund (GF) costs for federally eligible RNE recipients in mixed households.
- Cal Learn RNEs are funded with GF in the amount of $243,476 in the CY and $257,388 in the BY.
- Contract costs are projected to be $3.9 million in the CY and the BY.
- A single allocation adjustment amount of $191.9 million (previously budgeted in a separate premise) is now included in this premise for both CY and BY.

# California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program Basic

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- There is a shift in funding for the Employment Training Fund (ETF) from TANF to GF for the amount of $35 million in the CY. No ETF funds are expected to be available in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The basic funding for the CY and the BY is adjusted to reflect staff development expenditures, time limit savings, single allocation adjustment, Cal Learn RNE costs, contract costs, and the Wagner-Peyser reimbursement. Funds for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) ineligible RNEs were subtracted and shifted to the RNE premise.

Approximately $24.4 million is included in the CY and $128.9 million is included in the BY to fund CalWORKs caseload growth.

## FUNDING:

- The costs for RNE families are 100 percent GF. All other costs are 100 percent TANF.
- The GF is countable toward the state's maintenance of effort requirement.

## CHANGE FROM FEBRUARY BUDGET BILL OF 2009:

The increase in the CY and the BY is due to the CalWORKs Services caseload growing more than previously anticipated.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to the increasing CalWORKs Services caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $795,203 | $923,700 |
| Federal | 752,641 | 915,682 |
| State | 42,562 | 8,018 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Safety Net Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of continued assistance and services for the Safety Net program. The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, established by Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997), mandates that an adult may only receive a maximum of 60 months of CalWORKs assistance, but that children may continue to receive aid until they reach 18 years of age. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11320.15, adults who have received aid for a total of 60 months are removed from the assistance unit for the purpose of calculating aid. At county option, however, these adults may continue to receive post 60-month time limit employment services which may include, but are not limited to, transportation, ancillary and case management services. In addition, former recipients who are working or participating in an approved welfare-to-work (WTW) activity after leaving aid are eligible for up to two years of transitional child care.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: W&IC sections 11320.15, 11450.13, and 11454.5.
- Individuals began reaching their CalWORKs 60-month time limit in January 2003.
- The data sources used to determine the impacted caseload for the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY) are the CA 237 for grants, WTW 25/25A for services, and the CW 115/115A for child care.
- The cases that reach the time limit and are working or participating in WTW activities are eligible to receive up to 24 months of transitional child care and, at county option, up to 12 months of job retention services.

**Grants**

- The average monthly grant ($463.46) for Safety Net cases is calculated using actual data reported on the October 2008 to December 2008 CA 800 and CA 237 reports.
- The average monthly Safety Net caseload is 48,406 in the CY.
- The average monthly Safety Net caseload is 52,011 in the BY.

**Services**

- The Safety Net employment services caseload is projected to increase an approximate 4.81 percent from FY 2007-08 to the CY and an additional 7.45 percent from the CY to the BY.
- Based on the County Expense Claim (CEC), the cost of providing Safety Net employment services was approximately $6.0 million for the period January 2008 to December 2008.

**Administration**

- The Safety Net caseload was approximately 11 percent of the CalWORKs All Family caseload.
- The funding for the CY and the BY is based on actual expenditures from the January 2008 to December 2008 CEC which totaled $29.97 million.

# CalWORKs Safety Net Program

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

**Child Care**

- The funding for the CY is held to the Appropriation.
- The BY projected monthly Stage One Safety Net caseload (children) is projected to increase by approximately 7.45 percent.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Grants**

- For the CY and the BY, Safety Net grant costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly Safety Net cases by the cost per case (BY: 52,011 x $463.46 x 12).

**Services**

- For the CY and the BY, Safety Net employment services costs are based on actual expenditures for the period January 2008 to December 2008 plus caseload growth (CY: $6.0 million + $6.0 million x 4.81 percent).

**Administration**

- For the CY and the BY, Safety Net administration costs are based on actual expenditures for the period January 2008 to December 2008 plus caseload growth (CY: $30 million + $30 million x 4.81 percent).

**Child Care**

- The funding for the CY is held to the Appropriation.
- In the BY, the child care costs are calculated by increasing the prior year child care costs by the projected Safety Net growth (BY: $3.95 million + $3.95 million x 7.45 percent).

## FUNDING:

The Safety Net cost associated with CalWORKs grants is 97.5 percent General Fund (GF)/Maintenance of Effort and 2.5 percent county funds. The Safety Net costs associated with employment services, administration, and child care are 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in grant costs is due to a higher projected cost per case than what was projected in the February 2009 Budget Bill ($463.46 vs. $459.38). Administration costs have increased due to the caseload growing faster in the CY and the BY than was projected in the February 2009 Budget Bill. In the BY child care costs have increased due to the caseload growing faster than was projected.

The employment services costs have increased from the February 2009 Budget Bill based on the most recent actual expenditures.

# CalWORKs Safety Net Program

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in Safety Net grants, employment services, administration costs, and child care costs reflects an increase in the projected caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Grants** | 2008-09 Grants | 2009-10 Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $268,619 | $289,261 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 261,904 | 282,029 |
| County | 6,715 | 7,232 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **CalWORKs Services** | Services | Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $6,248 | $6,714 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 6,248 | 6,714 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 Admin. | 2009-10 Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $31,418 | $33,758 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 31,418 | 33,758 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Safety Net Program

| **ITEM 101 -** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **CalWORKs Stage One Child Care** | Child Care | Child Care |
| Total | $3,957 | $4,245 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 3,957 | 4,245 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Substance Abuse Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide substance abuse services for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Welfare-to-Work program participants. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandated the implementation of the CalWORKs program. In addition, the bill mandated counties to provide for the treatment of substance abuse that may limit or impair a participant's ability to make the transition from welfare to work or retain long-term employment. The county welfare departments and county alcohol and drug departments are required to collaborate to ensure an effective system is available to provide evaluations and substance abuse treatment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11322.6 and 11325.8.
- Total Substance Abuse expenditures for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 were $46,496,883.
- Total Substance Abuse expenditures for FY 2006-07 were $47,451,438.
- Total Substance Abuse expenditures for FY 2007-08 were $50,258,182.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimate is calculated by using the average annual percentage change for the previous two fiscal years to project Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) expenditures.
    - The percentage increase in expenditures from FY 2005-06 to FY 2006-07 was 2.05 percent.
    - The percentage increase in expenditures from FY 2006-07 to FY 2007-08 was 5.91 percent
    - The average annual increase from FY 2005-06 to FY 2007-08 was 3.98 percent.
- The FY 2008-09 budgeted amount is calculated as follows:
    - $50.26 million (FY 2007-08 expenditures) x 1.0398 (percent increase) = $52.26 million
- The FY 2009-10 budgeted amount is calculated as follows:
    - $52.26 million (estimated FY 2008-09 expenditures) x 1.0398 (percent increase) = $54.34 million

## FUNDING:

Funding for this premise is 100 percent General Fund and countable toward the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families maintenance of effort requirement.

.

# Substance Abuse Services

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase reflects updated expenditure data for FY 2007-08

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase from CY to BY reflects the estimated expenditure levels.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Services | County Services |
| Total | $52,260 | $54,342 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 52,260 | 54,342 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Mental Health Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise provides necessary mental health services, including case management and treatment, to California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program Welfare-to-Work participants in need of these services to obtain or retain employment. Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandated the implementation of the CalWORKs program. In addition, it mandated that counties provide a plan for the treatment of mental or emotional difficulties that may limit or impair a participant's ability to make the transition from welfare to work or retain long-term employment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11322.6.
- Total Mental Health expenditures for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 were $57,965,411.
- Total Mental Health expenditures for FY 2006-07 were $60,901,989.
- Total Mental Health expenditures for FY 2007-08 were $63,845,247.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimate is calculated by using the average annual percentage change for the previous two fiscal years to project the Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) expenditures.
    - The percentage increase in expenditures from FY 2005-06 to FY 2006-07 was 5.07 percent.
    - The percentage increase in expenditures from FY 2006-07 to FY 2007-08 was 4.83 percent
    - The average annual increase from FY 2005-06 to FY 2007-08 was 4.95 percent.
- The FY 2008-09 budgeted amount is calculated as follows:
    - $63.8 million (FY 2007-08 expenditures) x 1.0495 (percent increase) = $67.0 million
- The FY 2009-10 budgeted amount is calculated as follows:
    - $67.0 million (estimated FY 2008-09 expenditures) x 1.0495 (percent increase) = $70.3 million

## FUNDING:

The funding for this premise is 100 percent General Fund and is countable toward the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families maintenance of effort requirement.

# Mental Health Services

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase reflects updated expenditure data for FY 2007-08.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase from CY to BY reflects the estimated expenditure levels.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Services | County Services |
| Total | $67,005 | $70,322 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 67,005 | 70,322 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Mental Health/Substance Abuse Services for Indian Health Clinics

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide mental health and/or substance abuse services to Native Americans by providing a clinician in each of the 36 Indian health clinics. Services provided are necessary to obtain or retain employment, or to participate in county or Tribal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) welfare-to-work (WTW) activities.

The services may include: (a) outreach and identification of individuals who are receiving, or may be eligible for, California's Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program assistance; (b) screening of individuals for substance abuse and/or mental health issues; (c) ensuring that individuals have transportation to the county welfare department (CWD) to apply for CalWORKs or to participate in WTW activities; (d) accompanying individuals to the evaluation for mental health and/or substance abuse services; (e) providing individual or group services, or making referrals to more intensive treatment services offered by the CWD; and (f) facilitating the integration of individuals into the CalWORKs WTW program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Twenty-seven clinics implemented this program in Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02. Nine additional clinics implemented in FY 2002-03.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11322.6.
- The Legislature appropriated $1.9 million for mental health and substance abuse services in 36 Indian health clinics.
- Each mental health and substance abuse services clinic receives approximately $54,000.
- There are 30 clinics operating in FY 2008-09.
- There are 36 clinics anticipated in FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent General Fund, which is countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. These funds will remain with the California Department of Social Services for distribution.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The decrease in funding for FY 2008-09 is associated with six fewer Indian health clinics receiving funding than was assumed in the prior subvention.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in funding for FY 2009-10 is associated with the assumed participation of all 36 Indian health clinics.

# Mental Health/Substance Abuse Services for Indian Health Clinics

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,619 | $1,943 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,619 | 1,943 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# County Performance Incentives

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide fiscal incentive payments to counties for case exits due to employment, grant reductions due to earnings, and the diversion of applicants, as specified by the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997), and AB 2876 (Chapter 108, Statutes of 2000). The counties receive an annual performance incentive allocation beginning Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98, subject to the amounts appropriated in the annual Budget Act. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) began advancing incentive payments to counties as they were earned, but prior to their expenditure. The incentive allocations to counties are for use in either the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program or the CalWORKs program.

In 2001, the United States Department of Health and Human Services advised CDSS that the advancement of performance incentives was inconsistent with the federal Cash Management Improvement Act regulations, and that the unexpended funds must be recouped for redistribution. By June 30, 2002, CDSS had recouped the unspent performance incentive funds from the counties in accordance with the federal Cash Management Improvement Act. In view of the pressures to California's TANF block grant in FY 2002-03 and beyond, CDSS used part of the recoupment to fund the CalWORKs program in FY 2002-03. The remainder of the recouped funding was allocated to the counties in FY 2003-04. Unexpended funds as of June 30, 2007, are reappropriated in the Current Year (CY).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 10544.1 and 10544.2.
- Section 10544.2 provides that incentive funds shall be available for encumbrance and expenditure by counties without regard to fiscal year until all funds are expended. Based on the latest expenditure information reported by the counties, as of March 2009, the unexpended performance incentive balance was $4.743 million.

## METHODOLOGY:

It is anticipated that the balance available in FY 2008-09 will be $4.743 million. There will be no remaining funds available in FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent TANF block grant funds.

# County Performance Incentives

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Based on updated expenditure data, more funds remain unspent than was projected in the February 2009 Budget Bill.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

It is projected that there will be no remaining funds available in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,743 | $0 |
| Federal | 4,743 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Pay for Performance

## DESCRIPTION:

Pay for Performance is an investment strategy to encourage counties to achieve critical California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program outcomes. The original proposal established a three-year pilot project to ensure that counties invest resources in activities that are most effective and efficient in achieving the desired outcomes.

Subject to an appropriation, payments for the Pay for Performance program were scheduled to begin in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07. However, funds were not set aside for the Appropriation in FY 2006-07 and the program was delayed.

In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Chapter 47, Statutes of 2006) and AB 1078 (Chapter 622, Statutes of 2007), the California Department of Social Services is required to periodically publish the county-specific outcomes measured by the Pay for Performance program. A total of $40 million was shifted from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) reserve from FY 2006-07 to fund incentives in FY 2007-08 for counties that meet or exceed program outcome goals. County performance will be evaluated based on the following outcome measures:

- Employment rate of county CalWORKs cases.
- Modified federal participation rate that accounts for state allowable activities of county CalWORKs cases.
- Percentage of county CalWORKs cases that have earned income three months after ceasing to receive assistance.
- Effective January 1, 2008, the percentage of county CalWORKs cases, and cases that have left aid, that have earned income equal to or in excess of the maximum income level for the Earned Income Tax Credit.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

FY 2008-09 funds have been suspended by legislative action for the FY 2008 Budget. The February 2009 Budget suspended the funding for FY 2009-10.

The cost avoidance for suspending the FY 2009-10 Pay for Performance funding is $40 million.

## FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

# Pay for Performance

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **101 – CalWORKs Services** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Services | Services |
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Effect of EDD Wagner-Peyser Reimbursement

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the Wagner-Peyser funds provided by the State Employment Development Department (EDD) to offset the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. As required in Assembly Bill 2580 (Chapter 1025, Statutes of 1985), 50 percent of the available federal Wagner-Peyser funds are directed to provide for job services for CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work program participants.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This is an ongoing premise based on an annual appropriation.

## METHODOLOGY:

Funding amounts are identified and provided by EDD.

## FUNDING:

EDD receives federal funds for this program and transfers a portion to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) as a funding source for the CalWORKs program. The availability of these federal funds reduces CDSS' cost of the CalWORKs program.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $2,735 | $2,735 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 2,735 | 2,735 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Base Veto

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Governor's veto of $60 million from the CalWORKs' Single Allocation reflected in the 2008 Budget Act.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented with the passage of the 2008 Budget Act.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The State's current fiscal situation necessitates a $60 million reduction to the CalWORKs' Single Allocation.

## METHODOLOGY:

Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10: Reduction of $60 million to the CalWORKs' Single Allocation.

## FUNDING:

The funding is 100 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$60,000 | -$60,000 |
| Federal | -60,000 | -60,000 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# TANF Pass-Through for State Agencies

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program block grant funds to other state agencies that provide employment and educational services to California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Welfare-to-Work (WTW) program participants.

These state agencies include the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California Department of Education (CDE), and the California Department of Public Health (CDPH).

The purpose of the CCC pass-through is to reimburse CCC for the federal share of costs of educational services provided to participants of the WTW program. The purpose of the CDE pass-through is to reimburse CDE for the federal share of costs of average daily attendance hours, including CalWORKs WTW hours that exceed each school district's cap. The CDPH pass-through is for Community Challenge Grant projects aimed at reducing adolescent and unwed pregnancies, and encouraging father-child involvement by linking community-based organizations, schools, health educators, social service providers, parents, and youth.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1992. Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98, these contracts were funded under TANF rather than Title IV-F funds.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The contracted amounts of TANF funds provided to these agencies are:

| | FY 2008-09 | FY 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| CCC | $ 8.39 million | $ 8.39 million |
| CDE | $ 9.98 million | $ 9.98 million |
| CDPH | $20.00 million | $20.00 million |

## METHODOLOGY:

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) entered into interagency agreements that specified the amounts of TANF funds to be transferred from CDSS to the contracting departments.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent TANF funds

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# TANF Pass-Through for State Agencies

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $38,374 | $38,374 |
| Federal | 38,374 | 38,374 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Cal Learn

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing intensive case management, supportive services, and fiscal incentives and disincentives to eligible teen recipients who are pregnant or parenting and participating in the Cal Learn program. The Cal Learn program was authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 35 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1993) and SB 1078 (Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1993). Assembly Bill 2772 (Chapter 902, Statutes of 1998) changed the status of the Cal Learn program from a five-year federal demonstration project to a permanent program.

The Cal Learn program provides services to encourage teen parents to stay in high school or an equivalent program and earn a diploma. Case management activities must meet the standards and scope of the Adolescent Family Life program. Those standards include case management activities such as arrangement and management of supportive services, development and review of the report card schedule, exemption and deferral recommendations, and recommendations for bonuses and sanctions.

This premise includes the identification of cases, initial informing notices, and referrals to orientation. Also included is the administrative time to process supportive services payments and county mandated activities performed by the county welfare department. Those required activities include the final determination of deferrals, exemptions, bonuses and sanctions, good cause determinations, and activities associated with fair hearings.

Effective March 31, 1999, the federal waivers for the Cal Learn program expired. Without waiver authority, sanctioned Cal Learn teen parents are not Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program-eligible. This sanctioned caseload is funded with General Fund (GF).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1994.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11331.7.
- The projected average monthly caseload for Cal Learn is 9,644 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 10,359 in FY 2009-10.
- Cal Learn incentives include a $100 bonus per report card period for satisfactory progress and a $500 bonus upon graduation. The disincentive is a $100 sanction per report card period for failure to submit a report card or to make adequate progress.
- The sanctioned caseload (366 in FY 2008-09 and 394 in FY 2009-10) represents 3.8 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload. This is based on the actual sanctioned caseload compared to the total Cal Learn caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports for Calendar Year 2008.
- The sanctioned grant cost is $484 per month. These rates are based on the Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) for an assistance unit (AU) of two minus the $100 sanction.
- Based on the actual Calendar Year 2008 caseload as reported on the Stat 45 Reports, it is assumed that 5.4 percent of the Cal Learn participants receive the $100 bonus and one percent receives the $500 bonus.

# Cal Learn

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The average hourly eligibility worker (EW) cost is $57.57.
- It is assumed the EW requires one hour of administrative time per month for each case.
- The case management cost is $2,691 per case per year for all activities performed by the case manager. The rate is based on Calendar Year 2008 case management expenditures divided by the total Cal Learn caseload.
- It is assumed that 19 percent of the total Cal Learn caseload will utilize transportation services at a cost of $34.61 per month per participant. The utilization rate is based on the Calendar Year 2008 caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports. The cost is based on Calendar Year 2008 county transportation expenditure claims.
- It is assumed that 2.8 percent of the total Cal Learn caseload will utilize ancillary services at a cost of $104.60 per month per participant. The utilization rate is based on the Calendar Year 2008 caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports. The cost is based on Calendar Year 2008 county ancillary expenditure claims.
- Subsidized child care is available for Cal Learn participants attending high school. Please refer to the "CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration" premise for the assumptions and methodology used to develop the estimate.
- The funding for FY 2008-09 for Services and Administration costs are based on the following key data/assumptions:
  - Automation costs for Cal Learn tracking is approximately $173,625.
  - The Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNE) caseload of 145 in FY 2008-09 represents 1.5 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload and is funded with GF.
  - The sanctioned caseload of 366 in FY 2008-09 represents 3.8 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload and is funded with GF.
- The funding for FY 2009-10 for Services and Administration costs are based on the following key data/assumptions:
  - Automation costs for Cal Learn tracking is approximately $200,600.
  - The Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNE) caseload of 155 in FY 2009-10 represents 1.5 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload and is funded with GF.
  - The sanctioned caseload of 394 in FY 2009-10 represents 3.8 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload and is funded with GF.

## METHODOLOGY:

- For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the case management cost was multiplied by the projected Cal Learn caseload to determine the annual cost.
- The EW cost of $57.57 per hour was multiplied by the Cal Learn caseload, and then multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual county administration cost.

# Cal Learn

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- The transportation cost was determined by multiplying the Cal Learn caseload by the transportation utilization rate of 19 percent, multiplied by the transportation cost per case of $34.61, and then multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual cost.
- The ancillary service cost was determined by multiplying the Cal Learn caseload by the ancillary utilization rate of 2.8 percent, multiplied by ancillary cost per case of $104.60, and then multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual cost.
- The utilization rates for the $100 and $500 bonuses were each multiplied by the total caseload, then multiplied by 12 to determine the annual costs. The 1.5 percent of bonuses for RNE cases are backed out and displayed in a separate premise.
- The state-only (sanctioned) rate was multiplied by the total caseload to determine the sanctioned caseload, multiplied by the MAP for an AU of two minus $100 to determine the sanctioned grant costs.

## FUNDING:

Cal Learn costs are 100 percent TANF, except for grants and services for the sanctioned caseload and the costs associated with the RNE caseload, which are 100 percent GF and are countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY increase in services and admin costs is related to an increase in case management costs and an increase in caseload. The CY and the BY increase in grant bonus and sanction costs is related to an increase in caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in bonuses, sanctioned grants, and services costs is due to a caseload increase in the Budget Year.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 9,644 | 10,359 |

# Cal Learn

## EXPENDITURES [1]:
(in 000's)

| **101 – CalWORKs Bonuses** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,185 | $1,273 |
| Federal | 1,185 | 1,273 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 |

| **101 – CalWORKs Sanctioned Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $2,126 | $2,288 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 2,126 | 2,288 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 |

| **101 – CalWORKs Services & Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Services | Services |
| Total | $33,633 | $36,141 |
| Federal | 32,101 | 34,494 |
| State | 1,532 | 1,647 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 |

[1] - The recent noncitizen entrant costs are a subset of these expenditures and are displayed in the "Recent Noncitizen Entrants" premise.

# TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs – Basic

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative costs for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. The basic costs include the costs for general administration, coordination and overhead for the programs such as the salaries and benefits of staff performing activities related to eligibility determination, preparation of budgets, monitoring programs, fraud units, services related to accounting, litigation, payroll and personnel, and costs for the goods and services required for the administration of the program such as supplies, equipment, utilities, and rental and maintenance of office space.

Historically, the budget for county administration was based on counties' administrative budget requests made through a Proposed County Administrative Budget (PCAB) process, modified by a cost containment system consistent with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 14154. Beginning with Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02, the PCAB process was suspended and the last PCAB process, 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.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 14154.
- The FY 2007-08 base funding which was held to the FY 2006-07 funding level for CalWORKs County Administrative Basic was approximately $642 million.
- The Current Year (CY) estimate reflects a projected increase of 10.45 percent, which represents caseload growth from FY 2006-07 to FY 2008-09 and the Budget Year (BY) reflects growth of 17.17 percent in FY 2009-10 over the FY 2008-09 caseload level.
- Staff development costs in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 are projected to be $14.2 million based on actual expenditures from January 2008 to December 2008.
- Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) development and testing interface costs are $129,000 in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Administrative costs related to the Merced Automated Global Information Control (MAGIC) automation system are $272,000 in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) savings are $10.6 million in FY 2008-09 and $11.3 million in FY 2009-10.
- Homeless Assistance costs are projected to be $.6 million in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Time limit savings are $38 million in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Legacy Systems savings are $12.1 million in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Contract costs are $4.1 million for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- In FY 2008-09, $8.5 million of the CalWORKs Administrative Basic expenditures are for Recent Noncitizens Entrants (RNEs). Of the $8.5 million, $4.3 million reflects the federally eligible recipients in mixed households.

# TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs – Basic

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- In FY 2009-10, $10 million of the CalWORKs Administrative Basic expenditures are for RNE. Of the $10 million, $5.6 million reflects the federally eligible recipients in mixed households.

## METHODOLOGY:

The basic funding from FY 2007-08 is adjusted to reflect the projected increase in caseload, staff development expenditures, savings for EBT, Homeless Assistance, time limits, Legacy Systems, the MAGIC system, the SAWS development and testing, and contract costs. Funds for TANF ineligible RNEs were subtracted and shifted to the RNE premise. (For more information see separate RNE premise.)

## FUNDING:

- The costs for RNE families are 100 percent General Fund (GF).
- For FY 2008-09, all other costs are 100 percent TANF.
- For FY 2009-10, all other costs are 94.31 percent TANF and 5.69 percent state MOE. The BY reflects a shift of funds from TANF to state Maintenance of Effort (MOE). Due to a federal audit exception, TANF hardship cases will be funded with MOE instead of TANF funds effective July 1, 2009.
- The GF is countable toward the state's MOE.

**Note**: W&I Code section 15204.4 requires an MOE from the counties based on expenditures during FY 1996-97. Please reference the "County MOE Adjustment" premise.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY change reflects a projected increase in the CalWORKs caseload. The BY change also reflects the shift of funds for hardship cases from TANF to state MOE as discussed above.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY change reflects a projected increase in the CalWORKs caseload. In addition, the BY reflects the shift of funds for hardship cases from TANF to state MOE as discussed above.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $662,878 | $780,992 |
| Federal | 658,596 | 730,675 |
| State | 4,282 | 50,317 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Restore California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Administration Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the restoration of $140 million for county CalWORKs administration pursuant to Assembly Bill 1801, (Chapter 47, Statutes of 2006) which restores funding to the actual Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 spending level. The counties will utilize these funds consistent with single allocation spending.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The county CalWORKs single allocation will be increased by $140 million in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding for CalWORKs Administration will be increased by $140 million to restore funding to the actual FY 2005-06 spending level.

## FUNDING:

The funds are 100 percent TANF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **101- CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $140,000 | $140,000 |
| Federal | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Single Allocation Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

Section 15204.2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code provides that state and federal funds shall be appropriated in a single allocation to county welfare departments (CWDs) for the support of administrative activities undertaken by the CWDs to provide benefit payments to California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) recipients and to provide work activities and supportive services to efficiently and effectively carry out the purposes of the CalWORKs program. Due to pressures on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant funding and the overall General Fund budget, the single allocation has been reduced by $20.6 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented with passage of the 2008 Budget Act.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The CalWORKs single allocation was reduced by $20.6 million TANF funds in FY 2008-09.
- In FY 2008-09, it was assumed that 50 percent of the prior year's (PY) county performance incentive funds and fraud recovery incentive funds would remain unspent and would be used to backfill the single allocation reduction in FY 2008-09.
- Pursuant to language contained in the 2008 Budget Act the single allocation shall be restored to the extent that the county performance and fraud recovery incentive funds available as of June 30, 2008 are less than $20.6 million.

## METHODOLOGY:

Based on updated expenditure information, available PY county performance incentive funds available and unspent are $4.7 million and PY fraud recovery incentive funds available and unspent are $3.1 million for a total of $7.8 million.

Based on updated expenditure information the single allocation reduction will be $7.8 million for FY 2008-09, therefore resulting in a restoration of $12.8 million.

## FUNDING:

This reduction will be 100 percent TANF funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in funds available to backfill the single allocation reduction is due to the most recent expenditure information which reflect more unspent PY performance incentive and fraud recovery incentive funds.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a Current Year item only.

# Single Allocation Reduction

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **101 – CalWORKs** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Administration** | | |
| Total | -$7,844 | $0 |
| Federal | -7,844 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Work Verification

## DESCRIPTION:

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. One of the key goals of the DRA is to improve work participation information for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program through the uniform and consistent collection of data. The DRA also requires improved verification and oversight of work participation. Each state was required to establish and must maintain work verification procedures and internal controls to ensure compliance with the procedures. The verification and oversight procedures are described in California's federally-approved Work Verification Plan (WVP), which explains procedures for:

- Determining whether activities may be counted as work activities
- Counting and verifying reported hours of work
- Determining who is a work-eligible individual
- Establishing internal controls to ensure compliance with the procedures

The WVP requires counties to document and verify all reported hours of participation, as well as hours that are counted as excused absences. Counties must also document and verify disability and school attendance, if applicable. In addition to increasing verification requirements, the DRA requires California to collect, document, and verify participation data on individuals that were previously excluded from federal reporting requirements in the calculation of participation rates. These changes pose a significant additional workload for county staff.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Current Year (CY) funding has been held to the Appropriation.
- Funding may be used by counties to hire additional staff, retrain existing staff, and/or pay for staffs' additional workload to document and verify work participation required by federal law. Clearly documenting and verifying an individual's participation will enhance California's ability to meet the federal work participation rates and avoid penalties associated with inadequate documentation and verification of the data used in calculating the rates.
- Based on information from the County Welfare Directors Association of California, of the cases that are currently participating through work activities in FY 2009-10, 80 percent of cases have pay stubs that fulfill work verification requirements (documented hours for which the individual was paid); 20 percent of cases will require additional documentation by the county.
- It is assumed that 100 percent of the cases that participate through non-work activities will require additional documentation by the county.

  Per Q5 data, the total pre-60 month cases that are subject to work participation (including sanction cases) amount to 276,566. Of this figure, 41.6 percent or approximately 115,064 cases are participating at some level.

# Work Verification

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Of the 115,064 cases that participate at some level and noted above, 56 percent participate either partially or fully through work activities. 44 percent fully participate through non-work activities.

- Per Q5 survey data, 26 percent of the safety net caseload is projected to participate either partially or fully through work activities. Five percent are projected to fully participate through non-work activities. This assumes the impact of the Modified Safety Net proposal.

- The average hourly eligibility worker (EW) cost is $57.57. It is assumed that it will take ten minutes ($9.60) of administrative time per month to verify participation for cases that participate through work, and 15 minutes ($14.39) of administrative time per month for cases that participate through non-work activities.

## METHODOLOGY:

- For FY 2009-10, approximately 276,566 pre-60 month cases will be subject to work participation requirements. Of this figure, 41.6 percent or approximately 115,064 cases are participating at some level. Of the 115,064 that are participating at some level, 56 percent or 64,436 will participate through work activities and 44 percent or 50,628 will participate in non work activities.

  - Of the 64,436 that participate through work activities, 80 percent have pay stubs and do not require work verification, the remaining 20 percent will require work verification at a cost of $1.5 million (10 minutes per case).

  - Of the 50,628 that participate in non work activities, 100 percent will require work verification at a cost of $8.8 million (15 minutes per case).

- For FY 2009-10, approximately 13,580 safety net cases will participate through work activities and 2,595 cases will participate through non work activities.

  - Of the 13,580 that participate through work activites, 100 percent will require work verification at a cost of 1.6 million (10 minutes per case),

  - Of the 2,595 that participate in non work activities, 100 percent will require work verification at a cost of $.5 million (15 minutes per case).

## FUNDING:

This premise is 100 percent TANF for TANF eligible cases. Safety Net cases are 100 percent general fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY has been held to the Appropriation. The methodology has been adjusted to account for all cases partially participating or fully participating in federal work requirements.

# Work Verification

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to an increased number of cases requiring work verification.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

**ITEM 101-**
**CalWORKs Administration**

| | 2008-09 Admin. | 2009-10 Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $11,149 | $12,240 |
| Federal | 8,736 | 8,336 |
| State | 2,413 | 3,904 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Fraud Recovery Incentives

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the incentive payments made annually to counties for the detection of fraud. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) provided that each county shall receive 25 percent of the actual share of savings, including federal funds under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, that results from the detection of fraud. This statute, amended by AB 444 (Chapter 1022, Statutes of 2002), now provides that each county shall receive 12.5 percent of the actual amount of aid repaid or recovered by a county resulting from the detection of fraud. These savings/recoveries have been defined as the amounts collected on client-caused (non-administrative error) overpayments. County incentives paid with TANF monies must be used for purposes prescribed under the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11486(j).
- Based on the FNS 209 Status of Claims Against Households, client-caused overpayments represent 55.7 percent of all collections.
- The total overpayment collections were $67.1 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08.
- The total estimated overpayment collections are $60.5 million for FY 2008-09.
- Based on the amount of overpayment collections, incentive payments are made annually to the counties in arrears.
- Effective with the passage of AB 444, the counties receive 12.5 percent of the savings due to client-caused overpayments.
- Overpayments are assumed to be funded 97.5 percent TANF/maintenance of effort and 2.5 percent county.

## METHODOLOGY:

The county incentive payment is the product of the total collections multiplied by the TANF share of collections (97.5 percent), multiplied by the percentage of client-caused errors (55.7 percent), and multiplied by the county incentive (12.5 percent).

## FUNDING:

The costs are 100 percent TANF.

# Fraud Recovery Incentives

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The FY 2009-10 decrease is associated with a decline in overpayment collections.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is associated with a decline in overpayment collections.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **ITEM 101 – TANF** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $4,557 | $4,109 |
| Federal | 4,557 | 4,109 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# TANF and NAFS Programs – PA to NA Fund Shift

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an allocation of costs to Food Stamp (FS) administration for FS recipients receiving California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) benefits. Eligibility and ongoing costs for FS recipients that receive CalWORKs are charged as CalWORKs administrative costs. The federal share of administrative costs for FS activities for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program cases is funded by the United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service (USDA-FNS).

The Department of Health and Human Services Division of Cost Allocation directed the California Department of Social Services to distribute costs for the eligibility determination activity among the benefiting programs. The methodology develops ratios based upon CalWORKs and Public Assistance Food Stamp (PAFS) caseload and administrative expenditure data to determine the portion of the Eligibility, Case Management, and Program Integrity activity costs in CalWORKs that benefit the FS program. The PAFS allocation for common intake costs is also included in the cost shift.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in March of 1984.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Based on July 2008 through December 2008 data, the amount of ongoing eligibility costs shifted to the FS program was $72.6 million.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, PAFS caseload will increase by 9.0 percent from January 2009 to June 2009.
- In FY 2009-10, PAFS caseload will increase by 15.5 percent over FY 2008-09 levels.
- The eligibility worker common intake administrative costs are divided equally among CalWORKs, PAFS and Medi-Cal. The PAFS share of the common intake costs is $62.5 million in FY 2008-09 and $72.3 million in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

Funding for the Current Year (CY) was calculated by applying the anticipated CalWORKs caseload growth (9.0 percent) to the total funding level from July 2008 through December 2008. The common intake costs are then added to this total.

The Budget Year (BY) costs were calculated by growing the base funding by the anticipated CalWORKs caseload growth and then adding the common intake costs to the total.

FY 2008-09:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | July 2008 through December 2008 eligibility costs | $ 72.6 million |
| + | With additional 9.0 percent caseload growth | $ 79.1 million |
| = | FY 2008-09 eligibility costs | $151,7 million |
| + | FY 2008-09 common intake costs | $ 62.5 million |
| = | Total PA to NA Fund Shift | $214.3 million |

# TANF and NAFS Programs – PA to NA Fund Shift

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

FY 2009-10:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | FY 2008-09 eligibility costs | $151.7 million |
| + | 15.5 percent caseload growth | $ 23.6 million |
| + | FY 2009-10 common intake costs | $ 72.3 million |
| = | Total PA to NA Fund Shift | $247.6 million |

## FUNDING:

Non-Assistance FS (NAFS) costs are shared 50 percent federal funds (USDA-FNS), 35 percent General Fund, and 15 percent county funds. The CalWORKs costs shifted are 100 percent federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY decrease in funds shifting from CalWORKs Administration to FS Administration is due to updated Calendar Year 2008 initial eligibility determination and ongoing eligibility expenditures.

The BY increase in funds shifting from CalWORKs Administration to FS Administration is due to greater than expected CalWORKs caseload growth.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in funds shifting from CalWORKs Administration to FS Administration is due to an increase in the CalWORKs caseload from the CY to the BY.

# TANF and NAFS Programs – PA to NA Fund Shift

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **ITEM 101 – TANF** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$214,254 | -$247,560 |
| Federal | -214,254 | -247,560 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 – Food Stamps** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $214,254 | $247,560 |
| Federal | 107,127 | 123,780 |
| State | 74,989 | 86,646 |
| County | 32,138 | 37,134 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Medi-Cal Services Eligibility / Common Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with shifting eligibility costs from the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program to the Medi-Cal program. The Medi-Cal Services Eligibility program was authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code section 14154 which mandates the California Department of Social Services to instruct counties to modify the eligibility determination process so that eligibility for Medi-Cal is determined prior to eligibility for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The initial eligibility determination expenditures were $89.7 million from July 2008 through December 2008.The CalWORKs county administrative expenditures were $436.1 million from July 2008 through December 2008. This includes common costs for the Food Stamp and Medi-Cal programs.
- CalWORKs initial eligibility expenditures equal 20.6% of total CalWORKs eligibility expenditures ($89.7 million / $436.1 million = $20.6%)
- In FY 2008-09, CalWORKs caseload is expected to increase by 9.0 percent from January 2009 to June 2009.
- In FY 2009-10, CalWORKs caseload is expected to increase 15.5 percent from FY 2008-09 levels.
- The Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, and Food Stamp programs each share one third of the initial eligibility determination common costs.

## METHODOLOGY:

Medi-Cal Services Eligibility/Common Costs are calculated as follows:

**FY 2008-09**

- Eligibility expenditures for January 2009 through June 2009 are calculated using actual expenditures from July 2008 through December 2008 ($436.1 million).
- This amount is increased by the percentage of CalWORKs caseload growth projected for January 2009 through June 2009 ($436.1 x 1.09 = $475.4).
- The totals are then added together to arrive at the net FY 2008-09 eligibility expenditures ($436.1 million + $475.4 million = $911.5 million).
- The percent of CalWORKs eligibility expenditures related to initial eligibility are then multiplied by the net eligibility expenditures (20.6% x $911.5 million = $187.6 million).
- The costs are then divided equally between Medi-Cal, CalWORKs and Food Stamps ($187.6 million / 3 = $62.5 million).

# Medi-Cal Services Eligibility/Common Costs

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

**FY 2009-10**

- The shared costs between CalWORKs, Food Stamps, and Medi-Cal is increased by the anticipated CalWORKs caseload growth for FY 2009-10 ($62.5 million x 1.155 = $72.2 million).

## FUNDING:

The funds are 100 percent TANF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in funds shifting from CalWORKs Administration to Medi-Cal is due to updated calendar year 2008 initial eligibility determination and ongoing eligibility expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in funds shifting from CalWORKs Administration to Medi-Cal is due to an increase in the CalWORKs caseload in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$62,530 | -$72,250 |
| Federal | -62,530 | -72,250 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Administrative Cap Adjustment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an adjustment to ensure California does not exceed the 15 percent administrative cap required under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. Under TANF, states may not spend more than 15 percent of either their federal TANF funds or state maintenance of effort (MOE) dollars on administrative costs. Administrative costs are defined as costs necessary for the proper administration of the TANF or separate state programs. Expenditures in excess of the 15 percent federal cap are considered a misuse of funds which may result in a reduction of federal TANF funds.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented October 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 263.0 and 263.13.
- The administrative cap is applied on a statewide basis rather than county specific.
- Administrative activities include, but are not limited to, eligibility determinations, administrative costs incurred by contractors, automation costs not related to tracking and monitoring of TANF requirements, preparation of program plans, procurement, property management, and costs of fraud and abuse units.

## METHODOLOGY:

- Actual State and federal administrative expenditures from the first three quarters of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2008 were added to a projected final quarter and then compared to the net annual TANF grant and the required state MOE for FFY 2008.
- Administrative expenditures were adjusted between federal TANF (9.02 percent) and state MOE (9.02 percent) until the administrative cost percentages were at the lowest common rate.

## FUNDING:

The administrative cap adjustment consists of a shift from federal funds to the General Fund (GF) or GF to federal funds, whichever is necessary to keep the percentages at the lowest common rate.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The adjustment has been updated to reflect the actual FFY 2008 expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# CalWORKs Administrative Cap Adjustment

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | -139,000 | -139,000 |
| State | 139,000 | 139,000 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Court Cases

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects settlement costs and attorney fees relating to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Foster Care (FC), Food Stamp, and Adoption Assistance Programs (AAP). The costs result from the settlement of lawsuits related to local assistance in accordance with Budget Letter 98-22, and instructions from the Department of Finance.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

**Item 101 – TANF Administration**

- A total of $320,000 is budgeted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the Current Year (CY).
- A total of $610,000 is budgeted in FY 2009-10 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the Budget Year (BY).

**Item 141 – FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration**

- A total of $1,354,000 is budgeted in FY 2008-09 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the CY.
- A total of $3,696,000 is budgeted in FY 2009-10 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the BY.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Item 101 – TANF Administration**

The estimate is based on actual and projected attorney fees, settlement costs, and miscellaneous writs to be paid in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

**Item 141 – FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration**

The estimate is based on actual and projected attorney fees, settlement costs, and miscellaneous writs to be paid in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

**Item 101 –TANF Administration**

The funding is 100 percent TANF.

**Item 141 – FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration**

Attorney fees associated with federally-eligible cases are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Attorney fees associated with nonfederally-eligible cases are funded 100 percent GF. Court settlement costs are shared at the same ratios as the respective programs (i.e. AAP and AFDC-FC).

# Court Cases

## CHANGE FROM THE BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The decrease in the CY TANF administration court case costs is due to a combination of cases which were expected to settle in the CY being pushed into the BY and cases that closed with no additional costs. The BY increase for TANF court costs is the combination of CY cases moving to BY and expected to settle, combined with new cases expected to settle in BY.

The decrease in the CY FC, AAP, and Food Stamp court costs is due to cases, which were expected to settle in the CY being pushed into the BY. The BY increase for FC, AAP, and Food Stamp court costs is the combination of CY cases moving to BY and expected to settle, combined with new cases expected to settle in BY.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY TANF administrative court costs reflect an increase due to a combination of new cases and cases that were expected to settle in the CY carrying over into the BY.

The increase in the BY FC, AAP, and Food Stamp court costs is due to a combination of new FC cases and cases that were projected to settle in the CY being pushed into the BY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **TANF Administration** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $320 | $610 |
| Federal | 320 | 610 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,354 | $3,696 |
| Federal | 677 | 1,848 |
| State | 677 | 1,848 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# State/County Peer Reviews

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the provisions in Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 that require the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to conduct a pilot of State/County Peer Reviews in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 with statewide implementation by July 1, 2007. CDSS staff and staff from two county welfare departments (CWDs) will visit other CWDs to review their California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program policies, procedures, and data to improve performance outcomes. The primary purpose of these collaborative visits is to identify and share best practices between the CWDs and provide an opportunity for the identification of potential obstacles that may prevent CWDs from achieving the outcomes required by federal law. Since the Peer Reviews are mandatory under AB 1808, it is necessary to provide CWDs with appropriate funding to participate in these visits. This premise reflects the costs associated with backfilling, travel, and per diem costs for the participating county staff.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10533.
- There will be 18 peer reviews in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Each peer review will take approximately five days (eight hours per day) to complete. One additional eight hour day is required for preparation and training in the host county for staff from the visiting counties.
- Two staff persons from each of the two visiting counties will travel to the host county for the Peer Review. One manager and two staff persons from the host county will participate in the Peer Review.
- The travel and per diem costs for each person from the visiting counties is $1,336 per visit.
- This estimate includes the costs to backfill for four county staff: one staff person from each of the two visiting counties and two staff persons from the host county. No backfill is assumed for managers.
- The hourly salary and benefits for a worker is $35.80.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The cost for travel and per diem for one manager and one staff person from each visiting county for two peer reviews is $96,192 in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- The average backfill cost for each county staff for 48 hours is $1,718.
- The total backfill cost for four county staff for 18 peer reviews is $123,725 in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

# State/County Peer Field Reviews

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- The total cost for travel, per diem, and county staff backfill is $219,917 in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $220 | $220 |
| Federal | $220 | 220 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Research and Evaluation

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to develop a research design to ensure a thorough evaluation of the direct and indirect effects of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. Research and evaluation of the CalWORKs program was authorized by Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code sections 11520 through 11521.7. The statute specifies that an independent evaluator or evaluators shall conduct the statewide evaluation and that the outcomes derived from these evaluations will be provided through discrete reports issued at regular intervals and will include information regarding process, impacts, and analyses of the costs and benefits of the CalWORKs program.

In addition, the statute specifies that the California Department of Social Services will ensure that county demonstration projects and other innovative county approaches to the CalWORKs program implementation are rigorously evaluated and that the findings are reported to the Legislature in a timely fashion. The evaluation of a county-specific program shall be developed in conjunction with the county and other appropriate agencies responsible for the local program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&I Code sections 11520 through 11521.7.
- Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandated the evaluation of the CalWORKs program and county demonstration projects.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 has been held at the Budget Act of 2007 Appropriation level.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Research and Evaluation

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $4,000 | $4,000 |
| Federal | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# County Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs counties are required to expend from their general funds or from the social services account of the County Health and Welfare Trust Fund to support the administration of programs providing services to needy families, and the administration of food stamps. Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 15204.4 authorized the county maintenance of effort (MOE).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 15204.4.
- The individual county requirement for spending is equal to that amount which was expended by the county for comparative activities during Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97. Failure to meet this required level will result in a proportionate reduction in funds provided as part of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program single allocation.
- Actual county expenditures in FY 1996-97 were $140,540,757. This amount represents the ongoing county MOE requirement. In FY 1996-97, county expenditures were made in the following programs: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; Non-Assistance Food Stamps; Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN); Cal Learn, Health & Safety (for child care); Transitional Child Care Administration; and Non-GAIN Education & Training program.
- The estimated county expenditures for the administration of the Food Stamp (FS) program for FY 2008-09 is $115,535,280.
- The estimated county expenditures for the administration of the FS program for FY 2009-10 is $133,721,645.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funds reflected in this premise are the total statewide expenditures for FY 1996-97 minus the estimated county expenditures for the administration of the FS program.

FY 2008-09:

$140,540,757 - $115,535,280 = $25,005,477

FY 2009-10:

$140,540,757 - $133,721,645 = $6,819,112

## FUNDING:

This is a shift from federal to county funds.

# County Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The decrease in the amount shifted in the Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) is due to an increase in the county share of cost in the FS program. Even though caseload is increasing more than previously expected, there is no county share of overmatch projected for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decreased amount shifted in the BY is due to an increase in the county share of cost in the FS program. The increase in the cost of the FS program can be attributed to the projected caseload increase.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | -25,005 | -6,820 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 25,005 | 6,820 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for Stage One Child Care to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (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. Child care services are available to CalWORKs families with children under 13 years of age.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) authorized CalWORKs Stage One Child Care. Child care services for Cal Learn participants were authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 35 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1993) and SB 1078 (Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1993).

The CalWORKs Child Care program is administered in three stages. Stage One is administered by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Stage Two, administered by the California Department of Education (CDE), serves individuals determined to be in a more stable situation, either working or participating in work activities while on aid, and participants transitioning off of aid. Stage Three is also administered by CDE and serves participants who have been off of aid for two years.

As a result of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Reauthorization, two-parent families will no longer be funded with Maintenance of Effort (MOE) for CalWORKs Grants, Services, and Administration. However, CalWORKs child care for two-parent families will continue to be funded with General Fund (GF) as these families must work or participate a minimum of 55 hours per week in welfare-to-work activities to be eligible for federally funded child care.

Total Stage One costs are reduced by five percent and are reflected in the Stage One Holdback premise.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Education Code sections 8350, 8351, 8352 and Welfare and Institutions Code section 11331.7.
- The cost of providing CalWORKs child care is based on the following:
  - The projected monthly caseload (children) for the Current Year (CY) is 61,746 and the Budget Year (BY) is 66,848 based on a regression analysis projection using actual caseload from Calendar Year 2008 as reported on the Child Care Monthly Report - CalWORKs Families (CW 115) and Child Care Monthly Report - Two-Parent Families (CW 115A).

# CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The monthly cost of CalWORKs child care for FY 2009-10 is $738.00 per child. This is based on child care expenditures and caseload as reported on the County Expense Claims and the CW 115 and CW 115A reports from January 2008 – December 2008. The cost per child is increased by an additional 1.53 percent cost of doing business added to the July 2008 Consumer Necessities Index of 5.26 percent.
- The CalWORKs child care administrative ratio is 10.88 percent and is based on the actual administrative expenditures compared to services expenditures for Calendar Year 2008.
- The child care cost for two-parent families is 3.22 percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2008.
- The child care costs for the Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs) is 0.48 percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2008.
- The child care cost for sanctioned teens for State-Only Cal Learn Child Care is 0.023 percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2008.
- It is assumed $195.9 million in the CY and $186.3 million in the BY in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds are transferred to Title XX and used to fund Stage One.
- The CY reflects the addition of $8.4 million from the Stage One Holdback , $10.1 million in RMR costs (though not implemented), and $13.7 million of child care costs previously reflected in the Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts premise.
- In the BY, the Stage One holdback is $32.8 million. This amount is based on five percent of Stage One child care costs. Refer to the “Child Care Stage One Holdback” premise description for more information.

- Based on historical percentages of the employment services and child care caseloads to the total CalWORKs caseload a $94 million caseload supplement equivalent to an additional 9,575 cases has been provided for FY 2009-10 to account for the overall expected growth in the CalWORKs caseload.
- In FY 2009-10, the net need after adjustments for Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNE) and State-Only Cal Learn is approximately $654.7 million.

## METHODOLOGY:

- 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 Stage One Child Care basic costs, Safety Net, and the RMR impact are reduced by five percent and placed in the Stage One Holdback.
- The caseload supplement is then added to the Stage One Child Care basic costs.

# CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration

## METHODOLOGY (continued):

- The Stage One two-parent child care costs are calculated by multiplying the total Stage One child care costs by 3.22 percent.
- The RNE caseload represents 0.48 percent of Stage One Child Care costs.
- Federally eligible members of mixed RNE households represent 50.12 percent and remain in the Stage One Basic Program, funded with GF. The remaining portion of the RNE child care cost is reflected on the RNE premise line. Refer to the "Recent Noncitizen Entrants Services/Administration" premise description for more information.
- Sanctioned teens for State-Only Cal Learn Child Care represent 0.023 percent of Stage One Child Care Costs. These funds are reflected in the "State-Only Cal Learn Child Care" premise, funded with GF.

## FUNDING:

Stage One Child Care for single parents is funded with 100 percent TANF. Child Care for two-parent families and RNEs is funded with 100 percent GF, which is countable toward the state's TANF MOE requirement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY reflects the addition of $8.4 million from the Stage One Holdback, $10.1 million in RMR costs (though not implemented), and $13.7 million of child care costs previously reflected in the Previous CalWORKs Reform Efforts premise. In the BY, the change reflects an increase in the overall projected caseload, cost per case, and the application of a 1.53 percent cost of doing business increase.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in services and administration costs in the BY reflects an increase in the overall projected caseload, cost per case, and the application of a 1.53 percent cost of doing business increase.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Children | 61,746 | 76,423 |

# CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration

## EXPENDITURES:

### 101 – CalWORKs Child Care

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Services | 2009-10 Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $554,246 | $644,716 |
| Federal | 534,654 | 624,932 |
| State | 19,592 | 19,784 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 Administration | 2009-10 Administration |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $58,598 | $71,259 |
| Federal | 56,532 | 69,107 |
| State | 2,066 | 2,152 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# RMR Impact to the 85th Percentile March 2009

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost impact to California's subsidized child care system from the updated Regional Market Rate (RMR) Ceilings. RMR ceilings are the maximum amount child care providers can be reimbursed from the state for subsidized child care. California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) participants that are receiving CalWORKs Stage One and Stage Two child care will be affected by these RMR updates.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise did not implement.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Education Code sections 8357 and 8447.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, this premise reflected the implementation of the new regional market rates at the 85th percentile, effective March 2009 (Based on the 2007 Survey). The February 2009 Budget Bill removed the RMR increase at the new 85th percentile and instead implemented an RMR increase at the new 75th percentile based on the 2007 Survey, effective July 1, 2009.

## METHODOLOGY:

No Budget Year (BY) costs were budgeted for this premise due to implementation of the new RMR at the 75th percentile of the 2007 survey effective July 1, 2009. (See the RMR Impact to the 75th Percentile July 2009 premise for more information)

## FUNDING:

Stage One Child Care for single parents is funded with 100 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Child Care for two-parent families is funded with 100 percent General Fund, which is countable toward the state's TANF maintenance of effort requirement.

# RMR Impact to the 85th Percentile March 2009

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year amount is reflected in the "Stage One Child Care Services Basic". The premise will not implement in the BY.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# RMR Impact to the 75th Percentile July 2009

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost impact to California's subsidized child care system from the updated Regional Market Rate (RMR) Ceilings. RMR ceilings are the maximum amount child care providers can be reimbursed from the state for subsidized child care. California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) participants that are receiving CalWORKs Stage One and Stage Two child care will be affected by these RMR updates. This premise reflects the costs associated with the implementation of the 2007 RMR survey at the 75th percentile in July 2009.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 implementation and is included in the 2009-10 Budget Bill enacted February 20, 2009 (SBX3 1).

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Education Code sections 8357 and 8447. This premise reflects the July 2009 RMR impact from the following premises: Stage One Child Care Services and Administration; Safety Net; Recent Noncitizen Entrants Services and Administration; State-Only Cal Learn Child Care.
- Five percent of the savings associated with the July 2009 RMR changes are reflected in the Stage One Child Care Holdback.

## METHODOLOGY:

A weighted cost per case at the 85th percentile for child care centers, family child care homes and exempt providers was determined based on the 2005 RMR survey. A weighted cost per case at the 75th percentile for child care centers, family child care homes and exempt providers was determined based on the 2007 RMR survey. The categories were then combined and another weighted average was computed based on the percentage of CalWORKs cases in each category. The 2007 RMR at the 75th percentile is .27 percent higher than the 2005 RMR at the 85th percentile.

## FUNDING:

Stage One Child Care for single parents is funded with 100 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Child Care for two-parent families is funded with 100 percent General Fund, which is countable toward the state's TANF maintenance of effort requirement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Feb 2009 Budget Bill (SBX3 1) reflected savings associated with lowering the RMR from the 85th percentile of the 2007 RMR survey to the 75th percentile at the 2007 RMR survey. The increase to the 85th percentile did not implement. This premise now reflects only the cost of the 75th percentile of the 2007 RMR survey.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a Budget Year premise only.

# RMR Impact to the 75th Percentile July 2009

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $1,121 |
| Federal | 0 | 1,081 |
| State | 0 | 40 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# State-Only Cal Learn Child Care

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing child care services to sanctioned teen parents participating in the Cal Learn program. The Cal Learn program, including child care services, was authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 35 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1993) and SB 1078 (Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1993). Assembly Bill 2772 (Chapter 902, Statutes of 1998) changed the status of the Cal Learn program from a five-year federal demonstration project to a permanent program.

Federal law (Public Law 104-193) prohibits the use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds to teen parents who do not participate in school or another approved activity. Cal Learn teen parents who do not attend school, do not turn in a report card, or receive poor grades are subject to a $100 sanction. Because the Cal Learn program operated under a five-year federal waiver as a California Work Pays Demonstration Project, the program was not affected by the federal rules. However, effective March 31, 1999, the federal waivers for the Cal Learn program expired. In order to provide support services to sanctioned teens, the cost for the State-Only Cal Learn Child Care program is funded with General Fund (GF).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11331.7.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10, 0.023 percent of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Stage One Child Care caseload represents sanctioned teens receiving services under State-Only Cal Learn Child Care.
- Refer to the “Stage One Services and Administration” premise for more information regarding the Cal Learn Child Care estimate.

## METHODOLOGY:

The sanction rate for the Budget Year (BY) was applied to the total Stage One Child Care cost to determine the State-Only Cal Learn Child Care need.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent GF and is countable toward the state’s maintenance of effort under the TANF federal requirements.

# State-Only Cal Learn Child Care

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year (CY) was held to the appropriation. In the BY, the change reflects a decrease in the percentage of CalWORKs sanctions to the overall CalWORKs caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change from the CY to the BY reflects the updated percentage of CalWORKs sanctions to the overall CalWORKs caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $164 | $149 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 164 | 149 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Care – Trustline

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for providing a state-mandated registration program that includes fingerprinting of certain child care providers and applicants as well as searching the California Criminal History System and the California Child Abuse Central Index. The Trustline program was authorized by Assembly Bill (AB) 2053 (Chapter 898, Statutes of 1994), AB 2560 (Chapter 1268, Statutes of 1994), and AB 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997). Senate Bill (SB) 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998) mandated that a second set of fingerprints is required to search the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In addition, SB 933 required fingerprint and search requirements to be funded for certain fee-exempt providers. AB 1659 (Chapter 881, Statutes of 1999) added certain categories of licensed fee-exempt providers for FBI background checks.

Trustline registration is required for child care providers in Stage One Child Care compensated by the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. This premise also includes the reimbursement cost for processing applications referred by the California Department of Education (CDE).

The Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) is responsible for processing the applications pursuant to AB 753 (Chapter 843, Statutes of 1997). CCLD contracts with the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the California Child Care Resource and Referral (R&R) Network to process the fingerprint and index search file activities. Additionally, CCLD contracts with Identix Identification Services, LLC, a private vendor, for the Live Scan fingerprinting. The Live Scan fingerprint process is an electronic technology that transfers images of fingerprints and personal information to the DOJ.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The initial program implemented on September 1, 1995. The implementation for the FBI clearance was January 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code sections 1596.60 through 1596.68, Health and Safety Code section 1596.67, and Welfare and Institutions Code section 11324.
- Providers for CalWORKs participants who are currently licensed, or who are an aunt, uncle or grandparent of the child, are exempt from Trustline requirements.
- Voluntary applicants pay fees to cover all costs associated with their Trustline registration.
- For voluntary applicants using Live Scan, this premise includes only the R&R Network costs. These applicants pay a fee directly to Identix to cover Live Scan and DOJ charges.

# Child Care – Trustline

## KEY DATA ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10, the cost of providing for the Trustline for the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), CDE, and voluntary applicants is based on the following key data and assumptions:
    - The projected number of Trustline applications for CDE, CDSS, and voluntary is 28,267 in the Current Year (CY) and 32,364 in the Budget Year (BY). This is based on a regression analysis projection using the number of actual applications for Trustline fingerprinting from Calendar Year 2008. The estimate assumes the effects of the Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569), premise. As more adults begin to work or participate in work activities, there would be a greater need for child care; therefore, the number of Trustline applications would increase.
    - This estimate assumes that 0.50 percent of CDSS and CDE caseloads use Cardscan and 99.50 percent use Live Scan.
    - This estimate assumes that 100 percent of voluntary cases use Live Scan.
    - The county administration cost per case is $91 based on actual county expenditures divided by the number of DOJ applications for Calendar Year 2008.
- The Trustline Automated Registration Process (TARP) pilot implemented in October 2006, with statewide implementation completed in twenty counties as of July 1, 2008 (Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Fresno, Kern, Orange, Placer, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Shasta, Siskiyou, Solano, Tehama, and Ventura ). Los Angeles County implemented on August 1, 2008. Santa Clara County implemented on January 1, 2009. Sonoma County implemented on April 1, 2009. Implementation plans for Kings County have yet to be determined. The projected caseload is 24,768 in the CY and 28,357 in the BY. TARP costs are reflected in the Identix contract.
- The Trustline Web-based Application (TWA) pilot implemented on December 1, 2008 in Riverside County. Imperial County is scheduled to pilot by June 2009.
- Included in the Identix contract is a $35,000 maintenance fee for the Live Scan machines.
- The R &R Network increased its application fee from $25 to $35 in July 2008.

# Child Care – Trustline

## KEY DATA ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The fees for the contracted services are as follows:

| | FY 2008-09 | FY 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| DOJ Fingerprinting/Criminal History File | $32 | $32 |
| DOJ California Child Abuse Central Index | $15 | $15 |
| DOJ FBI Fingerprints | $19 | $19 |
| R&R Network Application Fee | $35 | $35 |
| R&R Network Incomplete Application Fee | $15 | $15 |
| Identix Cardscan Fee[1] | $10 | $10 |
| Identix Live Scan[1] | $16 | $16 |
| TARP | $5 | $5 |

[1] The Cardscan Fee is not charged for the cases utilizing Live Scan.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The cost of each contract was calculated by multiplying the projected number of Trustline applications by the cost per activity.
- The county administration cost was calculated by multiplying the projected number of CDSS Trustline applications by the county administration cost per case.
- The breakout of funding is as follows:

| | FY 2008-09 | FY 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| DOJ | $1,715,340 | $1,969,638 |
| R&R Network | $1,047,932 | $1,182,545 |
| Identix [2] | $573,892 | $653,373 |
| County Administrative Costs | $1,628,182 | $1,696,676 |

[2] TARP costs are included in the Identix contract.

## FUNDING:

The state share reflects the percentage of child care costs for two-parent families, Safety Net, state portion of Recent Noncitizen Entrants, and state-only Cal Learn and is countable toward the state's maintenance-of-effort requirement. The federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program share reflects the cost for all other families. All costs associated with services to applicants referred by CDE are funded by reimbursements from CDE. Costs for voluntary applicants are paid from the General Fund.

# Child Care – Trustline

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increased CY costs reflect an increase in the CDSS caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in the BY reflects an increase in the projected caseload.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly CDSS Trustline Caseload | 1,497 | 1,793 |
| Average Monthly CDE Trustline Caseload | 669 | 693 |
| Average Monthly Voluntary Trustline Caseload | 190 | 210 |

## Expenditures:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,965 | $5,502 |
| Federal | 3,796 | 4,268 |
| State | 230 | 261 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 939 | 973 |

# Self-Certification

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative costs associated with assuring that license-exempt child care providers self-certify that they meet the minimum health and safety standards required by Assembly Bill (AB) 2053 (Chapter 898, Statutes of 1994), AB 2560 (Chapter 1268, Statutes of 1994), and AB 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997). Effective October 1, 1998, license-exempt providers must also meet the following minimum standards: the prevention and control of infectious diseases, building and physical premises standards, and minimum health and safety training appropriate to the provider setting. License-exempt child care providers who are aunts, uncles, and grandparents are excluded from these requirements.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1996.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code sections 1596.60 through 1596.68, Health and Safety Code section 1596.67, and Welfare and Institutions Code section 11324.
- The projected cost of self-certification is based on the following key data and assumptions:
  - The projected number of Trustline applications for the California Department of Social Services is 17,961 in the Current Year (CY) and 21,522 in the Budget Year (BY), based on a regression analysis projection using the number of applications for Trustline fingerprinting from Calendar Year 2008.. The statewide cost of self-certification ($190) is based on actual county expenditures divided by total Trustline applications processed in Calendar Year 2008.

## METHODOLOGY:

The administrative costs for notification of new recipients were developed utilizing the average statewide cost of self-certification multiplied by the total number of Trustline fingerprinting applications.

For the CY: $190 x 17,961 = $3.4 million

For the BY: $190 x 21,522 = $4.1 million

## FUNDING:

The state share reflects the percentage of child care costs for two-parent families, Safety Net, state portion of Recent Noncitizen Entrants, and state-only Cal Learn and is countable toward the state's maintenance of effort requirement. The federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program share reflects the cost for all other families.

# Self-Certification

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and BY reflects a projected caseload and cost-per-case increase.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects a projected caseload increase.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Annual Caseload | 17,961 | 21,522 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $3,412 | $4,088 |
| Federal | 3,258 | 3,903 |
| State | 154 | 185 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Care
# Stage One Holdback

## DESCRIPTION:

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 reserve of TANF funds is authorized by the annual Budget Act. The CalWORKs Child Care program was authorized by Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997).

The CalWORKs Child Care program is administered in three stages. Stage One is administered by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Stage Two is administered by the California Department of Education (CDE) and serves individuals that the county welfare departments determine to be in a more stable situation, either working or participating in a work activity while on aid, and participants transitioning off aid due to increased employment. Stage Three is also administered by CDE and serves participants that have been off aid for two years and the working poor.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Education Code sections 8350, 8351, 8352, and 8353.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, approximately $8.4 million has been transferred from the Stage One holdback and is reflected in the CalWORKs Child Care Stage One Services and Administration premise.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10, a total of five percent from Stage One will be held in the reserve.

## METHODOLOGY:

- In FY 2008-09, the Stage One hold back is $0 as approximately $8.4 million has been shifted to Stage One basic to be allocated to the counties and no funding is reserved above the need in this premise.
- In FY 2009-10, the total holdback is five percent of Stage One ($32.8 million).

## FUNDING:

Funds are 100 percent TANF. TANF funds will be transferred from the reserve as needed for Stage One Child Care.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year reflects that funds have been shifted to Stage One basic.

The Budget Year (BY) was updated to reflect a five percent holdback for Stage One Child Care.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects a five percent hold back for Stage One Child Care.

# Child Care
# Stage One Holdback

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $0 | $32,793 |
| Federal | 0 | 32,793 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Tribal TANF

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the General Fund (GF) cost to operate Tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs in California. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) allowed GF to be provided for tribes to administer a Tribal TANF program. The California Department of Social Services has established a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the following: 1) California Tribal TANF Partnership (CTTP), representing the tribal members in Amador, Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Napa, Plumas, Solano, San Joaquin, Sutter, Trinity, and Yuba counties; 2) Hoopa, representing tribal members in Humboldt County; 3) Morongo, representing tribal members in Riverside County; 4)North Fork Rancheria (NFR), representing the tribal members in Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, and Merced counties; 5) Owens Valley Career Development Center (OVCDC), representing the tribal members in Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, and Tulare counties; 6) Tule Reservation Scott's Valley, representing the tribal members in Contra Costa county; 7) Southern California Tribal Chairman Association (SCTCA), representing tribal members in Santa Barbara and San Diego counties; 8) Soboba, representing tribal members in Riverside County; 9) Torres-Martinez Tribal TANF (TMTT), representing tribal members in Los Angeles and Riverside counties; 10) Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California (WTNC), representing tribal members in Alpine, Alameda, El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz counties; and 11) Yurok, representing tribal members in Del Norte and Humboldt counties. Federal welfare reform legislation allows for each Indian tribe that has an approved Tribal Family Assistance Plan to receive a Tribal Family Assistance Grant (TFAG) based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1994 actual expenditures. The administrative authority to operate a TANF program is transferred to the tribes, together with federal and state funding based on FFY 1994 levels. Transferred funds include monies to meet grant costs and administrative costs related to cash aid and Welfare to Work (WTW) services. The GF costs are based on the estimated participation rates of reimbursement for the counties during FFY 1994, in which the tribal organizations are located.

Previously under Senate Bill 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004) state funding for existing tribal TANF programs was based on actual program caseloads, including assistance and service only cases effective July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2006. The state funding did not exceed the original state share designated for the tribal TANF program in the original negotiation of 1994 caseload counts. Those programs that had received funding for less than three years did not have their state funding adjusted.

Pursuant to AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) beginning July 1, 2006, state funding for tribal TANF programs is based on the caseload used to develop the TFAG negotiated with the federal Administration for Children and Families and the state. The state funding will not exceed the original state share designated for the tribal TANF program in the original negotiation of 1994 caseload counts.

# Tribal TANF

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

- The original CTTP tribes implemented in July 2003. CTTP Phase II consisting of tribes in Amador, Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Modoc, and Trinity counties implemented in July 2004. CTTP Phase III-A in San Joaquin County implemented in June 2006. CTTP Phase III-B in Calaveras, Tehama, and Yolo counties are pending approval of a MOU for their July 2009 implementation date.
- The Graton tribe that represents tribal members from Marin and Sonoma counties implemented in May 2008.
- The original Hoopa tribe in Humboldt implemented in October 2004.
- The Karuk tribe that represents tribal members from Siskiyou and Humboldt implemented in December 2008.
- The Morongo Band of Mission Indians in Riverside County implemented in March 2006.
- The original tribes in NFR implemented in August 2003. NFR-Phase II in Fresno County implemented in July 2007.
- The original OVCDC tribes in Inyo and Kern implemented in May 2001 and October 2001, respectively. The OVCDC tribe expansion in Tule River Reservation and Tulare County implemented in July 2002. Additional OVCDC tribes in Fresno and Kings counties implemented in January 2004 with a portion of Fresno Cases withdrawing in July 2007. Mono and Ventura counties are seeking approval of an MOU for their May 2009 implementation.
- The Pinoleville Band of Indians that represents tribal members from Sonoma, Lake, Mendocino and Napa counties is seeking approval of an MOU for their May 2009 implementation.
- The Redding Rancheria Band of Indians that represents tribal members from Shasta and Trinity counties is seeking approval of an MOU for their May 2009 implementation.
- The Round Valley Band of Indians that represents tribal members from Mendocino County implemented in January 2009.
- The Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians that represents tribal members from Contra Costa County implemented in January 2008.
- The original SCTCA tribes implemented in March 1998. Seventeen additional tribes in San Diego County implemented in May 1999. Another tribal expansion in San Diego County implemented in June 2006.
- The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians in Riverside County implemented in October 2005.
- The original TMTT tribes in Los Angeles and Riverside counties implemented in May 2001. The TMTT tribal service area expansion in nine additional cities in Riverside implemented in April 2002. Additional TMTT tribes in Imperial, Orange, and San Bernardino counties are seeking approval of an MOU for their May 2009 implementation.

# Tribal TANF

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE (CONTINUED):

- The original Washoe tribe implemented in January 2003. Washoe Phase II implemented in July 2005. Washoe Phase III was not implemented in California because it included two counties in the State of Nevada and was therefore negotiated with Nevada. Phase IV was not implemented because it included counties that were already covered by other Tribes and were not available to Washoe. Washoe Phase V implemented Amador county in October 2008. Additionally, they are seeking approval of an MOU for their May 2009 implementation for Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Sierra counties.

- The Yurok tribe in Del Norte and Humboldt counties implemented on August 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10553.25.
- TANF transferred directly to the tribes and the state participation rates for FFY 1994 are estimated based on the following:
  - The average monthly cash aid cost of $211.34 per person is based on the average cash aid expenditure amount per person for FFY 1994.
  - The average monthly number of cash aid cases is 18,590 in the Current Year (CY) and 23,068 in the Budget Year (BY).
  - The average persons per case is 2.9.
  - The average monthly number of cases receiving Welfare-to-Work (WTW) services is 1,801 in the CY and 2,134 in the BY.
  - The average monthly WTW services cost per person is $206.36.
  - The average monthly administrative cost per case is $50.73.

## METHODOLOGY:

TANF transferred directly to the tribes and the state participation rates for FFY 1994 are calculated as follows:

- The grant costs were derived by multiplying the average number of persons per case by the number of cases to determine the total number of persons. The total number of persons was then multiplied by the cash aid cost per person.
- The WTW services costs were derived by multiplying average monthly number of persons receiving WTW services by the average monthly WTW services cost per person.
- The administrative costs were derived by multiplying the average number of cash aid cases by the average monthly administrative cost per case.

# Tribal TANF

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

The state funded grants, county admin and WTW services for Tribal TANF are as follows:

| 2008-09 | | | 2009-10 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grants | WTW Services | Admin. | Grants | WTW Services | Admin. |
| $65,015 | $1,710 | $4,275 | $80,676 | $2,027 | $5,299 |

## FUNDING:

The GF amount will be counted toward the state's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The GF share of grant costs is 47.5 percent. The GF share of administrative and WTW services costs is based on the applicable state percentage that was reimbursed during FFY 1994 in those counties in which the tribal organizations are located. The counties are not funding their normal 2.5 percent share of grant costs or their MOE share of the costs. The direct distribution of TANF funds to the tribal organizations reduces both the TANF block grant available to the state and the state's MOE requirement. The state's MOE has been reduced in the same proportion as the reduction in the block grant.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Both CY and BY costs were updated to reflect revised implementation dates and updated caseload figures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY costs reflect full-year costs for tribes that implemented in the CY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $71,001 | $88,003 |
| Federal[1] | 0 | 0 |
| State | 71,001 | 88,003 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

[1] The federal share of the above costs was deducted from the TANF block grant to show the transfer of funds to the tribal organizations, a total of $76.3 million in FY 2008-09 and $94.5 million in FY 2009-10.

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs and savings associated with the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program. The Kin-GAP program is authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 1901 (Chapter 1055, Statutes of 1998) and modified by Assembly Bill (AB) 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999).

The Kin-GAP program is intended to enhance family preservation and stability by recognizing that many foster children are in long-term, stable placements with relatives and that these placements are the permanent plan for the child. Accordingly, a dependent child who has been living with a relative for at least twelve months may receive a subsidy if the relative assumes guardianship and the dependency is dismissed. Once dependency is dismissed, there is no need for continued governmental intervention in the family life through ongoing, scheduled court and social services supervision of the placement.

Kin-GAP rates are equal to 100 percent of the basic foster care rate for children placed in a licensed or approved home as specified in Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11461, subdivisions (a) through (d). In addition, when a child is living with a minor parent for whom a Kin-GAP payment is made, the payment shall include an amount for the care and supervision of the child. AB 1111 changed the effective date of the Kin-GAP program to January 1, 2000.

Pursuant to AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006), enhanced benefits to the Kin-GAP program became effective October 1, 2006. Provisions of AB 1808 increased the basic Kin-GAP rate to include all clothing allowances and specialized care increments (SCI) the child would have been eligible for while in Foster Care (FC).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The Kin-GAP program implemented on January 1, 2000. Kin-GAP enhancements implemented on October 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 11360 through 11380.
- The Kin-GAP rate equals 100 percent of the basic foster care rate for children placed in a licensed or approved foster family home, including all clothing allowances and SCIs received while in FC, as specified in statute.
- Federal and nonfederal caseloads are based on actual cases reported on the CA 800 KG, Summary Report of Expenditures for the Kin-GAP program, through December 2008.
- A State-Only Kin-GAP program is available for those cases that are not eligible for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program but would be eligible for the Kin-GAP program. Based on the caseload reported on the CA 800 KG, nonfederal cases represent an insignificant percentage of the total caseload.
- The average Kin-GAP basic grant payments are based on the most recent actual expenditures and cases reported on the CA 800 KG through December 2008. The average federal Kin-GAP basic grant payment is $610.87 and the average nonfederal Kin-GAP basic grant payment is $693.18 for both existing and new caseloads.
- It is assumed a total of 200 new cases per month will move from FC to Kin-GAP, beginning January 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The average Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) portion of the Kin-GAP rate is $347 but will no longer be federally funded and will be replaced with General Fund (GF).
- Based on actual expenditures through December 2008, the cost of ongoing county Kin-GAP administrative functions is $36.57 per case per month.
- State and county expenditures associated with all cases are considered to be eligible for the state's TANF maintenance of effort requirement.
- This estimate assumes no Title IV-E funding.
- Based on data from all counties, the average initial clothing allowance provided to new cases is $220, and $99 annually thereafter.
- All cases will also receive an annual supplemental clothing allowance of $100.
- Savings to FC grants and administration, CalWORKs grants and administration, and Child Welfare Services (CWS) administration based on new cases transferring from FC to Kin-GAP as a result of the enhanced benefits are displayed as separate premises titled "Enhanced Kin-GAP Savings" under the appropriate budget item.
- FC grant savings for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 will be realized as a result of cases exiting FC and are based on the Kin-GAP grant each child will receive.
- CWS administrative savings of $371 per long term placement case each month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the FC and CalWORKs programs. In addition, eligibility worker savings of $57.11 per case per month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the FC program.
- CalWORKs administrative savings of $33.58 per case per month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the CalWORKs program.
- Due to the impact of the Title IV-E Waiver, the estimated savings to FC grants, FC Administration and CWS will not be reflected for Los Angeles County and Alameda County. Federal funding will not be reduced below the federal Title IV-E Waiver capped amount.

## METHODOLOGY:

To estimate the cost of the basic Kin-GAP program, the total number of projected existing and new casemonths are multiplied by the average Kin-GAP rate. To estimate the cost of the enhancements, the total number of projected new casemonths is multiplied by the clothing allowance and SCI amounts. Kin-GAP administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected casemonths by the monthly administrative cost per case.

## FUNDING:

The Kin-GAP basic rate was paid utilizing the applicable regional per-child CalWORKs grant from federal funds received as part of the TANF block grant. This portion will now be funded with GF. The balance of the Kin-GAP basic and SCI rate is paid with 50 percent GF and 50 percent county funds. For State-Only Kin-GAP cases, grant and administrative costs are shared 50 percent GF and 50 percent county.

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

## FUNDING (CONTINUED):

The annual clothing allowance costs are shared 50 percent GF and 50 percent county. The supplemental clothing allowance will be paid with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) decreases are based on fewer new cases entering the Kin-GAP program than were projected in the prior subvention, offset by an increase to the average grant.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase is based on a projected caseload growth of 15.5 percent.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload (Existing) | 13,906 | 13,967 |
| Average Monthly Caseload (New) | 350 | 2,505 |
| Average Monthly Caseload (Total) | 14,256 | 16,472 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Kin-GAP Basic Costs** | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $104,543 | $120,799 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 81,859 | 94,582 |
| County | 22,684 | 26,217 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 – Kin-GAP Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $6,971 | $7,228 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 6,961 | 7,216 |
| County | 10 | 12 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Kin-GAP Enhancements** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $2,538 | $15,627 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,334 | 8,000 |
| County | 1,204 | 7,627 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 101 – CalWORKs Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$8 | -$54 |
| Federal | -4 | -27 |
| State | -3 | -19 |
| County | -1 | -8 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 101 – CalWORKs Admin Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | -$5 |
| Federal | 0 | -3 |
| State | 0 | -2 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 – Foster Care Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$2,114 | -$14,579 |
| Federal | -1,004 | -7,171 |
| State | -481 | -3,027 |
| County | -629 | -4,381 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 141 – Foster Care Admin Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$459 | -$754 |
| Federal | -229 | -377 |
| State | -161 | -264 |
| County | -69 | -113 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 151 – CWS Admin Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$4,053 | -$4,292 |
| Federal | -2,026 | -2,146 |
| State | -1,419 | -1,502 |
| County | -608 | -644 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program Dual Agency Rate

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects a proposed amendment to the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program statute which would allow children receiving the Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) rate under Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11464 while in foster care to be eligible for that rate when the children transition into the Kin-GAP program. The rate paid under Kin-GAP for children who are regional center clients would be paid by the state and counties in the same ratio as is currently paid under the Kin-GAP program. Under the proposed statute change, children currently in Kin-GAP who are regional center clients would be eligible for the dual agency rate retroactive to July 1, 2007.

Senate Bill (SB) 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007), created a new rate structure and rate setting process for children who are consumers of regional center services and recipients of either AFDC-FC or Adoption Assistance Program benefits. This legislation established a new rate of $2,006 for the care and supervision of dual agency children three years of age and older. The legislation also established a new supplement to the $2,006 rate not to exceed $1,000 for dual agency children three years of age and older with extraordinary care and supervision needs. SB 84 legislation for the new dual agency rates omitted a Kin-GAP provider's eligibility to the new dual agency rate thereby creating a barrier for children in foster care who are regional center clients, and would otherwise be eligible to a guardianship placement, permanency with a relative, and dismissal of dependency.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- All estimates are based on children residing in a Foster Family Home or relative out-of-home placements.
- The estimate assumes that sixty percent of eligible Foster Care (FC) children living with a relative and receiving regional center services would transfer to Kin-GAP over a 24 month period.
- The estimate assumes that all FC children receiving regional center services transferring to Kin-GAP are currently receiving the dual agency grant of $898 for children under the age of three and $2,006 for children over the age of three.

<u>Caseloads and Grants</u>

- It is estimated that 217 FC children under the age of three receive regional center services and have been living in a stable placement with a relative for more than one year. Of these, 46 percent or 100 cases would be eligible for Kin-GAP and would phase in over a 24 month period starting July 1, 2009.
- It is estimated that 243 FC children over the age of three receive regional center services and have been living in a stable placement with a relative for more than one year. Of these, it is estimated that 46 percent or 112 cases would be eligible for Kin-GAP and would phase in over a 24 month period starting July 1, 2009.

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program Dual Agency Rate

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- It is estimated that a total of 687 casemonths in the Budget Year (BY) will be applied to FC and Child Welfare Services Savings (CWS) and Kin-GAP administrative costs.
- Under the proposal, children under three years of age will receive the same grant of $898, but instead of the FC sharing ratios of 50 percent federal, 20 percent state, and 30 percent county, the costs are divided based on current sharing ratio law for Kin-GAP.
- Under the proposal, children over three years of age will receive the same grant of $2,006, but instead of the FC sharing ratios of 50 percent federal, 20 percent state, and 30 percent county, the costs are divided based on current sharing ratio law for Kin-GAP.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Item 101**

- Kin-GAP 101 grant costs for children under the age of three are calculated by multiplying the number of casemonths (324) for FC children transferring to Kin-GAP in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 by $898. There is no federal participation for costs in Kin-GAP, so the state assumes 100 percent of the initial $347 of the $898 payment and the remaining $551 is split 50 percent General Fund (GF) and 50 percent county fund.
- Kin-GAP 101 grant costs for children over the age of three are calculated by multiplying the number of casemonths (363) for FC children transferring to Kin-GAP in FY 2009-10 by $2,006. There are no federal participation for costs in Kin-GAP, so the state assumes 100 percent of the initial $347 of the $2,006 payment and the remaining $1,659 is split 50 percent GF and 50 percent county fund.
- Kin-GAP 101 administrative costs are based on 687 casemonths of cases entering Kin-GAP multiplied by the average Kin-GAP administrative cost per month of $36.57. The cost is 100 percent GF.
- FC 101 grant savings for children under the age of three are calculated by multiplying the number of casemonths (324) leaving FC and entering Kin-GAP in FY 2009-10 by $898. The normal FC sharing ratios were applied of 50 percent federal, 20 percent GF and 30 percent county fund.
- FC 101 grant savings for children over the age of three are calculated by multiplying the number of casemonths (363) leaving FC and entering Kin-GAP in FY 2009-10 by $2,006. The normal FC sharing ratios were applied of 50 percent federal, 20 percent GF and 30 percent county fund.

**Item 141**

- FC 141 administrative savings are based on 687 casemonths of cases leaving FC multiplied by the average FC administrative cost of $57.11. The cost is shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent GF, and 15 percent county funds.

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program Dual Agency Rate

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

**Item 151**

- CWS 151 savings are based on 687 casemonths of cases no longer receiving CWS multiplied by the average Long Term Foster Care (Permanent Placement) cost per month of $407. The cost is shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent GF, and 15 percent county funds.

## FUNDING:

**Item 101**

Foster Care - Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent GF and 60 percent county.

**Items 141 and 151**

FC 141 and CWS 151 costs are shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent GF, and 15 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The BY decrease is due to a fewer number of cases eligible for Kin-GAP than what was projected in the prior subvention.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise takes effect in the BY only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| **Kin-GAP – 101 – Basic Costs** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $1,020 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 629 |
| County | 0 | 391 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program Dual Agency Rate

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(In 000's)

| **Kin-GAP- 101 – Administrative Costs** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $25 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 25 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **FC- 101 - Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$566 |
| Federal | 0 | -283 |
| State | 0 | -113 |
| County | 0 | -170 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **FC- 141 - Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$25 |
| Federal | 0 | -12 |
| State | 0 | -9 |
| County | 0 | -4 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **CWS- 151 - Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$178 |
| Federal | 0 | -89 |
| State | 0 | -62 |
| County | 0 | -27 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide a supplemental rate to the existing Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) and the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and the California Department of Developmental Services (DDS) have developed a rate-setting methodology for the care and supervision of foster and adoptive children receiving services from both county welfare departments and regional centers. An established rate of $2,006 for AAP and the federal AFDC-FC program for children over the age of three was approved in Senate Bill (SB) 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2008). SB 84 also established a workgroup consisting of multiple state and county departments, advocacy groups, the Legislative Analyst Office, and regional centers to develop the criteria for children with "extraordinary needs" that will be eligible for a supplement to that rate. During that process, it was agreed that the supplement to the rate is to be comprised of four payment categories - $250, $500, $750, and $1,000. The supplement to the rate is to be paid retroactively back to July 1, 2007, for eligible children. The SB 84 workgroup criteria for children eligible for the supplement to the rate and the instructions to administer the program were released in All County Letter 08-54 on December 1, 2008. The estimates are based on the below assumptions until actual data from counties can be analyzed.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented retroactively to July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: Senate Bill 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2008).
- All estimates are based on children who receive AAP benefits, or children who receive AFDC-FC benefits and who reside in a Relative Home (RH) or Foster Family Home (FFH).
- It is assumed that currently no Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program cases receive regional center services. Pending legislation allows for children over three years of age living in an AFDC-FC placement with a relative for more than a year to be eligible for not only the dual agency rate (see Dual Agency Kin-GAP premise) of $2,006, but the supplement to the rate as well. This estimate costs out the supplement to the rate.
- The estimate assumes a transfer of Child Welfare Services funds from Item 151 to Item 153 to process the retroactive eligibility forms.

<u>AAP Caseload</u>

- As a result of a data match between CDSS and DDS, it is estimated that total of 1,867 adoption cases over the age of three receive AAP payments and regional center services. Additionally, it is estimated that 225 new cases will enter over a 12 month period in both Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Cases presumed to be eligible for the federal AAP make up 86 percent of the total AAP payment caseload, based on data through December 2008 as reported on the CA 800 claim forms.

# Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Based on a Regional Center Survey – Alternative Residential Model (ARM) Level Analysis Summary - the estimate assumes that 58 percent of children residing in an adoption placement will receive a supplement to the rate. Of these, 25 percent will receive a supplement of $250, 18 percent will receive a supplement of $500, 18 percent will receive a supplement of $750, and 39 percent will receive a supplement of $1,000.

Foster Care (FC) Caseload

- As a result of a data match between CDSS and DDS, it is estimated that total of 1,004 FFH and RH cases over the age of three receive FC grants and regional center services. Additionally, it is estimated that 63 cases will enter in both FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Federal cases are projected to account for 73 percent of total placements.
- Based on a Regional Center Survey - ARM Level Analysis Summary - the estimate assumes that 58 percent of children residing in an FFH or RH placement will receive a supplement to the rate. Of these, 25 percent will receive a supplement of $250, 18 percent will receive a supplement of $500, 18 percent will receive a supplement of $750, and 39 percent will receive a supplement of $1,000.

Kin-GAP Caseload

- It is estimated that 248 FC children over the age of three receive regional center services and have been living in a stable placement with a relative for more than one year. Of these, it is estimated that 60 percent, or 149 cases, would transition to Kin-GAP and phase in over a 24 month period starting July 1, 2009.
- Based on a Regional Center Survey - ARM Level Analysis Summary - the estimate assumes that 58 percent of children transitioning from an RH placement to Kin-GAP will receive a supplement to the rate. Of these, 25 percent will receive a supplement of $250, 18 percent will receive a supplement of $500, 18 percent will receive a supplement of $750, and 39 percent will receive a supplement of $1,000.

CWS Caseload

- In the Current Year (CY), a total of 2,854 cases were held to the appropriation and will require additional social worker activities.
- It is estimated that 343 new cases for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties will enter dual agency status and require additional social worker activities in the Budget Year (BY).
- The estimate assumes an average of 4.75 hours of social worker time to complete the 'Supplement to the Rate – Questionnaire' and 'Supplement to the Rate – Eligibility Form'.

## METHODOLOGY:

AAP

- It is estimated that 27,693 cumulative AAP casemonths will be paid in FY 2008-09, including payments back to July 1, 2007. Of these, 6,923 casemonths are expected to receive $250, 4,985 will receive $500, 4,985 will receive $750, and 10,800 will receive $1,000. The standard AAP sharing ratios apply.

# Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- It is estimated that 14,565 AAP casemonths will be paid in FY 2009-10. Of these, 3,641 casemonths are expected to receive $250, 2,622 will receive $500, 2,622 will receive $750, and 5,680 will receive $1,000. The standard AAP sharing ratios apply.

FC

- It is estimated that 14,456 cumulative FC casemonths will be paid in FY 2008-09 including payments back to July 1, 2007. Of these, 3,614 casemonths are expected to receive $250, 2,602 will receive $500, 2,602 will receive $750, and 5,638 will receive $1,000. The standard FC sharing ratios apply.
- It is estimated that 7,428 FC casemonths will be paid in FY 2009-10. Of these, 1,857 casemonths are expected to receive $250, 1,337 will receive $500, 1,337 will receive $750, and 2,897 will receive $1,000. The standard FC sharing ratios apply.

KinGAP

- It is estimated that 280 cumulative Kin-GAP casemonths will be paid in FY 2009-10. Of these, 70 casemonths are expected to receive $250, 50 will receive $500, 50 will receive $750, and 110 will receive $1,000. The standard Kin-GAP sharing ratios of 50 percent General Fund (GF) and 50 Percent county funds apply. The $347 (one hundred percent GF) is included in the basic dual agency grant of $2,006, and will not be applied to the supplement to the rate.

CWS

- For CWS, the 56 county foster care caseload is multiplied by the hours required to fill out additional forms, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker, plus the AAP (58 county) caseload multiplied by the hours required to fill out additional forms and the hourly cost of a social worker: (CY=2,298 cases x $72.60 x 4.75 hours; BY= 343 cases x $72.60 x 4.75 hours).

## FUNDING:

FC Item 101

FC federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent state and 60 percent county.

CWS Item 151

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

AAP

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal costs and the costs of the nonfederal program are shared 75 percent state and 25 percent county.

# Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY changes are the result of projected decreases in FC caseloads, and projected increases to the AAP caseloads.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Kin-GAP costs commence in the BY. The FC, AAP and CWS decreases in costs reflect ongoing costs and do not contain the impact of retroactive costs budgeted in the CY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| **Kin-GAP - 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $190 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 95 |
| County | 0 | 95 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Foster Care - 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $9,794 | $4,844 |
| Federal | 3,546 | 1,727 |
| State | 2,499 | 1,247 |
| County | 3,749 | 1,870 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **AAP- 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $18,760 | $9,867 |
| Federal | 8,067 | 4,243 |
| State | 8,020 | 4,218 |
| County | 2,673 | 1,406 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(In 000's)

| **CWS- 151** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $793 | $118 |
| Federal | 288 | 42 |
| State | 353 | 53 |
| County | 152 | 23 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Subsidized Relative Guardianship (P.L. 110-351)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs and savings associated with the federal Subsidized Relative Guardianship (SRG) program. This program implemented from the passing of the new federal law, Public Law (P.L.) 110-351, the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, which permits states to opt in to a new kinship guardianship payment program eligible for federal financial participation (FFP). In order to be eligible for FFP, the federal law requires a written agreement with the relative be entered into for new cases; that subsidized guardianship payments continue regardless of state of residence; and, renegotiations of payment based on the needs of the child and the circumstances of the relative. Additionally, before a relative guardian may receive a Title IV-E subsidized guardianship agreement, a criminal background check must be conducted, and the child must have been in an approved or licensed relative home for six consecutive months prior to guardianship.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on January 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: P.L. 110-351.
- The average SRG grant payment equals the average Kin-GAP federal grant payment, which includes basic and enhanced amounts. This average SRG grant payment is $690.
- Caseload is based on cases that move from Foster Care to SRG. It is assumed that 200 new cases per month will move, beginning January 1, 2010.
- Administrative costs assume two hours to complete an initial assessment, comprised of the execution of the Kin-GAP agreement and additional documentation in the case plan. The cost for these two hours is $72.60 per hour. Administrative costs also assume an additional, ongoing six hours per case, which equals the average Kin-GAP cost per case of $36.57.
- The amount of FFP is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

To estimate the cost and savings of the SRG program, the projected cases are calculated as if they were transferring to the current state Kin-GAP program, utilizing current law and sharing ratios. These cases are then calculated under the new SRG sharing ratios. The costs of both the state Kin-GAP program and the new SRG program are subtracted which results in the cost and savings attributable to the SRG program. SRG administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected casemonths by the monthly administrative cost per case.

# Subsidized Relative Guardianship (P.L. 110-351)

## FUNDING:

The SRG program is paid with 50 percent federal funding, provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. The balance of the SRG program is paid with 26 percent General Fund (GF) and 24 percent county funds.

Under the ARRA, the Title IV-E FMAP rate for the SRG services is 56.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

For administrative costs, federal portion is 50 percent of the federal discount rate (72 percent), with the remaining paid with GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements on January 1, 2010.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 – SRG Costs/Savings** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 1,450 |
| State | 0 | -1,425 |
| County | 0 | -25 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

(in 000's)

| **Item 101 – SRG Administration** | 2008-09 Admin. | 2009-10 Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $328 |
| Federal | 0 | 118 |
| State | 0 | 210 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title IV-E Child Support Collections/Recovery Fund

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the estimated federal share of Foster Care (FC) child support collections as determined by the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS). The DCSS is responsible for transferring to the Recovery Fund the federal share of FC collections as reported to the federal government. The FC child support collections offset the Title IV-E share of FC expenditures.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: Social Security Act section 457(6)(e)(1).
- The estimated federal share of FC collections is provided by DCSS based on the most recent budget process.
- The level of federal financial participation is assumed to be 50 percent based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimates are provided by DCSS.

## FUNDING:

The FC child support collections will offset the Title IV-E share of FC expenditures.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and Budget Year increases in collections reflect updated actual FC collections.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The year-to-year decrease in collections reflects updated actual FC collections.

# Title IV-E Child Support Collections/Recovery Fund

## Offset Collections:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$10,504 | -$8,354 |
| Federal | -10,504 | -8,354 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## Recovery Fund:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $10.504 | $8,354 |
| Federal | 10,504 | 8,354 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures associated with children eligible for foster care payments that are placed in foster family homes (FFHs) for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the Waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The state AFDC-FC program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

FFHs provide 24-hour care and supervision in a family environment for children who cannot live in their own home. FFHs have a capacity of six or less and are either homes licensed by state or county community care licensing agencies or are approved homes of relatives or nonrelated legal guardians. FFH reimbursement rates are based on the age of the child in placement and range from $446 to $627 per month. A specialized care increment may be paid to a family home in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC child requiring specialized care because of health and/or behavioral problems. A clothing allowance may also be paid in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC eligible child.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11461.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal Foster Care (FC) program benefits is based on a 12 month period, ending December 2008 as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 69.6 percent of total FFH placements.
- Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent six month period ending December 2008. The projected federal grant is $717.33 and the nonfederal grant is $757.67.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

FFH basic costs are the product of projected federal and nonfederal case months and average grant, as identified above.

# Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided for by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

- This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description."

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) net decreases reflect lower caseloads than projected in the prior subvention, and updated average grants based on actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease reflects a projected caseload decline.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 22,500 | 21,583 |
| Federal Caseload | 15,667 | 15,028 |
| Nonfederal Caseload | 6,833 | 6,555 |

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **FFH – Basic Costs** | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $196,986 | $188,962 |
| Federal | 59,429 | 57,008 |
| State | 55,023 | 52,782 |
| County | 82,534 | 79,172 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

## EXPENDITURES (continued):

| **FFH – Federal** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $134,856 | $129,363 |
| Federal | 59,429 | 57,008 |
| State | 30,171 | 28,942 |
| County | 45,256 | 43,413 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **FFH – Nonfederal** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $62,130 | $59,599 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 24,852 | 23,840 |
| County | 37,278 | 35,759 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Group Home – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed in group homes (GH) for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the Waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The state AFDC-FC program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

GHs are private, nonprofit, non-detention facilities that provide services in a group setting to children in need of care and supervision. GHs are the most restrictive out-of-home placement alternative for children in foster care, providing an option for children with significant emotional or behavioral problems who would otherwise require more restrictive environments. GH programs are reimbursed based on classification levels within a standardized schedule of rates. The reimbursement for rate classification levels (RCL) 1 through 14 ranges from $1,486 to $6,694 per month.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11462.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal Foster Care (FC) program benefits is based on a 12 month period, ending December 2008, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 58.0 percent of total GH placements.
- The federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported on the CA 237 FC during the most recent six month period ending December 2008. The projected federal grant is $5,146.24 and the nonfederal grant is $5,703.45.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

The basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal casemonths and average grant, as identified above. Federal, state and county sharing ratios are based on county expenditure data.

# Group Home – Basic Costs

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

- This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) decreases reflect lower projected caseloads, and updated average grants based on actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease reflects a projected caseload decline.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 6,671 | 6,433 |
| Federal Caseload | 3,867 | 3,729 |
| Nonfederal Caseload | 2,804 | 2,704 |

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **GH – Basic Costs** | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $430,709 | $415,364 |
| Federal | 105,242 | 101,494 |
| State | 130,187 | 125,548 |
| County | 195,280 | 188,322 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Group Home – Basic Costs

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **GH – Federal** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $238,817 | $230,310 |
| Federal | 105,242 | 101,494 |
| State | 53,430 | 51,526 |
| County | 80,145 | 77,290 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **GH – Nonfederal** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $191,892 | $185,054 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 76,757 | 74,022 |
| County | 115,135 | 111,032 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed with foster family agencies (FFAs) for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The state AFDC-FC program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

FFAs are nonprofit agencies licensed to recruit, certify, train and support foster parents for children needing placement. FFAs primarily serve children who would otherwise require group home care. FFA treatment rates are established by using a basic rate similar to the foster family home rate plus a set increment for the special needs of the child, an increment for social work activities, and a percentage for administration, recruitment and training. Treatment rates are based on the age of the child in placement and range from $1,589 to $1,865 per month. Reimbursement rates for FFAs participating in the Intensive Treatment Foster Care Program are based on the level of services provided to the child and range from $2,985 to $4,476. A clothing allowance may also be paid in addition to the FFA rate for an AFDC-FC eligible child.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11463 and 18358.3.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal FC program benefits are based on a 12 month period ending December 2008, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 81.7 percent of total FFA placements.
- Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent 12 month period ending December 2008. The projected federal grant is $1,716.97 and the nonfederal grant is $2,054.43.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

The basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal casemonths and average grant, as identified above. Federal, state and county sharing ratios are based on county expenditure data.

# Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) decreases reflect lower caseloads and updated average grants based on actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease reflects projected caseload decline.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 12,298 | 12,242 |
| Federal Caseload | 10,047 | 10,001 |
| Nonfederal Caseload | 2,251 | 2,241 |

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **FFA – Basic Costs** | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $262,490 | $261,294 |
| Federal | 91,218 | 90,803 |
| State | 68,509 | 68,196 |
| County | 102,763 | 102,295 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

## EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

| **FFA– Federal** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $206,992 | $206,050 |
| Federal | 91,218 | 90,803 |
| State | 46,310 | 46,099 |
| County | 69,464 | 69,148 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **FFA – Nonfederal** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $55,498 | $55,244 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 22,199 | 22,097 |
| County | 33,299 | 33,147 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the out-of-home board and care costs associated with children placed in accordance with the Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) program. Assembly Bill (AB) 3632 (Chapter 1747, Statutes of 1984) and AB 882 (Chapter 1274, Statutes of 1985) authorized the SED program as a separate out-of-home care component. Eligible participants are children designated as SED by the California Department of Education (CDE).

Senate Bill 485 (Chapter 722, Statutes of 1992) modified the program by eliminating any California Department of Social Services participation in funding “for profit" facilities, shifting responsibility for the cost of children in those facilities to the CDE and local education agencies.

Payments may be made on behalf of SED children placed in privately operated residential facilities licensed in accordance with the Community Care Facilities Act, and shall be based on foster care rates established in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 11460 to 11467, inclusive. Most SED children are placed in group home psychiatric peer group Rate Classification Levels 12 through 14; however, some children are placed in foster family homes or foster family agencies. As there is no court adjudication, these children are eligible only for nonfederal foster care program benefits.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1987.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 18350-18356.
- Casemonths are based on trend caseload projections.
- Average grants are based on actual expenditure and caseload data for the most recent eighteen months ending December 2008. The projected average grant for Los Angeles County is $5,426.56. The projected average grant for the remaining counties is $5,743.34.

## METHODOLOGY:

SED costs are the product of projected casemonths and the computed average grant. Program costs are the aggregate of separate projections for Los Angeles County and the remaining 57 counties.

## FUNDING:

SED costs are shared 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county funds.

# Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Basic Costs

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) decreases reflect slower caseload growth than projected in the November 2008 Subvention.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Budget Year increase reflects projected caseload growth.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 1,898 | 2,037 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $128,407 | $137,788 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 51,363 | 55,115 |
| County | 77,044 | 82,673 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Supplemental Clothing Allowance

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures associated with an augmentation of $100 per child to the existing clothing allowance program for children placed in Foster Family Homes (FFHs) or certified family homes of Foster Family Agencies (FFAs) for 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

Currently, counties have the authority to provide a clothing allowance, in addition to the basic foster care rate paid on behalf of eligible foster children. This premise reflects an augmentation to the current program funding level, allowing for an annual supplemental clothing allowance of $100 per child with no county share of cost.

Counties that currently have clothing allowance expenditures are expected to maintain their current level of funding in the program. The additional state and federally funded clothing allowance is intended to supplement not supplant current spending levels.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11461(f) (4) and 11463(g).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The statewide annual supplemental clothing allowance will be $100 per child.
- All FFH and FFA placements are eligible for the clothing allowance. The average monthly projected caseload is 34,797 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, and 33,825 for FY 2009-10.
- All cases shifting to the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program are presumed to receive the clothing allowance prior to exiting foster care.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

The counties expenditures for the statewide supplemental clothing allowance are a product of the projected cases and the $100 allowance.

# Supplemental Clothing Allowance

## FUNDING:

- Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal share of federal program costs and for those cases not meeting federal eligibility criteria is 100 percent General Fund.

- This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) decreases reflect a decline in caseloads.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease reflects a projected decline in caseloads.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $3,480 | $3,382 |
| Federal | 1,286 | 1,251 |
| State | 2,194 | 2,131 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title XX Funding

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Title XX Social Services Block Grant awarded to the state as well as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that are transferred to Title XX. This funding is provided under Title XX of the federal Social Security Act as amended by the federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Federal funding for social services has been given to states under Title XX since October 1981. In order to qualify for these funds, a state must prepare an expenditure plan prior to the start of the state fiscal year that is consistent with the five Title XX goals:

1. Achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency.
2. Achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency.
3. Preventing or remedying neglect, abuse or exploitation of children or adults unable to protect their own interests; or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families.
4. Preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care.
5. Securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate or providing services to individuals in institutions.

Through Fiscal Year (FY) 1992-93, Title XX funds were used exclusively to fund the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. With the implementation of the Title XIX Personal Care Services Program in 1993, a portion of the Title XX funds was shifted to other eligible programs. Those funds now support the following programs:

- Foster Care services (goal 3);
- Child Welfare Services (CWS) (goals 3 and 4);
- Deaf Access Program (goals 1 and 2); and,
- Community Care Licensing (CCL) (goals 3 and 4).

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13000 through 13008.
- State legislation permits Title XX funds to be used in CWS and Foster Care to supplant the state share without affecting county funds.
- The Title XX funding awarded to California is $205.9 million for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2008 and $204.9 million for FFY 2009. $365.7 million in TANF grant dollars in FFY 2008-09 and $363.9 million in TANF grant dollars in FFY 2009-10 will be transferred to Title XX.
- The FFY awards are adjusted to conform to FY funding needs.

# Title XX Funding

## METHODOLOGY:

- In the Current Year (CY) $30.3 million in TANF grant dollars will be transferred into the Title XX Block Grant to fund services for children residing in group homes in non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The funds decrease to $29.9 million in the Budget Year (BY) for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. In the CY and the BY, $16.9 million in TANF grant dollars will be transferred into the Title XX Block Grant to fund services for children residing in group homes in the Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, $147.9 million in Title XX funds are being shifted to the Department of Developmental Services (DDS).
- TANF funds are transferred to Title XX for the following purposes: $32.5 million in FY 2008-09 and $40.7 million in FY 2009-10 for non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, and $24.2 million for each FY for the Title IV-E Waiver counties to supplant a portion of the state share of CWS eligible expenditures in the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and $56.0 million for both the CY and the BY respectively are added to the Title XX funds shifted to DDS.
- In the Deaf Access Program, $3.0 million in Title XX funds for both the CY and the BY will reduce the General Fund (GF) share in an otherwise 100 percent GF program.
- For Community Care Licensing (CCL), State Support, $55.2 million in Title XX funds will be used in CCL for both the CY and the BY.
- In the CY and the BY, $20.0 million of TANF funds may be transferred to Title XX for child care: $10 million for CDSS' Stage One Child Care program and $10 million for the California Department of Education's child care programs, in order to broaden access to Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) benefits for low-income children in proprietary child care centers. The CY and BY reflect an additional TANF Title XX amount of $185.9 million and $176.3 million respectively to fund Stage One Child Care.

## FUNDING:

Title XX is a federal block grant that does not require a state or county match.

## CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The Title XX transfer from TANF for Foster Care in the CY and the BY has decreased to reflect actual expenditures. For FY 2008-09, the Title XX transfer from TANF to Stage One Child Care has increased due to an increase in Title XX-eligible costs. For FY 2009-10, the CWS Title XX eligible expenditures have increased.

# Title XX Funding

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The net change in the Title XX transfer was due to a reduction in the amount of TANF that can be transferred to Title XX. The TANF Title XX shifting of funds to CWS has increased in the BY due to an increase in eligible costs. This has resulted in a commensurate reduction in the amount of TANF Title XX available to fund Stage One Child Care.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| **Total Title XX** | **$571,607** | **$568,804** |
| Title XX Grant | 205,853 | 204,872 |
| TANF Transfer In | 365,754 | 363,932 |
| **Foster Care (Transfer from TANF)** | $0 | $0 |
| **Item 101** | | |
| Federal | 30,301 | 29,902 |
| State | -30,301 | -29,902 |
| **Item 153** | | |
| Federal | 16,858 | 16,858 |
| State | -16,858 | -16,858 |
| **CWS** | | |
| **(Item 151)** | | |
| **CWS Transfer to DDS** | $203,903 | $ 203,903 |
| CWS (Title XX Transfer to DDS) | 147,903 | 147,903 |
| Federal | 147,903 | 147,903 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| CWS (Transfer from TANF) | | |
| For Transfer to DDS | | |
| Federal | 56,000 | 56,000 |
| State | 0 | 0 |

# Title XX Funding

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):
(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| **For CWS (Transfer from TANF)** | $56,634 | $64,865 |
| Item 151 | | |
| Federal | 32,484 | 40,715 |
| State | -32,484 | -40,715 |
| Item 153 | | |
| Federal | 24,150 | 24,150 |
| State | -24,150 | -24,150 |
| **Deaf Access (Item 151)** | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 2,996 | 2,996 |
| State | -2,996 | -2,996 |
| **CCL (Item 151)** | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| **CCL (State Support)** | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 55,172 | 55,172 |
| State | -55,172 | -55,172 |
| **CalWORKs Child Care (Transfer from TANF)** | | |
| | $205,961 | $196,307 |
| Federal | 205,961 | 196,307 |
| State | 0 | 0 |

# Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide financial support to emancipating foster youth up to age 21 if participating in an educational or training program or any activity consistent with their "transitional independent living plan." These payments are authorized by Assembly Bill 427 (Chapter 125, Statutes of 2001) which added Section 11403.1 to the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC). This premise also reflects the administrative costs for updating the Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP) and determining the eligibility of applicants for the Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program (STEP).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was effective on January 1, 2002; however no counties have implemented the program.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 11403.1
- There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.
- Trailer bill language limits participation in this program subject to the availability of funds in the current Budget Act.

## METHODOLOGY:

There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.

## FUNDING:

There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **101 – Assistance Payments – STEP** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 141 – STEP Eligibility** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 151 – STEP Plan Activity** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Emergency Assistance Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Emergency Assistance (EA) Foster Care (FC) and General Assistance (GA) programs, which provide funding for benefits and services granted to children and families in emergency situations. Eligibility is restricted to one episode in any 12-month period. The EA-FC Welfare program provides support payments for dependents and voluntary FC placements not otherwise eligible for federal Title IV-E benefits. The "Child Welfare Services-Emergency Assistance" premise discusses additional program components.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA program but permitted use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding for this portion of the EA program, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with General Fund (GF). Based on interpretation of the final TANF regulations, that EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, effective October 1, 1999, the GF was replaced with TANF funding.

The EA-GA program provides funding for qualified aliens and other cases that do not qualify for federal or state FC. Only those "qualified aliens" who entered the country before August 22, 1996, are eligible for TANF-funded services.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The EA-FC Welfare program became effective September 1, 1993.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10101.
- Based on actual expenditure and caseload data through December 2008, the projected average grant for EA-FC cases is $1,454.50, and the projected average grant for EA-GA cases is $1,969.34.
- EA casemonths are projected using a 24-month linear trend forecast based on actual caseload data. EA-FC and EA-GA caseloads are projected separately.
- The Current Year (CY) EA administrative costs are held to the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation.
- Foster children receiving EA benefits are eligible to receive the $100 supplemental clothing allowance.

## METHODOLOGY:

- **Item 101** – EA-FC and EA-GA costs are the product of projected casemonths and the computed average grant, plus the cost of the supplemental clothing allowance for each case.
- **Item 141** - Costs for administrative activities performed by County Welfare Department staff are based upon actual expenditures and adjusted for caseload growth in both Fiscal Years (FYs) 2008-09 and 2009-10. Administrative costs also include $35,000 added to the federal share for reimbursements to the California Department of Health Services for data processing activities associated with the Assistance to Children in Emergency System, which enables tracking of EA cases currently receiving assistance.

# Emergency Assistance Program

## FUNDING:

EA funding was used in the TANF block grant calculation and, therefore, is part of the TANF funding schedule.

Effective October 1, 1999, the EA-FC component is funded 70 percent TANF, 30 percent county; the EA-GA component is funded 50 percent TANF, 50 percent county; and, the EA administrative costs are funded 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county.

The supplemental clothing allowance component is funded 100 percent with TANF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the Budget Year (BY) decreases are based on lower projected caseloads, and a reduction to the EA-FC average grant. The CY administrative costs are held to the appropriation; the BY administrative costs are updated based on actual expenditures. GF is being used for both the CY and the BY in lieu of TANF funds to fund both grant and county administrative costs.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in BY costs reflects a projected decrease in caseload.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 3,288 | 3,118 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEMS 101 & 141 – EA** | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grant | County Admin. | Grant | County Admin. |
| Total | $57,891 | $7,526 | $54,912 | $4,756 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State | 40,490 | 6,402 | 38,399 | 4,048 |
| County | 17,401 | 1,124 | 16,513 | 708 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

# Expansion Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) Program (SB 1380)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with expanding the number of children eligible for the Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) program in the 56 non-waiver counties, by including youth with serious behavioral problems.

SB 1380 authorizes the expansion of eligibility of children and services for the ITFC program by increasing the types of services that Foster Family Agencies would be required to provide or arrange for under the program. The overall purpose of ITFC is to provide a home-like placement alternative for children and youth with significant behavior challenges. This premise will also require revisions to eligibility, operational, reporting, and foster parent training components of the ITFC Program.

ITFC premise seeks to improve outcomes for foster youth by providing less restrictive environments for children, and allows the counties to determine which children from the expanded eligible population in Group Homes with Rate Classification Levels (RCLs) 9-11 will be placed in ITFC programs.

This premise limits the number of children able to participate in the ITFC program to 750 in the first three years (excluding counties participating in the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project). This limitation will allow time to determine if the expansion of eligibility, pursuant to this premise, produces the desired outcome of reducing the group home population, in keeping with the State's public policy goals.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: SB 1380 (Chapter 486, Statutes of 2008)

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- 30 cases are assumed as the initial monthly caseload, beginning October 1, 2009.
- 30 additional cases are added each successive month through FY 2009-10.
- The following rates of $5,091 for the average of RCLs 9-11 and $4,101 for the average of ITFC Rates A-C are used to calculate potential savings.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated savings are the product of casemonths multiplied by the difference between the average rate based on ITFC Rates A-C less the average rate for RCL 9-11 cases.

# Expansion Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) Program (SB 1380)

## FUNDING:

The program funding is based on Fiscal Year 2009-10 Foster Family Agency sharing ratios of 34.75 percent federal, 26.10 percent state, and 39.15 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The implementation date change from January 1, 2009 to October 1, 2009, eliminated savings previously calculated for the Current Year. The Budget Year (BY) loss of savings is based on the delayed implementation date.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects nine months savings as opposed to the full year of savings previously estimated in the November 2008 Subvention.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 0 | -$1,336 |
| Federal | 0 | -464 |
| State | 0 | -349 |
| County | 0 | -523 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Care Overpayments

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Title IV-E Foster Care Overpayments. The federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Region IX has notified the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) that the federal share of Title IV-E overpayments identified through state audits performed on group homes and the share of Title IV-E overpayments identified through county overpayments must be returned immediately once the overpayment has been identified as required by federal regulations. The practice has been to repay the federal share upon recoupment from foster care providers. Therefore, DHHS has issued a demand for repayment for the federal share of all state and county overpayments identified regardless of whether or not CDSS collects the overpayment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Adjustments to federal claim began in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties from July 1, 2007.
- The federal share of additional identified retrospective overpayments from January 2007 to June 2008 (Prior Year) has been budgeted for FY 2008-09.
- Beginning July 1, 2009, counties will begin paying their share of the reported overpayments.

## METHODOLOGY:

- For county overpayments, the estimate reflects ongoing costs as determined by calculating an annual average based on actual claims.
- For state audit overpayments, the estimate reflects ongoing costs as determined by calculating an annual average based on actual claims.

## FUNDING:

Senate Bill 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007) requires that General Fund (GF) will pay the full federal share of all uncollected overpayments until regulations have been adopted, after which counties will be required to share at the normal non-federal foster care sharing ratios. Funding for the repayment of the federal Title IV-E overpayments will be 40 percent GF and 60 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year (CY) increased costs are a result of a slight increase in retroactive payments from January 2007 to June 2008, a delay in the counties participating from January 1, 2009 to July 1, 2009, and an increase in actual claims. The Budget Year (BY) reflects estimated actual on-going overpayment expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is the result of BY estimated actual on-going overpayment expenditures compared to CY actual on-going overpayment expenditures combined with retroactive (uncollected) overpayments.

# Foster Care Overpayments

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – FC Payments** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $7,151 | $2,931 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 7,151 | 1,442 |
| County | 0 | 1,489 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title IV-E Foster Parent Child Care Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise provides the state the budgetary authority to pass through federal Title IV-E funds to counties for the implementation of a child care program for foster parents. Senate Bill 1612 (Chapter 845, Statutes of 2004) permits the pass through of federal Title IV-E funds, subject to federal approval, for the purpose of implementing a child care program in participating counties. There will be no General Fund (GF) participation, and the 50 percent match will be provided by participating counties. Under Title IV-E foster care maintenance costs, states have the option to offer subsidized child care to foster parents when the need is related to non-ordinary parental duties such as foster parents who must work and school activities outside the home. On March 17, 2005, the Federal Department of Health and Human Services provided a policy clarification that allows states to implement a child care program, in some or all jurisdictions of the state, and that a State Plan Amendment is not necessary to implement this maintenance payment option.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented on July 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Title IV-E is a federal funding source for children placed in out-of-home care who are eligible to receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC). Title IV-E funds provide the state and counties with matching funds for out-of-home placement costs, e.g. foster care which now includes child care. Federal financial participation is available at the Federal Medical Assistance Payment (FMAP) rate of 50 percent. Counties will be responsible for providing the 50 percent match.
- This program is open to all counties statewide. The counties currently participating in the Title IV-E child care program include Butte, Orange, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Siskiyou, and Yolo.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SRG, FC, AAP, and IHSS – FMAP Increase” premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate utilized actual expenditures from calendar year 2008 to project the Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) estimates.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 50 percent federal funds, 50 percent county funds. There is no GF share.

This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. For more information regarding the temporary ARRA FMAP increases, please see the “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SRG, FC, AAP, and IHSS – FMAP Increase” premise.

# Title IV-E Foster Parent Child Care Program

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and BY decreases are based on updated actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $ 5,072 | $5,072 |
| Federal | 2,536 | 2,536 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 2,536 | 2,536 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Care Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs and savings pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 1331 (Chapter 465, Statutes of 2007) that requires counties to screen all foster youth in its care age 16 ½ and older to determine if they are eligible for federal SSI benefits utilizing the best practice guidelines developed pursuant to AB 1633 (Chapter 641, Statues of 2005). AB 1331 requires that an application be submitted for any child who is screened as being likely to be eligible for SSI benefits. Under current federal law and regulations, in order to apply for SSI benefits a child may not be receiving federally funded Aid to Families with Dependent Children – Foster Care (AFDC-FC) benefits in the month of application or, depending on the timing of the application, the month after the application is filed. Therefore, AB 1331 requires counties to move foster youth receiving federal AFDC-FC benefits to the state AFDC-FC program for one month to allow the youth to be eligible to apply for SSI benefits.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1331 (Chapter 465, Statutes of 2007).

**Foster Care Grants**

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

  **Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 Caseload**

  - There are 4,202 children in foster care age 16 ½ through 17 ½ that will require an SSI/SSP screening each FY based on caseload data from December 2008. Upon implementation in FY 2008-09, there will be a back-log of an additional 1,261 children that did not receive a screening in the prior year for a total of 5,463 screenings.
  - Of the 5,363 children age 16 ½ through 17 ½ in FY 2008-09, 3,765 are receiving federal foster care that will require an SSI/SSP screening. It is estimated that 15 percent or 564 cases will receive an application for SSI. Of these, 217 are estimated to be in Foster Family Homes (FFH), 163 are estimated to be in Foster Family Agencies (FFA), and 184 are estimated to be in Group Homes (GH).

  **FY 2009-10 Caseload**

  - It is assumed that an on-going caseload of 4,202 children in foster care age 16 ½ through 17 ½ will require an SSI/SSP screening each FY based on caseload data from June 2008.
  - Of the 4,202 children age 16 ½ through 17 ½ in FY 2009-10, 2,872 are receiving federal foster care that will require an SSI/SSP screening. It is estimated that 15 percent or 431 cases will receive an application for SSI. Of these, 167 are estimated to be in FFH, 125 are estimated to be in FFA, and 139 are estimated to be in GH.

# Foster Care Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

**Grants**

- Federal foster care cases receiving an application for SSI for one month will not receive federal participation for the maintenance payment, and will receive state and county funds at the normal sharing ratios
- Due to the additional screenings, it is estimated that 107 state-only cases in the Current Year (CY), which includes backlog cases, and 56 state-only cases in the Budget Year (BY) will receive an SSI grant instead of a state-only foster care grant.
- The FFH BY federal grant amount is estimated at $717.
- The FFA BY federal grant amount is estimated at $1,717.
- The GH BY federal grant amount is estimated at $5,146.

- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

**SSI/SSP**

- The average monthly number of state-only FC cases found eligible for SSI/SSP after screening will be 95 cases in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- The average monthly number of federal FC cases found eligible for SSI/SSP after screening and that have an FC grant less than the applicable SSI/SSP grant is six cases in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- The average monthly SSI grant is $637 and was effective January 2008, increasing to $674 in January 2009, and will remain at $674 in January 2010.
- The average monthly SSP grant will be $412 per case from July 2008 through April 2009. The SSP grant will decrease to $375 due to withholding the pass-through of the January 2009 federal cost of living adjustment (COLA), effective May 1, 2009. The SSP grant will remain at that level throughout the BY, due to the suspension of the June 2010 state COLA.
- The average SSI/SSP administrative cost per case is estimated to increase from $9.95 to $10.45 per case effective October, 1, 2008, and is estimated to remain at that level throughout the remainder of the BY, due to an estimated negative 2009 Consumer Price Index percentage.

**Foster Care Admin.**

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Each screening will require 30 minutes of social worker time.
- The screening cost utilizes the social worker salary rate of $57.57 per hour.

# Foster Care Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application

**Child Welfare Services (CWS)**

**FY 2008-09**

- The estimate has been held to the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation.

**FY 2009-10**

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- There are 4,202 children in foster care aged 16 ½ through 17 ½ that will require an SSI/SSP screening each FY based on caseload data from January 2009.
- Each screening will require 30 minutes of social worker time.
- Fifteen percent of those screened (630) will have an SSI/SSP application submitted which will require eight hours of social worker time. Fifty percent of applications submitted (315) will be initially denied and then appealed, requiring an additional six hours of social worker time.
- The average statewide social worker hourly cost is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Foster Care Grants**

Foster Care grant costs are estimated by multiplying the foster care grant amounts by 15 percent of the federal caseload projected to receive an application for SSI/SSP.

**SSI/SSP**

SSI/SSP program costs are estimated by multiplying the projected monthly caseload by the SSP average grant and administrative cost per case.

**Foster Care Admin.**

Foster Care Administration costs are estimated by multiplying the projected total yearly caseload by the administrative cost per case.

**CWS**

CWS Administration costs are estimated by multiplying the caseload by the number of social worker hours, multiplied by the hourly cost.

# Foster Care Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application

## FUNDING:

The FC program, SSI/SSP program, FC Administration and CWS Administrative costs/savings are shared at the same ratios as in their respective programs.

This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY change in the Foster Care Item 101 estimate and the CY and BY decreases in the SSI/SSP Item 111 estimate are based on updated caseload and grants. The caseload and the foster care federal discount rate have decreased for CWS Item 151.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase in the Foster Care Item 101 savings and the SSI/SSP Item 111 costs reflect the cumulative impact of ongoing costs. The decrease in the Foster Care Item 141 and Item CWS 151 estimates reflect ongoing annual costs which exclude the impact of the backlogged cases budgeted in CY, as well as the decrease in caseload and federal discount rate.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – Foster Care Grant Costs** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$792 | -$2,235 |
| Federal | -705 | -581 |
| State | -35 | -667 |
| County | -52 | -987 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Care Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000s)

| **ITEM 111 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **SSI/SSP Costs** | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,764 | $3,424 |
| Federal | 1,087 | 2,178 |
| State | 677 | 1,246 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Foster Care Admin** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $171 | $121 |
| Federal | 60 | 41 |
| State | 111 | 80 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 151 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **CWS Admin Costs** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $929 | $656 |
| Federal | 339 | 233 |
| State | 590 | 423 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500 Amended by SB 720)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with the implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 500 (Chapter 630, Statutes of 2005) and SB 720 (Chapter 475, Statutes of 2007). SB 500 made changes in the way foster care providers are paid for teen parents in placement with their child. It allows for a separate full foster care payment to be paid for the care of a child living in the same foster care facility as that child's minor parent, provided federal financial participation is available and both the child and parent are dependents of the court and receiving reunification services. It creates a new placement option called "whole family foster home," in which care and supervision are provided to dependent teen parents and their non-court dependent children, to ensure the teen parents develop skills necessary to provide a safe, stable, and permanent home for their children. It requires the development of a written "shared responsibility plan" to be created by the foster caregiver and the teen parent in a whole family foster home, and would provide a $200 monthly payment above the current infant supplement for the added care and supervision provided by the foster caregiver to the teen parent and child, pursuant to the shared responsibility plan. SB 720 clarifies that Group Homes will receive the infant supplemental rate for both dependent and non dependent infants who are placed with their dependent mothers rather than a full Group Home rate for the infant. SB 720 also allows infants and mothers living with Non-Related Legal Guardians and related guardians in the KinGAP program to be eligible for the increased benefits established in SB 500.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

SB 500 was implemented January 1, 2006.

SB 720 which amends SB 500 implemented on January 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The estimated number of teen moms who are in placement with their children is 408.
- The estimated number of non-dependent infant cases is 265.
- The Foster Family Agency and Foster Family Homes infant supplement rate will change from $391 to $425.
- SB 500 allows for an additional $200 above the infant supplemental rate for non-dependent infants.
- Under the provisions of SB 500, the average grant for Group Homes is $5,380 with a current infant supplement rate of $848 for non-dependent infant and a rate of $5,380 for dependent infant. Effective January 1, 2008, the rate for a dependent infant to be placed with a dependent mother for reunification purposes will be the infant supplemental rate.
- It is estimated that Group Home providers are currently receiving a full Group Home grant for 22 infants placed with their mothers. The estimate assumes that the infant grant will be reduced to the current infant supplement rate in Group Homes of $848 as of January 1, 2008.

# Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500 Amended by SB 720)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Effective January 1, 2008, SB 720 allows payment of the increased benefits provided in SB 500 to be extended to an estimated 36 infants living with Non-related legal guardian (NRLG) providers and 3 infants receiving a Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP)
- For Child Welfare Services (CWS) it is assumed that an additional two hours of social work time would be required to develop the written "shared responsibility plan." The caseload for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties is estimated at 146 cases. The social worker cost per hour is $72.60.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## FUNDING:

**Item 101**

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage for those cases meeting eligibility criteria at the 50 percent rate. Funding for the nonfederal cases is 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county.

This premise will benefit from the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description."

**Item 151**

For the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, after applying the foster care federal discount rate for each Fiscal Year (FY), costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year decreased savings reflects an update to average grants based on actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decreased savings reflects an update to average grants based on actual expenditures.

# Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500 Amended by SB 720)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – FC Payments** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$709 | -$705 |
| Federal | -257 | -256 |
| State | -180 | -179 |
| County | -272 | -270 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 151 – Child Welfare Services** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $22 | $22 |
| Federal | 8 | 8 |
| State | 10 | 10 |
| County | 4 | 4 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# *This page left intentionally*

*blank for spacing*

# Multi-Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) Program Rates

## DESCRIPTION:

The Multi-Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) premise is an evidence-based model of treatment foster care for children with severe emotional and behavioral disorders and/or severe delinquency. This model aims to create opportunities for youths to successfully live in families rather than in group or institutional settings. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) has endorsed this model as a best practice for providing foster children with permanency and child/family well-being. The CDSS is encouraging development of this model as part of the Department's Program Improvement Plan (PIP).

SB 1380 provides counties the authority to pursue MTFC programs and to work with shareholders to establish MTFC rates. Currently, implementation of the MTFC model is hampered by the challenges associated with setting appropriate MTFC rates. Several counties are currently utilizing the Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) rates to fund care and supervision for their MTFC programs, because the ITFC rate offers a higher payment for the foster parent to compensate for the extra care and supervision required by foster care providers. Counties must find additional funding beyond Aid to Families with Dependent Children–Foster Care (AFDC-FC) and Medi-Cal to close the gap between allowable AFDC-FC fundable activities and the funding necessary to pay for activities that are part of the MTFC model. Typically, the populations served in MTFC are children who are usually placed in group home Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 or above and have a myriad of behavioral disorders and require an intense level of care and supervision from the foster parent.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects cost/savings for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The cases presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal MTFC Program benefits are based on a maximum of 335 children from Group Home RCL 12, 13, and 14.
- 28 new cases per month are phased into the program, beginning January 1, 2010.
- The following rates of RCL 12, $5,891, RCL 14, $6,634, and ITFC Range A, $4,476, are used to calculate costs/savings.
- Federal and nonfederal case costs not covered by Title IV-E are estimated at $350 per case per month.

## METHODOLOGY:

The basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal casemonths multiplied by the rates associated with RCL levels 12 and 14, which are then compared to the identical casemonths multiplied by the rates associated with the existing ITFC Range A rate. Additional federal and nonfederal case services/costs not covered under Title IV-E funding are calculated on the overall number of cases to offset the savings calculated between ITFC Range A rates and RCL rates.

# Multi-Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) Program Rates

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on the federal medical assistance percentage for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General fund and 60 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for Current Year. The Budget Year (BY) change reflects updated federal and non-federal caseload percentages.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in BY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$699 |
| Federal | 0 | -262 |
| State | 0 | -175 |
| County | 0 | -262 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with reimbursing foster caregivers for travel expenses related to educational travel. The Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351) requires states to develop a plan to ensure the educational stability of a child in foster care. Part of meeting the educational stability requirement is for the placement decision to take into account the appropriateness of the current educational setting and the proximity to the school in which the child is enrolled at the time of placement. P.L. 110-351 authorizes the use of Title IV-E funds to pay for reasonable travel to the child's school of origin.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on March 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- This estimate reflects costs for both the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties under Item 101 and Title IV-E Waiver counties under Item 153.
- The number of children whose placement is outside of their school district of origin is 9,714 for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties and 5,277 for the Title IV-E Waiver counties. Of those, there are 1,044 in the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties and 567 children in the Title IV-E Waiver counties that are excluded from the estimate because they have an Individual Education Plan (IEP). The transportation costs for children with an IEP are already paid for by the Department of Education. The impacted caseload is 8,670 for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties and 4,710 for the Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Personal vehicle mileage rate is 55 cents per mile.
- Assumes reasonable round trip mileage of 20 miles.
- Assumes an average of 180 school days annually.

## METHODOLOGY:

The annual cost is calculated by multiplying the impacted caseload by 20 miles at a rate of 55 cents per mile for 180 school days. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 the number of school days is 45 based on a March 1, 2010 implementation date. The Title IV-E Waiver county funding for this premise is included as part of the Foster Care 101-Non-Base Premises total under Item 153.

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided for by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Nonfederal costs are shared 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county.

# Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)

## FUNDING (CONTINUED):

This premise will be impacted by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise beginning March 1, 2010.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Item 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $4,291 |
| Federal | 0 | 2,146 |
| State | 0 | 858 |
| County | 0 | 1,287 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 153** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $2,331 |
| Federal | 0 | 1,166 |
| State | 0 | 466 |
| County | 0 | 699 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Ten Percent Reduction to the Basic Care for Group Homes, Foster Family Agencies, Specialized Care Increment, Seriously Emotionally Disturbed, and Supplemental Clothing Allowance

## DESCRIPTIONS:

This premise reflects the savings from reducing the Basic Care for Group Homes (GH), Foster Family Agencies (FFA), Specialized Care Increments (SCI), Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED), and Supplemental Clothing Allowances (SCA) by 10 percent. Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions. Foster Care rates for GHs and FFAs support the care and supervision needs of children placed in out-of-home care by child welfare and probation agencies. SCIs may be paid on behalf of Aid for Dependent Children – Foster Care (AFDC-FC) children requiring specialized care because of health and/or behavioral problems. SCA provides an augmentation to the current program funding level for Foster Family Homes (FFH) and FFAs, allowing for annual supplemental clothing allowances of $100 per child with no county share of cost. SED reflects the out-of-home board and care costs associated with children placed in accordance with the SED program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

These reductions assume an implementation date of October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The program reductions reflect savings based on the estimates for 58 counties.
- A ten percent reduction is assumed for current GH, FFA, SED, SCI and SCA estimates.
- For the Title IV-E Waiver counties, there will be no reduction in the federal or county foster care assistance shares due to the funding cap established within the waiver agreements.

## METHODOLOGY:

The projected savings are the result of the reductions applied to the caseloads and corresponding average grants for the applicable programs.

## FUNDING:

### Foster Care

Federal funding is provided for by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county.

# Ten Percent Reduction to the Basic Care for Group Homes, Foster Family Agencies, Specialized Care Increment, Seriously Emotionally Disturbed, and Supplemental Clothing Allowance

## FUNDING (CONTINUED):

This premise is impacted by the ARRA by receiving a temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description."

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise reflects 9 months of savings beginning October 1, 2009.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

**Total**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$62,955 |
| Federal | 0 | -15,325 |
| State | 0 | -19,148 |
| County | 0 | -28,482 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

**Item 101 – Group Homes**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$31,153 |
| Federal | 0 | - 7,613 |
| State | 0 | - 9,416 |
| County | 0 | -14,124 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Ten Percent Reduction to the Basic Care for Group Homes, Foster Family Agencies, Specialized Care Increment, Seriously Emotionally Disturbed, and Supplemental Clothing Allowance

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(In 000's)

| **Item 101 - Foster Family Agencies** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$19,597 |
| Federal | 0 | - 6,810 |
| State | 0 | - 5,114 |
| County | 0 | - 7,673 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

**Item 101 – Specialized Care Increment**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$1,618 |
| Federal | 0 | -809 |
| State | 0 | -324 |
| County | 0 | -485 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

**Item 101 – Seriously Emotionally Disturbed**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$10,334 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -4,134 |
| County | 0 | -6,200 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Ten Percent Reduction to the Basic Care for Group Homes, Foster Family Agencies, Specialized Care Increment, Seriously Emotionally Disturbed, and Supplemental Clothing Allowance

### Item 101 – Supplemental Clothing Allowance

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$ 253 |
| Federal | 0 | - 93 |
| State | 0 | -160 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

### Total Item 153 – Title IV-E Waiver Counties

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$ 8,262 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -8,262 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SRG, FC, AAP, and IHSS – FMAP Increase

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact of increasing the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate from 50 percent to 56.2 percent for the Subsidized Relative Guardianship (SRG), Foster Care (FC), and Adoption Assistance Program (AAP), due to the enactment of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. This premise also reflects the impact of increasing the FMAP rate from 50 percent to 61.594 percent for services under the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW), and 1915(j) State Plan Option. The ARRA is a multi-year, federal economic stimulus program. With respect to programs under the purview of the California Department of Social Services, the purposes of the funds are to preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery; assist those impacted by the recession; and stabilize state and local government budgets.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented October 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Public Law (P.L.) 111-5. FMAP increase for SRG/FC/AAP: P.L. 111-5, Division B, Title V, Section 5001(b). FMAP increase for IHSS: P.L. 111-5, Division B, Title V, Section 5001(c).
- Assumes only new cases will transfer from the existing state funded Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program (Kin-GAP) to the new SRG program, effective January 1, 2010.
- Assumes federal-only AAP cases will be eligible for the FMAP increase.
- Assumes federal-only FC cases will be eligible for the FMAP increase.
- Assumes that the federal share of the PCSP, IPW, and 1915(j) will be eligible for the FMAP increase, effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Item 101 and Item 153**

- For the SRG program, the projected cases were calculated as if they were transferring to the new SRG program, utilizing the current federal share. These cases are then calculated under the new federal share that was increased by 6.2 percent. The costs of both the SRG program with the current federal share and the SRG program with the increased federal share are subtracted from one another, which results in the cost and savings attributable to the FMAP increase.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SRG, FC, AAP, and IHSS – FMAP Increase

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- For the AAP program, the federal share was increased by 6.2 percent. This increase was then split by the state and county shares, which resulted in a savings for both the state and the county.
- For the FC program, the federal share of foster care cash payments was increased by 6.2 percent. The additional federal funding resulted in corresponding savings for both the state and county shares of the foster care cash payments.

**Item 111**

- For the IHSS program, the federal share of all cases that receive in home support services was increased by 11.594 percent. The increased FMAP for eligible IHSS cases resulted in a savings for both the state and county shares.

## FUNDING:

**Item 101 and Item 153**

SRG – The SRG program is paid with 50 percent federal funding, provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate of 50 percent. The balance of the SRG program is paid with 26 percent General Fund (GF) and 24 percent county funds.

FC – Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. The balance of the FC funding is paid with 20 percent GF and 30 percent county funds. The waiver counties' FC FMAP increase was computed utilizing the base plus two percent growth.

AAP – Federal funding is provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on an FMAP rate of 50 percent. The balance of the AAP program is paid with 75 percent GF and 25 percent county funds.

**Item 111**

IHSS – For the PCSP, IPW, and 1915(j), the Title XIX FMAP rate for services is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010, the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Current Year represents nine months of costs/savings; Budget Year represents a full year.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SRG, FC, AAP, and IHSS – FMAP Increase

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| **Subsidized Relative Guardianship – 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 334 |
| State | 0 | -201 |
| County | 0 | -133 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Foster Care – 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 24,167 | 28,101 |
| State | -9,667 | -11,240 |
| County | -14,500 | -16,861 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Adoption Assistance – 101** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 29,924 | 42,704 |
| State | -22,443 | -32,028 |
| County | -7,481 | -10,676 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SRG, FC, AAP, and IHSS – FMAP Increase

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(In 000's)

| **IHSS – 111** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -296,302 | -274,878 |
| County | -159,428 | -147,846 |
| Reimbursements | 455,730 | 422,724 |

| **Title IV-E Waiver – 153** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 15,548 | 20,731 |
| State | -6,219 | -8,292 |
| County | -9,329 | -12,439 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Adoption Assistance Program – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic cost of providing financial support to families adopting a child with special needs under the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP).

Children eligible for AAP benefits have one of the following characteristics that are barriers to adoption: mental, physical, medical or emotional handicap; ethnic background, race, color, or language; over three years of age; member of a sibling group to be adopted by one family; or adverse parental background (e.g., drug addiction, mental illness). To be eligible to receive federal benefits, the child shall have been otherwise eligible to receive aid under the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care Program. The amount of the AAP payment is based on the child's needs and the prospective family's circumstances, with eligibility reassessed every two years. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 390 (Chapter 547, Statutes of 2000), the statewide median income guideline shall not be used for negotiations between the prospective adoptive family and the adoption agency to determine the amount of payment to be received.

The AAP benefit shall not exceed the age-related, foster family home care rate for which the child would otherwise be eligible. The AAP payment may include the value of a specialized care increment that would have been paid on behalf of a child due to health and/or behavioral problems. Payments may continue until the child attains the age of 18, unless a mental or physical handicap warrants the continuation of assistance until the child reaches the age of 21.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16115 through 16123.
- Cases presumed to be eligible for the federal AAP make up 85.8 percent of the total AAP payment caseload, based on data through December 2008 as reported on the CA 800 claim forms.
- Caseload and expenditure data extracted from the CA 800 provide the basis for caseload and average grant projections.
- The federal and nonfederal average grants are $775.07 and $783.56, respectively, for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and $783.49 and $759.10, respectively, for FY 2009-10, based on a 12-month linear trend analysis.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

AAP basic costs are the product of projected federal and nonfederal casemonths and the respective average grant, as identified above.

# Adoption Assistance Program – Basic Costs

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Federal case costs ineligible for FFP and the costs of the nonfederal program are shared 75 percent General Fund and 25 percent county.

Title IV-E FMAP rate will temporarily increase by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) changes reflect decreases in the average grant and average monthly caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase reflects a projected caseload increase and an increase to the federal average grant offset by a decrease to the nonfederal average grant.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 80,255 | 84,161 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $747,109 | $787,890 |
| Federal | 311,820 | 332,034 |
| State | 326,467 | 341,892 |
| County | 108,822 | 113,964 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs for the Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) program. The RCA program provides cash grants to refugees during their first eight months in the United States (U.S.) if they are not otherwise eligible for other categorical welfare programs.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1522 of Title VIII of the United States Code (U.S.C.) authorizes the federal government to provide grants to states to assist refugees who resettle in the U.S.

- Sections 13275 through 13282 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorize the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to administer the funds provided under Title VIII of the U.S.C. It also provides CDSS authority to allocate the federal funds to the counties.

- The average grant cost for RCA recipients is $303.57, which reflects actual expenditures through December 2008.

- The average monthly caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is estimated at 2,322 cases, and for FY 2009-10 is estimated at 2,400 cases.

## METHODOLOGY:

The RCA average grant is multiplied by the estimated caseload to arrive at total RCA costs for each fiscal year.

## FUNDING:

The program is 100 percent federally funded by the Cash, Medical and Administration Grant through the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) program costs have increased due to a higher average monthly caseload and a higher average grant cost based on actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase is due to a higher average monthly caseload.

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Basic Costs

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $8,458 | $8,748 |
| Federal | 8,458 | 8,748 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Four Percent MAP Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with the implementation of a four percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, whose grant amounts are mirrored in the Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) program. The RCA program provides cash grants to refugees during their first eight months in the United States (U.S.) if they are not otherwise eligible for other categorical welfare programs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes an implementation date of July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1522 of Title VIII of the United States (U.S.) code authorizes the federal government to provide grants to states to assist refugees who resettle in the U.S.

- Sections 13275 through 13282 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorize the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to administer the funds provided under Title VIII of the U.S.C. It also provides CDSS authority to allocate the federal funds to the counties.

- The average grant cost for RCA recipients is $303.57, which reflects actual expenditures through December 2008. Applying the four percent MAP reduction will result in an average grant cost of $291.43.

- The average monthly caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is estimated at 2,322 cases, and for FY 2009-10 is estimated at 2,400 cases.

- Statute would need to be enacted to implement this premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

The grant savings is calculated by multiplying the decrease in the average RCA grant by the impacted caseload.

## FUNDING:

The program is 100 percent federally funded by the Cash, Medical and Administration Grant through the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Four Percent MAP Reduction

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$350 |
| Federal | 0 | -350 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Six Percent MAP Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with the implementation of a six percent Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) reduction to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, whose grant amounts are mirrored in the Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) program. The RCA program provides cash grants to refugees during their first eight months in the United States (U.S.) if they are not otherwise eligible for other categorical welfare programs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes an implementation date of July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1522 of Title VIII of the United States (U.S.) code authorizes the federal government to provide grants to states to assist refugees who resettle in the U.S.

- Sections 13275 through 13282 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorize the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to administer the funds provided under Title VIII of the U.S.C. It also provides CDSS authority to allocate the federal funds to the counties.

- The average grant cost for RCA recipients is $303.57, which reflects actual expenditures through December 2008. Applying the six percent MAP reduction will result in an average grant cost of $285.36.

- The average monthly caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is estimated at 2,322 cases, and for FY 2009-10 is estimated at 2,400 cases.

- Statute would need to be enacted to implement this premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

The grant savings is calculated by multiplying the decrease in the average RCA grant by the impacted caseload.

## FUNDING:

The program is 100 percent federally funded by the Cash, Medical and Administration Grant through the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Six Percent MAP Reduction

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$525 |
| Federal | 0 | -525 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Emergency Food Assistance Program Fund

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures from contributions designated on state income tax returns for the Emergency Food Assistance Program (EFAP). Assembly Bill 2366 (Chapter 818, Statutes of 1998) established an EFAP fund which, upon appropriation by the Legislature, is allocated to the State Franchise Tax Board (FTB) and State Controller's Office (SCO) for reimbursement for their costs associated with administering the fund. The balance of the fund is directed to the California Department of Social Services for allocation to EFAP.

As a result of Senate Bill 1101 (Chapter 203, Statutes of 2008) this Fund will be shown as the "Emergency Food for Families Fund" on future state income tax forms.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Revenue and Taxation Code Sections 18851 through 18855.
- Funds available in the Current Year (CY) include the actual amount of contributions made to the EFAP fund from June 2007 through May 2008 of $426,777, unexpended funds of $27,003 from prior years, and interest of $19,884. Estimated expenditures are limited to the Budget Act Appropriation of $449,000.
- The Budget Year (BY) reflects the estimated amount of contributions to be made to the EFAP fund from June 2008 through May 2009 of $616,000, unexpended funds of $17,011 from the prior year, and estimated interest of $14,000.
- The estimated annual administrative costs for FTB and SCO are $7,653 in both the CY and BY.
- These funds are provided to supplement, and not supplant, existing program funds.

## METHODOLOGY:

The CY reflects the actual amount available for expenditure in Fiscal Year 2008-09. The BY reflects the estimated amount of contributions to the EFAP fund in the state income tax year, plus accrued interest and unspent funds from prior years, less the annual administrative costs for FTB and SCO.

## FUNDING:

The costs are 100 percent from the EFAP fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The BY has been increased based on actual data showing higher contributions to the Fund, partially offset by reduced interest earnings.

# Emergency Food Assistance Program Fund

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects increases in the estimated taxpayer contributions and interest earnings.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $449 | $639 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 449 | 639 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# California Food Assistance Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the coupon and administrative costs associated with the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) for eligible noncitizens. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, provided that legal noncitizens who entered the United States (U.S.) on or after August 22, 1996, were ineligible for federal food stamp benefits unless they were exempt under certain refugee categories. Federal food stamp benefits for the ineligible legal noncitizens were terminated in August 1997. CFAP serves legal noncitizens over 18 and under 65 years of age, who were legally in the U.S. prior to August 22, 1996, and met all federal food stamp eligibility criteria except for their immigration status and legal noncitizens that entered the country on or after August 22, 1996, and are otherwise eligible.

The Food Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2002 (H.R. 2646 Farm Bill) restored federal food stamp eligibility to legal noncitizens who are disabled, effective October 2002; noncitizens who have been in the U.S. for five years or more, effective April 2003; and all noncitizen children, effective October 2003.

Annual coupon costs are reduced by costs for Prospective Budgeting as these costs are reflected on a separate premise. Administrative costs are increased to reflect the impact of Simplification Options.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise originally implemented on September 1, 1997.

The H.R. 2646 Farm Bill implemented on October 1, 2002.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18930.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 2009-10, CFAP costs are based on the following key data/assumptions:
- It is assumed that the trend in the total number of CFAP recipients resembles the monthly fluctuations in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) and Non-Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS) trend forecasts.
- The total number of CFAP recipients is projected by applying the CalWORKs and NAFS trend forecast to actual December 2008 recipients.
- The projected average monthly number of CFAP recipients is 25,684 for FY 2008-09 and 30,131 for FY 2009-10.
- The projected average monthly number of CFAP households is 10,145 for FY 2008-09 and 11,917 for FY 2009-10.

  The average coupon value per person is $104.00 for FY 2008-09 and $116.83 in FY 2009-10. These coupon values account for the annual Cost of Living Adjustments of 8.51 percent on October 1, 2008 and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 benefit increase of 13.6 percent on April 1, 2009. The impact from the 13.6 percent benefit increase is removed from this premise and reflected in the ARRA – 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase premise.

# California Food Assistance Program

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The processing fee charged by the Food and Nutrition Service for Electronic Benefit Transfer is $314 per $1 million. The average monthly administrative cost per case is $25.01.
- The ratio between public assistance (PA) and nonassistance (NA) is 21.01 percent PA and 78.99 percent NA.
- The PA costs are considered eligible expenditures for the state's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The NA costs are not considered MOE eligible.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The coupon costs are calculated by multiplying the average coupon value per person ($104.00 for FY 2008-09 and $116.83 in FY 2009-10) by the projected average monthly number of recipients (25,684 for FY 2008-09 and 30,131 for FY 2009-10) and then by the number of months.
- The coupon costs are increased by the processing fees that are added to the coupon total. The processing fee equates to $314 for every $1 million in coupon benefits.
- The coupon costs are increased by the Standard Utility Allowance adjustment of $321,095 in FY 2008-09 and $490,883 in FFY 2009-10.
- Annual coupon costs are reduced to account for the savings that come from Prospective Budgeting. These savings are $1,145,551 in FY 2008-09 and $1,345,697 in FY 2009-10.
- Coupon costs are reduced by $1,062,125 in FY 2008-09 and $5,630,727 in FY 2009-10 to account for the 13.6 percent benefit increase from the ARRA. These coupon costs are included in the ARRA – 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase premise.
- Administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the average administrative cost per case ($25.01) by the projected monthly number of cases (10,145 for FY 2008-09 and 11,917 for FY 2009-10) and then by the number of months.

## FUNDING:

The expenditures are 100 percent General Fund. The PA portion of the costs is eligible to be counted towards the MOE requirement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Both the Current Year and the Budget Year increases in costs are associated with a higher than expected caseload growth.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Budget Year reflects an increase in caseload.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Number of Recipients | 25,684 | 30,131 |

# California Food Assistance Program

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Coupon | County Admin. | Coupon | County Admin. |
| Total | $30,177 | $3,073 | $35,772 | $3,619 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State | 31,177 | 3,073 | 35,772 | 3,619 |
| County | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Expanded Categorical Eligibility Food Stamp Program

## DESCRIPTION:

As required under Assembly Bill (AB) 433 (Chapter 625, Statutes of 2008), this premise reflects the impact of a program of categorical eligibility for food stamps to improve nutrition and promote the development and retention of assets and resources for needy households who meet all other Food Stamp Program (FSP) eligibility requirements. This bill would extend categorical eligibility for the FSP to individuals who are members of households with minor children eligible to receive, Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF)-funded benefits. AB 433 requires the categorical eligibility program to be established no later than July 1, 2009, and be available for new applicants of food stamps by January 1, 2010.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18901.5.
- This premise allows applicants who meet income-eligibility requirements but have resources that exceed the eligibility limits to become eligible for the FSP by providing a TANF-funded service to these households.
- A May 2007 Mathematica Policy Research study indicated that the 4.51 percent of families with children under 18 who would have otherwise been eligible for the FSP, were denied due to their assets.
- It is assumed that the FSP caseload would increase by 4.51 percent with the implementation of this categorical eligibility program.
- This caseload increase is slightly offset by the implementation of the asset waiver included in the 2008 Farm Bill.
- It is assumed that the overall increase to the FSP caseload will be 33,872 households.
- It is assumed that this caseload increase will phase in over six months beginning July 1, 2009, resulting in an average monthly FSP increase in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 of 26,816.
- Based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006 Food Stamp Characteristics Survey Data (Q5), and accounting for Cost of Living Adjustments, it is assumed that the average benefit for this group is $329.85 per household. Included in this premise is the impact from the April 1, 2009 food stamp benefit increase of 13.6 percent from the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) of 2009.
- It is assumed that the intake cost for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process a Non Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS) case is $51.00 per case.
- It is assumed that the cost for an EW to process NAFS continuing cases on a quarterly basis is $39.33 per case.
- It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- It is assumed that the administrative cost for an EW to process a mid-quarter report is $28.23.

# Expanded Categorical Eligibility Food Stamp Program

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Based on historical experience it is assumed that California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) benefit and administration costs consist of approximately one percent of FSP costs.
- The CFAP Public Assistance Food Stamps costs (approximately 21 percent) are considered eligible expenditures for the state's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The CFAP NAFS costs (approximately 79 percent) are not considered MOE eligible.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The average monthly increase in the number of FS households is 26,816, which equates to an increase of approximately $106.1 million in federally funded food stamp benefits.
- The increase in state funded CFAP benefits is one percent of this total, which equals $1.1 million.
- Each new case must go through the intake process with a one-time cost of $51. This applies to the 33,872 new expected cases and to four percent of the caseload monthly to account for caseload movement, resulting in a cost of $2.2 million.
- Assuming a phased in implementation results in quarterly administration costs of $3.3 million.
- Assuming a phased in implementation results in mid-quarter reporting costs of $0.6 million.
- Total Food Stamp admin associated with this premise is $6.1 million and is calculated as follows:
    - $0.6 million (mid-quarterly reporting cost) + $3.3 million (quarterly reporting costs) + 2.2 million (intake costs) = $6.1 million
- The increase in state funded CFAP administrative costs is one percent of this total, which equals $61,000.

## FUNDING:

The CFAP administration and benefit costs are 100 percent General Fund (GF). FS administration costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent GF. The GF portion of these costs, are funded with reimbursement funds from the Food Stamp Nutrition Education (FSNE)/California Nutrition Network pass through plan. Please see the "FSNE shift to the California Department of Social Services" premise for a more detailed description of this transfer.

The FS benefit costs are 100 percent federally funded.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in FY 2009-10 is due to caseload increase and the ARRA 13.6 percent benefit increase.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in FY 2009-10.

# Expanded Categorical Eligibility Food Stamp Program

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – CFAP Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $0 | $1,061 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 1,061 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 – Food Stamp Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $6,058 |
| Federal | 0 | 3,029 |
| State | 0 | 3,029 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 – CFAP Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $61 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 61 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008

## DESCRIPTION:

The Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill) includes mandatory federal changes that will increase benefits and administrative costs of the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) and the federal Food Stamp Program (FSP). The following are provisions of the Farm Bill that will increase the average food stamp (FS) benefit and administrative costs: raising the minimum standard deduction for households with one to three members from $134 to $144; eliminating the cap on the deduction for dependent care expenses which allows families eligible for the deduction to deduct the entire amount of dependent care expenses when calculating benefit levels; excluding retirement and tax preferred education accounts (i.e. IRAs, 529s) from countable resources in determining eligibility; and increasing the minimum benefit for one and two person households from $10 to $14. The provision to exclude retirement and tax preferred education accounts from countable resources in determining benefit eligibility will increase FSP and CFAP caseload, thereby increasing administration costs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The projected number of average monthly FS households based on the caseload trend is 1,044,939 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 1,273,017 in FY 2009-10.
- The projected number of average monthly CFAP households is 10,145 in FY 2008-09 and 11,917 in FY 2009-10.
- Based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007 FS Characteristics Data (Q5), the average monthly number of FS households that will claim a standard deduction is 843,801 in FY 2008-09 and 954,595 in FY 2009-10.
- Based on a typical three-person household with average shelter deductions, every additional one-dollar increase in deductions would result in a fifty-cent increase in benefits. Therefore, it is assumed that every household claiming a standard deduction will receive a five dollar increase in benefits.
- Based on FFY 2007 Q5 data, 0.59 percent of households claimed a dependent care deduction and had actual costs exceeding the $175 / $200 cap. The average monthly number of FS households that will claim a dependent care deduction is 6,390 in FY 2008-09 and 7,229 in FY 2009-10.
- Given the removal of the $175 and $200 cap on dependent care deductions, the average monthly increased benefit amount for households claiming this deduction will be $39.
- Based on a May 2007 Mathematica Policy Research study it is assumed that the overall FS participation rate in California of eligible households is 44.7 percent.
- Based on the same Mathematica study, 48.6 percent of households that were ineligible based on assets hold a retirement or tax preferred education account. Additionally, 90.7 percent of those who hold a retirement or tax preferred education account also hold another asset that would still keep them ineligible for the FSP.

# Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- It is assumed that 8,493 new households will become eligible and begin receiving benefits in October 2008 because of the asset exclusion provisions. A four percent attrition and intake, or 340 households, is anticipated beginning in November 2008.
- The average FS benefit per household is $310.49 for FY 2008-09 and $348.14 in FY 2009-10. These benefit amounts account for the annual Cost of Living Adjustment of 8.51 percent on October 1, 2008 and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 benefit increase of 13.6 percent on April 1, 2009.
- Based on FFY 2007 Q5 data, the number of one and two person FS households that would have otherwise received the minimum FS benefit is 4,850 in FY 2008-09 and 5,487 in FY 2009-10.
- It is assumed that the average benefit increase for these households will be four dollars.
- It is assumed that the intake cost for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process new Non Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) and CFAP cases is $51 per case.
- It is assumed that the cost for an EW to process NAFS and CFAP continuing cases on a quarterly basis is $39.33 per case.
- It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- It is assumed that the administrative cost for an EW to process a mid-quarter report is $28.23.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimated increase in federal FS benefits due to the standard deduction is calculated by multiplying the FS households that will claim a standard deduction times the increase in benefits ($5) and the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The estimated increase in federal FS benefits due to eliminating the cap on dependent care deduction is calculated by multiplying the FS households that claim the dependent care deduction and had actual costs exceeding the $175 / $200 cap times the increase in benefits ($39) and the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The estimated increase in federal FS benefits due to the exclusion of retirement and tax preferred education accounts is calculated by multiplying the households that become eligible and receive benefits due to of the asset exclusion provisions times the average benefit ($310.49 FY 2008-09 and $348.14 FY 2009-10) and the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The estimated increase in federal FS benefits due to increasing the minimum benefit is calculated by multiplying the FS households that would have otherwise received a minimum benefit times the increase in benefits ($4) and the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The increase in CFAP benefits is calculated by taking approximately one percent of the estimated FSP increases.
- Approximately $22,000 in FY 2008-09 and $131,000 in FY 2009-10 is removed from total CFAP grants and is reflected in the ARRA – 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase premise.

# Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the new cases is calculated by multiplying the new monthly cases by the EW cost ($51) and then by the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The administrative costs to process quarterly reports are calculated by multiplying the quarterly cost ($39.33) times the number of households, the percentage of cases required the report on a quarterly basis (33.3 percent) and the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The administrative costs to process mid-quarter reporting costs are calculated by multiplying the cost per case times ($28.23) the number of new cases, the percent of cases that would report mid-quarter (7.2 percent) and the number of months (nine months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10).
- The FY 2008-09 increase in CFAP admin is calculated by taking approximately one percent of the FS administration totals.

## FUNDING:

The CFAP administration and benefit costs are 100 percent General Fund (GF). FS administration costs are shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent GF, and 15 percent county. FS benefit costs are 100 percent federally funded.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 expenditures is due to the increase in the FS caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in FY 2008-09 expenditures is due to the anticipated increase in the FS caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – CFAP Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $612 | $830 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 612 | 830 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Food Conservation and Energy Act of 2008

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

| **ITEM 141 – Food Stamp Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $1,378 | $1,751 |
| Federal | 689 | 876 |
| State | 482 | 612 |
| County | 207 | 263 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 – CFAP Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $14 | $18 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 14 | 18 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase

## DESCRIPTION:

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 is a multi-year, federal economic stimulus program. With respect to programs under the purview of the California Department of Social Services, the purposes of the funds are to:

- Preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery
- Assist those impacted by the recession
- Stabilize state and local government budgets

This premise reflects the increase in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Food Stamp Program (FSP) in California) benefits provided in the ARRA. Effective April 1, 2009, individuals receiving benefits in the FSP and the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) will receive a 13.6 percent benefit increase. The new benefit levels supersede other Cost-of-Living Adjustments (COLAs) until such time as the cumulative annual COLAs surpass the 13.6 percent level.

Federal food stamps are 100 percent federally funded and are not included in local assistance estimates. Therefore, the impact from the 13.6 percent benefit increase to federal food stamps is not included in this premise.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: ARRA of 2009, Welfare and Institutions Code section 18930.
- Effective April 1, 2009, there is a 13.6 percent increase in CFAP benefits.
- The ARRA benefit increase supersedes the annual FSP/CFAP COLAs until total cumulative FSP COLAs surpass the 13.6 percent level.
- The average CFAP household benefit for October 2008 through December 2008 (after the October 2008 COLA) is $262.24. After the 13.6 percent increase, the average benefit per household is estimated to be $297.90.
- Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 includes three (3) months of the benefit increase and FY 2009-10 includes 12 months of the benefit increase.
- As authorized by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), a portion of the funding received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) will be used to provide support for the California Recovery Task Force (CRTF) and for the ARRA oversight and administrative activities of the various departments administering those funds. Pursuant to Executive Order S-02-09, CRTF is charged with tracking the ARRA funding coming into the state; helping cities, counties, non-profits, and others access the available funding; ensuring that the funding provided to the state is spent efficiently and effectively; and maintaining a Web site that is frequently and thoroughly updated so Californians can track the stimulus dollars.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
# 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

The mechanism for accessing these federal funds and for allocating them to the CRTF and state entities administering ARRA funds is under development and is not available to include in this estimate. Consequently, a future Section 28.00 request may be submitted in the coming months to properly increase the department's federal funds reimbursement authority to fund the cost of accountability and related administrative and transparency activities.

## METHODOLOGY:

The CFAP benefit impact is calculated by applying the increased benefit amount to CFAP Basic, CFAP Prospective Budgeting, CFAP Face-to-Face Waiver and CFAP Farm Bill of 2008 premises for three months in FY 2008-09 and 12 months in FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

FSP benefits are 100 percent federally funded. CFAP benefits are 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FY 2009-10 contains 12 months of benefit increase compared to three (3) months of benefit increase in FY 2008-09.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | CFAP Coupon | CFAP Coupon |
| Total | $1,123 | $6,000 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,123 | 6,000 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise represents the costs associated with extending social services and benefits to noncitizen victims of human trafficking, domestic violence, and other serious crimes. Pursuant to provisions contained in Senate Bill (SB) 1569 (Chapter 672, Statutes of 2006), these individuals are eligible for services and benefits to the same extent as persons who are eligible under the federal Refugee Act of 1980, including, but not limited to, refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, employment social services, and Healthy Families Program benefits.
SB 1569 requires victims of human trafficking to file for a T visa with the appropriate federal agency, to prepare to file an application for federal status, or to show evidence that they are taking steps to meet the conditions for federal benefits eligibility to qualify for state public social services. Victims of domestic violence and other serious crimes must file a formal application for a U visa with the appropriate federal agency to qualify. In order to remain eligible for benefits and services, victims of trafficking must show evidence that they have applied for the T visa within one year from the date of application for state public social services.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18945.
- Based on an annual report from the federal Attorney General's Office entitled "US Government Activities to Combat Trafficking in Persons" (updated June 2007) to the United States Congress, an estimated 17,500 undocumented trafficking victims are in the United States.
- Based on a published news article by the San Diego Tribune, the federal government has received 3,011 U visa applications over a four-year period (2001 to 2005).
- Based on a publication by the Census Bureau published in 2000, an estimated 32 percent of undocumented citizens are in California. Assuming 50 percent of these undocumented citizens apply for a visa, approximately 3,200 people will be eligible for services and benefits.
- Based on historical data trends on social services,435 persons will be eligible for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), and 421 persons for other services.

**CalWORKs**

- It is assumed that recipients who apply for U visas are adults who are added to existing CalWORKs cases. These cases receive additional CalWORKs benefits and services associated with adding one person to the existing Assistance Unit (AU). Recipients who apply for T visas are more likely to be single and would not be eligible for CalWORKs.
- Recipients are required to apply for a U visa to become eligible for CalWORKs. Until the U visa application is approved or denied, these recipients can continue to receive CalWORKs benefits and services.

# Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Between January and June 2007, actual data reported from the counties show 70 adults have been added to existing CalWORKs cases under SB 1569. An additional 365 adults are projected to be added to existing CalWORKs cases by the end of the Current Year (CY).
- The cost of adding an adult to an existing AU is $139 per case.
- It is assumed these recipients are not legally able to work to receive earned income to offset the monthly grant.
- The average monthly number of new cases for the CY is 15. The caseload is assumed to be completely phased in for the entire Budget Year (BY).
- The provisions of SB 1569 state these recipients are subject to the same welfare-to-work (WtW) requirements and exemptions as other participants, provided that compliance with these requirements is authorized by law. The county will assist these recipients to engage in work activities once these recipients achieve legal residency.
- For the CY and the BY, it is assumed that there are 1.9 children per case and assumed that 32.4 percent of the cases that are required to participate in WtW activities utilize child care services.
- The child care cost per case is $807 in the CY and the BY.
- The average number of children who will receive services is 217 in the CY and 268 in the BY.

**CFAP:**

- This premise assumes an October 1, 2009 elimination of the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP).
- The average monthly number of CFAP recipients is 350 in the CY and 421 in the BY from July 2009 through September 2009. This includes unduplicated persons estimated to receive benefits for CalWORKs, CAPI, and RCA.
- The average coupon value per person is $104.00 for FY 2008-09 and $116.83 in FY 2009-10. These coupon values account for the annual Cost of Living Adjustment of 8.51 percent on October 1, 2008 and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 benefit increase of 13.6 percent on April 1, 2009.
- Approximately $15,000 in FY 2008-09 and $20,000 in FY 2009-10 is removed from total CFAP grants and reflected in the ARRA – 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase premise.
- An estimated 7.2 percent of the new cumulative caseload will be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- The administrative costs include one-time intake cost of $51.00 for new cases, ongoing costs of $13.11 per case per month, and mid-quarter costs of $28.23 per case per month.

# Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569)

## METHODOLOGY:

**CalWORKs**

- The grant cost is calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of cases by the cost per case.
- The employment services costs include case management, transportation, and ancillary costs. The average monthly number of cases for the CY is 351 and the BY is 435, which is multiplied by the utilization rate for each service and the corresponding cost per case. The utilization rates and cost per case are as follows: Case management (41.2 percent; $206), transportation (54.31 percent; $73), and ancillary (11.02 percent; $73).
- The 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 adults by the cost per case.
- The child care costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of children by the cost per child.

**CFAP:**

- The coupon costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly coupon benefit per person by the projected monthly number of CFAP recipients.
- The one-time intake administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of new RCA and CAPI cases by the cost per case.
- The on-going quarterly administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of cases by the average monthly cost per case. The ongoing mid-quarter administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly number of cases by the percentage of cases subject to mid-quarter reporting, and then multiplied by the cost per case.

## FUNDING:

CalWORKs grants are funded with 97.5 percent General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county.

CalWORKs employment services, administrative services, child care, and CFAP are funded with 100 percent GF.

Under Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations section 263.2(b), these cases are not Maintenance of Effort eligible.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY increase in costs is due to an increase in the average CFAP grant.

The BY decrease in costs is due to the elimination of the CFAP program effective October 1, 2009.

# Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in grant costs is due to the elimination of CFAP effective October 1, 2009 offset by an increase in CalWORKs grants due to a full year of completed phase in of the CalWORKs cases for the BY. The increase in services is due to a full year of completed phase in of the CalWORKs cases for the BY. The decrease in administration is due to the October 1, 2009 elimination of CFAP.

## .Expenditures:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 - Grand Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,372 | $4,181 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,340 | 4,163 |
| County | 32 | 18 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 - Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,261 | $874 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,229 | 856 |
| County | 32 | 18 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 151 - Services** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $3,047 | $3,288 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 3,047 | 3,288 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Undocumented Citizens (SB 1569)

## EXPENDITURES (continued):

| **ITEM 151 - Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $64 | $19 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 64 | 19 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# California Food Assistance Program - Elimination

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects savings associated with eliminating the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP). The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, provided that legal noncitizens who entered the United States (U.S.) on or after August 22, 1996, were ineligible for federal food stamp benefits unless they were exempt under certain refugee categories. CFAP provides food stamp benefits to legal noncitizens over 18 and under 65 years of age, who were legally in the U.S. prior to August 22, 1996, and met all federal food stamp eligibility criteria except for their immigration status, and legal noncitizens that entered the country on or after August 22, 1996, and are otherwise eligible.

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes an October 1, 2009 elimination of the CFAP program.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The CFAP elimination will require a change in state statute and emergency regulations.
- The projected average monthly number of CFAP recipients is 30,131 for FY 2009-10.
- The projected average monthly CFAP benefit per person for is $116.83 for FY 2009-10.
- The ratio between public assistance (PA) and non-assistance (NA) is 21.01 percent PA and 78.99 percent NA.
- The PA costs are considered eligible expenditures for the state's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The NA costs are not considered MOE eligible.

## METHODOLOGY:

The following CFAP premises will be eliminated October 1, 2009: Expanded Categorical Eligibility, Prospective Budgeting, Face-to-Face Waiver, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, and the Farm Bill of 2008. The costs to fund these premises between October 2009 and June 2010 total approximately $34.7 million.

The reduction to grants and administration for undocumented citizens due to the CFAP elimination is reflected in the Undocumented Citizens (Senate Bill 1569) premise.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded 100 percent General Fund.

# California Food Assistance Program - Elimination

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Coupon | County Admin. | Coupon | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $0 | -$32,935 | -$1,746 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 | -32,139 | -1,700 |
| County | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 | -796 | -46 |

# SSI/SSP – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs for the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program. The SSI program, authorized by Title XVI of the Social Security Act, replaced the prior federal/state matching grant program of adult assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled in January 1974. The SSI/SSP program is a cash assistance program for low-income aged, blind, and disabled persons. California opted to supplement the SSI payments, creating the SSP program. The Social Security Administration (SSA) administers the SSI/SSP program at California's option.

The maximum amount of aid is dependent on the following factors:

- Whether one is aged, blind, or disabled;
- The living arrangement;
- Marital status; and,
- Minor status.

As a result of the various factors determining the maximum amount of aid, there are 19 different payment standards in the SSI/SSP program.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The SSA will continue to administer the program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
- Section 1611 of Title XVI defines the amount of SSI benefits an individual may be eligible to receive.
- Section 12200 of the Welfare and Institutions Code defines the maximum payment standard available under each living arrangement.
- SSI/SSP caseload is adjusted to reflect the decrease in recipients who become ineligible for SSI/SSP due to grant reductions. These grant reductions include the withholding of the pass-through of the 2009 Federal COLA, effective May 1, 2009; the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction, effective July 1, 2009; and the SSP Maintenance of Effort (MOE) floor reduction, effective October 1, 2009.
- The basic costs per case for SSI and SSP estimates are developed from actual state and federal expenditures reported on the State Data Exchange (SDX) and SSA 8700 reports. The SSI and SSP average grants are based on actual data through December 2008 and are as follows:

| | SSI | SSP |
|---|---|---|
| Aged | $296.74 | $227.50 |
| Blind | 375.73 | 283.47 |
| Disabled | 405.67 | 226.28 |

## METHODOLOGY:

The SSI/SSP basic costs are computed for each aged, blind, and disabled component, then summed to produce total basic costs. Both the SSI and SSP basic average grants were adjusted to exclude the effects of payments to recipients residing in medical facilities.

# SSI/SSP – Basic Costs

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

The adjusted average grants were multiplied by the estimated caseloads to arrive at an adjusted basic cost. Estimated expenditures for recipients in medical facilities were then added to total basic costs.

## FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent General Fund. Costs for each component are computed separately.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year total costs have decreased due to a lower caseload due to SSI/SSP recipients losing their eligibility because of proposed grant reductions.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in expenditures is due to a higher reduction to the monthly caseload due to the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction and the SSP MOE floor reduction.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Persons | 1,263,304 | 1,246,957 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $9,007,200 | $8,894,512 |
| Federal | 5,595,307 | 5,527,772 |
| State | 3,411,893 | 3,366,740 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Withhold Pass-Through of the January 2009 Federal COLA

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings resulting from a one-time withholding of the pass-through of the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) beginning May 2009. The January 2009 federal COLA took effect on January 1, 2009, and increased the SSI for a typical, independent SSI/State Supplementary Payment (SSP) recipient by $37 per month. Effective May 1, 2009, the SSP portion of the SSI/SSP grant will be reduced by the increase in the federal SSI portion. Withholding the pass-through of the SSI COLA (and suspending the 2009 State COLA) will revert the SSI/SSP payment standards back to December 2008 levels. Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) recipients and California Veterans Cash Benefit (CVCB) recipients will also be affected because their benefits are linked to the SSI/SSP rates. The impact to CAPI and CVCB recipients is reflected in their respective premises.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on May 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1617 of Title XVI of the Social Security Act authorizes the COLA for SSI recipients.
- Section 12201 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorizes the COLA for SSP recipients.
- The state COLA, based on the California Necessities Index (CNI), is 5.26 percent for 2009, and will be suspended, effective June 1, 2009.
- The federal COLA, based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI), is 5.8 percent for 2009, and will be withheld on May 1, 2009.
- Withholding the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA does not reduce the SSI portion of the SSI/SSP grant. The state can only reduce the SSP portion of the SSI/SSP grant, but not below the federally required Maintenance of Effort (MOE) level of the 1983 payment standards. This reduction will not reduce the SSP portion beyond the MOE level.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The SSI average grants for the three categories (aged, blind, and disabled) change as a result of the 2009 federal COLA.
- The CPI percentage is applied to the 2008 SSI payment standards and the result is the new SSI payment standards for 2009.
- The new payment standards are used in a statistical model to determine the value of the 2009 federal COLA for each of the three categories. The value of the 2009 federal COLA is added to each category's average SSI grant and the result is the increased average SSI grant for each category. These increased grants are multiplied by the caseload and the results are the increased costs to the SSI/SSP program due to the January 2009 federal COLA. The increased costs are subtracted from the basic SSI costs and the result is the increase in expenditures due to the 2009 federal COLA.

# Withhold Pass-Through of the January 2009 Federal COLA

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- The average SSP grants for the three categories decrease as a result of withholding the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA. The value of the 2009 federal COLA is subtracted from each category's average SSP grant and the result is the decreased average SSP grant for each category. These decreased grants are multiplied by the caseload and the result is the decreased costs to the SSI/SSP program due to withholding the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA. The decreased costs are subtracted from the basic SSP costs and the results are the savings due to withholding the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA.
- Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care, Restaurant Meal Allowance, and Title XIX Medical Facilities recipients are excluded from this reduction.
- Statutory changes would be needed to withhold the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA.

## FUNDING:

The SSP portion of the SSI/SSP program is funded with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The decreases in savings in the Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) are due to updated caseload projections and the use of average SSP grant amounts instead of maximum SSP payment standards.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The CY reflects two months of savings. The BY reflects a full year of savings.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$60,650 | -$360,493 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -$60,650 | -$360,493 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Reduce SSI/SSP Grants by 2.3 Percent

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with reducing the Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/State Supplementary Payment (SSP) grant amounts by 2.3 percent.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Social Security Administration will continue to administer the program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
- Section 1611 of Title XVI defines the amount of SSI benefits an individual may be eligible to receive.
- The savings associated with reducing SSI/SSP grant amounts for Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants recipients and California Veterans Cash Benefit recipients are reflected in this premise.
- Statutory changes would be needed to reduce the SSI/SSP grants by 2.3 percent.
- Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care, Restaurant Meal Allowance, and Title XIX Medical Facilities recipients are excluded from this reduction.
- This premise takes into account the withholding of the pass-through of the 2009 federal cost of living adjustment (COLA), effective May 1, 2009. Assumes the suspension of the June 2009 and June 2010 state COLAs.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The reduced grant amounts are calculated by using a statistical model which determines the change to the basic SSI/SSP average grant due to the 2.3 percent reduction. The reduced average grant amounts are multiplied by the caseload to determine the reduced costs to the SSI/SSP program.
- The SSP payment standards were decreased as a result of reducing the SSI/SSP grant by 2.3 percent. The reduced SSP grants are subtracted from the current law SSP grant amounts. The results are the savings associated with reducing the SSI/SSP grant amounts by 2.3 percent.

## FUNDING:

The SSP portion of the SSI/SSP program is funded with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The decrease in savings in the Budget Year (BY) is due to updated caseload projections and the use of average SSP grant amounts instead of maximum SSP payment standards.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the BY.

# Reduce SSI/SSP Grants by 2.3 Percent

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 0 | -$229,093 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -229,093 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# SSI/SSP - Reduce SSP Grant to MOE Floor

## DESCRIPTION:

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This premise is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions, and reflects the savings associated with reducing the State Supplementary Payment (SSP) standard of the Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/SSP program to the federally required Maintenance of Effort (MOE) level of the 1983 payment standards. MOE refers to a federal provision that limits the reduction a state can make to their SSP benefit levels without penalty. If a state were to reduce its SSP benefit levels below MOE levels, it would lose federal funding for Medi-Cal. SSI/SSP eligibility also establishes automatic eligibility for Medi-Cal.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The SSA will continue to administer the program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
- Section 1611 of Title XVI defines the amount of SSI benefits an individual may be eligible to receive.
- Section 12200 of the Welfare and Institutions Code defines the maximum payment standard available under each living arrangement.
- Section 416.096 of Title XX of the Code of Federal Regulations defines the loss of federal funding for Medi-Cal if a state reduces SSP payments below MOE levels.
- The savings associated with reducing SSP grant amounts for Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants recipients and California Veterans Cash Benefit recipients are reflected in this premise.
- Statutory changes would be needed to implement this premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The reduced grant amounts are calculated by using a statistical model to determine a change to the basic SSI/SSP average grant due to the SSP MOE floor reduction. The reduced average grant amounts are multiplied by the caseload to determine the reduced costs to the SSI/SSP program.
- The SSP payment standards were decreased as a result of reducing the SSI/SSP grant to the MOE floor. The reduced SSP grants are subtracted from the July 2009 SSP grant amounts. The results are the savings associated with reducing the SSI/SSP grant amounts.
- Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care, Restaurant Meal Allowance, and Title XIX Medical Facilities recipients are excluded from this reduction.

## FUNDING:

The SSP portion of the SSI/SSP program is funded with 100 percent GF.

# SSI/SSP - Reduce SSP Grant to MOE Floor

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$223,321 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -223,321 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# SSI/SSP – 2009 Federal COLA

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) given to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program recipients in 2009. The estimated SSI Consumer Price Index (CPI) COLA of 5.8 percent will be passed through to recipients resulting in an increase in the SSI portion of the January 1, 2009, grant payment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The CPI COLA will implement on January 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1617 of Title XVI of the Social Security Act authorizes the COLA for SSI recipients.
- The CPI is estimated at 5.8 percent for 2009, and will be passed through to recipients on January 1, 2009, pursuant to current law.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The SSI average grants for the three categories (aged, blind, and disabled) change as a result of the 2009 federal COLA.
- The CPI percentage is applied to the 2008 SSI payment standards and the result is the new SSI payment standards for 2009.
- The new payment standards are used in a statistical model to determine the value of the 2009 federal COLA for each of the three categories. The value of the 2009 federal COLA is added to each category's average SSI grant and the result is the increased average SSI grant for each category. These increased grants are multiplied by the caseload and the result is the increased costs to the SSI/SSP program due to the January 2009 federal COLA. The increased costs are subtracted from the basic SSI costs and the result is the increase in expenditures due to the 2009 federal COLA.
- The General Fund (GF) impact to the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants and California Veterans Cash Benefit Program are not included in the total impact of the COLA.

## FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) decreases are due to updated caseload projections.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects the full-year impact of the COLA.

# SSI/SSP – 2009 Federal COLA

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's):

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $184,598 | $364,177 |
| Federal | 184,598 | 364,177 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# SSI/SSP – 2010 Federal COLA

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) given to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program recipients in 2010. The estimated -2.6 percent Consumer Price Index (CPI) for 2010 eliminates the pass through of an SSI COLA to recipients. As a result, the SSI portion of the grant payment will not increase but, instead, will remain at the January 2009 level.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The CPI COLA will implement on January 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1617 of Title XVI of the Social Security Act authorizes the COLA for SSI recipients.
- Since the CPI is estimated at -2.6 percent for 2010, there will be no COLA to be passed through to recipients on January 1, 2010, pursuant to current law.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The SSI average grants will not change as a result of the 2010 COLA. The 2010 SSI payment standards will remain at the January 2009 level.
- The maximum monthly payment for an aged or disabled SSI/SSP individual living independently with no other income will not change as a result of the 2010 COLA.

## FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's):

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# SSI/SSP – 2010 State COLA

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the suspension of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) given to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program recipients in 2010 as a cost avoidance measure. The state COLA is based on the California Necessities Index (CNI) of 1.53 percent.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The CNI COLA will implement on June 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 12201 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorizes the COLA for SSP recipients.
- The estimated state COLA is based on the CNI. For 2010, the CNI is 1.53 percent and will be suspended on June 1, 2010.
- On June 1, 2010, an SSI/SSP recipient's grant amount will not change from the payment levels in effect on May 31, 2010.
- The cost avoidance associated with the suspension of the 2010 state COLA is $45.7 million. This takes into account the impact of withholding the pass-through of the January 2009 Federal COLA, effective May 1, 2009, and the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction, effective July 1, 2009.

## METHODOLOGY:

By suspending the 2010 state COLA, the SSP portion of the SSI/SSP grant will not change.

## FUNDING:

The SSP portion is funded with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# SSI/SSP – 2010 State COLA

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's):

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# SSI/SSP – SSP Administration

## DESCRIPTION:

The Social Security Administration (SSA) formerly administered the Supplemental Security Income/ State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program benefit payments without charge to the states. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 shifted costs for administration of SSP to the state, effective October 1, 1993. It also provided for additional service fees to be charged if SSA provides services beyond the expected level, such as payment standard reductions or increases made on outside of the normal January 1 schedule.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented on October 1, 1993.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The SSA will continue to administer this program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
- The federal Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33) amended existing federal statutes pertaining to administration fees for SSP payments. For each Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) from 1998 through 2002, administration fees increased from an initial $5.00 per payment to $8.50 per payment in FFY 2002. Increases after FFY 2002 are based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- Effective October 1, 2008, the fee increased from $9.95 to $10.45, based on the increase in the CPI from June of the Current Year compared to June of the previous year. Effective October 1, 2009, the fee is projected to stay at the 2008 level, due to a projected negative CPI percentage.
- Administrative costs associated with the California Veterans Cash Benefit program are included in this premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

The projected number of payments is based on the projected caseload plus the six-month moving average of the difference between the actual caseload and the number of payments. The projected number of payments is then multiplied by the respective cost per payment.

## FUNDING:

The administration costs consist of 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Expenditures increased in the Current Year due to the use of a higher cost per case than what was projected in prior subvention, offset by a lower caseload due to SSI/SSP recipients losing their eligibility because of proposed grant reductions. The Budget Year (BY) decrease is due to a lower caseload due to SSI/SSP recipients losing their eligibility because of proposed grant reductions.

# SSI/SSP – SSP Administration

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in the BY is due to a lower caseload due to SSI/SSP recipients losing their eligibility because of proposed grant reductions.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Payments | 1,284,231 | 1,267,651 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin | Admin |
| Total | $159,124 | $158,963 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 159,124 | 158,963 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Interest for Delayed SSI/SSP Payments

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise addresses the interest owed to the federal government for the February and March 2009 advanced payments it forwarded to Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/State Supplementary Payment (SSP) recipients while the state was unable to make payment due to budget issues.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Assumes a monthly SSI/SSP payment amount of approximately $300 million.
- Assumes an interest rate of 1.716 percent, based on 2008 thirteen week Treasury Bill rates.
- Payments for February 2009 and March 2009 will need to be repaid.
- The interest to be applied is assumed to be for a period of ninety days. The final amount the state owes depends on when the State Controller's Office issues warrants for repayment to the federal government.

## METHODOLOGY:

The interest is calculated by multiplying the interest for each advanced payment by the time of delay for repayment, and summing the total.

## FUNDING:

The interest will be paid with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise is a Current Year item only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's):

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,269 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,269 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SSI/SSP and CVCB – One-Time Payment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects a one-time payment to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) and California Veterans Cash Benefit (CVCB) recipients due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) enacted in February 2009. The ARRA is a multi-year, federal economic stimulus program. With respect to programs under the purview of the California Department of Social Services, the purposes of the funds are to preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery; assist those impacted by the recession; and stabilize state and local government budgets. Social Security beneficiaries and SSI recipients will receive a one-time economic recovery payment of $250. The Social Security Administration (SSA) will distribute these payments to almost 55 million beneficiaries and recipients nationwide by late May. SSA received $90 million to cover the administrative cost associated with issuing these payments and sending notices to all eligible beneficiaries. This funding is available until expended. The ARRA of 2009 also authorizes a one-time lump-sum payment to all eligible Filipino World War II veterans who are also CVCB recipients. These recipients will receive a one-time lump-sum payment of $9,000. It will not change or affect other benefits an individual may be receiving. As authorized by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), a portion of the funding received under the ARRA will be used to provide support for the California Recovery Task Force (CRTF) and for the ARRA oversight and administrative activities of the various departments administering those funds. Pursuant to Executive Order S-02-09, CRTF is charged with tracking the ARRA funding coming into the state; helping cities, counties, non-profits, and others access the available funding; ensuring that the funding provided to the state is spent efficiently and effectively; and maintaining a Web site that is frequently and thoroughly updated so Californians can track the stimulus dollars. The mechanism for accessing these federal funds and for allocating them to the CRTF and state entities administering ARRA funds is under development and is not available to include in this estimate. Consequently, a future Section 28.00 request may be submitted in the coming months to properly increase the department's federal funds reimbursement authority to fund the cost of accountability and related administrative and transparency activities.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Public Law (P.L.) 111-5, enacted on February 17, 2009. SSI/SSP one-time payment: P.L. 111-5, Division B, Title II, Subtitle C, Section 2201. Payments to Filipino veterans: P.L. 111-5, Division A, Title X, Section 1002.
- Assumes an SSI/SSP caseload of approximately 1,048,000 recipients, based on updated caseload projections.
- SSP only recipients and Title XIX medical facility recipients are excluded from this one-time payment.
- Assumes each qualified SSI/SSP recipient will receive a one-time payment of $250.
- Assumes a CVCB caseload of 1,536 recipients, based on the January 2009 SSA 8700 report.
- Assumes each eligible Filipino World War II veteran who is also a CVCB recipient and resides outside of the United States will receive a one-time payment of $9,000.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for SSI/SSP and CVCB – One-Time Payment

## METHODOLOGY:

The Supplemental Security Income and/or State Supplemental Payment (SSI/SSP) program one-time payment is calculated by multiplying the qualified caseload by the $250 one-time payment. The California Veterans Cash Benefit (CVCB) program one-time payment is calculated by multiplying the CVCB caseload by the $9,000 one-time payment.

## FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the SSI/SSP program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF). The CVCB program is funded 100 percent with GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise is a Current Year item only.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's):

| **SSI/SSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $261,930 | $0 |
| Federal | 261,930 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

(In 000's):

| **CVCB** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $13,824 | $0 |
| Federal | 13,824 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# California Veterans Cash Benefit Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing benefits at the same level as State Supplementary Payment (SSP) benefits to certain veterans of World War II who 1) return to the Republic of the Philippines and no longer have a place of residence in the state; and 2) were receiving SSP benefits on December 14, 1999. The California Veterans Cash Benefit (CVCB) payments are authorized under Assembly Bill 1978 (Chapter 143, Statutes of 2000).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 19, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12400.
- The grant costs associated with the implementation of this bill are the equivalent of SSP benefits the veterans would receive under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/SSP program.
- An average benefit payment of $232.13 will be paid to eligible recipients, but will decrease in the Current Year (CY) to $197.30 to reflect the withholding of the pass-through of the 2009 federal cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), effective May 1, 2009.
- The Social Security Administration (SSA) administers the CVCB program in conjunction with benefits under Title VIII of the federal Social Security Act.
- Administrative costs associated with the CVCB program are now reflected in the “SSI/SSP Administration” premise.
- The average monthly number of participating veterans is 1,545 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, and 1,395 in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The cost of the program is estimated by multiplying the number of participating veterans by the benefit and administrative costs per case.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded 100 percent with General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the Budget Year (BY) decreases are due to a lower average monthly caseload based on actual data and withholding the pass through of the 2009 federal COLA.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease is due to a lower average monthly caseload based on actual data.

# California Veterans Cash Benefit Program

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **CVCB Costs** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,201 | $3,303 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,201 | 3,303 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# SSI Extension (P.L. 110-328)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs and savings associated with qualified Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) recipients transferring to the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program, and SSI/SSP recipients who will remain on SSI/SSP for two more years. Prior to the enactment of Public Law (P.L.) 110-328, refugees and other humanitarian immigrants became eligible for the 100 percent state-funded CAPI benefit once the seven-year period of SSI/SSP eligibility expired. They obtained CAPI eligibility because they were aged, blind or disabled, and no longer eligible for SSI/SSP due to their non-citizen immigration status. Under the new federal law, refugees and other humanitarian immigrants are eligible to receive at least two more years of SSI benefits. However, the new law does place conditions on this extended eligibility. The affected immigrants will have to show some evidence of having adjusted their immigration status to Lawful Permanent Resident (LPR) within certain timeframes, or be under age 18, or age 70 or older, in order to be eligible for reinstatement to SSI/SSP.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Social Security Administration (SSA) will continue to administer the program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
- Section 1611 of Title XVI defines the amount of SSI benefits an individual may be eligible to receive.
- Section 12200 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) defines the maximum payment standard available under each living arrangement.
- Chapter 10.3 of the W&IC gives the California Department of Social Services the authority to administer the CAPI program.
- Section 18940 of the W&IC states that the CAPI program will be governed by the same federal and state regulations which govern the SSI/SSP program.
- Section 18941 of the W&IC authorizes benefits paid under CAPI to be equivalent to benefits provided under the SSI/SSP program, except that the schedule for individuals and couples shall be reduced $10 per individual and $20 per couple per month.
- Assumes 572 CAPI cases will transfer to SSI/SSP per month, beginning April 2009, for three months, resulting in a total of 1,716 CAPI cases transferring to SSI/SSP.
- Assumes a monthly average of 62 cases will stay on SSI/SSP for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, beginning October 1, 2008, and a monthly average of 55 cases that will stay on SSI/SSP for FY 2009-10.
- SSI/SSP and CAPI average grants reflect the 2009 federal cost of living adjustment (COLA), effective January 2009; the withholding of the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA, effective May 2009; the suspension of the 2009 state COLA, effective June 2009; the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction, effective July 2009; the 2010 federal COLA, effective January 2010; and the suspension of the 2010 state COLA, effective June 2010.

# SSI Extension (P.L. 110-328)

## METHODOLOGY:

SSI/SSP costs and CAPI savings were calculated by multiplying the average grant amounts by the number of cases transferring to SSI/SSP, and the number of cases staying on SSI/SSP.

## FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent General Fund. The CAPI program is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Current Year reflects nine months of costs/savings. The Budget Year reflects a full year of costs/savings.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| SSI/SSP | | |
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $4,924 | $25,225 |
| Federal | 3,618 | 19,058 |
| State | 1,306 | 6,617 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

(In 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| CAPI | | |
| Total | -$5,930 | -$30,767 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -5,930 | -30,767 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with providing benefits to aged, blind, and disabled legal immigrants under the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI). CAPI benefits are equivalent to Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and/or State Supplemental Payment (SSP) program benefits, less $10 per individual and $20 per couple. This premise includes costs for both the grant and administrative costs necessary for implementation.

CAPI recipients in the base program include the following immigrants: 1) those who entered the United States (U.S.) prior to August 22, 1996, and are not eligible for SSI/SSP benefits solely due to their immigration status; and 2) those who entered the U.S. on or after August 22, 1996, but meet special sponsor restrictions (have a sponsor who is disabled, deceased, or abusive). The extended CAPI caseload includes immigrants who entered the U.S. on or after August 22, 1996, who do not have a sponsor or have a sponsor who does not meet the sponsor restrictions of the base program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Chapter 10.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) gives the California Department of Social Services the authority to administer the CAPI program.
- Section 18940 of the W&IC states that the CAPI program will be governed by the same federal and state regulations which govern the SSI/SSP program.
- Section 18941 of the W&IC authorizes benefits paid under CAPI to be equivalent to benefits provided under the SSI/SSP program, except that the schedule for individuals and couples shall be reduced $10 per individual and $20 per couple per month.
- Although CAPI was originally due to sunset on July 1, 2000, Assembly Bill (AB) 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999) extended the base program indefinitely.
- AB 1111 also created time-limited CAPI eligibility from October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000, for immigrants who entered the country on or after August 22, 1996. This bill established a five-year deeming period for these cases. AB 2876 extended time-limited CAPI for one more year through September 30, 2001. AB 429 (Chapter 111, Statutes of 2001) eliminated the sunset date for the time-limited ("extended") program altogether, and lengthened the deeming period to ten years.
- The average monthly number of total CAPI cases will be 11,052 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, and 12,839 in FY 2009-10.

# Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The average monthly grant is $636.06 for the Base CAPI cases, based on actual expenditures through October 2008. The average grant will increase due to a 5.8 percent federal cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), effective January 1, 2009. The average grant will decrease due to withholding the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA, effective May 1, 2009. The average grant will again decrease due to the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction, effective July 1, 2009. The average grant will remain at the 2009 level in 2010 to reflect a -2.6 percent federal COLA effective January 1, 2010, and will remain at that level due to the suspension of the 2010 state COLA, effective June 1, 2010.
- The average monthly grant is $786.09 for the Extended CAPI cases, based on actual expenditures through October 2008. The average grant will change as discussed above for the Base CAPI cases.
- The average monthly administrative cost per case for FY 2008-09 of $176.39 is based on actual expenditures through October 2008. For FY 2009-10, the average administrative cost per case will remain unchanged at $176.39.

## METHODOLOGY:

Base CAPI program costs are estimated by multiplying the projected monthly caseload by the Base CAPI average grant and administrative cost per case. Extended CAPI costs are estimated by multiplying the Extended CAPI caseload by the Extended CAPI average grant and administrative cost per case. Base CAPI and extended CAPI costs are then added to determine total CAPI Program costs.

## FUNDING:

The program is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) have increased due to a higher average monthly caseload based on actuals.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase is due to a higher projected average monthly caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total CAPI | Grant/Admin | Grant/Admin |
| Total | $125,244 | $145,564 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 125,244 | 145,564 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Base CAPI | | |
| Total | $19,080 | $14,746 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 19,080 | 14,476 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Extended CAPI | | |
| Total | $106,164 | $130,818 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 106,164 | 130,818 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Elimination of the Cash Assistance Program For Immigrants (CAPI)

## DESCRIPTION:

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This premise is included as one of the May Revision Reductions Solutions, and reflects the savings associated with the elimination of the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI). The CAPI program provides benefits to aged, blind, and disabled legal immigrants which are equivalent to Supplemental Security Income and/or State Supplemental Payment (SSI/SSP) program benefits, less $10 per individual and $20 per couple.

CAPI recipients in the base program include the following immigrants: 1) those who entered the United States (U.S.) prior to August 22, 1996, and are not eligible for SSI/SSP benefits solely due to their immigration status; and 2) those who entered the U.S. on or after August 22, 1996, but meet special sponsor restrictions (have a sponsor who is disabled, deceased, or abusive). The extended CAPI caseload includes immigrants who entered the U.S. on or after August 22, 1996, who do not have a sponsor or have a sponsor who does not meet the sponsor restrictions of the base program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Chapter 10.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) gives the California Department of Social Services the authority to administer the CAPI program.
- Section 18940 of the W&IC states that the CAPI program will be governed by the same federal and state regulations which govern the SSI/SSP program.
- Section 18941 of the W&IC authorizes benefits paid under CAPI to be equivalent to benefits provided under the SSI/SSP program, except that the schedule for individuals and couples shall be reduced $10 per individual and $20 per couple per month.
- Although CAPI was originally due to sunset on July 1, 2000, Assembly Bill (AB) 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999) extended the base program indefinitely.
- AB 1111 also created time-limited CAPI eligibility from October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000, for immigrants who entered the country on or after August 22, 1996. This bill established a five-year deeming period for these cases. AB 2876 extended time-limited CAPI for one more year through September 30, 2001. AB 429 (Chapter 111, Statutes of 2001) eliminated the sunset date for the time-limited ("extended") program altogether, and lengthened the deeming period to ten years.
- The average monthly number of total CAPI cases will be 12,839 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10.

# Elimination of the Cash Assistance Program For Immigrants (CAPI)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The average monthly grant is $636.06 for the Base CAPI cases, based on actual expenditures through October 2008. The average grant will increase due to a 5.8 percent federal cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), effective January 1, 2009. The average grant will decrease due to withholding the pass-through of the 2009 federal COLA, effective May 1, 2009. The average grant will again decrease due to the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction, effective July 1, 2009. The average grant will remain at the 2009 level in 2010 to reflect a -2.6 percent federal COLA effective January 1, 2010, and will remain at that level due to the suspension of the 2010 state COLA, effective June 1, 2010.
- The average monthly grant is $786.09 for the Extended CAPI cases, based on actual expenditures through October 2008. The average grant will change as discussed above for the Base CAPI cases.
- The average monthly administrative cost per case for FY 2008-09 of $176.39 is based on actual expenditures through October 2008. For FY 2009-10, the average administrative cost per case will remain unchanged at $176.39.
- The savings associated with reducing SSP grant amounts for Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants recipients to the MOE floor are reflected in reducing the SSP to MOE floor premise.
- Statutory changes would be needed to eliminate the CAPI program.

## METHODOLOGY:

Base CAPI program savings are estimated by multiplying the projected monthly caseload by the Base CAPI average grant and administrative cost per case. Extended CAPI savings are estimated by multiplying the Extended CAPI caseload by the Extended CAPI average grant and administrative cost per case. Base CAPI and extended CAPI savings are then added to determine total CAPI program savings.

Savings are calculated based on projected Base and Extended CAPI caseloads for the final nine months of FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

The program is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

# Elimination of the Cash Assistance Program For Immigrants (CAPI)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE*:*

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total CAPI | Grant/Admin | Grant/Admin |
| Total | $0 | -$85,751 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -85,751 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS SSP MOE Eligible

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the State Supplementary Payment (SSP) expenditures countable towards the state Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program maintenance of effort (MOE). More specifically, the increase in SSP expenditures for disabled SSP children in California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) families since the inception of the TANF program is countable as MOE.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the TANF program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. States must meet an 80 percent MOE to receive their full block grant allocation. The MOE is reduced to 75 percent for states that meet the work participation rate requirement. For California, the amount of the MOE is based on state and county expenditures in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1994. As a result of the state having consistently met its work participation agreement, the MOE level has been lowered from $2.9 billion (80 percent) to $2.7 billion, which constitutes 75 percent of the 1994 level.

The state may count toward the MOE both local and state expenditures made by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) or other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: 45 Code of Federal Regulations Section 263.2.
- The average number of SSP children living in a CalWORKs household for October through December 2008, was 9,094, or 11.3 percent of total SSP children living with relatives.
- SSP expenditures for SSP children living with relatives were $52.8 million in 1995. SSP expenditures for the same population are estimated at $132.3 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.
- Expenditures for SSP children living in a CalWORKs household in 1995 is estimated at $8.5 million.

# Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS SSP MOE Eligible

## METHODOLOGY:

- Expenditures for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 are forecasted based on the increase or decrease in the SSP payment standard from year to year. For FY 2008-09, the SSP payment standard will decrease on May 1, 2009, due to withholding the pass-through of the 2009 Federal COLA. For FY 2009-10, the SSP payment standard will decrease on July 1, 2009, due to the 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction, and will decrease again on October 1, 2009, due to the SSP MOE Floor reduction.
- The percentage of SSP children living in a CalWORKs household is multiplied by the estimated SSP expenditures for each fiscal year to arrive at expenditures attributable to SSP children living in a CalWORKs household. For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, SSP expenditures for this population are estimated at $15.3 and $9.1 million, respectively.
- For FY 2007-08, the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed total state program expenditures in 1995 is $6.8 million ($15.3 - $8.5 million).
- For FY 2008-09, the amount by which allowable SSP expenditures will exceed total state program expenditures in 1995 is $0.6 million ($9.1 - $8.5 million).

## FUNDING:

The SSP expenditures are funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Due to the delay in implementing the SSP MOE Floor premise, which reduces SSP payment standards to the federally required MOE level of the 1983 payment standards, the estimated level of countable SSP expenditures has increased for the Current Year (CY), and by a higher percentage of SSP children living with relatives in a CalWORKs household. The Budget Year (BY) decrease is due to the additional 2.3 percent SSI/SSP grant reduction.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The CY reflects two months of decreased SSP payment standards. The BY reflects a full year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $6,833 | $571 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 6,833 | 571 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. Assembly Bill (AB) 1773 (Chapter 939, Statutes of 1992) required the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to submit a Medicaid state plan amendment to the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) (formerly the Health Care Financing Administration) to include a portion of the IHSS program as a Title XIX eligible service. This portion of the IHSS program is known as the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP).

In 2004, DHCS received approval for an Independence Plus Section 1115 Demonstration Project to allow certain IHSS Residual program recipients to receive services under the new IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) (See the Waiver for Residual Program premise description for the savings associated with the waiver). Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled to begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system.

The IHSS program enables eligible individuals to remain safely in their own homes as an alternative to out-of-home care. Eligible recipients are aged, blind or disabled individuals who receive public assistance or have low incomes.

AB 925 (Chapter 1088, Statutes of 2002) allows recipients to utilize authorized personal care services in locations outside of the home, including their place of employment, as authorized by the Director. Services and service hours remain limited to those authorized for the recipient in their own home.

The PCSP and IPW programs provide services which including the following:

- Domestic services such as meal preparation, laundry, shopping, and errands.
- Non-medical personal care services.
- Assistance while traveling to medical appointments or to other sources of supportive services.
- Teaching and demonstration directed at reducing the need for supportive services.
- Certain paramedical services ordered by a physician.
- Protective supervision tasks.
- Restaurant meal allowance (RMA).
- Advance payment.

The third component of the IHSS program is the state-only Residual program, which provides services to recipients who are ineligible for the federal PCSP or IPW programs.

IHSS is provided in any of three service delivery modes. Those service modes are the individual provider (IP) mode, the county contract (CC) mode, and the welfare staff (WS) mode. The WS mode is also referred to as the county homemaker mode. The IP mode consists of an individual, hired by the recipient, who provides services to the recipient. The CC mode provides for IHSS services to be performed by a service provider under contract with the individual counties. The contractor employs the individuals who provide the services to the recipient. The WS mode utilizes county employees to provide services for recipients.

# Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED):

The State Compensation Insurance Fund (SCIF), under contract, administers the workers' compensation insurance for the IPs providing services for IHSS recipients.

The Department of General Services (DGS), under contract, acts as agent for the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) in the management and supervision of SCIF. DGS also monitors high cost cases ($50,000 and over in paid costs) on a quarterly basis.

The IHSS Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) authorizes payments and provides CDSS and the counties with information regarding wages, taxes, hours per case, cost per hour, PCSP and Residual program caseload and funding ratios, share of cost, RMA, and the number of providers in the IP mode. (See the CMIPS premise for more information.)

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1993.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12300-12314 and 14132.95.
- The projected caseload percentages for the PCSP and Residual program are 91.96 percent and 8.04 percent, respectively, based on the average caseloads to date for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.
- PCSP caseloads were 3,209 (CC) and 79 (WS), and Residual caseloads were 1,000 (CC) and 47 (WS). The balance of the caseload is IP.
- The PCSP CC mode average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 67.71 hours at a cost per hour of $20.54. The WS average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 8.49 hours at a cost per hour of $19.40.
- The Residual CC mode average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 27.58 hours at a cost per hour of $18.73. The Residual WS average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 7.24 hours at a cost per hour of $18.25.
- The IP wage rate and average monthly hours per case are based on the individual counties data.
- The payroll tax rate associated with the IP wages is assumed at ten percent.
- Based on actuals for FY 2007-08, the average PCSP program recipient's share of cost (SOC) in the IP mode of service is assumed to be $399 per case in the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY). The average Residual program recipient's share of cost in the IP mode of service is assumed to be $432 in both the CY and the BY, and in the CC/WS modes of service $156 in the CY and the BY.

# Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- In the PCSP program, the average monthly SOC caseload is assumed to be 7,839 in the CY and 8,402 in the BY.
- In the Residual program, the average monthly SOC caseload is assumed to be 644 in the CY and 690 in the BY in the IP Mode, and nine in the CC/WS for both the CY and the BY.
- The RMA cost per case is $62.
- The RMA cost is estimated to be $462,478 for the CY and $495,662 in the BY.
- The SCIF contract cost is assumed to be $48.4 million in the CY and $48.5 million in the BY.
- The DGS contract cost is set at $120,000 for both the CY and the BY.
- The CY and the BY include costs for the Los Angeles County Back-Up Attendant Program.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimated PCSP basic cost is computed by multiplying the casemonths times the average hours per case, times the cost per hour, plus the associated payroll taxes, minus the share of cost. In addition, the PCSP caseload percentage of the SCIF and DGS contract costs are added.
- The estimated Residual basic cost is computed by multiplying the casemonths times the average hours per case times the cost per hour, plus associated payroll taxes, minus the share of cost. In addition, the Residual program caseload percentage of the SCIF and DGS contract costs, and RMA are added.

## FUNDING:

- Under the PCSP, the Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the CY, and for the entire BY the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- The nonfederal share of the PCSP is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of cost is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.
- Under the Residual program, total basic service costs are split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county SOC is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.

# Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY increase reflects caseload growth, an increase in hours per case and wage and/or benefit increases for 13 counties. The BY increase reflects caseload growth and a full year of wage increases.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This increase reflects caseload growth and wage and/or benefits increases.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly PCSP Caseload | 396,579 | 425,034 |
| Average Monthly Residual Program Caseload | 34,676 | 37,164 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **TOTAL** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $5,129,208 | $5,493,851 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,784,784 | 1,911,661 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 3,344,424 | 3,582,190 |

# Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,683,493 | $5,016,426 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,498,530 | 1,605,043 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 3,184,963 | 3,411,383 |

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $445,715 | $477,425 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 286,254 | 306,618 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 159,461 | 170,807 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) and Associated Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS). The CMIPS consists of the following three components:

**Case Management**

The CMIPS stores the case record of each individual recipient. The case record of each recipient contains information on eligibility, needs assessment, share of cost, if appropriate, and all changes affecting the recipient's case. The CMIPS also generates notices of action, cost-of-living adjustments, and rate changes. The CMIPS further allows for data exchanges with other welfare systems and is used to establish Medi-Cal eligibility. Unique Client Index Numbers (CINs) facilitate the identification of common clients and the exchange of data with other systems. CIN transactions are processed through the Office of Systems Integration server.

**Management Information**

The CMIPS provides periodic management reports that include fiscal and statistical data on a case-by-case, worker-by-worker, office-by-office, county-by-county, and statewide basis.

**Payrolling System**

The CMIPS provides for the authorization and issuance of warrants for payments for services provided by the individual-provider mode and prepares all employer tax forms and reports. These reports are used for bookkeeping, accounting, and tax preparation purposes on behalf of recipients, County Welfare Departments, and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

The State Controller's Office (SCO), under contract with CDSS, issues payroll checks to the individual providers on behalf of IHSS recipients. The SCO also issues replacement checks and handles checks returned as undeliverable.

The State Treasurer's Office (STO), under contract with CDSS, performs bank reconciliation of IHSS warrants, and redeems all valid warrants issued for IHSS providers.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12302.2.
- The CMIPS contract is currently held by Electronic Data Systems (EDS).
- The estimated costs for the SCO contract were updated. In the Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY), there is no direct deposit costs associated with the SCO contract.

# Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) and Associated Costs

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The estimated CIN transaction costs are based on a projection of the number of transactions and a cost of 0.7 cents per transaction.

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **EDS** | $11,832,074 | $12,247,436 |
| **STO** | $915,987 | $915,987 |
| **SCO** | $5,385,000 | $5,745,000 |
| **CIN Transaction** | $8,307 | $8,307 |
| **Total Costs** | $18,141,368 | $18,916,730 |

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is computed by summing the EDS, STO, SCO, and CIN data and transaction fee costs. The total cost is split between the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) and the Residual program based on percent to total caseload.

## FUNDING:

- In the PCSP, the federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 50 percent of the total funding in the CY and BY. The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.
- In the Residual program, the state share is 70 percent of the total, and the county share is 30 percent.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and BY increases are due to increased EDS costs for processing payroll and an increased cost for a new SCO contract.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This increase is due to increased EDS costs for processing payroll.

# Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) and Associated Costs

## EXPENDITURES:
(in 000's)

| **TOTAL** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $18,141 | $18,916 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 6,860 | 7,153 |
| County | 2,940 | 3,065 |
| Reimbursements | 8,341 | 8,698 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $ 16,683 | $17,396 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 5,839 | 6,088 |
| County | 2,502 | 2,609 |
| Reimbursements | 8,341 | 8,698 |

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,459 | $1,521 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,021 | 1,065 |
| County | 438 | 456 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) Enhancements

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the funding required for several Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) enhancements needed to meet the documentation and data collection and reporting requirements of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. This premise includes programming, implementation and ongoing costs for enhancements, systems operation and maintenance, monthly outreach mailing, Help Desk staffing and forms processing for Provider Direct Deposit (PDD) and Conlan. PDD was successfully implemented on May 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12317 [Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004 (Senate Bill 1104)] and section 12304.4 [Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006 (Assembly Bill 1808)].
- The PDD cost assumes 30 percent provider participation. The Current Year (CY) PDD cost is $1.1 million. The Budget Year (BY) cost is $1.1 million.
- The Conlan cost assumes $0.1 million in the CY and the BY.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is computed by summing the programming, implementation, and ongoing costs for enhancements, systems operation and maintenance, ongoing monthly outreach mailing, Help Desk staffing and forms processing for the PDD and Conlan.

## FUNDING:

- In the Personal Care Service Program (PCSP), the federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 50 percent of the total funding in the CY and the BY. The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.
- In the Residual program, the state share is 70 percent of the total, and the county share is 30 percent.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no significant change in the CY and the BY total, however there is a funding swap between county and federal funds.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) Enhancements

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **TOTAL** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,240 | $1,240 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 469 | 469 |
| County | 201 | 201 |
| Reimbursements | 570 | 570 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,140 | $1,140 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 399 | 399 |
| County | 171 | 171 |
| Reimbursements | 570 | 570 |

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $100 | $100 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 70 | 70 |
| County | 30 | 30 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) II Contract Procurement

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for contracting with the Health and Human Services Agency Office of Systems Integration (OSI) for development, support, and implementation of a new and enhanced In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS). This project proposes to replace the existing CMIPS with new technologies that provide system access for all IHSS county workers and a communication network between state and county IHSS offices.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12302.2.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated costs are detailed in the October 2007 Implementation Advance Planning Document, and in the Supplementary Premise Information Spring 2009.

## FUNDING:

- In the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is a blended rate of 64 percent.
- The nonfederal share is funded 100 percent General Fund (GF).
- In the Residual Program, the funding is 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 costs have decreased due to a schedule shift resulting from changes in the development cycle strategy. The schedule shift caused an increase in costs for FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs have increased due to the schedule shift moving costs forward from the Current Year.

# Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) II Contract Procurement

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $64,106 | $115,418 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 26,082 | 46,958 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 38,024 | 68,460 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $59,413 | $106,969 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 21,389 | 38,509 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 38,024 | 68,460 |

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $4,693 | $8,449 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,693 | 8,449 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) II Contract Procurement

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $64,106 | $115,418 |
| CDSS | 5,577 | 28,571 |
| OSI | 58,529 | 86,847 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Public Authority Administration

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Public Authority (PA) administrative costs for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW), the 1915(j) State Plan Option, and non-Title XIX eligible IHSS recipients in the Residual program. Senate Bill 1780 (Chapter 206, Statutes of 1996) defined the make-up and functions of the PAs. PAs are the employers of IHSS providers for the purposes of collective bargaining over wages, hours, and other terms of employment. IHSS recipients, however, retain the right to hire, fire, and supervise the work of any IHSS worker providing services to them. A county board of supervisors may elect to establish a PA to provide for the delivery of IHSS. PAs are separate entities from the county in which they operate. Employees of PAs shall not be employees of the county for any reason.

The PA shall provide, but is not limited to, the following functions:

- The provision of assistance to recipients in finding IHSS providers through the establishment of a registry.
- The investigation of the qualifications and background of potential providers.
- The establishment of a referral system under which IHSS providers shall be referred to recipients.
- The provision of training for providers and recipients.
- Other functions related to the delivery of IHSS.

The PA rate includes the hourly costs for wages, employer taxes, benefits, and administrative costs. The PA rate cannot exceed 200 percent of the current minimum wage in order to qualify for federal financial participation. The PA must submit a rate approval request to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Once CDSS approves the request, it is submitted to the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) for final approval. After DHCS approves the rate, the PA is notified of the new rate at which it can claim costs.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12301.

Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the casemonths by the average hours per case by the administrative hourly rates for each PA.

# Public Authority Administration

## FUNDING

- Under the PCSP, the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the Current Year (CY), and for the entire Budget Year (BY) the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- For PCSP, the nonfederal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.
- In the Residual program, the state share is 65 percent of the total, and the county share is 35 percent of the total.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY changes reflect increases in caseload and county PA rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This increase reflects caseload growth and administrative rate changes.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **TOTAL** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin | Admin |
| Total | $60,673 | $65,022 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 21,758 | 23,318 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 38,915 | 41,704 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin | Admin |
| Total | $54,398 | $58,297 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 17,679 | 18,947 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 36,719 | 39,350 |

# Public Authority Administration

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin | Admin |
| Total | $6,275 | $6,725 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,079 | 4,372 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 2,196 | 2,353 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the service and administrative costs associated with implementing a Medi-Cal rule that provides reimbursement for eligible In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) personal care services rendered up to three months prior to application. This premise applies to the Personal Care Services (PCSP), IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW), and Residual Programs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Budget Act of 2004.
- Based on the number of approvals in July 2008 through February 2009, 1.71 percent of cases each month will be new applicants.
- Based on Medi-Cal data, it is assumed that 0.02 percent of all applicants will be eligible to receive at least one month of retroactive benefits for the period prior to the month of application. It is also assumed that, on average, these applicants will receive 1.16 months of retroactive benefits.
- In addition, it is assumed that 2.58 percent of applicants will be eligible to receive a retroactive benefit for a portion of the month in which they applied. The average period of retroactive benefit is assumed to be two weeks.
- The administrative cost of processing the retroactive payments is assumed to require one additional hour to review incoming claims to determine eligibility and 1.5 additional hours to process eligible claims. It is assumed that ten percent of all applicants will submit a claim. The social worker cost per hour is assumed to be $60.55.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

The number of cases to receive retroactive benefits was derived using the percentage of new cases and the percentage of cases that are eligible to receive retroactive benefits.

Estimated costs for benefits are based on the number of eligible retroactive cases, the average monthly cost per case and the assumption that each case will receive either two weeks or 1.16 months of retroactive benefits.

The administrative costs are based on the number of claims received and eligible retroactive claims, the time to review or process each case and the IHSS social worker cost per hour.

# PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits

## FUNDING:

- For PCSP services, the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the Current Year (CY), and for the entire Budget Year (BY) the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- The nonfederal share for PCSP services is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage for administrative costs is 49.62 percent, based on actual expenditures reported on County Expense Claims for the past four quarters.
- For state-only Residual program services, the state share is 65 percent and county share is 35 percent.
- Administrative costs for PCSP and Residual are split 70 state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY change is a result of a decrease in new case approvals and cost per case.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects increased caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Total PCSP/Residual** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,147 | $1,227 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 405 | 433 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 742 | 794 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $1,047 | $1,121 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 340 | 364 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 707 | 757 |

# PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits

## EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $100 | $106 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 65 | 69 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 35 | 37 |

| **Administration (PCSP/Residual)** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Admin. | Admin. |
| Total | $781 | $796 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 276 | 281 |
| County | 118 | 120 |
| Reimbursements | 387 | 395 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Reduce State Participation to up to $9.50 in Wages and $0.60 in Benefits until September 30

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with reducing the state's participation in the costs of In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) wages to up to $9.50 per hour and benefits up to $0.60 per hour.

Under current law, IHSS providers may organize and collectively bargain for wages and individual health benefits on a county-by-county basis. In the Current Year (CY), state law provides that the state will share in wages up to $12.10 per hour for IHSS providers and health benefits in the counties that have an IHSS Public Authority (PA) or Non-Profit Consortium (NPC). For the counties that have neither a PA nor an NPC, the law requires the state to share in the cost of wages only up to the state minimum wage plus 5.31 percent ($8.42/hour) with no state share in health benefits. Effective July 1, 2009, current law will implement reduced costs in wages up to $9.50 per hour and benefits up to $0.60 per hour. For the counties that have a Contract Mode, current statute provides for state participation in the costs up to the maximum allowable contract rate (MACR).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Statutory changes will be made prior to the reduction in the state share of costs.
- The state will share in wages up to $9.50 per hour.
- The state will share in benefits up to $0.60 per hour.
- Assumes a July 1, 2009, implementation date.
- Assumes three months of savings in the Budget Year (BY).
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled to begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same plus some enhanced services. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

- Savings are calculated by taking the difference between the product of current Individual Provider wages and benefits in each county, by the number of recipients and hours of service, and the product of the new state share up to $9.50 in wages plus up to $0.60 in benefits in each county, by the number of recipients and hours of service.

# Reduce State Participation to up to $9.50 in Wages and $0.60 in Benefits until September 30

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- The statewide savings reflect the estimated caseload and hours in each county.
- The premise reflects only state savings. Counties will retain the discretion to fund all or part of the non-federal cost of wages above the level in which the state will participate.

## FUNDING:

- Under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the CY, and for the entire BY the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- For PCSP, the non-federal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.
- The state-only Residual program share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a BY item.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the BY and reflects nine months erosion of savings.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$24,533 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -24,533 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$21,016 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -21,016 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Reduce State Participation to up to $9.50 in Wages and $0.60 in Benefits until September 30

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **Residual** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$3,517 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -3,517 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Reduce State Participation to the Minimum Wage – October 1, 2009

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with reducing the state's participation in the costs of In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) wages to the minimum wage level of $8.00 per hour and benefits up to $0.60 per hour. Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions.

Under current law, IHSS providers may organize and collectively bargain for wages and individual health benefits on a county-by-county basis. In the Current Year (CY), state law provides that the state will share in wages up to $12.10 per hour and health benefits for IHSS providers in the counties that have an IHSS Public Authority (PA) or Non-Profit Consortium (NPC). For the counties that have neither a PA nor an NPC, the law requires the state to share in the cost of wages only up to the state minimum wage plus 5.31 percent ($8.42/hour) with no state share in health benefits. Effective July 1, 2009, current law will implement reduced state participation in the costs of wages up to $9.50 per hour and benefits up to $0.60 per hour. For the counties that have a Contract Mode, current statute provides for state participation in the costs up to the maximum allowable contract rate (MACR).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Statutory changes will be made prior to the reduction in the state share of costs.
- The state minimum wage is currently $8.00 per hour.
- The state will share in benefits up to $0.60 per hour.
- Assumes an October 1, 2009, implementation date.
- Assumes nine months of savings in the Budget Year (BY).
- This premise takes into consideration the “Limit D&R to Recipients with FI Rank 4.0 and Above” premise and the “IHSS Cost Containment-Tiered FI Score” premise.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same plus some enhanced services. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

# Reduce State Participation to the Minimum Wage – October 1, 2009

## METHODOLOGY:

- Savings are calculated by taking the difference between the product of current Individual Provider wages and benefits in each county, by the number of recipients and hours of service, and the product of the new state share at the minimum wage of $8.00 plus up to $0.60 in benefits in each county, by the number of recipients and hours of service.
- The statewide savings reflect the estimated caseload and hours in each county.

## FUNDING:

- Under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the CY, and for the entire BY the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- For PCSP, the non-federal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.
- The state-only Residual program share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects nine months of savings.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$234,769 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -234,769 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Reduce State Participation to the Minimum Wage – October 1, 2009

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):
(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **PCSP** | | |
| Total | -$0 | -$202,799 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -202,799 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Residual** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$31,970 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -31,970 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Conlan

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with implementing a Medi-Cal rule that provides reimbursement for eligible In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) personal care services rendered up to three months prior to application, during the evaluation period and post approval. In *Conlan v. Bontá*, the San Francisco Superior Court ordered the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to ensure that Medi-Cal recipients entitled to reimbursement for covered services 90 days prior to the Medi-Cal application date are promptly reimbursed. The DHCS implementation plan to comply with *Conlan v. Bontá* is the subject of *Conlan v. Shewry*. Beginning December 2006, DHCS sent notices to current and former Medi-Cal beneficiaries regarding the process to file a Beneficiary Reimbursement claim. To process the claims, DHCS contracted with Electronic Data Systems (EDS) to establish the Beneficiary Services Center (BSC). Claims for reimbursement for IHSS are forwarded to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Adult Programs Branch (APB) by EDS/BSC. Claims regarding missed share of cost (SOC) buyouts and excess SOC claims, also known as X-27 SPEC Transactions, are forwarded by counties to CDSS' APB in the same manner as requests for review under the Conlan decision. Both types of claims are processed in the same manner as it cannot be determined which of the two types (X-27 SPEC Transactions or Conlan) have been submitted until they have been fully reviewed and prepared for processing.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The court ordered a start date of November 16, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Implemented by All-County Letters No. 07-11 (February 20, 2007) and No. 07-32 (September 13, 2007).
- Based on current data from EDS/BSC, it is assumed that approximately 34 claims will be forwarded to APB per month, of which each qualified analyst will process an average of 12 Conlan and nine X-27 SPEC Transactions per month. The average cost per claim is assumed to be $688 for Conlan claims and $662 for X-27 SPEC Transaction claims in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the number of claims by the approval rate, then by the average cost per claim.

## FUNDING:

- Conlan claims are paid 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share is reflected as a reimbursement.
- X-27 SPEC Transactions are paid 100 percent General Fund.

# Conlan

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 have been updated to reflect current, updated data.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects more complete data now available.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $165 | $298 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 131 | 236 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 34 | 62 |

# Limit Domestic and Related Services to Recipients with Functional Index Rank of Four and Above

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with establishing a baseline functional index (FI) rank (or minimum threshold) for In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) recipients to be able to receive domestic and related services (D&R) (housework, shopping for food, meal preparation and clean-up, and laundry). Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions. The threshold would limit the provision of D&R to only those individuals with an FI ranking of 4 and above, and target reductions in D&R to individuals with the highest functional abilities and the lowest need. The threshold would not be extended to any other IHSS, such as personal care, protective supervision or paramedical services.

The IHSS Program's Uniform Assessment Tool is used by counties to assess individuals' needs and establish FI rankings, and is based on one's level of functioning across a spectrum of average daily activities. Current program requirements do not allow for individuals at Rank 1, who are considered independent, to receive these services. Individuals at Rank 2 typically require direction or encouragement to perform an activity, and individuals at Rank 3 require some physical assistance from another person for some chores. In comparison, individuals at Rank 4 require substantial physical assistance to perform most chores, and individuals at Rank 5 cannot perform the specified activity with or without assistance.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise has an implementation date of October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Approximately, 96 percent of IHSS recipients receive D&R. The recipient population who have FI rankings of 2 or 3 is estimated to be 84,517 in the Budget Year (BY).
- The individuals impacted by this premise have been assessed and authorized to receive an average of 21.7 hours per month of D&R. These individuals use, on average, 95 percent of their authorized hours.
- With an October 1, 2009, implementation date, the total BY savings reflects nine months of savings.
- The savings were adjusted for costs associated with potential appeals. The adjusted costs consist of the hours restored for successful appeals, and state and county administrative costs for work on appeals and hearings.
- It is assumed that 20 percent of impacted cases will appeal the elimination of these services. Of that 20 percent, it is assumed 75 percent will have their cases reviewed by a social worker (SW), will not go to hearing, and will not have their hours restored.

# Limit Domestic and Related Services to Recipients with Functional Index Rank of Four and Above

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- It is assumed the remaining 25 percent will be reviewed by a SW, will receive a full hearing, and will have their hours restored.
- Assume a SW hourly cost $60.55 per hour, and that SWs require 0.5 hours per case to work on/review appeals, and 1.0 hour per case to work on/prepare for and present at hearings.
- Assume an average wage of $11.48 per hour for D&R.
- The interaction between this premise and the "Reduce State Participation to the Minimum Wage – October 1, 2009" premise is included.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimated savings are based on the number of D&R cases with an FI ranking of less than 4 and recipients' usage of an average of 95 percent of their authorized hours.
- The estimated savings were adjusted for costs associated with appeals and hearings, including an associated county administrative cost, and restored hours resulting from successful appeals.

## FUNDING:

- For the entire BY, the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- The non-federal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of cost is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects nine months of savings.

# Limit Domestic and Related Services to Recipients with Functional Index Rank of Four and Above

## EXPENDITURES:
(in 000's)

| **Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$166,196 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -53,712 |
| County | -0 | -29,391 |
| Reimbursements | -0 | -83,093 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$152,834 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -49,394 |
| County | -0 | -27,028 |
| Reimbursements | -0 | -76,412 |

| **Residual** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$13,362 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -4,318 |
| County | -0 | -2,363 |
| Reimbursements | -0 | -6,681 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# IHSS Anti-Fraud Initiative

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with multiple anti-fraud measures which together enhance state and county efforts to prevent fraud, identify errors and overpayments, pursue collections, and detect and refer suspected incidences of fraud for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) programs. Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. The savings associated with this premise are included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions. These measures are intended to significantly increase the prevention and detection of fraud within the IHSS program, thereby ensuring that scarce resources are being used to serve eligible people and to pay for actual services rendered rather than misdirected.

The following six measures constitute the IHSS Anti-Fraud Initiative:

1. Establish a Program Integrity Review Team at the State Level
2. State Targeted Mailings and State and Follow-up
3. Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) Fraud Training
4. California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and DHCS Directors Discretionary Waivers
5. Provider and Recipient New Accountability Requirements
6. Timecard Accountability

The costs associated with state staff are included under the State Operations portion of the budget.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise has an implementation date of July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The applicable costs under this premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

Estimated net General Fund (GF) savings annualized at $33.7 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 (at the 50 percent Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate; assumes a two percent savings in IHSS Basic Cost, minus the below costs.)

1. Establish a Program Integrity Review Team at the State Level
   - Add CDSS fraud staff for the purpose of conducting statewide program integrity reviews to validate the receipt of IHSS services which are billed to the Medi-Cal program by IHSS providers. (This measure includes the addition of 30 Medi-Cal fraud investigators for DHCS, which are included under the DHCS budget.)

# IHSS Anti-Fraud Initiative

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

2. State Targeted Mailings and State Follow-Up
   - Targeted fraud deterrent mailings would be sent to high risk behavior populations that meet specific criteria, such as providers who are also recipients, or providers who work more than 300 hours per month.
3. DHCS Fraud Training
   - Provide fraud detection/prevention training to county staff to assist them in preventing, identifying fraud indicators and high risk behavior analysis.
4. CDSS and DHCS Directors Discretionary Waivers
   - Provides counties that have innovative solutions related to fraud prevention and detection the authority to move forward with a pilot project to prevent/detect fraud in their county.
5. Provider and Recipient New Accountability Requirements (Criminal Fingerprinting of IHSS Providers)
   - This measure would require a criminal background check to be conducted on all non-relative, non-registry IHSS providers.
   - It is estimated that 147,000 providers will be fingerprinted each year of the first two years. Approximately 6,000 providers would be fingerprinted on an ongoing basis.
   - It is expected that 900 providers will appeal a denial of placement on the registry due to the results of fingerprints.
6. Timecard Accountability
   - This measure would revise the provider timesheet to create greater accountability, including a timesheet signature requirement to include the statement “under penalty of perjury” and directing providers to submit their timesheets more timely. Additional activities will focus on random quarterly verification of hours and services delivered.
   - Conduct quarterly assessments of a random sample of all timecards to verify hours and services being delivered.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise creates a state mandate for which counties do not participate in the costs. Savings are calculated by identifying two percent of the IHSS basic cost for BY, then subtracting the following costs:

1. Establish a Program Integrity Review Team at the State Level -- Total GF cost for two CDSS fraud staff is $606 thousand.
2. State Targeted Mailings and State Follow-Up – Total GF cost for targeted mailings to 25 percent of the total population is $35,000.
3. DHCS Fraud Training – Total GF cost for curriculum development and trainings for 500 SWs is $50,000.
4. CDSS and DHCS Directors Discretionary Waivers -- The costs are unknown; however, the goal would be to maintain cost neutrality.
5. Criminal Fingerprinting of IHSS Providers -- County level costs would be incurred in the amount of Local Assistance GF cost of $4.0 million. (This is the only cost that will benefit from the ARRA enhanced FMAP rate.)
6. Timecard Accountability -- A one-time cost of $200,000 for changing timesheets for CMIPS I.

# IHSS Anti-Fraud Initiative

## FUNDING:

- Under the PCSP, the Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the Current Year, and for the entire Budget Year (BY) the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

- The FMAP rate is 50 percent. The non-federal share is 100 percent state.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects a full year of cost/savings.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Totals** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **PCSP/Residual** | | |
| Total | $0 | $-100,095 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -33,690 |
| County | 0 | -20,775 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | -45,630 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# IHSS Cost Containment – Tiered FI Score

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise would establish a baseline functional index (FI) score (or minimum threshold) for those persons receiving domestic and related services (i.e. housework, shopping for food, meal preparation and clean-up, and laundry) and applying a three tiered categorization. Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions. This three tiered proposal would establish that 1) individuals with an FI score below 2.99 would be ineligible for In-Home Support Services (IHSS); 2) an FI threshold for need eligibility at 3.0 to 3.99 would be eligible for some IHSS services, with the exception of domestic and related services; and 3) an FI threshold for need eligibility at 4.0 would not be limited in eligibility and would continue to receive all appropriate IHSS services. This baseline threshold would not be extended to any other services, such as personal care, protective supervision, or paramedical services. The IHSS program's Uniform Assessment Tool is used by counties to assess individuals need for IHSS based on one's functioning across a spectrum of average daily activities. The Uniform Assessment is conducted to determine initial eligibility for IHSS and at annual reassessments, or following any change in a recipient's condition.

The goal of this proposal is to target the proposed reductions in services to the highest functioning individuals who have been identified as having the lowest need of services, as established by the recipient's FI score, which is derived from the Uniform Assessment. This proposal prioritizes the highest assessed level of needed assistance, which is reflected by an FI score of 4.0 or higher. Each recipient is given an FI ranking in each of the eleven activities of daily living (ADLs). A weighted average of these rankings is calculated to determine the FI score.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise has an implementation date of October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12309 and 12309.1.
- Assumes approximately 231,567 individuals have an FI score of 2.99 or less. The average monthly hours of this population is 61.4 hours.
- Assumes approximately 155,692 individuals have an FI score of 3.0 to 3.99, and receive domestic and related services. The average monthly hours of domestic and related services for this population is 82.8 hours. The average for all other services received by this population is 24.9 hours, for a total of 107.7 hours.
- Assumes approximately 36,207 individuals who have an FI score of 4.0 or higher are excluded from this proposal. The average monthly hours of this population is 176.5 hours.

# IHSS Cost Containment – Tiered FI Score

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Assumes 20 percent of impacted cases will appeal the elimination of these services. Of that 20 percent, it is assumed 75 percent will have their cases reviewed by a social worker (SW), and will not go to hearing. It is assumed that the remaining 25 percent will be reviewed by a SW, and will receive a full hearing.
- Assumes a SW cost $60.55 per hour, and that SWs require 0.5 hours per case to work on/review appeals, plus 1.0 hour per case to work on, prepare for, and present at hearings.
- Assumes an average wage of $8.60 per hour to account for the "Reduce State Participation to the Minimum Wage – October 1, 2009" premise.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimated savings are based on the number of IHSS service hours for recipients with an FI score of 2.99 and below, and the number of domestic and related services hours for recipients with an FI score of 3.0 to 3.99, using an average of 95 percent of their authorized hours being utilized.
- The savings were adjusted to reflect costs associated with potential appeals. The adjusted costs consist of the hours restored as a result of successful appeals, as well as state and county administrative costs for processing appeals.
- The savings includes the impact to the Department of Developmental Services budget.

## FUNDING:

- For the entire Budget Year (BY), the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- The non-federal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of costs is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects nine months of savings.

# IHSS Cost Containment – Tiered FI Score

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$1,193,116 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -417,745 |
| County | 0 | -231,310 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | -544,061 |

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$1,097,190 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -384,158 |
| County | 0 | -212,713 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | -500,319 |

| **Residual** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$95,926 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -33,587 |
| County | 0 | -18,597 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | -43,742 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Waiver Personal Care Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise, formerly called Extended Personal Care Services (Assembly Bill (AB) 668), reflects the costs for personal care services that are provided above a recipient's assessed limit in the In-Home Supportive Services/Personal Care Services Program (IHSS/PCSP).

AB 668 (Chapter 896, Statutes of 1998) provided for additional hours on behalf of eligible PCSP recipients if they needed more than the 283 monthly hours allowed under IHSS and qualified for the Medi-Cal Skilled Nursing Facility Level of Care (SNFLOC) Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) Waiver program. The SNFLOC waiver program was approved by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), formerly the Health Care Financing Administration, effective July 1, 1999.

On January 1, 2007, CMS approved the renewal of the Nursing Facility A and B Levels of Care (NF A/B) Waiver for a five-year period effective January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2011. At the time of renewal, the NF Subacute (NF S/A) and In-Home Medical Care (IHMC) Waivers were combined with the NF A/B Waiver and the name was changed to the Nursing Facility/Acute Hospital (NF/AH) Waiver. The NF/AH Waiver maintains the NF A/B, NF S/A, and Acute Hospital levels of care (LOC) that were previously in the separate waivers. The combining of these waivers helped streamline the administrative and reporting process of three waivers into one.

On January 1, 2007, CMS also approved the In-Home Operations (IHO) Waiver for a three-year period effective January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2009. The IHO Waiver has enrolled Medi-Cal beneficiaries who have continuously been enrolled in a Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)-administered HCBS waiver since prior to January 1, 2002, have received and continue to receive direct care services primarily rendered by licensed nurses, and whose HCBS costs exceed the level of care cost cap under the NF/AH Waiver. DHCS is preparing a renewal of the IHO Waiver, and anticipates CMS approval for a five-year period effective January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2014.

"Waiver Personal Care Services" (WPCS) has been redefined under these two waivers to include services that differ from those in the State Plan which allow beneficiaries to remain at home. Although there is no longer a requirement that waiver consumers receive the maximum of 283 hours of State Plan Personal Care Services (SPPCS) prior to receiving waiver personal care services, waiver consumers must be receiving some SPPCS. Waiver personal care services will be one option on a menu of services that waiver participants may choose from, to the extent that waiver cost neutrality is assured. These services will be provided by the counties' IHSS program providers and will be paid via an interagency agreement with the California Department of Social Services, or will be provided by home health agencies.

SB 643 (Chapter 551, Statutes of 2005) required DHCS to increase the number of NF A/B Waiver slots by 500, reserving a minimum of 250 for Medi-Cal beneficiaries transitioning from facilities, and adding community transition services and habilitation services as available waiver services. These slot increases were approved for the NF/AH Waiver, and new services were implemented on July 1, 2007, when new procedure codes were implemented. SB 643 allows implementation of the expansion only to the extent fiscal neutrality within DHCS's budget as a department for these slots, and federal fiscal neutrality as required under the terms of the federal waiver, can be demonstrated.

# Waiver Personal Care Services

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 14132.97.
- The average number of NF A/B LOC beneficiaries is estimated to increase by an average of 22 per month in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, and 23 per month in FY 2009-10.
- The average number of NF S/A LOC beneficiaries is estimated to increase by an average of four per month in FY 2008-09, and three per month in FY 2009-10.
- As of January 2009, DHCS expects to enroll 439 beneficiaries who are currently on a waiting list. These beneficiaries will be phased into existing slots of the NF/AH Waiver at a rate of approximately fifteen per month through February 2011 until all 439 are enrolled. DHCS estimates 248 NF/AH Waiver NF B LOC slots will be filled in FY 2008-09 and 251 slots will be filled in FY 2009-10, under the provisions of SB 643. Sixty-five percent of the beneficiaries are expected to use waiver personal care services.
- Current Year (CY): The NF A/H Waiver NF A/B LOC total hours are 1,279,895 and NF S/A LOC total hours are 1,082,280. The IHO Waiver NF A/B LOC total hours are 14,313 and NF S/A LOC total hours are 2,121.
- Budget Year (BY): The NF A/H Waiver NF A/B total hours are 1,932,681 and NF S/A total hours are 1,250,243. The IHO Waiver NF A/B total hours are 16,120 and NF S/A total hours are 3,291.
- The cost per hour is assumed at $10.49 in the CY, and $10.10 in the BY per ABX3 6, Statutes of 2009.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- The IHO Waiver is set to expire on December 31, 2009. DHCS is preparing a renewal of the IHO Waiver and anticipates CMS approval of the renewal for a five-year period effective January 1, 2010, through December 31, 2014. This premise assumes an approval of the renewal request and a continuation of services through the BY for the IHO Waiver.

## METHODOLOGY:

The CY estimated cost is computed by multiplying the average monthly caseload by projected monthly hours per case by the cost per hour by twelve months.

# Waiver Personal Care Services

## FUNDING:

Under the WPCS, the Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the CY, and for the entire BY the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent.

The nonfederal share of the service costs is reimbursed 100 percent by the Department of Health Care Services.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The estimate has been updated to reflect current caseload and cost per hour information.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects caseload growth.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $24,952 | $32,343 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 24,952 | 32,343 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Waiver for Residual Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the state and county savings resulting from recipients under the state-only In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Residual Program moving to the federal Medicaid (Medi-Cal) Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) or federal Medi-Cal IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW). Both the PCSP and IPW receive federal financial participation under Title XIX which causes the savings. IHSS enables Medi-Cal eligible individuals to remain safely in their own homes as an alternative to out-of-home care. Eligible IHSS recipients include aged, blind, or disabled individuals who receive public assistance or have low incomes and can be cared for by a relative or nonrelative.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1773 (Chapter 939, Statutes of 1992) required the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to submit a Medicaid State Plan amendment to the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)(formerly Health Care Financing Administration) to include a portion of the IHSS program as Title XIX-eligible services. This portion of the IHSS program is known as the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP). In 2004, DHCS received approval from CMS for an Independence Plus Section 1115 Demonstration Project to allow certain recipients in the State-only IHSS Residual program to receive services under the new IHSS Plus Waiver (IPW).

Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled to begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and will provide the same services plus some enhanced services.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The IPW became effective on August 1, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Costs for the new Section 1915(j) State Plan Option are expected to be the same as those of the IPW.

The IPW expires on July 31, 2009, and represents one month of the BY.

The 1915(j) implements on August 1, 2009, and represents 11 months of the BY.

This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

Savings are determined by computing a federal Medi-Cal share of cost for projected Residual program expenditures with corresponding state and county matching shares.

Prior to calculating the savings, the estimate for the basic costs was reduced by $93 million [$60 million General Fund (GF)] for the Current Year (CY) and $96 million ($63 million GF) for the Budget Year (BY) to adjust for the estimated total of cases that will be ineligible for services under the PCSP or IPW .

# Waiver for Residual Program

## FUNDING (CONTINUED):

- Under the PCSP, the Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the CY, and for the entire BY the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- The nonfederal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of cost is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.
- The Title XIX funds are shown as a reimbursement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in CY and BY savings reflects cases that have not yet been determined eligible for the PCSP or IPW.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increases in savings reflect increases in cases moving from the Residual program to the federal PCSP or IPW.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Residual Program** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -118, 742 | -129,376 |
| County | -234 | - 243 |
| Reimbursements | 118, 976 | 129,619 |

# Title XIX Reimbursement – In-Home Supportive Services/CSBG/Child Welfare Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal financial participation (FFP) associated with Title XIX eligible services as authorized under Title XIX of the federal Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., Section 1396, et. seq.). Certain In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), assessment and eligibility activities, County Services Block Grant (CSBG) activities, and Adult Protective Services (APS) are eligible to receive Title XIX federal funding. Additionally, certain health-related (HR) activities in Child Welfare Services (CWS) are also eligible to receive these funds.

The California Department of Social Services coordinates with the Department of Health Care Services to establish claiming processes to pull down applicable FFP.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

**IHSS**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 12300 through 12317.2.
- Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) and the 1915(j) State Plan Option are eligible to receive Title XIX funding at the applicable Federal Medical Assistance Percentages (FMAP).
- Qualified IHSS activities performed by Skilled Professional Medical Personnel (SPMP) are eligible to receive Title XIX funding at the enhanced administrative FMAP rate of 75 percent. Qualified activities performed by non-SPMP are eligible to receive the non-enhanced administrative FMAP rate of 50 percent.
- The IPW became effective August 1, 2004. Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled to begin. The costs and savings associated with the 1915(j) are assumed to be the same as those under the IPW. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same plus some enhanced services. For more information, please see Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.
- The PCSP, IPW, and 1915(j) under IHSS services will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. Administrative and other activities eligible to receive enhanced FMAP are not eligible to receive temporary FMAP increases as a result of the ARRA. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

**CWS**

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 16500.
- CWS program costs are eligible for Title XIX funding at the enhanced administrative rate of 75 percent for SPMP and 50 percent for non-SPMP.

# Title XIX Reimbursement – In-Home Supportive Services/CSBG/Child Welfare Services

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

**CSBG/APS**

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 13004 through 13007 (CSBG) and sections 15703 through 15705.40 (APS).

## METHODOLOGY:

**IHSS PCSP/IPW/1915(j)**

Title XIX FMAP rate is 50 percent effective July 1, 2008, to September 30, 2008. Effective October 1, 2008, through the remainder of the Current Year (CY), and for the entire Budget Year (BY) the FMAP rate will be 61.594 percent. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

**IHSS Administration**

- HR activities in support of Medi-Cal eligible recipients are eligible to receive Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent. Activities performed by SPMP are eligible to receive Title XIX reimbursement at the enhanced FMAP rate of 75 percent.
- The federal share of actual expenditures for the past four quarters was used in calculating the CY and the BY estimates.

**CWS**

For the CY and the BY, the Title XIX reimbursement was calculated using prior year actual expenditures.

**CSBG/APS**

- HR activities in support of Medi-Cal eligible recipients are eligible to receive Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent. Activities performed by SPMP are eligible to receive Title XIX reimbursement at the enhanced FMAP rate of 75 percent.
- Estimated costs are based on actual expenditures.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This estimate has been updated to reflect current data.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects increases due to changes in program costs and savings, and the ARRA.

# Title XIX Reimbursement – In-Home Supportive Services/CSBG/Child Welfare Services

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| **Title XIX Total** | **$3,381,001** | **$2,571,946** |
| | | |
| **IHSS Services** | **$3,067,313** | **$2,236,487** |
| PCSP | 2,838,671 | 1,943,863 |
| IPW/1915(j) | 228,642 | 292,624 |
| | | |
| **Health Related Activities** | **$313,688** | **$335,459** |
| IHSS Administration | 165,009 | 182,351 |
| CWS | 87,208 | 91,637 |
| CSBG | 17,895 | 17,895 |
| APS/APS Training | 43,576 | 43,576 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# In-Home Supportive Services Administration – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of administering the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program through the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the IHSS Plus Waiver, and Residual Programs. Assembly Bill 1773 (Chapter 939, Statutes of 1992) required the California Department of Health Care Services to submit a Medicaid state plan amendment to the federal Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services, formerly the Health Care Financing Administration, to include a portion of the IHSS program as a covered service. The IHSS program provides in-home services to the aged, blind, and disabled to help individuals maintain an independent living arrangement and avoid institutionalization. This premise also includes administrative costs for completion of the emergency contact and back-up form, previously in the Waiver for Residual Program premise.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The Title XIX eligible PCSP was implemented in April of 1993.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12300 through 12314 and 14132.95.
- The social worker (SW) unit cost is held at $60.55 per hour in both the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY).
- The standard hours per case are 11.58 hours, including five minutes for completing the required emergency contact and emergency back-up plan form.
- The Supported Individual Provider (SIP) expenditures are assumed to increase with caseload growth. The estimated caseload growth is 6.7 percent in the BY.
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is 49.62 percent, based on actual expenditure information as reported on the County Expense Claim for the past four quarters.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the caseload times the standard hours per case times the SW unit cost, plus the estimated SIP costs.

# In-Home Supportive Services Administration – Basic Costs

## FUNDING:

- Skilled professional medical personnel (SPMP) are reimbursed at the enhanced Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 75 percent. Non-SPMP are reimbursed at the FMAP rate of 50 percent.
- Under the PCSP, the non-federal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.
- The state-only Residual program share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY increase reflects caseload growth, an increase in hours per case and wage and/or benefit increases for 13 counties.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects caseload growth and wage and/or benefits increases.

## CASELOAD:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Average Monthly Caseload | 431,255 | 462,198 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $310,908 | $333,283 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 109,646 | 117,536 |
| County | 46,991 | 50,373 |
| Reimbursements | 154,271 | 165,374 |

# County Employer of Record (AB 2235)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of administrative activities necessary for counties to act as the employer of record for In-Home Supportive Service (IHSS) providers. Counties may choose to act as the employer of record for IHSS individual providers to achieve compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 1682.

AB 2235 (Chapter 1135, Statutes of 2002) further requires any county which is not in compliance with the mandates of AB 1682 to act as the employer of record (within a specified timeframe) for collective bargaining purposes. To comply, counties had to provide documentation no later than January 15, 2003, in support of compliance, or detailed information in support of delayed compliance by March 31, 2003. Counties that did not provide required documentation or meet the delayed compliance deadline automatically defaulted to act as the employer of record.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12300 through 12314 and 14132.95.
- This estimate assumes that Alpine and Tuolumne counties will act as employer of record for both the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY).
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage for the BY is 49.62 percent based on actual expenditure information as reported on county administrative expense claims for the past four quarters.

## METHODOLOGY:

The CY and the BY estimated costs are the sum of the projected annual costs for each county.

## FUNDING:

The Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate is 50 percent. The nonfederal share for PCSP administrative costs is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

For state-only Residual program administrative costs, the state share is 70 percent and the county share is 30 percent.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY was held to the Appropriation. The BY decrease reflects lower cost assumptions for both Alpine and Tuolumne county.

# County Employer of Record (AB 2235)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease reflects lower cost assumptions for both Alpine and Tuolumne Counties.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $369 | $352 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 130 | 124 |
| County | 56 | 53 |
| Reimbursements | 183 | 175 |

# In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program Court Cases

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of court settlements and attorney fees related to the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. Costs include the settlement of lawsuits pertaining to local assistance in accordance with Budget Letter 98-22 and instructions from the Department of Finance.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The estimate is based in part on actual payments for cases in the Current Year (CY), and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Legal Division's projection of costs to be paid in both the CY and the Budget Year (BY).

## METHODOLOGY:

The CY and the BY estimates of costs reflect known and anticipated settlements and attorney fees related to the IHSS program and $25,000 for other court cases. These are state-only costs.

## FUNDING:

IHSS costs for case settlement and attorney fees are funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY decrease and BY increase reflect the latest projected attorney fees from the CDSS Legal Division.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease reflects the settlement and payment of the Tyler lawsuit.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,075 | $265 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,075 | 265 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally blank for spacing***

# In-Home Supportive Services - Advisory Committees

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of establishing and operating In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) advisory committees as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 1682 (Chapter 90, Statutes of 1999). AB 1682 mandated that counties act as or establish an employer-of-record for IHSS providers on or before January 1, 2003, and establish advisory committees for IHSS purposes. The advisory committees are to submit recommendations to their respective county boards of supervisors on the preferred mode of IHSS service to be utilized in their counties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12300 through 12314.
- The estimate assumes the average annual cost for advisory committees is $52,966 per county.
- The estimate assumes that all counties have established and will operate advisory committees in the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY).
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage is 47 percent in the CY and the BY, based on actual expenditures as reported on county administrative expense claims for Fiscal Year 2005-06.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the average annual cost per county by 58 counties.

## FUNDING:

The federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 47 percent of the total funding in the CY and the BY. The remaining nonfederal share is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# In-Home Supportive Services - Advisory Committees

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $3,072 | $3,072 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,628 | 1,628 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 1,444 | 1,444 |

# IHSS Quality Assurance

## DESCRIPTION:

The Quality Assurance (QA) Initiative was mandated by Senate Bill (SB) 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004). The intent of this initiative is to improve the quality of services, enhance program integrity, and detect and prevent program fraud and abuse. SB 1104 mandated ongoing staff training for county In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) workers and required the California Department of Social Services to collaborate with the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) on annual error rate studies and investigations of suspected fraud in the receipt or provision of services. The QA methodology derived savings from improved assessments and reassessments completed after social workers received training.

This premise reflects the administrative costs of implementing the QA program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on December 1, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12305.7 and 12305.71.
- County QA staff and additional IHSS workers were hired in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 and FY 2005-06.
- The "Hourly Task Guidelines Implementation Analysis: Fiscal Year 2006-07" produced by the Institute for Social Research (ISR) at the California State University, Sacramento concluded that there is greater consistency in authorized hours for certain ranks and tasks. Also, the hourly task guidelines (HTGs) have been successful in bringing greater uniformity to the assessment process.
- The ISR analysis also concluded that there has been a modest decrease in authorized hours for assessments (two minutes) and reassessments (five minutes).

## METHODOLOGY:

### COSTS

County Staff

- It is assumed there are 220 county QA staff or additional IHSS workers working on the QA Initiative.
- The annual Social Worker (SW) cost is assumed to be $129,083.
- County QA staff costs are estimated at $14.2 million for both the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY), with $5.0 million in General Fund (GF) each year.
- The CY includes costs for a contract with the ISR to evaluate the impact of the HTGs.

# IHSS Quality Assurance

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

State Level Training for SWs

- Training costs include: curriculum development; classroom training; post-training evaluation.
- Training will be provided in the CY and the BY on an on-going basis.

## FUNDING:

- The Title XIX reimbursement rate is 49.62 percent. The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY was held to the Appropriation. The BY decrease reflects an updated HTG contract.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease reflects an updated HTG contract.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $32,602 | $32,373 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 11,515 | 11,417 |
| County | 4,935 | 4,893 |
| Reimbursements | 16,152 | 16,063 |

# Reduce County Administration Costs by Five Percent

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings from reducing county administration costs by five percent effective July 1, 2008, with reassessments continuing to occur annually.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The reduction to In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) county administration costs were held to the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation.

## METHODOLOGY:

Projected savings are based on a five percent across-the-board cut.

## FUNDING:

- The Title XIX federal sharing ratio is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate of 49.62.
- The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **PCSP/Residual** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$14,993 | -$14,993 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -5,295 | -5,295 |
| County | -2,270 | -2,270 |
| Reimbursements | -7,428 | -7,428 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Social Security Act Section 1915(j) - Administration

## DESCRIPTION:

In 2008, the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services informed the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) that it would not renew the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) following its July 31, 2009, expiration date. In an effort to continue providing the same services to this same population, as well as draw down federal financial participation (FFP), CDSS worked closely with the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to discuss options. As a result of the discussions, the Social Security Act section 1915(j) State Plan Option was identified as the only alternative which allowed for the continuation of services and ability to draw down FFP.

On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin, which will absorb the IPW caseload and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. The 1915(j) State Plan Option is based on person-centered planning and self-directed concepts. It includes enhanced development of service plans and risk management, and a supports-broker/consultant component.

This premise reflects the administrative costs for notification and compliance with 1915(j) requirements. Implementation of the 1915(j) requires social workers (SWs) to be trained on the concepts and methods of being a supports-broker. A risk management process is also required for all recipients to be able to identify, mitigate and assume unmitigated risks. Lastly, a notification letter will need to be sent to all IPW recipients and their providers informing them of the end of the IPW and new 1915(j) State Plan Option.

1915(j) service costs are included under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP)/Residual IHSS Basic Costs premise.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on August 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Twenty minutes of SW time to incorporate a risk management process for all current PCSP and Residual program recipients, as well as new 1915(j) recipients. All IHSS recipients will be phased-in to the risk management process over two years.
- Three hours of supports-broker training for each SW. Four training sessions in the Budget Year (BY) will be needed at an assumed cost of $15,000 per session.
- A notification letter regarding the end of the IPW and available new 1915(j) will be sent to all IPW recipients and their providers at a cost of $0.82 per letter. This assumes a one-time cost for file creation and letter setup, as well as a one-time cost for language translation.
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage is 49.62 percent based on actual expenditures as reported on county administrative expense claims for the past four quarters
- The total caseload of IHSS recipients in the BY is 462,198.
- The average monthly caseload of IPW/1915(j) recipients in the BY is 30,385 with 24,718 corresponding providers.

# Social Security Act Section 1915(j) - Administration

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- SW rate of $60.55 per hour.
- 1915(j) service costs are expected to be the same as those under the IPW.
- The 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system for this same population.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The cost for implementing the Risk Management Process is determined by multiplying the amount of SW time required by the total number of IHSS recipients by the SW rate for each fiscal year.
- The cost for training SWs is determined by multiplying the time needed to train all SWs by the SW rate.
- The cost of the notification letter is determined by multiplying the cost per letter by the total IPW population of recipients and their providers.

## FUNDING:

The Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate is 50 percent. The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects 11 months of cost.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Totals** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $6,893 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 2,431 |
| County | 0 | 1,042 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 3,420 |

# Provider Enrollment Statement Form

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with revising the Provider Enrollment Statement Form (SOC 426) to bring it into compliance with the requirements of Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 12305.81, Senate Bill (SB) 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004). The new compliant form indicates that a person shall not be eligible to provide or receive payment for providing supportive services for ten years following a conviction for, or incarceration following a conviction for, fraud against a government health care or supportive services program. It also states that each person seeking to provide supportive services shall complete, sign under penalty of perjury, and submit to the county their completed SOC 426. Lastly, it includes various statements and declarations regarding:

- An applicant's criminal history regarding fraud against a government health care or supportive services program and corresponding penalties for enrollment as a provider, including the inability of supportive services providers to receive payment for providing supportive services,
- An agreement that providers reimburse the state for overpayments,
- Subdivision (a) of Section 273a of the Penal Code and Section 368 regarding crimes which cause harm, death, suffering, pain, or injury to children, elders or dependent adults, and
- A statement that a public authority (PA) or non-profit consortium (NPC) shall exclude a provider from its registry if it is notified by the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) that a supportive service provider is ineligible to receive payments under this chapter or under Medi-Cal law, and shall report to DHCS any determinations and/or findings that a registry provider is not eligible to provide supportive services.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC Code section 12305.81, SB 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004).
- 376,000 In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) providers will be phased-in over 24 months.
- Ongoing enrollment of 15,000 new IHSS providers monthly.
- The Social Worker (SW) rate is $60.55 per hour.
- In bringing the Provider Enrollment Statement Form into compliance with W&IC section 12305.81, the counties will have additional responsibilities including:
  - Fifteen minutes to mail and verify forms, copy documents/identifications, and schedule appointments for providers.
  - Ten minutes to resolve errors on forms, reschedule appointments and send reminders for appointments; this applies to 20 percent of providers.
  - Fifteen minutes to resolve issues for clients when a particular provider is ineligible; this applies to 20 percent of providers.

# Provider Enrollment Statement Form

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Five minutes to cross reference applicants with the ineligible provider list, and place providers on the ineligible list; this applies to three percent of providers.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is computed by summing the newly enrolled and phased-in supportive services providers, then applying the SW rate of pay, applicable time per activity, and percentage of providers impacted.

## FUNDING:

- The Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a Budget Year (BY) item.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the BY and reflects nine months of costs.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **PCSP/Residual** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $5,816 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 2,036 |
| County | 0 | 872 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 2,908 |

# Eligibility Income Adjustment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the eligibility income adjustment for certain In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) recipients. Assembly Bill 2779 (Chapter 329, Statutes of 1998), allows the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to buy down IHSS Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) recipients' share of cost (SOC) from the higher Medi-Cal SOC level to the lower IHSS level. The Medi-Cal SOC is determined by taking the countable income of the Medi-Cal family unit and subtracting a maintenance allowance of $600 (medically needy). The IHSS SOC is determined by taking the countable income of the individual recipient, and subtracting the Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) payment standard. Senate Bill 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) extended the SOC buyout to include IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) program participants. The eligibility income adjustment applies to those recipients for whom Medi-Cal eligibility has been determined.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12305.1 and 14132.95.
- Based on the last twelve months of actual data (May 2008 through April 2009), there was an average of 8,939 SOC recipients per month with an average monthly buyout of $402.
- The Current Year (CY) – The monthly average of SOC recipients is projected to be 8,977 with an average monthly buyout of $406.
- The Budget Year (BY) - The monthly average of SOC recipients is projected to be 9,607 with an average monthly buyout of $427.
- Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, a Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this same population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

## METHODOLOGY:

This estimate is calculated by multiplying the number of projected cases per year by the average projected buyout cost-per-case.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and the BY decreases reflect a decreasing trend of SOC cases.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects caseload growth.

# Eligibility Income Adjustment

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **PCSP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $43,608 | $49,242 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 43,608 | 49,242 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Cap SOC Buyout Enrollment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with establishing a cap on the number of recipients eligible to receive share of cost (SOC) buyouts for certain In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) recipients. Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions.

Assembly Bill 2779 (Chapter 329, Statutes of 1998), allows the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to buy down IHSS recipients' SOC (which takes into account only the recipient's income) from the Medi-Cal SOC level to the IHSS SOC level. Senate Bill 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) extended the SOC buyout to include IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) program participants. The eligibility income adjustment is the difference between a recipient's higher monthly Medi-Cal SOC and lower monthly IHSS SOC, and applies to recipients who receive services under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) or IPW program for whom Medi-Cal eligibility has been determined.

This premise will eliminate the state's SOC buyout for new recipients coming into the IHSS program on or after July 1, 2009, and will not allow re-enrollment for receipt of this benefit. Under this premise, those SOC recipients in the existing SOC caseload on June 30, 2009, will continue to receive the existing state SOC buyout, but there will be no new enrollments under the SOC buyout beyond June 30, 2009. This will not result in any change in eligibility to the IHSS program. It will require certain IHSS recipients to pay a SOC (that the state currently pays) to receive IHSS services.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise has an implementation date of July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The buyout applies when a recipient's Medi-Cal SOC is greater than his/her IHSS SOC. When a recipient's Medical Family Budget Unit (MFBU) is composed of more than just the recipient, the comparison applies to the entire MFBU SOC under Medi-Cal.
- Based on the last twelve months of actual data (May 2008 through April 2009), there was an average of 8,939 SOC recipients per month with an average monthly buyout of $402.
- Assumes in FY 2009-10, the projected monthly average of SOC recipients will be 9,607, with an average monthly buyout of $427.
- Assumes the projected June 30, 2009 SOC caseload will be capped at 9,277 monthly cases, eliminating 330 from the SOC program.
- Assumes three months of savings in the Budget Year (BY).
- Effective July 31, 2009, the IPW program will expire and not be renewed. On August 1, 2009, the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) State Plan Option is scheduled begin. The new 1915(j) will absorb the IPW caseload, and provide the same services plus an enhanced support system. Service costs are expected to be the same for this former IPW population. For more information, please see the Social Security Act Section 1915(j) – Administration premise description.

# Cap SOC Buyout Enrollment

## METHODOLOGY:

The savings are calculated by taking the difference between the projected caseload for June 2009 and the projected average monthly caseload for the BY, then multiplying the resulting amount (SOC cases to be eliminated prospectively) by the average buyout for the BY, and three months.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent GF

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The reduced savings reflect a decrease in SOC caseload trend since the February 20, 2009, Budget Act, and the BY reflects only three months of savings as compared to 12 months of savings.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Totals** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | -$423 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -423 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Limit Share of Cost (SOC) Buyout to Recipients with a Functional Index (FI) Score of 4.0 and Above

## DESCRIPTION:

The premise reflects the savings associated with limiting the state's payment of the difference between the Medi-Cal share of cost (SOC) and the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) SOC to In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) recipients with a Functional Index (FI) Score of 4.0 and above. Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the 2009-10 Budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions. It is assumed that the SOC caseload will be capped at the June 30, 2009, level with no new or return enrollment.

Assembly Bill 2779 (Chapter 329, Statutes of 1998), allowed the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to buy down IHSS recipients' SOC from the Medi-Cal SOC level to the IHSS SOC level. Senate Bill 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) extended the SOC buyout to include IHSS Independence Plus Waiver (IPW) program participants. The buyout, or eligibility income adjustment, is the difference between a recipient's higher monthly Medi-Cal SOC and lower monthly IHSS SOC, and applies to recipients who receive services under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) or IPW program for whom Medi-Cal eligibility has been determined.

Current program requirements do not allow for individuals at Rank 1, who are considered independent, to receive these services. Individuals at Rank 2 typically require direction or encouragement to perform an activity, and individuals at Rank 3 require some physical assistance from another person for some chores. In comparison, individuals at Rank 4 require substantial physical assistance to perform most chores and individuals at Rank 5 cannot perform the specified activity with or without assistance.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The reduction has an implementation date of October 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Budget Year (BY) - The monthly average of SOC recipients is projected to be 9,607 with an average monthly buyout of $427.
- SOC caseload is projected to be capped at 9,277 monthly cases, through September 30, 2009.
- The SOC buyout will be limited to recipients with a functional index score of four or greater.
- 1,629 of the projected BY recipients would not be affected by this proposal since they have an FI score of 4.0 and above with an average monthly buyout of $385.
- The BY reflects nine months of savings.
- The savings were adjusted for costs associated with potential state and county administrative costs for work on appeals and hearings.

# Limit Share of Cost (SOC) Buyout to Recipients with a Functional Index (FI) Score of 4.0 and Above

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- It is assumed that 20 percent of impacted cases will appeal the elimination of these services. Of that 20 percent, it is assumed 75 percent will have their cases reviewed by a Social Worker (SW), will not go to hearing, and will not have their hours restored. It is assumed the remaining 25 percent will have their appeals reviewed by a SW, receive a full hearing and get their hours restored.
- Assume a SW hourly cost of $60.55 per hour and that SWs require 0.5 hours per appeal to review cases for potential appeal, and 1.0 hour per appeal to prepare for and present at hearings.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The monthly savings are calculated by multiplying the average monthly grant and the projected monthly caseload for the SOC-eligible recipients with an FI score of four and above. The cost for the SOC recipients with an FI score of four and above is then subtracted from the cost for the entire BY SOC population.
- The savings were adjusted to account for hearings and appeals, and associated county administrative costs.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY reflects nine months of savings.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Totals** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$0 | -$42,462 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -0 | -42,462 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Care & NAFS Administrative Costs – Basic

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative and staff development costs for the Foster Care (FC) and Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) programs. Historically, the budget for county administration was based on counties administrative budget requests made through a Proposed County Administrative Budget (PCAB) process, modified by a cost containment system consistent with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 14154. Beginning with Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 the PCAB process was suspended and the last PCAB process, 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.

The FC administrative costs include the county administration for the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP). County eligibility workers are required to perform administrative functions related to AAP. Specifically, verification of linkage to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program (formerly Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program) is required for all new AAP cases to establish federal or nonfederal eligibility. Linkage is based on the child's situation at the time of removal from the natural home. The child must meet the general eligibility requirements for TANF and qualify as either a federal or state-only foster care case. Recertification is also required on an annual basis.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise is an annual appropriation.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 14154.
- The FC estimate for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties in FY 2008-09 is being held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level. Base funding for FC Administrative Costs Basic for FY 2009-10 is $50 million.
- The non-Title IV-E Waiver FC caseload growth projection for FY 2008-09 is -2.7 percent and for FY 2009-10 is -2.9 percent.
- The Staff Development costs for FC are $1,077,788 for FYs 2008-09 and 2009-10, based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures.
- The AAP costs of $16 million for FYs 2008-09 and 2009-10 are based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures.
- Contract costs for FC are $143,000 for FYs 2008-09 and 2009-10.
- The NAFS Administrative Costs base funding is $592.2 million in FY 2007-08 and $682.3 million in FY 2008-09.
- The impact of Transitional Benefits, Vehicle Exclusion/Face-to-Face Interviews (Assembly Bill (AB) 231), Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT), and Simplification Options are reflected in the NAFS Administrative Basic Costs resulting in net savings of $33.6 million in FY 2008-09 and in FY 2009-10.
- The NAFS caseload growth projection is 22.1 percent in FY 2008-09 and 19.1 percent in FY 2009-10.

# Foster Care & NAFS Administrative Costs – Basic

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Staff development costs for NAFS are $7.5 million for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, based on calendar year 2008 actual expenditures.
- Statewide Automated Welfare System Development and Testing Interface (SAWS) costs for NAFS are $230,113 for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, based on updated expenditures.
- Contract costs for NAFS are $3.3 million for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- The Merced Automated Global Information Control (MAGIC) system administrative costs for NAFS and FC are $97,206 and $7,776, respectively for both FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- It is assumed that counties will not overmatch their Food Stamp administration in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Savings from Legacy System data collection and quality control systems for NAFS are $3.9 million for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10. Savings from Legacy System data collection and quality control systems for FC are $505,000 for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The NAFS and FC non-Title IV-E Waiver counties basic funding are adjusted to reflect caseload growth and updated premises. Staff development expenditures, the MAGIC system, and contract costs were added to both the NAFS and FC estimates. AAP administrative expenditures were also added to the FC estimate.

## FUNDING:

FC and NAFS costs are shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent General Fund, and 15 percent county.

**Note:** W&IC section 15204.4 requires MOE from the counties based on expenditures during FY 1996-97, which include the administration of food stamps. Please reference the "County MOE Adjustment" premise.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FC, the Current Year (CY) is held to the 2008-09 Budget Bill appropriation. The Budget Year (BY) increase is based on increased AAP expenditures offset in part by a decrease to FC expenditures.

The increase in NAFS basic for the CY is associated with the increased projected caseload growth. The decrease in federal costs is associated with the removal of the $24.0 million in federal funding previously budgeted for the anticipated county overmatch in food stamp administration funding.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY FC decrease is based on actual expenditures.

The NAFS basic increase for BY is associated with projected NAFS caseload growth.

# Foster Care & NAFS Administrative Costs – Basic

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Foster Care** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $66,128 | $65,936 |
| Federal | 36,490 | 36,606 |
| State | 23,085 | 22,973 |
| County | 6,553 | 6,357 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **NAFS** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $689,508 | $819,589 |
| Federal | 346,009 | 411,302 |
| State | 260,450 | 309,509 |
| County | 83,049 | 98,778 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Foster Care Reforms

## DESCRIPTION:

The California Department of Social Services implemented the annual redetermination of eligibility for foster care grants, resulting in the Current Year (CY) savings of $6.2 million and the Budget Year (BY) savings of $5.9 million.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate assumes a 20 percent reduction in continuing caseload eligibility costs as a result of reducing the redetermination requirement from every 6 months to every 12 months.

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the level of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal share of federal program costs and for cases not meeting federal eligibility criteria is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY is held to the Appropriation. The BY estimate is updated based on actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decreased savings are the result of lower FC caseloads.

## ADMINISTRATIVE:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$6,200 | -$5,904 |
| Federal | -3,409 | -3,323 |
| State | -1,963 | -1,815 |
| County | -828 | -766 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Food Stamp Administrative Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the reduction in federal reimbursement of California's food stamp administrative costs based on amounts charged to the former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program that could have been allocated to the Food Stamp and Medi-Cal programs for common administrative costs. Section 502 of the Agriculture Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 [Public Law (P.L.) 105-185] required states to determine such common administrative costs during their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program base year, Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1995.

The TANF block grant, which replaced the AFDC program, is based on the historical spending levels of the former program. The federal Office of Management and Budgets (OMB) cost principles applicable to the states (OMB Circular A-87) required that common costs be allocated to all benefiting programs. Consequently, California had to determine the amount of common costs attributable to eligibility determinations charged to AFDC that could have been allocated to the Food Stamp program. In order to assist in this process, the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) issued a guide entitled, "Implementation of Cost Allocation Determinations under the Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Reform Act." This guide provided direction to the states in determining their AFDC total base year administrative expenditures. California reviewed the base year's cost allocation methodology and the administrative costs charged to the AFDC program. The California Department of Social Services used a primary program cost allocation methodology rather than a benefiting program cost allocation methodology for the county administrative costs during the TANF block grant base year, FFY 1995. As a result, California received federal approval of its proposed reduction amount on January 15, 1999.

The amount attributable to the Food Stamp program is to be deducted from the food stamp administrative claims. The provisions of P.L. 105-185 stipulate that states may not use TANF funds to pay for this reduction, nor does it provide for a decrease in the maintenance of effort expenditures under TANF.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: P.L. 105-185, section 502.
- Based on a review of quarterly federal financial reports submitted to DHHS during FFY 1995, the total federal share of common administrative expenditures was $280,097,927.
- Non-AFDC program administrative costs and discrete AFDC costs, as defined in the guide, were identified in quarterly federal financial reports. These costs, as well as other allowable adjustments stipulated in the guide, totaled $59,412,705 and were deducted from the total federal share of common administrative expenditures.
- California's AFDC total base year administrative expenditure is $220,685,222.

# Food Stamp Administrative Reduction

## METHODOLOGY:

- California elected to use the optional formula described in the guide to determine the amount of the food stamp administrative reimbursement reduction. The optional formula is to multiply the AFDC total base year administrative expenditure by 80 percent and divide by three (for the three benefiting programs of AFDC, Food Stamp, and Medi-Cal).
- California's Food Stamp administrative reimbursement reduction is $58,849,393 ($220,685,222 x 0.80 ÷ 3).
- The TANF block grant has been reauthorized at the same level, therefore California will continue to reflect the reduction to the Food Stamp administrative claims.

## FUNDING:

The cost is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | -58,849 | -58,849 |
| State | 58,849 | 58,849 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Food Stamp Employment and Training Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) program, which provides job search assistance, work experience and supportive services to eligible Non-Assistance Food Stamp program recipients. This program was established under the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law [P.L.] 99-198). Employment and training opportunities enable recipients to become self-sufficient and reduce their need for food stamps. Some participants are geographically excluded due to reasons such as sparse population, great distances and lack of transportation. Individual county plans are developed that specify the job services, training and supportive services available to participants.

The United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) provides unmatched federal employment and training funding each year. The Food Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-171), signed into law on May 13, 2002, and effective October 1, 2002, made significant changes to the FSET program. The changes include freezing the base unmatched federal funds at the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2002 level through FFY 2007, adding certain criteria for a second component of unmatched federal funds each year from FFY 2002 through FFY 2007, eliminating a maintenance of effort requirement retroactive to October 1, 2001, rescinding carry-over of unmatched federal funds from years prior to FFY 2002 (unless states have already obligated the funds prior to the date of enactment), and changing the federal formula for allocating FSET funds to states. In addition, the legislation eliminated a $175 and $30 limit for offered and filled slots, a $25 limit on participant reimbursement for transportation and ancillary costs and an 80/20 spending requirement for Able Bodied Adult Without Dependents in qualifying FSET activities.

Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, California is expanding its FSET program to include a new education and training (E&T) component called FSET Third Party Reimbursement (also known as Cal Success). Counties that choose to offer Cal Success will be required to enter into contracts with their local community college to provide allowable E&T services to FSET participants. In FFY 2009, Cal Success will be operative as pilot projects in San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz counties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1987.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18901.
- There are 24 counties participating in the FSET program.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS(CONTINUED):

- The FY 2008-09 funding for this program is based on local assistance costs identified in the approved FSET program State Plans for FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.
- The FY 2009-10 funding for this program are based on the local assistance costs identified in the proposed FSET program State Plan for FFY 2009.

# Food Stamp Employment and Training Program

- It is assumed that costs in excess of the 100 percent federal grant would be shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent county.
- Funding in the amount of $1.0 million in FY 2008-09 and $0.3 million in FY 2009-10 will be available to fund the Cal Success pilot program.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The FY 2008-09 funding level represents 25 percent of the total amount of the approved FFY 2008 FSET program State Plan and 75 percent of the total amount of the approved FFY 2009 FSET program State Plan.
- The FY 2009-10 funding level represents 100 percent of the amount in the FFY 2009 FSET program State Plan.

## FUNDING:

The costs in excess of the 100 percent federal funds are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent county.[1]

| **2008-09:** (in 000's) | **Total** | **Federal** | **State** | **County** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 percent Federal Funds | $6,740 | $6,740 | $0 | $0 |
| Administration Overmatch [1] | $58,278 | $29,139 | $0 | $29,139 |
| Participant Reimbursement | $13,878 | $6,939 | $0 | $6,939 |
| Cal Success | $990 | $495 | $0 | $495 |
| **Total** | **$79,886** | **$43,313** | **$0** | **$36,573** |

| **2009-10:** (in 000's) | **Total** | **Federal** | **State** | **County** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 100 percent Federal Funds | $6,999 | $6,999 | $0 | $0 |
| Administration Overmatch [2] | $58,532 | $29,266 | $0 | $29,266 |
| Participant Reimbursement | $13,928 | $6,964 | $0 | $6,964 |
| Cal Success | $330 | $165 | $0 | $165 |
| **Total** | **$79,789** | **$43,394** | **$0** | **$36,395** |

[2] Administration Overmatch funds are used once costs exceed the 100 percent federal funds and participant reimbursement funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 costs were updated to reflect federally approved funding levels for FFY 2009. In addition, Cal Success funding was added for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

# Food Stamp Employment and Training Program

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The costs were updated to reflect federally approved funding levels for FFY 2009. Cal Success funding is reduced to account for the completion of the pilot program.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $79,886 | $79,789 |
| Federal | 43,313 | 43,394 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 36,573 | 36,395 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# California Nutrition Network

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of federal matching funds that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) passes through to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). The California Nutrition Network is a statewide marketing campaign to promote healthy eating and physical activity among food stamp recipients. The Network is a collaborative effort among DHCS, CDSS, California Department of Education, University of California Cooperative Extension, and private agencies. The California Nutrition Network partners with faith communities, local health departments, parks and recreation departments, and school districts. DHCS is the lead agency administering the project. CDSS serves as the pass-through agency for the matching federal funds.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1996.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The budget CDSS proposed to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 of $108,260,287 was used to estimate funding for the Current Year (CY).
- The Budget Year (BY) assumes continuation of the CY funding level.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The CY estimate is based on the approved funding for FFY 2009.
- The BY estimate is based on the CY funding level.

## FUNDING:

The pass-through consists of 100 percent FNS federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The decrease in the CY and BY funding reflects updated contract amounts.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# California Nutrition Network

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $108,260 | $108,260 |
| Federal | 108,260 | 108,260 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# UC Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of federal matching funds that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) passes through to the University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE). Food Stamp applicants and recipients will be provided nutrition education services in 41 counties by local university county extension offices. California's Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan is a cooperative effort between CDSS and UCCE. CDSS serves as the pass-through agency for the matching federal funds.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1995.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The CDSS budget approved by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 of $5,889,042 was used to estimate funding for the Current Year (CY).
- The Budget Year (BY) assumes continuation of the CY funding level.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The CY estimate is based on the approved funding for FFY 2009.
- The BY estimate is based on the CY funding level.

## FUNDING:

The pass-through consists of 100 percent FNS federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The slight decreases in CY and BY reflect updated contract amounts.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $5,889 | $5,889 |
| Federal | 5,889 | 5,889 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Face-to-Face Waiver

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise will streamline the application process and improve the administrative efficiency of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) by waiving the requirement for a face-to-face interview at application for all Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) households. Counties will have the option to conduct a telephone or other out of office interview in lieu of a face-to-face interview at application for NAFS households. This waiver is expected to increase FSP participation in households where work is a barrier to applying for benefits.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) issued an administrative notice informing states that a waiver of the face-to-face interview at application for all NAFS households is available upon request. Therefore, California has requested authorization to waive the face-to-face intake interview for all NAFS households.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise assumes a July 1, 2009 implementation date.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The face-to-face interview waiver is estimated to result in additional FSP households where the single head of the household and couples are working at least 20 hours per week.
- It is assumed that all counties will utilize the face-to-face waiver.
- Based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007 Food Stamp Characteristics Survey Data (Q5), there are currently 60,249 single head of household or couple headed households that are working between 20 and 30 hours per week.
- It is assumed that the households eligible for this waiver are considered part of the working poor population. Based on the USDA *State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2005* report issued in October 2007, 34 percent of the working poor population participated in the FSP.
- It is assumed that 60,249 households represent the 34 percent of the working poor population that participate in the FSP.
- It is assumed that removing the face-to-face waiver requirement would result in the working poor participating at a rate more consistent to the rest of the food stamp population. Based on the USDA *State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2005* report issued in October 2007, 50 percent of the total eligible food stamp households in California participated in the FSP.
- It is assumed that by removing the face-to-face interview requirement, the participation of this group will increase to 42 percent.
- The additional cases will be phased in over the first twelve months. This results in 1,581 new cases being added to the caseload each month for the first twelve months.

# Face-to-Face Waiver

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Based on FFY 2007 Q5 Data, working NAFS households are estimated to have an average food stamp benefit amount of $332.80. This amount takes into consideration the April 1, 2009 food stamp benefit increase of 13.6 percent as indicated by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. This benefit impact is reflected in the ARRA – 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase premise.

- It is assumed that the intake cost for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process new NAFS and the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) cases is $51.00 per case.

- It is assumed that the cost for an EW to process NAFS and CFAP continuing cases on a quarterly basis is $39.33 per case.

- It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- It is assumed that the administrative cost for an EW to process a mid-quarter report is $28.23.
- Based on Calendar Year 2008 actual reported CFAP and FS caseloads, the CFAP caseload consists of approximately one percent of the FS caseload.
- The impact of any administrative efficiency resulting from this premise is assumed to mitigate the NAFS administrative reduction premise.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the new cases are calculated by multiplying the new monthly cases by $51.00. After the phase in period, it is estimated that approximately four percent of the caseload will leave monthly and four percent will enter monthly.
- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the mid-quarter changes for the new cases are calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by 7.20 percent and by $28.23.
- The quarterly administrative costs associated with processing the quarterly reports are calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by $39.33 on a quarterly basis.
- The CFAP coupon costs associated with the new cases are calculated by multiplying the related caseload by the average CFAP coupon cost.
- CFAP coupon costs are reduced by $55,818 in FY 2009-10 to account for the 13.6 percent benefit increase from the ARRA. These coupon costs are included in the ARRA – 13.6 Percent Benefit Increase premise.

# Face-to-Face Waiver

## FUNDING:

The Food Stamp sharing ratio for the administrative cost is 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund (GF). The CFAP funding is 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The reduction in the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY) is due to the delay of implementation from January 1, 2009 to July 1, 2009.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the BY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **101 - CFAP Grants** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $354 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 354 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **141 - CFAP Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $18 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 18 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Face-to-Face Waiver

| **141 - Food Stamp Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $1,802 |
| Federal | 0 | 901 |
| State | 0 | 901 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# NAFS Administration Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

The Food Stamp program is the nation's largest nutrition program for low-income households. The program provides benefits to low-income Californians via electronic debit cards that participants may use to buy food from eligible retailers. This premise reflects a reduction of $21.0 million to county allocations for the administration of the federal Non-Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS) program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This reduction proposal implemented with the passage of the 2008 Budget Act.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- County allocations for the administration of the federal NAFS program are to be reduced by $21.0 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- The California Department of Social Services is committed to pursuing strategies to mitigate this impact on counties by improving the application process (e.g. face-to-face waiver and streamlining the recertification process).
- The 2008 Budget Act reduced county administration funding for a variety of programs as part of an overall compromise, and the reduction in NAFS administration funding is necessary due to the ongoing statewide fiscal challenges.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects a $21.0 million reduction in NAFS administration allocations for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

The reductions are reflected as federal and General Fund savings.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# NAFS Administration Reduction

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$20,976 | -$20,976 |
| Federal | -12,339 | -12,339 |
| State | -8,637 | -8,637 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Non Assistance Food Stamps Administration

## DESCRIPTION:

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 is a multi-year, federal economic stimulus program. With respect to programs under the purview of the Department, the purposes of the funds are to:

- Preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery
- Assist those impacted by the recession
- Stabilize state and local government budgets

The ARRA makes $22 million available for California in the Food Stamp program (federally referred to as Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, or SNAP) for use over two years. The funds can be spent on any eligible Food Stamp administration costs. The ARRA provides California approximately $10.8 million dollars to be used in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 and $11.3 million in FFY 2010.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The federal ARRA of 2009

- Approximately $10.8 million is available in FFY 2009 and $11.3 million in FFY 2010.

- The state and counties, including the County Welfare Directors Association, have been discussing the optimal use of the funds to assist the counties in achieving administrative simplicity while mitigating some of the challenges resulting from increasing caseloads and shrinking resources.

- As authorized by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), a portion of the funding received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) will be used to provide support for the California Recovery Task Force (CRTF) and for the ARRA oversight and administrative activities of the various departments administering those funds. Pursuant to Executive Order S-02-09, CRTF is charged with tracking the ARRA funding coming into the state; helping cities, counties, non-profits, and others access the available funding; ensuring that the funding provided to the state is spent efficiently and effectively; and maintaining a Web site that is frequently and thoroughly updated so Californians can track the stimulus dollars. The mechanism for accessing these federal funds and for allocating them to the CRTF and state entities administering ARRA funds is under development and is not available to include in this estimate. Consequently, a future Section 28.00 request may be submitted in the coming months to properly increase the department's federal funds reimbursement authority to fund the cost of accountability and related administrative and transparency activities.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
# Non Assistance Food Stamps Administration

## FUNDING:

The funding for this premise is 100 percent federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $22,095 |
| Federal | 0 | 22,095 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan Shift to the California Department of Social Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise references the amount of federal reimbursement funds that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) passes through to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS). CDSS passes these reimbursement funds to DHCS through the California Nutrition Network and the UC Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan premises. Consistent with the Governor's signing message for Assembly Bill (AB) 433, this premise holds back a portion of the pass-through funds to finance the Expanded Categorical Eligibility for Food Stamps provision of AB 433.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The Governor, upon signing AB 433, directed the use of these reimbursement funds to finance the Expanded Categorical Eligibility for Food Stamps provision of AB 433.

## METHODOLOGY:

The total transfer of reimbursement funds is $4.1 million. This represents $3.0 million for the General Fund portion of county administrative costs and $1.1 million for California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) coupon and administrative costs. Please see the Categorical Eligibility for Food Stamps premise for a description of how these costs were calculated.

## FUNDING:

The pass-through consists of 100 percent Food and Nutrition Service federal reimbursement funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009

The funding increase in FY 2009-10 accounts for a greater than expected caseload increase.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | CFAP Coupons | CFAP Coupons. |
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -1,061 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 1,061 |

# Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan Shift to the California Department of Social Services

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -3,029 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 3,029 |

| | 2008-09 CFAP Admin. | 2009-10 CFAP Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -61 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 61 |

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Administration

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs necessary to perform the administrative functions of the Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) program. The RCA program provides cash grants to refugees during their first eight months in the United States (U.S.) if they are not otherwise eligible for the standard categorical welfare programs. RCA administrative costs include salaries and benefits of eligibility workers and first line supervisors who determine eligibility and provide ongoing case management for the RCA program. Also included are allocated overhead and direct costs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on March 17, 1980.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1522 of Title 8 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) authorizes the federal government to provide grants to the states to assist refugees who resettle in the U.S.
- Sections 13275 through 13282 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorize the California Department of Social Services to administer the funds provided under Title 8 of the U.S.C. It also provides the Department authority to allocate the federal funds to the counties.
- Based on data through December 2008, the average administrative monthly cost per RCA case was approximately $73.
- The average monthly caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is estimated at 2,322 cases, and for FY 2009-10 is estimated at 2,400 cases.

## METHODOLOGY:

The average cost per case for RCA administration is multiplied by the estimated caseload for each fiscal year to arrive at the total cost.

## FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded by the Cash, Medical and Administration Grant through the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) administration costs increased due to a higher average monthly caseload than previously projected but the increase is partially offset by a lower average administrative monthly cost per RCA case.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase is due to a higher average monthly caseload.

# Refugee Cash Assistance – Administration

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,985 | $2,105 |
| Federal | 1,985 | 2,105 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# TANF Reauthorization

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the automation reprogramming costs associated with program changes made in response to the federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) of 2005, which reauthorized the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. In addition to TANF Reauthorization, the DRA implements a new requirement for documentation of citizenship/national status and identity for Medi-Cal eligibility. Counties must ensure that the Medi-Cal record includes satisfactory evidence of United States (U.S.) citizenship or U.S. national status and identity for all Medi-Cal applicants and beneficiaries who have declared that they are U.S. citizens or nationals.

Prior to the enactment of the DRA, documentary evidence to establish U.S. citizenship or U.S. national status was not required for Medi-Cal eligibility unless an applicant declared a birthplace outside the U.S., or if evidence suggested an applicant falsely claimed to be a U.S. citizen or U.S. national. Automation reprogramming is required to support the enhanced documentation requirements for the Medi-Cal program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Funding for automation reprogramming is included for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The federal DRA of 2005 established enhanced citizenship verification requirements for current and new Medi-Cal applicants.
- Based on information received from the Office of Systems Integration (OSI) it is assumed that it will cost $1.2 million in FY 2008-09 and $0.3 million in FY 2009-10 to complete the implementation of the automation changes associated with the new citizenship documentation requirements for Medi-Cal pursuant to the federal DRA of 2005.
- An additional $2.4 million is included in FY 2009-10 as placeholder funding to reprogram existing systems to implement the proposed California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program changes.

## METHODOLOGY:

The costs associated with the reprogramming of existing automated systems to support the proposed CalWORKs program changes and the citizenship documentation changes are estimated to be $3.9 million.

## FUNDING:

The automation associated with the federal DRA changes to Medi-Cal eligibility is funded 50 percent General Fund (GF) and 50 percent reimbursement from the United States Department of Health and Human Services. The automation changes associated with the CalWORKs program changes is funded with 100 percent federal TANF funds.

# TANF Reauthorization

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Information received from OSI indicated a need to move approximately $0.3 million from FY 2008-09 to FY 2009-10. Additionally, the $2.4 million for CalWORKs reform measures was moved from FY 2008-09 to FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Information received from OSI indicated a need to move approximately $0.3 million from FY 2008-09 to FY 2009-10. Additionally, the $2.4 million for CalWORKs reform measures was moved from FY 2008-09 to FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

| in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,191 | $2,751 |
| Federal | 0 | 2,427 |
| State | 596 | 162 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 595 | 162 |

# Be Vu v. Mitchell

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the local assistance costs associated with complying with the terms of the settlement agreement in the *Be Vu v. Mitchell* court case.

As a result of the settlement of this court case, the Food Stamp Program (FSP) forms and joint FSP/California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) forms must be translated into eight additional languages. The settlement agreement specifies that in addition to Chinese, Russian, Spanish and Vietnamese; the California Department of Social Services will translate FSP forms and forms jointly used with the CalWORKs program into Arabic, Armenian, Cambodian, Farsi, Hmong, Korean, Lao and Tagalog. In compliance with Be Vu, the following additional eight languages will now require translation: Cushite, Formosan, Japanese, Mien, Punjabi, Portuguese, Syriac, and Ukrainian.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise implemented with the settlement agreement effective December 4, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Federal Food Stamp Regulations Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations sections 272.4 (b)(2)(i), (ii), and (iii).
- Based on estimates received from the Office of Systems Integration (OSI), it is assumed that it will cost $2.1 million in the Current Year (CY) to reprogram existing automation systems to issue the FSP and CalWORKs forms in the original eight languages. Additionally, $0.1 million will be reappropriated from FY 2007-08 to fund this reprogramming.
- Staff time to manually complete the translated forms prior to automation is estimated for the original eight languages in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 resulting in costs of $0.4 million.
- Automation reprogramming is not scheduled for the final eight languages, therefore, additional staff time will result in costs of $0.2 million in FY 2008-09 and $0.2 million in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

Total costs associated with the reprogramming of existing automated systems and the manual completion of the translated forms are estimated to be $2.7 million in the CY and $0.2 million in the Budget Year (BY).

## FUNDING:

Manual completion costs are shared 50/50 with the CalWORKs and FSP. The CalWORKs share is funded with 100 percent federal/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and the Food Stamp share is funded 50 percent federal Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) funds, 35 percent General Fund (GF), and 15 percent county.

The automation costs are shared 85 percent with the FSP and 15 percent with the CalWORKs program. The CalWORKs share is funded 100 percent federal/TANF, and the Food Stamp share is funded 50 percent FNS funds, 35 percent GF, and 15 percent county.

# Be Vu v. Mitchell

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in the CY is related to increased food stamp and CalWORKs caseloads over what was previously projected. The automation costs did not change from the prior subvention, however, $0.1 million was identified as reappropriated funding from FY 2007-08.

The BY increase is due to increases in CalWORKs and Food Stamps caseloads.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in automation is related to consortia completing the automation of FSP and CalWORKs forms for the following languages: Arabic, Armenian, Cambodian, Farsi, Hmong, Korean, Lao and Tagalog. The decrease in administration is due to counties no longer needing to manually complete forms for the above listed languages, as the automation is complete. The BY administration costs reflects the ongoing manual completion of FSP and CalWORKs forms for the following languages: Cushite, Formosan, Japanese, Mien, Punjabi, Portuguese, Syriac, and Ukrainian.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – CalWORKs Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $243 | $75 |
| Federal | 241 | 74 |
| State | 2 | 1 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 – Food Stamp Administration** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $242 | $75 |
| Federal | 121 | 37 |
| State | 85 | 27 |
| County | 36 | 11 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Be Vu v. Mitchell

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 141-Automation** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2,120 | $0 |
| Federal | 1,271 | 0 |
| State | 566 | 0 |
| County | 283 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 141-Automation (Reappropriation from FY 2007-08)** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $90 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 90 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Statewide Project Management (SPM)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Statewide Project Management (SPM). This activity is performed by the California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 10823(a), which requires the implementation of SAWS. OSI provides statewide project management for the four SAWS consortia and the Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1995.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: W&IC section 10823.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the December 2001 (Revised May 2002) SAWS SPM Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent baseline adjustments.

## FUNDING:

SPM funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal share of Food Stamp, Title IV-E and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Costs are also eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is General Fund. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09. The allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated for FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FY 2009-10 costs have been adjusted for baseline adjustments.

# Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS)
# Statewide Project Management (SPM)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $6,377 | $6,451 |
| Federal | 1,776 | 1,822 |
| State | 2,797 | 2,829 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 1,804 | 1,800 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $6,377 | $6,451 |
| CDSS | 150 | 150 |
| OSI | 6,227 | 6,301 |

# Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP). Project management for WDTIP is provided by the California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI). WDTIP provides counties with the automated functionality required to conform to statewide tracking of time-on-aid requirements mandated by welfare reform in Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11454.5(b) (4).

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the June 2002 (Revised January 2003) SAWS-WDTIP Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent baseline adjustments.

## FUNDING:

SAWS-WDTIP funding is 100 percent California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the CalWORKs Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Fiscal Year 2009-10 costs increase as a result of baseline adjustments.

# Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $3,787 | $3,808 |
| Federal | 3,787 | 3,808 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $3,787 | $3,808 |
| CDSS | 2,823 | 2,823 |
| OSI | 964 | 985 |

# Interim Statewide Automated Welfare Systems (ISAWS)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium, one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. State level project management for ISAWS is provided by the California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI). In addition, OSI provides computing, application maintenance, and operational support services for the ISAWS Consortium. The Consortium is comprised of 35 counties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1994.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- The ISAWS estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.
- A Post-Implementation Evaluation Report was approved in August 2004.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the August 2008 “As Needed” ISAWS Consortium Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent baseline adjustments.

## FUNDING:

ISAWS funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp, Title IV-E, and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Also, the project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp and Title IV-E costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs increase as a result of baseline adjustments.

# Interim Statewide Automated Welfare Systems (ISAWS)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $28,302 | $28,410 |
| Federal | 8,668 | 8,772 |
| State | 11,308 | 11,256 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 8,326 | 8,382 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $28,302 | $28,410 |
| CDSS | 2,984 | 2,984 |
| OSI | 25,318 | 25,426 |

# Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium Migration Project

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for the Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium Migration Project. The ISAWS Consortium is one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The ISAWS Migration project will migrate the 35 ISAWS Consortium counties to Consortium IV.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- Planning activities began in July 2006 and development activities began in August 2007.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the March 2006 SAWS-ISAWS Consortium Migration Project Planning Advance Planning Document Update, and the December 2006 SAWS-ISAWS Consortium Migration Project Implementation Advance Planning Document and subsequent changes to reflect the budget request.

## FUNDING:

ISAWS Migration funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Costs are also eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Care Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is General Fund. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs increased to reflect a full year of implementation activities.

# Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium Migration Project

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $73,400 | $105,914 |
| Federal | 23,644 | 32,299 |
| State | 33,530 | 47,197 |
| County | 0 | 562 |
| Reimbursements | 16,226 | 25,856 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $73,400 | $105,914 |
| CDSS | 73,400 | 105,914 |
| OSI | 0 | 0 |

# Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER) Consortium, one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The LEADER Consortium includes only Los Angeles County.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1994.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- The LEADER estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.
- The county extended its M&O contract in May 2007 to continue M&O services until the replacement system is implemented.
- A Post-Implementation Evaluation Report was approved in November 2006.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the June 2005 SAWS LEADER Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent adjustments to reflect the extension of the M&O contract.

## FUNDING:

LEADER funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Costs are also eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp and General Relief costs. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Fiscal Year 2009-10 costs increased because the allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated.

# Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs increased because the allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $12,071 | $12,256 |
| Federal | 7,375 | 7,393 |
| State | 2,819 | 2,899 |
| County | 1,877 | 1,964 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $12,071 | $12,256 |
| CDSS | 12,071 | 12,256 |
| OSI | 0 | 0 |

# Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER) Replacement System

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER) Consortium Replacement System project. The LEADER Consortium is one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project and is comprised of only Los Angeles County. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The LEADER Replacement System project currently includes planning and procurement activities for a system to replace LEADER.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented as a separate LEADER premise on July 1, 2007. The Planning activities began in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- Planning activities for the Replacement System project began in July 2005.
- The Intent to Award for the replacement system is scheduled for July 2009.
- System development and implementation will be delayed by six months to achieve cost savings in 2009-10. Development and implementation will start on July 1, 2010.

## METHODOLOGY:

The project will be delayed for six months to achieve $14.6 million General Fund cost savings. Costs are calculated based on a six month delay to the timeframes outlined in the August 2008 SAWS LEADER Replacement System Implementation Advance Planning Document.

## FUNDING:

LEADER funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Costs are also eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp, Foster Care and General Relief costs. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

# Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER) Replacement System

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated for FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The estimate for FY 2009-10 reflects lower costs related to the timeframe delay.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,354 | $1,314 |
| Federal | 321 | 313 |
| State | 541 | 525 |
| County | 85 | 85 |
| Reimbursements | 407 | 391 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,354 | $1,314 |
| CDSS | 1,354 | 1,314 |
| OSI | 0 | 0 |

# Welfare Client Data System (WCDS)-CalWORKs Information Network (CalWIN)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for the Welfare Client Data System (WCDS) Consortium, one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The WCDS Consortium CalWORKs Information Network (CalWIN) system is managed by 18 counties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- The WCDS Consortium estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations costs.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the December 2006 (Revised May 2007) SAWS-WCDS Consortium Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent budget requests.

## FUNDING:

WCDS funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Costs are also eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp, Foster Care and General Assistance/General Relief costs. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated.

# Welfare Client Data System (WCDS)-CalWORKs Information Network (CalWIN)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 increase is a result of increased caseload growth, database license upgrade, and maintenance and operations reprocurement, offset slightly by a reduction for a revised equipment purchase schedule.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $69,410 | $72,264 |
| Federal | 19,265 | 20,136 |
| State | 27,176 | 28,256 |
| County | 3,868 | 4,151 |
| Reimbursements | 19,101 | 19,721 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $69,410 | $72,264 |
| CDSS | 69,410 | 72,264 |
| OSI | 0 | 0 |

# Consortium IV (C-IV)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for Consortium IV (C-IV), one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The C-IV system serves four counties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- The C-IV estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the June 2006 (Revised November 2006) SAWS-C-IV Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent changes to reflect the budget request.

## FUNDING:

C-IV funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Costs are also eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp and Foster Care costs. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 allocation of costs to benefiting programs has been updated.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The net increase in FY 2009-10 is due to providing new foster care functionality to the existing C-IV system, ongoing M&O services, and the procurement effort to continue M&O services after the ISAWS Migration implementation. Increases are partially offset by a decrease in hardware payments.

# Consortium IV (C-IV)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $49,656 | $51,043 |
| Federal | 16,289 | 16,537 |
| State | 18,588 | 19,190 |
| County | 2,316 | 2,684 |
| Reimbursements | 12,463 | 12,632 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $49,656 | $51,043 |
| CDSS | 49,656 | 51,043 |
| OSI | 0 | 0 |

# Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) and California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for testing activities associated with an interface between the SAWS consortium systems and California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS). The testing activities are necessary to ensure the successful exchange of data between the SAWS systems and CCSAS when CCSAS is implemented statewide. The implementation schedule for CCSAS requires that testing occur during Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, FY 2007-08, and FY 2008-09.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on workload estimates for the SAWS consortia testing activities.

## FUNDING:

Costs are eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Care Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is General Fund (GF) and county funds. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. SAWS-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The premise will be discontinued in FY 2009-10 due to scheduled completion of testing activities.

# Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) and California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $833 | $0 |
| Federal | 207 | 0 |
| State | 250 | 0 |
| County | 3 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 373 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $833 | $0 |
| CDSS | 833 | 0 |
| OSI | 0 | 0 |

# CalWORKs Business Analytics and Reporting System (CBARS)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the development of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Business Analytics and Reporting System (CBARS). The CBARS will be developed to improve the tracking of Welfare to Work recipients and case information. Currently, caseworkers record case information into the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) consortia system. This does not provide a statewide view of the data, which must be aggregated from the counties and consortia to obtain a statewide view of the CalWORKs program's performance.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The scheduled start date is September 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

**Major milestones:**

- Complete requirements by March 2010.
- Release Request for Proposal in July 2010.
- Award contract for System Integrator and Software in February 2011.
- Go live with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/CalWORKs data from first consortium in August 2011.
- Go live with data from last consortium in February 2012.

**Key Assumptions:**

- Appropriate resources from the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), the Office of Systems Integration (OSI), county welfare departments, and consortia system resources will be made available and allocated to this effort.
- Proactive risk management strategies will be employed to minimize risk and ensure timely completion of the project.
- OSI's standard project management methodology will be utilized to manage the project.
- Oversight will be managed by the Office of Systems Oversight pursuant to CDSS's standard procedures.
- All procurements and vendor contracts will be completed within the time periods specified in the Feasibility Study Report (FSR).
- Technical staff and end users will receive training to support the new system.
- CDSS program and OSI technical staff are involved throughout the project to enhance knowledge transfer from the integration vendor.
- CDSS will utilize existing CDSS and Department of Technology Services (DTS) infrastructure where appropriate.
- DTS facilities, equipment, and services will be used to host the application.

# CalWORKs Business Analytics and Reporting System (CBARS)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The proposed solution will meet state and CDSS security requirements.
- The Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) will no longer be in use by the consortium's 35 counties as they will have migrated to Consortium IV prior to the end of calendar year 2010.

## METHODOLOGY:

The costs are based on the October 2008 FSR.

## FUNDING:

Funding is 100 percent federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 is due to baseline adjustments.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in September 2009.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $1,211 |
| Federal | 0 | 1,211 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $1,211 |
| CDSS | 0 | 0 |
| OSI | 0 | 1,211 |

# Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) Project

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for the Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) project. Senate Bill 1780 (Chapter 206, Statutes of 1996) required applicants for, and recipients of California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Non-Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS), and California Food Assistance Program benefits to be fingerprint imaged as a condition of eligibility.

The following persons must provide fingerprint images and a photo image: (1) each parent and/or caretaker relative of an aided or applicant child when living in the home of the child; (2) each parent and/or caretaker relative receiving or applying for aid on the basis of an unaided excluded child; (3) each aided or applicant adult; and, (4) the aided or applicant pregnant woman in an assistance unit (AU) consisting of the woman only. Failure to provide the required images will result in ineligibility for the entire AU.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The first phase of counties began implementation on March 14, 2000. The statewide implementation of the SFIS was completed on December 7, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10830.
- The Health and Human Services Agency Office of Systems Integration cost estimates reflected in this premise are based on the negotiated contract with the SFIS development contractor. Cost estimates are based on the following:
    - Maintenance and Operations (M&O) vendor – The M&O vendor contract estimate is based on a structured monthly lease and maintenance cost for state and county-operated workstations and a “per transaction” cost. The “per transaction” cost includes: vendor project staff; help desk when the system is operational; fingerprint examiners; system operators; lease/maintenance costs for host computer(s) (i.e., central site); and software development and maintenance.
    - Change control – Change control is necessary since there are always items not addressed in the Request for Proposal, which require changes in the program(s). These can be legislative, interface, capacity or workload changes that affect the new system.

## METHODOLOGY:

The current cost estimates for FY 2008-09 are based on the negotiated contract with the current SFIS vendor and the September 1999 contract start date as reported in the June 2003 Post Implementation Evaluation Report. The estimates for 2009-10 are based on the negotiated contract with the successful bidder for the new contract for ongoing M&O services.

# Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) Project

## FUNDING:

The M&O automation project costs are funded with General Fund for the CalWORKs and Food Stamps programs and county share of General Assistance/General Relief costs. Project-related Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table. Federal Financial Participation (FFP) has been secured beginning in July 2009.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. The FY 2009-10 costs have increased due to the reprocured M&O contract and FFP.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs have increased due to the reprocured M&O contract and FFP.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $8,272 | $11,952 |
| Federal | 0 | 6,710 |
| State | 8,024 | 4,884 |
| County | 248 | 358 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $8,272 | $11,952 |
| CDSS | 4,093 | 4,093 |
| OSI | 4,179 | 7,859 |

# Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Maintenance and Operations (M&O)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) for the Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project. The EBT system is the automated delivery, redemption, and reconciliation of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP (formerly known as the Food Stamp program), and cash program benefits. EBT provides program recipients electronic access to food and cash benefits through the use of EBT cards at point-of-sale devices and automated teller machines. The EBT system replaced the paper-based food coupon and, as selected by 55 counties, cash benefit issuance methods for the distribution of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) program benefits.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10069.
- The Post Implementation Evaluation Report was approved by the Department of Finance on January 2, 2007.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are consistent with the November 2004 Implementation Advance Planning Document Update.

## FUNDING:

EBT funding comes from the SNAP and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs. Federal funds and General Fund are provided for the SNAP. The TANF program Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the “Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS” section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs have decreased due to implementation of a new EBT system. Costs have also been adjusted for baseline adjustments.

# Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Maintenance and Operations (M&O)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $40,551 | $27,034 |
| Federal | 24,845 | 16,481 |
| State | 10,312 | 7,195 |
| County | 5,394 | 3,358 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $40,551 | $27,034 |
| CDSS | 0 | 0 |
| OSI | 40,551 | 27,034 |

# Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Reprocurement

## DESCRIPTION:

The Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) system is the automated delivery, redemption, and reconciliation of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP (formerly known as the Food Stamp program), and cash program benefits. It provides program recipients electronic access to food and cash benefits through the use of EBT cards at point-of-sale devices and automated teller machines. The EBT system replaced the paper-based food coupons and, as selected by 55 counties, the cash benefit issuance methods for the distribution of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) program benefits.

The Office of Systems Integration is in the process of transitioning EBT services from its current Prime Contractor, J. P. Morgan Electronic Financial Services, Inc. (JPMorgan EFS), to the State's new EBT service provider, ACS State & Local Solutions, Inc. (ACS). At the conclusion of transition, expected in the fall of 2009, the EBT Project will enter into a new maintenance and operations (M&O) phase. Funding for this new M&O phase, under the ACS contract, will be redirected from the current EBT M&O Project under the JPMorgan EFS contract.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10069.
- Reprocurement activities will take at least three years to complete.

## METHODOLOGY:

The EBT Reprocurement Project's planning and implementation phase costs are detailed in the EBT Reprocurement November 2007 Implementation Advance Planning Document.

## FUNDING:

EBT funding comes from the SNAP and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs. Federal funds and General Fund are provided for the SNAP. The TANF program Block Grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

# Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Reprocurement

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs have increased due to a redirection of ongoing funding for EBT services currently provided by JPMorgan EFS (legacy system) to fund ongoing services provided by ACS upon the completion of transition. Costs also reflect baseline adjustments.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $7,043 | $20,662 |
| Federal | 4,357 | 12,699 |
| State | 2,686 | 6,259 |
| County | 0 | 1,704 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $7,043 | $20,662 |
| CDSS | 3,437 | 1,170 |
| OSI | 3,606 | 19,492 |

# Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs incurred by County Welfare Departments (CWDs) in the administration of each component of the Child Welfare Services (CWS) program as established through the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 16500. W&IC section 11461(e)(4)(B) provides additional funding to counties as incentives and assistance specifically for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children/Foster Care Specialized Care Program. These funds will be used to cover the purchase of nonrecurring items on an as needed basis, the purchase of services not available through other fund sources, and the development of a respite care program or purchase of respite care services.

In recognition of the funding and staffing needs identified by the workload study authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 2030 (Chapter 785, Statutes of 1998), the estimate reflects funding to allow counties to maintain the level of social workers funded in the prior year.

**Emergency Response (ER) Component**

ER services consist of a response system providing in-person response, when required, to reports of child abuse, neglect, or exploitation for the purpose of investigation and to determine the necessity for providing initial intake services and crisis intervention to maintain the child safely in his or her own home or to protect the safety of the child.

**Emergency Response Assessment (ERA) Component**

ERA is the initial intake service provided in response to reported allegations of child abuse, neglect or exploitation that is determined, based upon an evaluation of risk, to be inappropriate for an in-person investigation.

**Family Maintenance (FM) Component**

FM is designed to provide time-limited protective services to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation for the purpose of preventing separation of children from their families. CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and family aimed at sustaining the child in the home.

**Family Reunification (FR) Component**

FR is designed to provide time-limited services while the child is in temporary foster care to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation when the child cannot safely remain at home. CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and/or family aimed at reunifying the child with the family.

**Permanent Placement (PP) Component**

PP is designed to provide an alternative permanent family structure for children who because of abuse, neglect or exploitation cannot safely remain at home and who are unlikely to ever return home. The CWDs are responsible for determining the appropriate permanent goal for the child and facilitating the implementation of that goal. These goals are defined as guardianship, adoption or long-term placement.

# Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 16500 and 11461(e)(4)(B).
- The Title IV-E portion of this estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, excluding training.
- The workload standard was adopted by the California Department of Social Services in conjunction with the County Welfare Directors' Association in 1984. These standards are 15.8 for ER, 35.0 for FM, 27.0 for FR, 54.0 for PP and 320.0 for ER assessments.
- The statewide annual cost of a social worker (SW) ($129,074) was based on the estimated cost of providing services, to include total staff costs, support costs, and electronic data processing costs, provided in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 proposed county administrative budgets.
- All counties are reporting caseload data on the CWS/Case Management System (CMS). Caseload projections were developed for each individual county using data through October 2008.
- Additional funds are provided in recognition of the funding and staffing need identified by the workload study authorized by SB 2030. Costs are calculated in order to continue each county's SW full-time equivalent (FTE) level funded in the prior year.

## METHODOLOGY:

**FY 2008-09**

- The Current Year (CY) estimate is being held to the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation.

**FY 2009-10**

- The estimate is derived by applying the workload standards to the individual county caseload projections and expanding for a 7:1 supervisory ratio. Additional FTEs are included in order to continue each county's prior year FTE level.
- The annual cost of a SW in each county is applied to the total number of FTEs in each county to derive staff costs for each line.
- Direct costs are projected from FY 2007-08 actual expenditures and statewide average caseload growth from FY 2006-07 to FY 2007-08. Total direct costs, excluding county-operated emergency shelter care (ESC), are $94.9 million for the 56 counties. The projected county-operated ESC costs are $50.6 million for those counties with county-operated emergency shelters based on actual expenditures from FY 2007-08.

# Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- Once the total CWS basic costs are derived, costs for the Emergency Assistance (EA) program are subtracted and are displayed separately under the "EA Program" premise. The EA program costs are determined based on the FY 2008-09 funding level and any caseload growth.
- In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority, additional Titles IV-E and XIX funds are added to the estimate.
- An additional $2.8 million General Fund (GF) is shifted to this premise from the CWS/CMS System Support Staff to comply with federal Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) requirements and is matched with federal Title IV-E funds.

## FUNDING:

**FY 2009-10**

The federal share of costs is a combination of Titles IV-B, IV-E, XIX and XX funds. The Title IV-B funds are limited by the capped federal allocation.

The estimated Title IV-B funds available in local assistance are $32.9 million. These funds have a 75 percent federal match rate.

The Title IV-E amount reflects the actual expenditures from FY 2007-08 that 36.7 percent of the expenditures will be eligible for Title IV-E funding. In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority based on actual expenditures, additional Title IV-E funds are budgeted in the amount of $62.9 million.

The Title XIX amount for FY 2009-10 is calculated using individual county usage rates based on FY 2007-08 expenditure data which reflect that 6.6 percent of the expenditures will be eligible for Title XIX funding. These costs are reflected as a reimbursement. In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority based on actual expenditures, additional Title XIX funds are budgeted in the amount of $27.5 million.

Nonfederal costs are shared at 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the TANF block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2009-10, the Title XX-eligible amount is $34.6 million.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for the CY. For the Budget Year costs have been updated for actual expenditures and the Title XX-eligible costs have increased.

# Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Costs have been updated for actual expenditures and the Title XX-eligible costs have increased.

## CASELOAD:

(Average Monthly for non-Title IV-E counties)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Emergency Response | 28,320 | 28,336 |
| Emergency Response Assessment | 12,513 | 12,918 |
| Family Maintenance | 17,185 | 15,691 |
| Family Reunification | 16,731 | 14,574 |
| Permanent Placement | 31,022 | 28,591 |

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Total Basic** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $786,203 | $799,692 |
| Federal | 335,078 | 337,687 |
| State | 266,924 | 270,240 |
| County | 101,592 | 105,000 |
| Reimbursements | 82,609 | 86,765 |

# Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

**Reconciliation of Federal Funds:**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Title IV-B | $32,880 | $32,880 |
| Title IV-E | 276,604 | 269,610 |
| Title XIX | 82,609 | 86,765 |
| Title XX | 26,756 | 34,561 |
| Total Federal Funding | $418,849 | $419,660 |

**Specialized Care:**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,288 | $4,245 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,288 | 4,245 |
| County | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally blank for spacing***

# Federal Budget Bill – Loss of Federal Financial Participation (FFP)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to backfill the loss of federal Title IV-E funds for children placed in hospitals or mental health institutions for longer than 30 days. The Federal Reconciliation Bill (FRB), signed February 8, 2006 (but effective October 1, 2005), limits the claiming of Title IV-E administrative costs when a child is placed in an ineligible facility to the 30 days prior to the child being moved to a Title IV-E eligible facility or home. Prior to the FRB, there was no limit on administrative claiming if the county was providing pre-placement preventive services or preparing for the child to enter foster care.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The FRB effective date is October 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- FRB S. 1932, signed February 8, 2006.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- There are approximately 164 cases placed in non-foster care facilities over 30 days.
- The children placed in ineligible foster care facilities represent 0.12 percent of the total foster care caseload.

## METHODOLOGY:

The Title IV-E funded Child Welfare Services (CWS) Basic budgeted expenditures were multiplied by the percent of cases that are placed in ineligible facilities.

## FUNDING:

These costs are ineligible for Title IV-E and will be funded with the General Fund and county funds at the 70 percent state, 30 percent county shares.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Title IV-E funded CWS Basic budgeted expenditures have decreased.

# Federal Budget Bill – Loss of Federal Financial Participation (FFP)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Title IV-E funded CWS Basic budgeted expenditures have decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | -262 | -244 |
| State | 183 | 171 |
| County | 79 | 73 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Augmentation to Child Welfare Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide an augmentation to the Child Welfare Services (CWS) program. These funds shall be expressly targeted for services provided through the Emergency Response, Family Maintenance, Family Reunification (FR) and Permanent Placement (PP) components of CWS, and shall not be used to supplant existing CWS funds. Funds will be available to counties contingent upon individual counties: 1) matching their CWS Basic General Fund (GF) allocation; and, 2) fully utilizing the CWS/Case Management System. There is no county match required for these funds.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise, formerly known as "Emergency Workload Relief," was implemented on July 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Assembly Bill (AB) 1656 (Chapter 324, Statutes of 1998) and AB 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000).
- AB 1656 authorized $40.0 million in GF with no county match required.
- AB 1740 authorized an additional $34.3 million in GF with no county match required.
- The GF Appropriation has been reduced by $17,150,000 due to lower revenues and other demands on the available GF.
- The 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties' portion of the total augmentation is $36,726,107 GF.

## METHODOLOGY:

AB 1656 and AB 1740 designated the GF amount; however, due to lower revenues and other demands on the available GF, the GF Appropriation has been reduced by $17,150,000.

## FUNDING:

- After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF.
- After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2008-09, the Title XX-eligible amount is $4,892,237. For FY 2009-10, the Title XX-eligible amount is $5,048,303.

# Augmentation to Child Welfare Services

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2008-09 there is no change. For FY 2009-10 the federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The amount of Title XX-eligible costs has increased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

**Augmentation Funds:**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $57,836 | $56,940 |
| Federal | 26,002 | 25,262 |
| State | 31,834 | 31,678 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Welfare Services/Case Management System – System Support Staff

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for county administrative staff needed to support the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System which was implemented as a result of Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989). These staff are needed for the ongoing operations of the system.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

There was a staggered implementation based on individual county start dates beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- The base amount is $25,119,682, consistent with the FY 2005-06 Appropriation.
- Of the base amount, funds budgeted for this premise are based on actual expenditures. The remaining General Fund is budgeted as part of Child Welfare Services (CWS) Basic.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on actual expenditures.

## FUNDING:

Costs are shared according to California's federally approved Cost Allocation Plan, which allocates costs to all benefiting CWS programs based on statewide county worker time study hours.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2009-10, the federal discount rate has decreased and actual expenditures have increased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due to a decrease in actual expenditures.

# Child Welfare Services/Case Management System – System Support Staff

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $19,638 | $15,463 |
| Federal | 10,117 | 7,780 |
| State | 5,959 | 4,718 |
| County | 2,931 | 2,311 |
| Reimbursements | 631 | 654 |

# Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF & Case Management)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Emergency Assistance (EA) program funded through federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and General Fund (GF).

In 1993, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) implemented a statewide EA program under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act for county welfare departments that provides funding for emergency shelter care to children determined to be at risk due to abuse, neglect, abandonment, or exploitation.

In 1994, CDSS implemented crisis resolution and emergency response (ER) as the child welfare services components of emergency assistance. Crisis resolution provides services to families aimed at resolving family crises without removing the child from the home or by allowing the child to be returned to the family with the provision of supporting services to ensure child safety. Under EA/ER, funds are available for emergency response activities such as receiving and assessing referrals, investigating emergency allegations, and gathering and evaluating relevant information.

EA case management is defined as an array of activities directed to a specific child. These activities include, but are not limited to, developing a case or service plan for a child, working with foster or adoptive parents to prepare them to receive a child, and conducting case and administrative reviews, case conferences, and permanency planning meetings.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA program but permitted use of TANF dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with General Fund (GF). Based on an interpretation of the final TANF regulations, effective October 1, 1999, EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. Therefore, the GF was replaced with TANF funding. In 2001, EA case management activities were funded with Title IV-E funds in order to free-up TANF dollars. In 2008, clarifying instructions were given by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) that EA case management costs are not IV-E eligible, and therefore are shifted to GF.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Emergency Shelter Care - This component implemented on September 1, 1993.

Crisis Resolution - This component implemented on August 1, 1994.

Emergency Response - This component implemented on August 1, 1994.

Case Management - This component implemented on October 1, 1995.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 15204.25.
- There is no caseload growth projected for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10.
- The EA TANF estimate reflects costs for all 58 counties. The EA Case Management estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

# Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF & Case Management)

## METHODOLOGY:

The total costs are based on the prior year and increased by any individual county caseload growth. The appropriate sharing ratios are then applied to the total costs.

## FUNDING:

EA TANF funding, although eliminated by P.L. 104-193, was used in the TANF block grant calculation and is, therefore, part of the TANF funding schedule.

The sharing ratio for EA eligible shelter care cases under 30 days, emergency response, and crisis resolution is 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county. For shelter care EA eligible cases over 30 days, the ratio is 50 percent TANF and 50 percent county. These funds are reflected in the "Emergency Assistance TANF" line.

For the non-Title IV-E Wavier counties, EA case management activities are funded as if Title IV-E eligible, with 50 percent of the costs funded with Title IV-E after the federal foster care discount rate is applied. The nonfederal costs are shared 85 percent GF and 15 percent county. After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the TANF block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the non-matching GF portion of Family Reunification and Permanent Placement expenditures. For FY 2008-09 the Title XX-eligible amount is $0.8 million. For FY 2009-10, the Title XX-eligible amount is $1.1 million. The federal Title IV-E costs are then shifted to GF. These funds are reflected in the "Emergency Assistance Case Management" line.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10, the EA Case Management costs that were previously IV-E eligible are shifted to GF instead of TANF.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

For EA Case Management, Title XX-eligible expenditures have increased.

# Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF & Case Management)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **EA TANF** | | **EA Case Management** | |
| Total | $209,563 | $209,563 | $30,523 | $30,523 |
| Federal | 173,500 | 173,500 | 836 | 1,106 |
| State | 0 | 0 | 25,109 | 24,839 |
| County | 36,063 | 36,063 | 4,578 | 4,578 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide start-up funding for three years when a tribe seeks to implement its own child welfare services program. The Federal Social Security Act, Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) and the California Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 10553.1, 10553.2 and 10553.3 allow states to enter into agreements to pass through federal Title IV-E funds for foster care maintenance and administration to tribes. Tribal-State Agreements are essential to allow the pass-through of Title IV-E funds to the tribes to provide foster care services to tribal children.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Federal Social Security Act, ICWA, W&IC sections 10553.1 and 10553.2.
- The Karuk Tribe of California has signed an Agreement with the state for the provision of child welfare services. Assistance payments and administrative costs are budgeted beginning April 1, 2009. The Yurok Tribe of California is expected to sign an Agreement with the state for the provision of child welfare services in October 2009.
- Eligible costs will draw down federal Title IV-E funding.
- Based on information from the Karuk Tribe, the annual cost of a social worker is estimated at $81,146. Based on information from the Yurok Tribe, the annual cost of a social worker is estimated at $50,000.
- The average monthly statewide Foster Family Home (FFH) federal grant of $717.33, the Group Home (GH) federal grant of $5,146.24, and the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) federal grants of $775.07 for FY 2008-09 and $783.49 for FY 2009-10 are based on statewide actual expenditures through December 2008.
- Based on information from the Karuk Tribe, the average monthly FFH caseload is projected at two cases, the average monthly GH caseload is projected at one case, and the average monthly AAP caseload is projected at one case.
- Based on information from the Yurok Tribe, the average monthly FFH caseload is projected at 12.
- The administration of Foster Care (FC) eligibility will require one social worker annually for the Karuk Tribe, and two social workers for the Yurok Tribe.
- Based on cost and caseload information from the Karuk and Yurok Tribes, the administration of Child Welfare Services (CWS) will require $25,000 General Fund (GF) for FY 2008-09 and $33,000 GF for FY 2009-10.
- Based on cost and caseload information from the Karuk and Yurok Tribes, the administration of the Adoptions program will require $1,000 GF for FY 2008-09 and $47,000 GF for FY 2009-10.

# Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on cost and caseload information from the Karuk and Yurok Tribes. The basic assistance estimate is the product of case months and average grant.

## FUNDING:

The FC grant, AAP grant, FC Administration, CWS Administration, and Adoptions program costs are shared at the same ratios as in their respective programs.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year (CY) decrease in FC and CWS reflect a reduction to caseloads and a delay in implementation. The BY increases for FC, CWS, and Adoptions reflect the addition of caseloads associated with the Yurok Tribe.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The year-to-year change reflects nine months of costs for the Yurok Tribe and a full year of costs for the Karuk Tribe in BY.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – Foster Care Grants** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $20 | $156 |
| Federal | 10 | 78 |
| State | 4 | 31 |
| County | 6 | 47 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 101 – Adoption Assistance Program Grants** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2 | $10 |
| Federal | 1 | 5 |
| State | 1 | 4 |
| County | 0 | 1 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 141 – Foster Care Admin.** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $20 | $156 |
| Federal | 10 | 78 |
| State | 7 | 55 |
| County | 3 | 23 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 151 – CWS Admin.** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $75 | $281 |
| Federal | 36 | 126 |
| State | 35 | 118 |
| County | 4 | 37 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 151 – Adoptions** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2 | $125 |
| Federal | 1 | 53 |
| State | 1 | 72 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# ***Gomez v. Saenz***

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for county activities related to the *Gomez, et al. v. Saenz* court settlement. Specifically, costs are for counties to enact a notification and grievance process to provide due process to any persons desiring to challenge their listing on the Child Abuse Central Index (CACI), both prospectively and retroactively.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Senate Bill 84, (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

**FY 2008-09**

- There are approximately 800,000 names currently listed on CACI, of which approximately 544,320 are from the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. One percent of those currently listed on CACI will request a grievance hearing. Each grievance hearing requires 19.5 hours of social worker time at an overtime rate. These grievance hearings commenced in July 2008.
- There are 37,620 new referrals to CACI per year, of which approximately 25,597 are from the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Twenty percent of the new referrals to CACI will request a grievance hearing. Each grievance hearing requires 15.5 hours of social worker time. These grievance hearings commenced in May 2008.
- A customized notice to all new referrals to CACI requires an additional five minutes of social worker time to add information to the current notice.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.
- Social worker overtime costs for salaries only are $40.50 per hour.

**FY 2009-10**

- On April 06, 2009 the Administration for Children and Families declared that costs associated with this premise are not eligible for Title IV-E funding. In addition, costs reported for Calendar Year 2008 were much lower than projected in the FY 2008-09 estimate. Due to the lack of federal funds and lower costs than anticipated, for FY 2009-10 costs are projected based on actual expenditures for Calendar Year 2008.

## METHODOLOGY:

For FY 2008-09, the caseload is multiplied by the number of hours, multiplied by the hourly cost. For the FY 2009-10 estimate, costs are projected using a four-quarter trend of actual expenditures for Calendar Year 2008.

# ***Gomez v. Saenz***

## FUNDING:

Costs are not eligible for federal Title IV-E funding. Costs are shared 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10, costs are based on actual expenditures. Costs are also not IV-E eligible and are split between GF and county.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due to the lack of federal funding and the change in methodology.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $9,773 | $2,333 |
| Federal | 3,567 | 0 |
| State | 4,344 | 1,633 |
| County | 1,862 | 700 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# State Family Preservation

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the authorization for the permanent transfer of funds from an incentive/penalty provision program to a program with a sharing ratio of 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county. In accordance with Assembly Bill 2365 (Chapter 71, Statutes of 1992), the counties that have operated a family preservation program for at least three years can participate in the program. Historically, funding was provided through an annual allocation derived from a shift in funds from the GF (and federal share, to the extent permitted under federal law) of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care appropriation. Fifteen counties opted to participate in the program which included an incentive/penalty provision based on increases/decreases in foster care placements. However, the foster care caseloads began to stabilize which resulted in little savings. Therefore, counties were given the option to permanently transfer funding to a 70 percent GF and 30 percent county share limited to not exceed 70 percent of the highest annual amount spent for family preservation.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 1993-94.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16500.5 through 16500.7.
- The GF share of funds reflects up to 70 percent of the highest annual amount expended for family preservation services by 15 counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Napa, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Stanislaus).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 14 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Los Angeles County is not a Waiver county under this premise.
- The GF portion of Alameda's funding has been transferred to Item 153 beginning in FY 2008-09.

## METHODOLOGY:

For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties are held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level. The Title IV-E Waiver counties base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.

## FUNDING:

The federal Title IV-B, nonfederal, and federal Title XIX reimbursement funding levels are based on FY 2001-02 expenditure data.

# State Family Preservation

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 the change is due to the GF shift of the Alameda's funding to Item 153.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $34,645 | $34,645 |
| Federal | 3,540 | 3,540 |
| State | 21,493 | 21,493 |
| County | 8,916 | 8,916 |
| Reimbursements | 696 | 696 |

# Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) grant to provide community-based, family-centered services to focus on supporting and preserving families, protecting children, and preventing child abuse and neglect. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 established this capped grant program under Title IV-B.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1993.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16600 through 16604.5.
- The federal Title IV-B funds cannot be used to supplant existing state or local spending.
- Effective Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02, based on federal requirements, a minimum of 20 percent of PSSF funds must be spent on each of the four components of the program (Family Preservation Services, Family Support Services, Adoption Promotion and Support, and Time-Limited Family Reunification).
- A 25 percent match from state or county funds is required. This match is made available through existing State Family Preservation program funds.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) federal grant amount less state operations costs.

Beginning in FY 2007-08 California received an additional PSSF grant to be used only to support monthly caseworker visits.

## FUNDING:

This premise reflects federal Title IV-B grant funds to be used over a two-year period. The additional grant for caseworker visits reflects federal Title IV-B grant funds to be used over a two-year period.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2008-09, the increase in the PSSF Caseworker Visits Grant estimate reflects a technical adjustment. For FY 2009-10 the change to the PSSF Basic Grant is due to an updated grant letter for FFY 2009.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease for the PSSF Basic Grant is based on an updated grant letter for FFY 2009. The decrease for the PSSF Caseworker Visits Grant is based on an updated grant letter for FFY 2009.

# Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $33,050 | $32,695 |
| Federal | 33,050 | 32,695 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **PSSF** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Caseworker Visit** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $4,814 | $1,016 |
| Federal | 4,814 | 1,016 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Independent Living Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal grant for the Independent Living Program (ILP). The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 permanently authorized this program, which offers training to foster care adolescents and emancipated youth enabling them to be independent when their foster care terminates. County welfare departments provide or arrange for the provision of services that facilitate the transition of foster children to emancipated lifestyles.

Federal statute, H.R.3443, the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-169), amended Section 477 of the Social Security Act providing more flexibility in funding of ILP services. The CFCIP authorized the expansion of this program to serve foster care youth ages 16 to 21. In addition, counties were given the discretion to provide ILP services to youth ages 14 and 15 when it was determined that these youth would most likely remain in foster care until emancipation. Counties are authorized to use up to 30 percent of their grant to provide housing assistance for emancipated foster youth and aftercare services to former foster youth ages 18 to 21.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1988.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10609.3.
- Funding is based on the federal grant award for ILP.
- The final grant amount for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2008 is $20,510,930.
- The final grant amount for FFY 2009 is $20,375,619.

## METHODOLOGY:

Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08, funds will be based on the FFY federal grant amount less state operations costs.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with a federal grant award. The matching funds are provided through the “Extended ILP” premise.

# Independent Living Program

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. The decrease in FY 2009-10 reflects the reduction in the FFY 2009 grant.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease reflects the reduction in the FFY 2009 grant.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $19,491 | $19,356 |
| Federal | 19,491 | 19,356 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Extended Independent Living Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the General Fund (GF) portion of the Independent Living Program (ILP), which provides training for eligible foster care adolescents aged 16 to 21 years old, enabling them to be independent when their foster care terminates. Senate Bill (SB) 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998) implemented the GF portion to extend ILP services to 100 percent of the eligible foster care adolescent population, up to the age of 21 years. County Welfare Departments (CWD) provide or arrange for the provision of services that facilitate the transition of foster children to emancipated lifestyles.

In addition, counties are given the discretion to provide ILP services to youth ages 14 and 15, when it is determined that these youth would most likely remain in foster care until emancipated. Counties are authorized to use up to 30 percent of their allocation to provide housing assistance for emancipated foster youth and aftercare service to former foster youth ages 18 to 21.

Effective January 1, 2006, SB 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) requires the CWD in a county that provides transitional housing placement services to include in its annual ILP report a description of currently available transitional housing resources in relation to the number of emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth in the county, and a plan for meeting any unmet transitional housing needs of the emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in September 1998.

SB 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) implemented on January 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10609.3 and SB 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005).
- Effective January 2006, additional GF was allocated to support SB 436 activities.
  - At least one (1) hour per case to collect and to report available transitional housing resources and to develop a plan for meeting any unmet transitional housing needs of the emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth.
  - The social worker cost per hour is $72.60.
  - For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, the number of female emancipated youths was 2,549.
  - In Calendar Year 2004, the teen parent birth rate for 19 year olds is 74.8 per 1,000 women.
  - SB 436 is a new state mandate; there is no county cost.

## METHODOLOGY:

For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the funding is held to the Budget Act 2008 Appropriation.

# Extended Independent Living Program

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $15,166 | $15,166 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 15,166 | 15,166 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal grant for Chafee Post Secondary Education and Training Vouchers. This funding is provided under the Educational and Training Vouchers (ETV) program which is part of the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP).

The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 107-133, amended Section 477 of the Social Security Act to provide states with flexible funding to design and conduct education and training voucher programs for youth who age out of foster care. This can assist youth with the development of skills necessary to lead independent and productive lives. The purpose of this program is to make available vouchers of up to $5,000 per year per youth for education and training, including post secondary training and education, to eligible youth who have aged out of foster care.

Individuals eligible to receive vouchers under this program are: (1) youth otherwise eligible for services under the state CFCIP program; (2) youth adopted from foster care after attaining age 16; and (3) youth participating in the voucher program on their 21st birthday, until they turn 23 years old, as long as they are enrolled in a post secondary education or training program and are making satisfactory progress toward completion of that program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 107-133, Section 477 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
- Funding is based on the federal grant award for ETV.
- The final grant for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2008 that California received is $6,909,043.
- The final grant for FFY 2009 that California will receive is $6,851,645.
- A 20 percent match of the total cost is required. The match may be cash or in-kind contributions.
- Future funding will be appropriated on an annual basis pending congressional authorization.
- Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Section 5.1) added $5.7 million General Fund (GF) to assist students who are current and former foster youth, for career and technical training or traditional college courses.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects federal grant funds to be used for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 through September 30, 2009, and for FY 2009-10 through September 30, 2010. An additional $5.7 million GF is included to support AB 1808 activities.

# Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with a federal grant award. AB 1808 activities are funded with 100 percent GF. The matching funds are provided through the "Emancipated Youth Stipend" premise.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. The decrease for FY 2009-10 reflects the reduction in the FFY 2009 federal grant.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease reflects the reduction in the FFY 2009 federal grant.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $16,000 | $12,552 |
| Federal | 10,300 | 6,852 |
| State | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Transitional Housing for Foster Youth

## DESCRIPTION:

The Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP) and Transitional Housing Program Plus (THP-Plus) offers foster youth emancipating from the foster care system and youth who have already emancipated from foster care the experience of learning basic life skills while living on their own under general supervision. These programs provide a safety net of services to assure attainment of educational and employment goals. Assembly Bill (AB) 427 expanded the THPP age range for participation from 17 to 18 years of age to 16 to 18 years of age and for the new THP-Plus program to ages 18 to 21. It also enabled additional counties to participate in the THPP and THP-Plus by providing a new rate-setting methodology. Effective January 1, 2006, AB 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005) raises the age limit for receipt of THP-Plus services by an emancipated foster youth to 24 years of age.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

AB 427 implemented on January 1, 2002.

AB 1119 implemented on January 1, 2003.

AB 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005) implemented on January 1, 2006.

AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) implemented on July 12, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code 1559.110 and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11400, 11403.2, 11403.3, 16522 and 16522.1.
- The nonfederal sharing ratio is 40 percent state and 60 percent county.
- The THP-Plus rate is 70 percent of the county's group home average grant.

## METHODOLOGY:

Funding is based on counties' approved rates multiplied by the number of approved beds.

## FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate, for those cases meeting federal eligibility criteria. The federal Title IV-E funding is available for youth ages 16 to 18. Youth ages 18 to 24 are ineligible for federal funds.

Funding is shared 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county for THPP and 100 percent GF for THP-Plus.

# Transitional Housing for Foster Youth

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Total** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $54,713 | $54,713 |
| Federal | 5,188 | 5,188 |
| State | 44,337 | 44,337 |
| County | 5,188 | 5,188 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **THPP** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $13,835 | $13,835 |
| Federal | 5,188 | 5,188 |
| State | 3,459 | 3,459 |
| County | 5,188 | 5,188 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **THP-Plus** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $40,878 | $40,878 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 40,878 | 40,878 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide special needs stipends for emancipating foster youth. The program can assist emancipating foster youth with finding affordable housing, text books for college or vocational training, employment searches, emergency personal needs, and bus vouchers. County welfare departments are responsible for providing these services. A portion of this amount is being used as match for the Chafee Post Secondary Education and Training Vouchers.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2000.

## METHODOLOGY:

The Budget Act designates General Fund (GF) support levels.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Services | 2009-10 County Services |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $3,602 | $3,602 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 3,602 | 3,602 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund a contract with Cooperative Personnel Services/Merit System Services to help recruit and retain social workers in 30 small counties. Due to the continued difficulties of hiring and retaining social workers, Merit System Services will work with counties to implement and provide on-going recruitment efforts and career development plans to increase and retain the number of social workers in the smaller counties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2001.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The recruitment and career development plans were designed during Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding for this premise reflects the amount of the contract with Merit System Services.

## FUNDING:

This premise is eligible for federal Title IV-E funding. After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Nonfederally-eligible costs are funded with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the total remains the same, however the federal discount rate for FY 2009-10 was adjusted.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The total remains the same, however the federal discount rate for FY 2009-10 was adjusted.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $269 | $269 |
| Federal | 101 | 97 |
| State | 168 | 172 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Total Child Welfare Training Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for providing a statewide coordinated training program designed specifically to meet the needs of county child protective services social workers assigned to emergency response, family maintenance, family reunification, permanent placement, and adoptions responsibilities. The training program was established by Senate Bill (SB) 834 (Chapter 1310, Statutes of 1987), and extended permanently by SB 1125 (Chapter 1203, Statutes of 1991).

The Total Child Welfare Training Program includes training for other agencies under contract with County Welfare Departments to provide child welfare case management services. The program also includes crisis intervention, investigative techniques, rules of evidence, indicators of abuse and neglect, assessment criteria, intervention strategies, family-based services, legal requirements of child protection, case management, and the use of community resources.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1988.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16200 through 16215.
- The implementation of regional training academies started in 1996.
- Funding is based on contract amounts entered into by the California Department of Social Services.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimates for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 are based on contract costs.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied federally-eligible costs are shared at 75 percent federal and 25 percent state, with the exception of various contracts which use federal Title IV-E funds with an in-kind match. Nonfederally eligible costs are funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 the increase is based on updated actuals.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects an increase in training as a result of the Program Improvement Plan and the reduction of Promoting Safe and Stable Families training funds.

# Total Child Welfare Training Program

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $22,303 | $23,327 |
| Federal | 14,201 | 14,763 |
| State | 8,102 | 8,564 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the recruitment, special training, and respite care for specially recruited and trained foster family providers caring for children with medical problems related to drug or alcohol exposure or to Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS). Originally established as a demonstration project by Senate Bill (SB) 1173 (Chapter 1385, Statutes of 1989) and Assembly Bill (AB) 2268 (Chapter 1437, Statutes of 1989), the program was extended by SB 1050 (Chapter 296, Statutes of 1993) and made into a permanent program in 1997 by AB 67 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 1997). AB 2037 (Chapter 799, Statues of 2000) revised the age for children participating in this program from age three to age five for those counties that have participated in the program for at least three years.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1989.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16525.10 through 16525.30.
- This program is available to any county requesting participation pursuant to established procedures and to the extent funds are available. Currently, there are ten counties that are participating in this program (Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Glenn, Monterey, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, and Shasta).
- This estimate reflects costs for only nine non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

The foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 was applied to the training and recruitment components. The Title IV-E Waiver county's base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.

## FUNDING:

Respite care is funded 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county funds. The training and recruitment components are funded with 75 percent and 50 percent federal funds, respectively, after the foster care federal discount rate is applied. The nonfederal portion is funded 70 percent GF and 30 percent county funds.

# Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. The change for FY 2009-10 is due to the change in the discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care discount rate was updated.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $5,022 | $5,022 |
| Federal | 1,598 | 1,594 |
| State | 2,397 | 2,399 |
| County | 1,027 | 1,029 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the pass-through of federal Title IV-E funds for probation and other public agency administrative costs, foster parent training, and social work training as described below.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

| | |
|---|---|
| Probation Costs | June 1991 |
| Social Work Training | Fiscal Year (FY) 1992-93 |
| Other Public Agencies | FY 2003-04 |
| Social Worker/County Counsel Training | FY 2005-06 |
| Foster and Kinship Care Education Program* (Community College Chancellor's Office) | FY 2005-06 |

*Incorporates the Foster Parent Training Fund (FY 1990-91) and the Foster Parent Training (FY 1998-99)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the Probation Costs estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise includes the combined estimated expenditures for the following five Title IV-E pass-through costs:

- **Probation Costs** - The state received federal approval to pass through Title IV-E administration funds for county probation staff activities that are similar to the Title IV-E eligible tasks of county social services workers. This federal funding source will be passed through to the county probation departments for their federally-eligible activities related to probation supervised cases in foster care and the Title IV-E eligible training of probation staff that complete case management activities on behalf of these children.
- **Other Public Agencies** – The federal government allows Title IV-E reimbursement for administrative activities associated with pre-placement prevention. Under current California Department of Social Services (CDSS) regulations and specified conditions, counties may pass on Title IV-E funds to other county public agencies, such as Education or Mental Health, who perform eligible administrative activities for children at risk of, or currently placed in foster care. This pass-on provision does not apply to similar activities performed by private non-profit organizations.

# Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

- **Foster and Kinship Care Education Program (Community College Chancellor's Office)** – Effective in FY 2005-06, the Foster Parent Training Fund was incorporated into the Community College Proposition 98 fund. Title IV-E funds will be accessed by using the Community College Proposition 98 funds as match for the purpose of reimbursing the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office for providing education and training to foster parents and kinship care providers. This program is conducted through community colleges in consultation with CDSS and key state foster and caregiver associations. Statutes that relate to the type of education and training this program delivers include: Senate Bill 2003 (Chapter 1597, Statutes of 1984); Assembly Bill (AB) 3062 (Chapter 1016, Statutes of 1996); AB 2307 (Chapter 745, Statutes of 2000); and AB 458 (Chapter 331, Statutes of 2003).
- **Social Worker Training** – An agreement between CDSS, the University of California and the California State University (CSU) was implemented for a statewide training program to increase the number of social workers employed in California county welfare departments. This effort was initiated due to the shortage of professionals in public child welfare services, especially those holding a master's degree in social work.

  Currently, there are 19 schools of social work participating. CSU Fullerton is new for FY 2009-10. Funding is provided with Title IV-E federal funds, with an in kind match provided by the state universities.
- **Social Worker/County Counsel Training -** The training will be coordinated and overseen by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) through a contract with statewide and local training providers to provide short-term training to enhance social worker and county counsel's understanding of the judicial determination process and necessary court findings on behalf of children in foster care.

## FUNDING:

Costs represent 100 percent federal Title IV-E funds and no state share of costs.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change is due to the AOC contract increase.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to an increase in federal authority for a stipend contract with CSU Fullerton and an increase in the AOC contract.

# Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **COMBINED TOTAL:** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $187,708 | $189,187 |
| Federal | 187,708 | 189,187 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

**DETAILED TOTALS**:

| **Probation:** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $147,683 | $147,683 |
| Federal | 147,683 | 147,683 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Other Public Agencies:** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2,915 | $2,915 |
| Federal | 2,915 | 2,915 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Foster and Kinship Care Education Program** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $6,112 | $6,112 |
| Federal | 6,112 | 6,112 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Social Worker Training** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $30,612 | $31,590 |
| Federal | 30,612 | 31,590 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

**DETAILED TOTALS (CONTINUED):**

| **AOC Social Worker/County Counsel Training:** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $386 | $886 |
| Federal | 386 | 886 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Foster Parent Training and Recruitment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the enhanced statewide Foster Parent Training and Recruitment Program. As part of the Foster Care Initiative, Assembly Bill (AB) 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993), required the California Department of Social Services to develop and implement an expanded Foster Parent Training and Recruitment Program. The expanded program provides specialized training for foster parents of children with special care needs, and specific recruitment activities for minority and sibling placements.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1994.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.8.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, a portion of the General Fund (GF) costs for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties are held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level. The Title IV-E Waiver counties base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.

## FUNDING:

This program is eligible for Title IV-E federal funding. For FY 2008-09 the federal discount rate is 73 percent. For FY 2009-10 the discount rate is 71 percent. After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, costs are shared 75 percent federal and 25 percent nonfederal for the training costs, and 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal for the recruitment costs. The nonfederal shares are funded 100 percent General Fund. The funds are evenly distributed to each component of the program.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2009-10 the change is due to the adjustment for the foster care federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to $10,000 being shifted back from Item 153, partially offset by the adjustment for the foster care federal discount rate.

# Foster Parent Training and Recruitment

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2,416 | $2,419 |
| Federal | 1,127 | 1,092 |
| State | 1,289 | 1,327 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Minor Parent Services and Investigations

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for a program designed to discourage teen pregnancy and encourage appropriate parenting of teen parents and their children. As established by Assembly Bill 908 (Chapter 304, Statutes of 1995), the guidelines require pregnant and parenting teens to live with their parents or legal guardians as a condition for receiving welfare benefits unless specific conditions exist. Teen parents not living at home will live in an appropriate, supervised setting. Minor Parent Services (MPS) will be provided if deemed necessary.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The investigative part of this premise implemented on May 1, 1997.

The MPS part of this premise implemented on June 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 11254, 16504(b), and 16506.
- It is assumed that any situations of abuse or neglect under W&IC section 300 requiring a foster care living arrangement resulting from this investigation are already reflected in Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Foster Care caseload trends.
- It is assumed that a social worker will spend four hours investigating each case. The four hours include one and one-half hours each for two client contacts (teen parent and the teen parent's parent(s) or legal guardian), including interviews and documentation. An additional hour is allocated for travel and time to prepare a report of the social worker's findings.
- Based on historical family maintenance data, it is assumed that minor parents (mostly those at 17 years of age) will be allowed to form their own assistance units (AUs) and receive MPS. The estimated number of minor parents approved for their own AUs at age 17 is based on application survey data. An average of six months of services is estimated for each case.

## METHODOLOGY:

The total funding for both Fiscal Years (FYs) 2008-09 and 2009-10 is being held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level.

## FUNDING:

The costs of performing the investigations and providing MPS are eligible for 50 percent funding under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant. All nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

# Minor Parent Services and Investigations

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 there is no change in the combined total; however, based on actual expenditures, the investigations and minor parent services costs are updated.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change in the combined total; however, based on actual expenditures, the investigations and minor parent services costs are updated.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **COMBINED TOTAL:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $7,097 | $7,097 |
| Federal | 3,549 | 3,549 |
| State | 2,484 | 2,483 |
| County | 1,064 | 1,065 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Investigations:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $3,516 | $4,679 |
| Federal | 1,758 | 2,340 |
| State | 1,231 | 1,637 |
| County | 527 | 702 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Minor Parent Services:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $3,581 | $2,418 |
| Federal | 1,791 | 1,209 |
| State | 1,253 | 846 |
| County | 537 | 363 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Kinship Support Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the grants-in-aid program that provides start-up and expansion funds for local kinship support service programs. As designated by Assembly Bill (AB) 1193 (Chapter 794, Statutes of 1997), the Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP) is to be conducted by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) with the initial grants being awarded in July 1998 to eight counties. Currently, there are 11 counties participating in the program. These programs are to provide community-based family support services to kinship (relative) caregivers and the children who are placed in their homes by the juvenile court or who are at risk of dependency or delinquency.

Effective in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, the KSSP was augmented by $2.5 million and all counties were allowed to apply for the KSSP funds. The application process requires each interested county to submit a comprehensive proposal outlining how many relative caretakers reside in their county, what services will be provided to relative caretakers and the children in their care, how the county will develop the necessary community supports, how many relative caretakers and children will be served, and what the county outcome improvement goals are for the program. The proposals must also include a description of how each county will measure the success and cost-effectiveness of their program, and how the county will report these measures to CDSS.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16605.
- The participating counties for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 are: Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Monterey, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Stanislaus.
- Beginning FY 2009-10, it is anticipated that additional counties will participate in KSSP.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate reflects the amount contained in AB 1193 and the 2006 Budget Act.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Kinship Support Services

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $4,000 | $4,000 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide emergency funds to relative caregivers and foster parents. The program primarily offers one-time assistance for necessary housing needs, such as extra beds and clothing. Short-term support services, such as crisis counseling, are also provided to prevent children from entering or re-entering the child welfare system.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2000.
- The California Department of Social Services received policy clarification from the federal Department of Health and Human Services that administrative costs for beds, cribs, and smoke detectors that are needed in order to license or approve a foster family home are allowable under Title IV-E.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties are held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level. The Title IV-E Waiver counties base is now reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.

## FUNDING:

For FY 2008-09 the federal discount rate is 73 percent and for FY 2009-10 the federal discount rate is 71 percent. After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal. The nonfederal shares are funded 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2009-10 the change is due to the adjustment in the federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to the adjustment in the federal discount rate.

# Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,422 | $1,422 |
| Federal | 519 | 505 |
| State | 903 | 917 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Welfare Services/Case Management System Staff Development

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund staff development for the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) which was implemented as a result of Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989). The estimate includes costs for five training components plus costs to maintain three training tools in order to continue to provide a statewide CWS/CMS training curriculum and classes. This statewide training promotes user continuity and consistency to meet Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System requirements.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented on July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- The estimate includes training costs for all new users as a result of user growth and staff turnover.
- The cost per hour of training is $48.07 for each fiscal year.
- The estimate assumes an 11.5 percent staff turnover rate.
- There are 15,819 budgeted users for each fiscal year.
- The estimate includes costs for five training components:
  - **New User Training** – provides 44 hours of basic training for newly hired staff as a result of staff turnover;
  - **Intermediate/Advanced Training** – provides 16 hours of training to service providers on the more difficult tasks not covered in the new user training;
  - **Management/Supervisory Training** – provides 16 hours of training to management on the supervisory process of approvals and program management reports;
  - **System Support Training** – provides 24 hours of training to newly hired system support staff as a result of caseload growth and staff turnover in order to assist other users as needed; and,
  - **Database Training** – provides 24 hours of training to staff responsible for extracting and interpreting caseload data.
- Costs are also included for statewide contracted training needs.

# Child Welfare Services/Case Management System Staff Development

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are calculated for each training component by multiplying the number of users being trained by the number of hours of training at the hourly cost for training. Costs are then added for the statewide contracted training needs.

**Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10:** (1,819 New Users x 44 hours x $48.07) + (1,559 Intermediate/Advanced Users x 16 hours x $48.07) + (195 Management/Supervisory Users x 16 hours x $48.07) + (55 System Support Users x 24 hours x $48.07) + (29 Database Users x 24 hours x $48.07). For the statewide contract costs, $3,000,000 is added in each FY in order to meet the total contract commitment.

## FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, costs are shared according to California's federally approved Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) which allocates costs to all benefiting CWS programs based on statewide county worker time study hours.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Budget Year costs are shared based on an updated CAP, and the federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $8,294 | $8,294 |
| Federal | 4,685 | 4,451 |
| State | 2,631 | 2,753 |
| County | 711 | 739 |
| Reimbursements | 267 | 351 |

# Child Welfare Services/ Case Management System (CWS/CMS) Maintenance and Operation (M&O) Project

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs related to the ongoing and administrative support of the CWS/CMS. As mandated by Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989), CWS/CMS provides a comprehensive database, case management tool, and reporting system for the CWS program. It contains both current and historical information for all children statewide in emergency response, family maintenance, family reunification, and permanent placement. CWS/CMS also includes information regarding adoptions to produce the semiannual adoption and foster care analysis reporting system reports.

CWS/CMS provides: (1) immediate statewide data on referrals for children at risk of abuse, neglect or exploitation; (2) immediate case status and case tracking for children and families receiving child welfare services; (3) necessary information and forms required to determine eligibility for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children - Foster Care program; (4) tracking for all placement activities for children in foster care; and (5) issuance of the appropriate notice of action messages, court reports, and service plans. The system also produces all required state and federal reports. State level project management for CWS/CMS is provided by the Office of Systems Integration (OSI). OSI administers the projects under an interagency agreement with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 1995-96.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- Costs represent ongoing M&O costs associated with support and oversight of CWS/CMS.
- Costs include the wide-area network maintained by Department of Technology Services (DTS), OSI administrative support, and vendor costs related to operation, support, and maintenance of the application and technical architecture.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the FY 2009-10 M&O Plan.

## FUNDING:

The cost allocation included in this document is based on the CDSS Operational Cost Allocation Plan approved by the Division of Cost Allocation/Department of Health and Human Services.

# Child Welfare Services/ Case Management System (CWS/CMS) Maintenance and Operation (M&O) Project

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. The FY 2009-10 costs have increased based on moving costs for DTS from the Cannery, and an increase for a DTS relocation surcharge.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The net increase in FY 2009-10 reflects cost increases for additional staffing and associated operating equipment and expenses, increased data center services, and DTS move costs, offset by a reduction in prime vendor services. Costs have also been adjusted for baseline adjustments.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $87,859 | $91,232 |
| Federal | 45,138 | 46,874 |
| State | 39,896 | 41,425 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 2,825 | 2,933 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $87,859 | $91,232 |
| CDSS | 38,499 | 41,192 |
| OSI | 49,360 | 50,040 |

# Child Welfare Services/ Case Management System (CWS/CMS) CWS/Web Project

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs related to the implementation of the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) CWS/Web Project. The CWS/Web project will be developed using a web services-based technical architecture and include the redevelopment of current functionality and development of the four unfulfilled Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems requirements on the new architecture. Where appropriate, improvements will be made during the redevelopment of the current functionality to address business and user needs. The CWS/Web project will include improvements that take advantage of the capabilities of the new architecture, while not changing the way the state and counties conduct business. The current CWS/CMS will be maintained during the development and decommissioned upon statewide implementation of the CWS/Web project.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise became effective Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- Costs represent CWS/Web costs associated with support and oversight of the CWS/CMS.
- Costs include staffing, operating expenses and equipment, consultant services, Department of General Services fees, and administrative overhead in support of the CWS/Web project development.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the December 2007 Special Project Report and associated policy adjustments.

## FUNDING:

The cost allocation included in this document is based on the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Operational Cost Allocation Plan approved by the Division of Cost Allocation/Department of Health and Human Services.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

# Child Welfare Services/ Case Management System (CWS/CMS) CWS/Web Project

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 costs have risen due to increases in staff, operating expenses and equipment, contract services and county travel. These increases are partially offset by reductions to hardware and software. Costs have also been adjusted for baseline adjustments.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $5,605 | $7,391 |
| Federal | 2,892 | 3,813 |
| State | 2,533 | 3,340 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 180 | 238 |

## CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $5,605 | $7,391 |
| CDSS | 1,254 | 820 |
| OSI | 4,351 | 6,571 |

# Child Health and Safety Fund

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the distribution of funding to counties from the Child Health and Safety Fund (CHSF) for child abuse prevention in the community. Assembly Bill 3087 (Chapter 1316, Statutes of 1992) established the CHSF for specified purposes. Monies for this activity are generated through the Department of Motor Vehicles' (DMV) "Have a Heart, Be a Star, Help our Kids" license plate program pursuant to Vehicle Code Section 5072.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 18285.
- Of the license plate monies, up to 25 percent may be used for child abuse prevention, and of that 25 percent, 90 percent (i.e., 22.5 percent of the total plate revenue) is to be provided to counties (county children's trust funds) for support of child abuse prevention services in the community [W&IC section 18285(e)(1)].
- The total actual CHSF license plate revenue for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 was $3,746,000 and for FY 2007-08 the revenue was $4,008,000.

## METHODOLOGY:

- Using FY 2006-07 actual revenue multiplied by 1.50 as the estimate for FY 2008-09 plates' revenue (and appropriating a portion of the fund balance which accrued in the early years of the fund), 22.5 percent will be transferred to the counties for child abuse prevention activities ($3,746,000 x 1.50 x 22.5 percent = $1,264,278) for FY 2008-09.
- Using FY 2007-08 actual revenue multiplied by 1.40 as the estimate for FY 2009-10 plates' revenue (and appropriating a portion of the fund balance which accrued in the early years of the fund), 22.5 percent will be transferred to the counties for child abuse prevention activities ($ 4,008,000 x 1.40 x 22.5 percent = $1,262,520) for FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

All funds are provided by the CHSF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change is based on updated actual revenues.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is based on updated actual revenues.

# Child Health and Safety Fund

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,264 | $1,263 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,264 | 1,263 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for providing expanded therapeutic day services as an alternative to placement in foster care and as a means of reunifying children in foster care placement with their families. These services are provided to families with children and youth returning from out-of-home placement or at-risk of such placements that cannot access services through current mental health services or other funding mechanisms. Services target a broader number of children than the current child welfare services population, such as children and youth at-risk of placement and those exiting foster care. Funds provide supportive and therapeutic services to prevent placement in out-of-home care and/or provide aftercare services to facilitate a successful transition to home or community from out-of-home care placements.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in August 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16500, 16508.2, and 16508.3.
- The Department of Mental Health's annual cost for mental health services per child is assumed to be $5,869 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and $6,130 in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 is being held to the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level. Initially, the cost for this program was calculated by multiplying the estimated number of children to be served by the cost per case for mental health services.

## FUNDING:

This premise is shared 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $14,220 | $14,220 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 9,954 | 9,954 |
| County | 4,266 | 4,266 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Group Home Monthly Visits

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing monthly visits to all foster care children placed in group homes (GHs), both in-state and out-of-state. This premise was authorized by Senate Bill 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16516.5.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The in-state GH caseload is projected to be 6,829 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 6,306 for FY 2009-10 based on data as reported on the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System. The out-of-state GH caseload is estimated at 134 for FY 2008-09 and 127 for FY 2009-10.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60 for each fiscal year.
- For the out-of-state placements, it is assumed that an average of two cases can be visited per trip.
- All GH placements will receive ten additional visits per year.
- In-state visits will take an average of two hours per visit and out-of-state visits will take an average of 12 hours to visit two cases.
- Based on caseload data for in-state GH placements, 3508 cases are placed out-of-county for FY 2008-09, and 3,217 cases for FY 2009-10. For each FY, these cases have been budgeted to include an additional two hours of travel time.
- For both fiscal years, out-of-state per diem costs are estimated at $124 and out-of-state travel costs are estimated at $500.

## METHODOLOGY:

- For each fiscal year, the in-state costs for ten visits are calculated using the in-state GH caseload for two hours per visit multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.
- 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 (two cases per visit) for 12 hours per visit multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.
- Per diem and travel costs are added for each out-of-state visit.

# Group Home Monthly Visits

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The caseload has declined and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is a decrease in the in-state caseload and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $11,424 | $10,570 |
| Federal | 4,170 | 3,752 |
| State | 7,254 | 6,818 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for county social workers to instruct caregivers on how to file a Caregiver Information Form with the court at each status review hearing as a result of Senate Bill (SB) 1667 (Chapter 389, Statutes of 2006). This bill requires a social worker to provide the child's caregiver a copy of the Caregiver Information Form in the caregiver's primary language when available and information regarding filing the form with the court.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise was implemented on January 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: SB 1667 (Chapter 389, Statutes of 2006).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Status review hearings are held every six months.
- The foster family home, small family home, relative home, and guardian home caseload is estimated at 29,038 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 26,161 for FY 2009-10.
- Ten percent of the caseload will submit the Caregiver Information Form, requiring 15 minutes of social worker instruction time.
- The average hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by 0.25 of the hourly cost of a social worker which is then multiplied by two hearings per year.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The change is due to the decrease in foster family home, small family home, relative home and guardian home caseloads. The federal discount rate has also decreased.

# Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is a decrease in caseload and federal discount rate.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $106 | $95 |
| Federal | 39 | 34 |
| State | 67 | 61 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to conduct background checks on parents wishing to reunify with their child as a result of Assembly Bill (AB) 1774 (Chapter 726, Statutes of 2006). AB 1774 expands the purposes for which criminal offender record information can be obtained to include assessing a parent's suitability to reunify with their child, provided that the parent's consent to fingerprint submission has been obtained. Courts would be allowed to consider the criminal history of a parent at review and permanency hearings.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise implemented on January 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1774 (Chapter 726, Statutes of 2006).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Family Reunification (FR) cases can be subject to up to three review and permanency hearings before termination of parental rights is considered, however, it is assumed that criminal records checks will only be performed once.
- The FR average monthly caseload is projected at 16,732 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 14,473 for FY 2009-10.
- The cost for a Department of Justice background check is $32 along with a Live Scan fingerprinting fee of $16 per check.
- The Federal Bureau of Investigations background check is $24.

## METHODOLOGY:

The FR caseload for each FY is multiplied by $72.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 there is a decrease in caseload and the federal discount rate.

# Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is a decrease in caseload and the federal discount rate.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,205 | $1,042 |
| Federal | 440 | 370 |
| State | 765 | 672 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Background Checks

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting background checks prior to placing children in the home of a relative, or the home of any other person who is not a licensed foster parent. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1695 (Chapter 653, Statutes of 2001), all unlicensed foster parents must meet the same standards set forth in regulations for the licensing of foster family homes. Therefore, all unlicensed foster parents will be subject to a background check to be conducted through the Child Abuse Central Index, the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented on January 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 361.4.
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is 24,233, based on new placement data for Calendar Year (CY) 2007. The caseload for FY 2009-10 is 21,825, based on new placement data for CY 2008.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require background checks.
- The cost for the Child Abuse Central Index check is estimated at $15 per check.
- The cost for a Department of Justice background check is $32 and there is a Live Scan fingerprint fee of $16 per check.
- The Federal Bureau of Investigations background check is $24.

## METHODOLOGY:

The costs are calculated by dividing the caseload by number of placements per home, multiplied by two persons in the home requiring background checks, multiplied by the cost for background checks.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

# Background Checks

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Budget Year net change is due to higher caseload than what was projected for the November 2008 Subvention, and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate and caseload have decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $2,703 | $2,434 |
| Federal | 1,013 | 876 |
| State | 1,690 | 1,558 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Relative Home Approvals

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting an in-home approval prior to placing children in the home of a relative or the home of a non-relative extended family member (Initial Approvals). This premise also reflects the cost of conducting an annual visit for continued approval of a relative home (Annual Approvals). Assembly Bill (AB) 1695 (Chapter 653, Statutes of 2001) requires the county welfare department to conduct an in-home inspection to assess the safety of the home and the ability of the relative to care for the child's needs. The bill stipulates that the standards used to evaluate and grant or deny approval of the home of the relative shall be the same standards set forth in regulations for the licensing of foster family homes. However, all homes will require an annual reassessment as opposed to targeted visits for continued licensure of foster family homes.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2002.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 309(d).
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is 24,233, based on placement data for Calendar Year 2007. The new caseload for FY 2009-10 is 21,825, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2008.
- The existing caseload for FY 2008-09 is 30,576 based on placement data for December 2007. The existing caseload for FY 2009-10 is 26,098 based on placement data for January 2009.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children are placed per home.
- Based on information from CWDA, it is assumed to take an average of nine hours to complete the additional activities associated with conducting an initial approval equivalent to the licensure of a foster family home.
- An additional 30 minutes is required to check the Licensing Administrative Action Records System (LAARS) as part of the background check process.
- It is assumed to take an average of three hours to conduct an annual visit for re-approval of the home.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60 for each FY.

## METHODOLOGY:

Costs for the initial assessments are calculated by dividing the new caseload by the number of children per home, multiplied by the number of hours for approval, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. Costs for annual re-approvals are then calculated for the existing caseload.

# Relative Home Approvals

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the caseloads and the foster care federal discount rate have decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The caseloads and the foster care federal discount rate have decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **Initial Approvals:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | **Annual Approvals:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. | | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $10,758 | $9,648 | Total | $4,269 | $3,684 |
| Federal | 4,034 | 3,473 | Federal | 1,601 | 1,326 |
| State | 4,707 | 4,322 | State | 1,868 | 1,651 |
| County | 2,017 | 1,853 | County | 800 | 707 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 | Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **COMBINED TOTAL:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $15,027 | $13,322 |
| Federal | 5,635 | 4,799 |
| State | 6,575 | 5,973 |
| County | 2,817 | 2,560 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Multiple Relative Home Approvals

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting additional approvals when more than one relative or non-related extended family member is seeking to have related foster children placed with them. These additional approvals of all willing relatives or non-related extended family members are necessary in order to fairly establish viable placement options and to better enable the State to meet the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement that approval of relative homes be in compliance with foster family home licensing/approval standards.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on December 1, 2002.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 309(d).
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is 24,233, based on placement data for Calendar Year 2007. The new caseload for FY 2009-10 is 21,825, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2008.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children are placed per home.
- It is assumed that 30 percent of the placements have more than one party interested in receiving the placement.
- It is assumed that there are two to three (2.5 average) interested parties per placement. Therefore, since the “Relative Home Approvals” premise already provides for one assessment, there is an average of 1.5 additional homes that require approvals.
- Based on information from CWDA, it is assumed to take an average of 15 hours to assess each home for approval.
- An additional 30 minutes is required to check the Licensing Administrative Action Records System (LAARS) as part of the background check process.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60 for both fiscal years.

## METHODOLOGY:

The number of approvals to be conducted is calculated by dividing the caseload by the average placements per home, then multiplying by the percentage of placements with multiple interest, multiplied by the additional homes requiring approval. Annual costs are calculated by multiplying the number of approvals by the number of hours per approval multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

# Multiple Relative Home Approvals

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2009-10, the caseload has increased and the federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Caseload has decreased and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $7,886 | $7,102 |
| Federal | 2,957 | 2,557 |
| State | 3,451 | 3,182 |
| County | 1,478 | 1,363 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Grievance Review for Relatives

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with providing a review process upon request for relatives seeking to have related foster children placed with them but who have been determined not to meet approval standards established by law and regulation. Making a grievance review available to relatives disapproved prior to placement is necessary to afford due process through an objective review of the basis for the disapproval and to better enable the state to meet the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement that approval of relative homes be in compliance with foster family home licensing/approval standards.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 309(d).
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is 24,233, based on placement data for Calendar Year 2007. The new caseload for FY 2009-10 is 21,825, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2008.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that 30 percent of the placements have more than one party interested in receiving the placement.
- It is assumed that there are two to three (2.5 average) interested parties per placement.
- It is assumed that 45 percent of homes will be disapproved.
- It is assumed that 20 percent of those whose homes are disapproved will request a review.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of eight hours to review each case.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60 for both fiscal years.

## METHODOLOGY:

The number of reviews to be conducted is calculated by dividing the caseload by the average placements per home, then multiplying by the percentage of placements with multiple interest, multiplied by the average interested parties per placement, then multiplying by the percent of homes that are disapproved and the percent of those requesting a review. Annual costs are calculated by multiplying the number of reviews by the number of hours per review multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

# Grievance Review for Relatives

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10, the caseload has increased and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The caseload has decreased and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $609 | $548 |
| Federal | 228 | 197 |
| State | 267 | 246 |
| County | 114 | 105 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Live Scan Technology

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to maintain Live Scan machines in the 58 county child welfare services agencies for the Foster Care program. Before a child can be placed in a foster home or an unlicensed relative or guardian home, caregivers must clear a criminal record check. Live Scan technology provides the capability to do instantaneous criminal record checks from fingerprints. Providing and maintaining Live Scan machines to the child welfare agencies allows for immediate onsite fingerprint processing.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Assembly Bill 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000).
- The 58 counties were provided funds to purchase 100 Live Scan machines in Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01.
- Costs are negotiated and contracted with a Live Scan vendor by each of the counties.
- Contract costs for on-going maintenance were based on an existing Live Scan contract for Community Care Licensing activities.

## METHODOLOGY:

Contract costs are budgeted to provide on-going maintenance.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09, and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

In the Budget Year, the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate has decreased from 75 percent to 72 percent.

# Live Scan Technology

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,200 | $1,200 |
| Federal | 450 | 432 |
| State | 750 | 768 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Health Services for Children in Foster Care

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund positions for public health care nurses (PHNs) in the county welfare departments. These nurses provide enhanced health services to children entering foster care. As authorized by Assembly Bill 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999), this program improves the physical, mental, dental, and developmental well being of children in the child welfare system. The PHNs funded through this program work closely with the child's caseworker or probation officer to coordinate health care services and serve as a liaison with health care professionals and other providers of health related services.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.3.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, the number of new cases added to foster care is being held at the FY 2007-08 level of 43,721 cases. FY 2009-10, the number of new cases added to foster care is 35,984 based on actual data from the previous 12 months.
- The foster care caseload per PHN is based on a 1:200 ratio.
- The cost for a PHN for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 is being held to the FY 2004-05 level of $104,039.
- The program receives 75 percent federal funds and 25 percent General Fund (GF). The GF is reflected in the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) budget and, through an interagency agreement, provided to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS).

## METHODOLOGY:

**FY 2008-09**

The FY 2008-09 estimate is being held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level.

**FY 2009-10**

The projected new foster care caseload is divided by the number of annual cases per PHN, then multiplied by the unit cost of a PHN to determine the total cost of the program (35,984 ÷ 200 x $104,039). The total funds are multiplied by 25 percent to calculate the amount reflected in the CDSS budget and the remaining 75 percent of the funds are reflected in the DHCS budget.

# Health Services for Children in Foster Care

## FUNDING:

This program is eligible for enhanced federal Title XIX funding of 75 percent with a match of 25 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2008-09 there is no change. For FY 2009-10 the change is due to lower caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due to a lower caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $5,686 | $4,680 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 5,686 | 4,680 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Health Oversight and Coordination

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise would ensure California's compliance with the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L.110-351), which requires states to specify in their Title IV-B plans how they determine and meet the health, mental health, developmental and dental care needs of children in foster care. This premise would increase funding and the number of nurses for the Health Care Program for Children in Foster Care (HCPCFC) to a level at which medical case management services can be provided by counties for all children in foster care.

Public health nurses supported by the HCPCFC provide case management services for children in foster care with the goal of supporting their physical, mental, dental and developmental well-being. Placed in county child welfare and juvenile probation offices, HCPCFC public health nurses participate in medical care planning and coordination, collect and review health information, determine the need for referrals and follow-up care, arrange for health, mental health and dental assessments, expedite referrals for specialty care, advocate for the health needs of the child, and ensure provider linkages. In close parallel to these functions, P. L. 110-351 states that California's Title IV-B plan must address how children's health needs will be monitored and treated, how medical information on each child will be updated and appropriately shared, coordinated strategies to identify and respond to the health, mental health and dental health needs of children, and steps to ensure continuity of health care services. The existing HCPCFC only provides services to new foster care entrants.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on January 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L.110-351).
- The projected foster care caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 is 65,383. The number of new cases added to foster care for FY 2009-10 is 35,984. These caseloads are based on actual data from the previous 12 months.
- This premise includes funding for the existing foster care caseload. The new entrants to foster care are funded through the HCPCFC premise.
- The foster care caseload per PHN is based on a 1:200 ratio.
- The updated cost for a PHN for FY 2009-10 is $130,620.
- This program receives 75 percent federal funding with 25 percent General Fund (GF). The GF is reflected in the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) budget and, through an interagency agreement, provided to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS).

# Health Oversight and Coordination

## METHODOLOGY:

The projected foster care caseload is divided by the number of annual cases per PHN, then multiplied by the updated unit cost of a PHN to determine the total cost of the program (65,383 ÷ 200 x $130,620). The projected new foster care caseload is divided by the number of annual cases per PHN, then multiplied by the FY 2004-05 level unit cost of a PHN to determine the cost of the existing program (35,984 ÷ 200 x $104,039). The cost of serving the entire population less the current population being served represents the incremental cost of this premise. The total funds are multiplied by 25 percent to calculate the amount reflected in the CDSS budget and the remaining 75 percent of the funds are reflected in the DHCS budget. For FY 2009-10, six months of costs are budgeted. The costs associated with serving the new foster care entrants are accounted for in the Health Services for Children in Foster Care premise.

## FUNDING:

This program is eligible for enhanced federal Title XIX funding of 75 percent with a match of 25 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise. The Budget Year reflects 6 months of costs.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $2,998 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 2,998 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# County Self-Assessment and System Improvement Planning (SIP) Development

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide funding to counties to support the additional administrative responsibility related to the planning and coordination of the periodic county Child Welfare Services (CWS) performance self-assessments and annual SIPs as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2002). Self-assessments and SIPs are critical and mandated components of the new CWS outcomes and accountability systems that require full and continuous participation by the public, service recipients, providers, courts, and agencies participating in CWS and are necessary to ensure a comprehensive, efficient, and non-duplicative approach to CWS assessment, design and operations.

Additional staff resources are necessary for the new function of identifying, selecting, updating membership, providing information, and coordinating the activities of the wide range of participants that include: advocates, the general public, law enforcement, courts, health and mental health agencies, local education, foster parents, foster youth, service recipient parents, and tribal organizations.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented January 1, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2007.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Seventy-eight staff at the social worker level are budgeted to perform these duties for each Fiscal Year (FY).
- The statewide average cost of a social worker is $129,074 for each FY.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is calculated by multiplying the number of social workers by the statewide average cost of a social worker.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

# County Self-Assessment and System Improvement Planning (SIP) Development

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $10,080 | $10,098 |
| Federal | 3,679 | 3,585 |
| State | 4,481 | 4,559 |
| County | 1,920 | 1,954 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Federal Child & Family Services Review

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for activities related to the preparation and completion of the federal Child and Family Services Review. The funds will be used to hire a contractor to complete research and prepare the Statewide Self Assessment. In addition, funding is needed to support preparation and completion of the onsite review in three counties and development of a Program Improvement Plan (PIP). Implementation of the PIP will begin in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Contractor costs for the Statewide Self Assessment are $200,000.
- Costs for the three county reviews are estimated at $50,000 each.
- Contractor costs for assistance with PIP implementation are $300,000.

## METHODOLOGY:

Only contractor costs for assistance with PIP implementation are incurred in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

# Federal Child & Family Services Review

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $300 | $300 |
| Federal | 112 | 108 |
| State | 188 | 192 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Program Improvement Plan Penalty

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of the federal penalty, plus interest, imposed on the State for failure to meet one of the outcome measures identified in the Child and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plan. California has appealed this penalty and is awaiting a decision. In the meantime, however, payment will be issued to stop the accrual of interest.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The amount of the federal penalty is $8,973,041.
- Interest payments in the amount of $100,000 per month are added for the months of January 2008 through June 2009.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate equals the sum of the federal penalty and interest payments.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Due to a delay in a federal response on the penalty appeal, an additional $700,000 has been added to reflect interest payments for the months of December 2008 through June 2009.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The penalty and interest will be paid in the Current Year.

# Program Improvement Plan Penalty

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $10,773 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 10,773 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Data Requirements for New Activities

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost related to the additional data requirements associated with the many new mandated activities counties must accomplish to implement the Program Improvement Plan (PIP) and the California Child & Family Services Review process authorized by Assembly Bill 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2002). Counties must review and update data already contained in the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System to ensure the new required data elements are entered into the case files. Counties must also spend additional time entering these additional data requirements in all new cases as they are created. This effort is needed to be able to measure program improvement progress as required by the PIP to avoid federal penalties.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2008.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 estimates are for new cases only.
- The new caseload is 31,600 for FY 2008-09 based on actual data for calendar year 2007 and 30,157 for FY 2009-10 based on actual data for calendar year 2008.
- It is assumed to take an average of 15 minutes per case to enter data for all new cases.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60 for each FY.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is calculated by multiplying the caseload by the number of hours per case and then by the hourly cost of a social worker.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

# Data Requirements for New Activities

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Budget Year net increase is due to an increase in caseload and decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects a decreased caseload and decreased foster care federal discount rate.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $574 | $547 |
| Federal | 210 | 194 |
| State | 255 | 247 |
| County | 109 | 106 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Peer Quality Case Reviews

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with backfilling staff time, travel and per diem costs for social workers and probation officers participating in Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCR) as required by Assembly Bill 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001). The purpose of the PQCR is to learn, through intensive examination of county child welfare practice, how to improve child welfare services and practices in California, both in the participating county and in other jurisdictions as well. Without relying on the PQCR as a vehicle for validating the quantitative data contained within each county's County Data Report and Self Assessment, the PQCR should provide another layer of information. Specifically, the PQCR is another mechanism for understanding the key to the child welfare system and social worker practice. While the quantitative data provides integral, population-based information, the PQCR provides a rich and deep understanding of actual practice in the field. In addition, the PQCR goes beyond the County Self-Assessment by incorporating outside expertise, including county peers, to help identify the strengths and weaknesses of county child welfare services delivery systems, and social worker and probation officer practices.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented July 1, 2004.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10601.2.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- There will be 20 counties completing County Welfare Department (CWD) and County Probation Department (CPD) reviews in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 22 counties completing CWD and CPD reviews in FY 2009-10.
- Each CWD review will take approximately five days to complete and will involve an average of 16 staff; eight staff from the county being reviewed and eight staff from other counties. Each CPD review will take approximately three days to complete and will involve an average of 16 staff; eight staff from the county being reviewed and eight staff from other counties.
- Based on information from the County Welfare Directors Association, it will require a total of 712 hours of social worker time for each CWD review, which also includes time for preparation, coordination and training for the reviews and completion and review of reports. Each CPD review will take approximately three-fifths the time of a CWD review, or 427 hours of probation worker time.
- The hourly cost of a worker is $72.60.
- Eight social workers from other counties will participate in each county review and will require travel and per diem costs of $124.00 per day.
- $20,000 of state support is included in the premise.

# Peer Quality Case Reviews

## METHODOLOGY:

The total number of worker hours per review is multiplied by the number of reviews and then by the worker cost per hour. Costs are then added for travel and per diem for eight visiting workers for each of the reviews at $124.00 per day.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 73 percent for FY 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The number of county reviews has increased and the federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,853 | $2,035 |
| Federal | 677 | 730 |
| State | 831 | 921 |
| County | 345 | 384 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Fatality and Near Fatality Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCRs)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with compiling and publishing reports on all child deaths and near deaths that are caused by suspected child abuse or neglect as required by the federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). A team will be established to review cases on a monthly basis and compile data for a final report. In addition, the on-site review of high profile cases will be contracted out.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: CAPTA
- Eight county staff will meet monthly in Sacramento for two days.
- The average hourly cost for a social worker is $72.60.
- Airfare is estimated at $100 and per diem costs are estimated at $124 per day.
- On-site contracting costs are $100,000.

## METHODOLOGY:

The number of staff is multiplied by the annual number of hours and then multiplied by the average cost per hour. Costs are added for travel and per diem and for on-site contracting.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

# Child Fatality and Near Fatality Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCRs)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $245 | $245 |
| Federal | 92 | 88 |
| State | 107 | 110 |
| County | 46 | 47 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Statewide Standardized Training

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the additional costs associated with the need for counties to fill behind county social workers and supervisors who must attend additional days of training, as required under the statewide standardized common core curriculum for all current and new child welfare workers and their supervisors, and probation workers. The additional training days resulted from California's negotiation of the federal Children and Family Services Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plan (PIP) which was aimed at improving outcomes for children in foster care. The PIP required that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) develop regulations to mandate the standardized training curricula that will result in four additional days of training. The standardized curricula and additional days of training were also added to the Training Plan section of the Title IV-B State Plan. The standardized curricula was developed in collaboration with the Statewide Training and Education Committee, which includes representation from all of the Regional Training Academies (RTA) and the Inter-University Consortium (IUC), the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), county staff, the tribal community, and other important stakeholders.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16200 through 16215.
- The additional days of training were required as part of the PIP and Title IV-B Training Plan.
- Funding is based on the number of county Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) who will be attending the additional days of training. For FY 2008-09 there are 827 new social workers, 118 new social work supervisors, 7,186 existing social workers, 1,027 existing social work supervisors, and 175 existing probation workers. For FY 2009-10 there are 826 new social workers, 118 new social work supervisors, 7,185 existing social workers, 1,026 existing social work supervisors, and 175 existing probation workers.
- New social workers will attend four additional days of initial training and new social work supervisors will attend one additional day of initial training.
- Existing social workers and supervisors will attend 20 hours of continued training annually.
- Existing probation workers will attend three additional days of continued training.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on the total number of FTEs in each county who will be attending the additional days of training multiplied by the number of hours of training. The total hours are then multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

# Statewide Standardized Training

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared at 75 percent federal, 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The foster care federal discount rate has decreased in the Budget Year.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The number of workers to be trained has decreased and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $14,219 | $14,215 |
| Federal | 7,998 | 7,676 |
| State | 4,355 | 4,577 |
| County | 1,866 | 1,962 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CWS Program Improvement Fund

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects donated grants, gifts, or bequests made to the State from private sources to be deposited into the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement Fund as established by Assembly Bill 2496 (Chapter 168, Statutes of 2004). These funds are intended to enhance the State's ability to provide a comprehensive system of supports that promote positive outcomes for children and families.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Donated funds will be eligible for federal Title IV-E enhanced training matching funds.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The expected donations total $4,000,000 in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally-eligible costs are shared 75 percent enhanced federal Title IV-E training funds and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund, payable from the CWS Program Improvement Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Budget Year change is due to the decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $9,143 | $8,696 |
| Federal | 5,143 | 4,696 |
| State | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for activities related to Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA), and Permanency and Youth Services (PYS) that were previously identified as separate premises. Beginning at the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Hotline, the new DR intake system provides a more customized response to families through case planning and development, and provides enhanced services to support the specific needs of children and families. The Standardized Safety Assessment System establishes the standards, tools, and practice applications to improve California's safety outcomes. PYS is aimed at increasing permanence and stability for children in the CWS system as well as supporting foster youth as they transition to adulthood.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This premise provides funding for continued implementation in ten counties (Contra Costa, Glenn, Humboldt, Placer, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Stanislaus, Tehama, and Trinity) that received funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 through other existing fund sources.
- Additional funding is provided for state level contracts for training and technical assistance in support of the DR, SA, and PYS activities.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10.
- It is assumed that a portion of activities for DR are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and are funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).

## METHODOLOGY:

The GF amount for the ten counties is $6,336,000. An additional $342,000 GF is provided for State contracts.

## FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal for the non-enhanced expenditures and 75 percent enhanced federal Title IV-E training funds and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF.

# CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS)

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased for FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $11,070 | $10,798 |
| Federal | 4,270 | 3,998 |
| State | 6,800 | 6,800 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# CWS Outcome Improvement Project

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for county child welfare and probation agencies to enhance/modify their existing service delivery systems to improve outcomes for children and families consistent with the strategies contained in the county System Improvement Plans (SIPs) approved by each county's Board of Supervisors. These plans are required under the California Child and Family Services Review, pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001). Improvements in the area of safety are a priority. In addition, the eleven Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement pilot counties can access these funds to support ongoing development of their Standardized Safety Assessment System, Differential Response, and Youth Permanency programs. The California Department of Social Services anticipates that there will be both one-time and ongoing costs for improvements that could include specialized training, equipment, consultant services, enhanced staffing, and expanded service capacity. In addition, AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) provided a $98.6 million augmentation for all counties to be spent flexibly on local priorities identified in the county SIPs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented July 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The General Fund (GF) for county welfare department Child Welfare Services Outcome Improvement Project (CWSOIP) activities is $10,618.
- The GF for county probation department CWSOIP activities is $1,203,000.
- AB 1808 provides an augmentation of $39,367,000 GF.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 73 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10.
- For county welfare department CWSOIP activities, 55 percent of the activities are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding.
- For county probation department CWSOIP activities, 100 percent of the activities are eligible for federal Title IV-E funding.

## METHODOLOGY:

The CWSOIP funding is added with the CWSOIP Augmentation funding.

# CWS Outcome Improvement Project

## FUNDING:

For the CWSOIP, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal, after applying the foster care federal discount rate. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF. The CWSOIP Augmentation funding was determined by AB 1808.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The foster care federal discount rate decreased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **CWSOIP:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $14,577 | $14,460 |
| Federal | 2,756 | 2,639 |
| State | 11,821 | 11,821 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **CWSOIP Augmentation:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $61,995 | $61,034 |
| Federal | 22,628 | 21,667 |
| State | 39,367 | 39,367 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **COMBINED TOTAL:** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $76,572 | $75,494 |
| Federal | 25,384 | 24,306 |
| State | 51,188 | 51,188 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of FC Act of 2006

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Adoptions social workers meeting the new 60-day home study time frame requirement of the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of the Foster Care Act of 2006 (H.R. 5403). Within the 60 days, county social workers must complete a study of a home environment in order to assess the safety and suitability of placing a child in a foster or adoptive home and to develop a report of their findings. The bill also grants authority for incentive payments of $1,500 for each home study completed within 30 days.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: H.R. 5403
- The CWS caseload for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties from out-of-state is estimated at 441 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 434 for FY 2009-10.
- The Adoptions caseload from out-of state is estimated at 196 for FY 2008-09 and 235 for FY 2009-10.
- Each CWS home study will take an average of 15.5 hours and each Adoptions home study will take an average of 24 hours.
- The average hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.
- California will not qualify for the incentive payments.

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the hours and then multiplied by the hourly cost.

## FUNDING:

For CWS, after the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county. For Adoptions, costs are shared 43.14 percent federal and 56.86 percent nonfederal for FY 2008-09 and 42.11 percent federal and 57.89 percent nonfederal for FY 2009-10.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change is due to adjusted caseloads.

# Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of FC Act of 2006

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The CWS caseload has decreased and the Adoptions caseload has increased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **CWS** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $497 | $489 |
| Federal | 181 | 174 |
| State | 221 | 220 |
| County | 95 | 95 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Adoptions** | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $343 | $410 |
| Federal | 147 | 173 |
| State | 196 | 237 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Public Law (PL) 109-248, known as the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 which requires that states check child abuse and neglect registries in each state in which prospective foster or adoptive parents, relative caregivers or nonrelative extended family members (NREFM) (as well as other adults in the home) have resided in the preceding five years prior to approval for placement of a child. This premise also reflects the costs associated with responding to other states' requests for underlying information about child abuse and neglect reports in California. Senate Bill (SB) 703 (Chapter 583, Statutes of 2007) brings California into conformity with this Act.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: PL 109-248 and SB 703.
- Ten percent of those seeking home approval have resided in another state within the past five years and will require a child abuse and neglect registry check.
- Ten percent of those who have resided in another state within the past five years will have a history of child abuse and neglect.
- Both social workers, adoption workers, and licensing workers will spend one hour per registry check. When information from other states indicates a history of child abuse and neglect, an additional seven hours will be required to investigate and review the facts of the case.

**Child Welfare Services (CWS)**

- The annual relative and NREFM caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 is 24,233, based on new placement data for FY 2007-08. The annual relative and NREFM caseload for FY 2009-10 is 21,825, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2008.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children are placed per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require a child abuse and neglect registry check in another state.
- The fee charged by other states to check their registries is $15 per check.
- The number of outgoing registry checks that indicate a history of child abuse and neglect is assumed to be the same as the number of incoming requests for underlying case information.
- Social workers will spend four hours responding to incoming requests for underlying case information.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

# Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

### Adoptions

- The number of approved families for FY 2008-09 is 7,446 and for FY 2009-10 is 7,598 based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2008.
- It is assumed that an average of two children are adopted per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require a child abuse and neglect registry check in another state.
- The fee charged by other states to check their registries is $15 per check.
- The number of outgoing registry checks that indicate a history of child abuse and neglect is assumed to be the same as the number of incoming requests for underlying case information.
- Social workers will spend four hours responding to incoming requests for underlying case information.
- The hourly cost of an adoption worker is $72.31.

### Community Care Licensing (CCL)

- The Foster Family Home (FFH) caseload for FY 2008-09 is 1,753, based on new licensing activity for FY 2006-07. The FFH caseload for FY 2009-10 is 1,679, based on new licensing activity for FY 2007-08.
- It is assumed that an average of 2.5 persons in the home will require a child abuse and neglect registry check in another state.
- The hourly cost of a licensing worker is $70.68.

## METHODOLOGY:

### CWS

The caseload is multiplied by the percentage of those living in another state, multiplied by the number of hours required to complete a registry check, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those with a history of child abuse and neglect, multiplied by the additional hours of investigative activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the cost per check. The number of incoming requests for underlying case information is multiplied by the number of hours to respond to the request, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

# Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

**Adoptions**

The caseload is multiplied by the percentage of those living in another state, multiplied by the number of hours required to complete a registry check, multiplied by the hourly cost of an adoption worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those with a history of child abuse and neglect, multiplied by the additional hours of investigative activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of an adoption worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the cost per check. The number of incoming requests for underlying case information is multiplied by the number of hours to respond to the request, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

**CCL**

The caseload is multiplied by the percentage of those living in another state, multiplied by the number of hours required to complete a registry check, multiplied by the hourly cost of a licensing worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those with a history of child abuse and neglect, multiplied by the additional hours of investigative activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of a licensing worker.

## FUNDING:

For CWS, after the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

For Adoptions, the sharing ratio for FY 2008-09 is 42.80 percent federal and 57.20 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2006-07. The sharing ratio for FY 2009-10 is 42.11 percent federal and 57.89 percent nonfederal based on FY 2007-08 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic Program.

For CCL, based on actual expenditure data from Calendar Year 2008, the sharing ratio is 39.12 percent federal Title IV-E and 60.88 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 there is no change for CCL. For CWS and Adoptions the change reflects a caseload increase.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects decreased caseload for CWS and CCL and an increase in Adoptions

# Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| CWS | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $493 | $444 |
| Federal | 185 | 158 |
| State | 217 | 202 |
| County | 91 | 84 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| Adoptions | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $114 | $116 |
| Federal | 48 | 49 |
| State | 66 | 67 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

(in 000's)

| CCL | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $52 | $51 |
| Federal | 21 | 20 |
| State | 31 | 31 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Relationships
# (AB 408 Amended by AB 1412)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for social workers to perform additional activities on every initial and six month case plan and court report on children 10 years of age and older who are placed in group homes for more than six months to establish a special relationship with an important person in the child's life as stipulated by Assembly Bill (AB) 408 (Chapter 813, Statutes of 2003). Social workers will conduct investigations to identify these individuals, evaluate and assess relationships between foster children and other important people in their lives, excluding siblings, and take necessary actions to maintain these relationships. These identified persons will be included in the child's Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP).

Effective January 1, 2006, the provisions of AB 408 were amended as stipulated by AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005) to include all children who are developmentally appropriate and who are in out-of-home placements. In addition, the social workers will insure that developmentally appropriate children are involved in the development of their case plan, help plan for permanent placement, and that children 12 years of age or older review their case plan, sign it, and receive a copy.

The implementation and operation of the amendments are to be budgeted by phases.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2004 and was amended on January 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: AB 408 (Chapter 813, Statutes of 2003) and AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005).

AB 408

- There are approximately 600 new out-of-home placements 10 years of age and older in group homes six months or more with a Family Reunification service component.
- There are approximately 6,300 foster children 16 and older in group homes to complete a TILP.
- One out of every four relationships initially assessed will not be deemed in the child's best interest. In such cases, another relationship will be assessed, which will require four additional hours of social worker time.
- The social worker cost per hour is $72.60.
- Background checks will be performed on each initial and additional assessment case at a cost of $87.00 per case.

AB 1412

- Implementation of AB 1412 was delayed until July 1, 2006.
- There are approximately 38,800 children 10 years of age and older in out-of-home placement for six months or longer.

# Child Relationships
# (AB 408 Amended by AB 1412)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- There are approximately 1,100 new children 10 years of age and older and who have been in out-of-home placement for six months or longer.
- There are approximately 11,000 children 8 to 11 years old who are developmentally appropriate to participate in their case plan development.
- There are approximately 23,000 children 12 years and older who will review and sign their case plan.
- There are approximately 6,700 foster children 16 and older in out-of-home placement to complete a TILP.
- One out of every four relationships initially assessed will not be deemed in the child's best interest. In such cases, another relationship will be assessed, which will require four additional hours of social worker time.
- For Phase I (Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07), a social worker will spend at least four hours per case for the initial assessment of new cases for children 10 years and older placed with a non-relative for six months or longer and one-half hour for one-half of the new cases for a six month case plan/court report.
- For Phase II (FY 2007-08), a social worker will spend at least 15 minutes for Phase I children for the six months court report and at least four hours per case for the children 10 years and older placed in PP relative care for six months or longer and one-half hour for the PP cases for the six month case plan/court report.
- For Phase III (FY 2008-09), a social worker will spend at least 15 minutes for Phase I and Phase II children for the six months court report, at least four hours per case for the children 10 years and older placed in out-of-home placement for more than six months and one-half hour for the out-of-home placement cases for the six month case plan/court report.
- For FY 2009-10, ongoing costs for a social worker to spend at least four hours per case for the children 10 years and older placed in out-of-home placement for more than six months and one-half hour for the out-of-home placement cases for the six month case plan/court report.
- The social worker cost per hour is $72.60.
- Background checks will be performed on each initial and additional assessment case at a cost of $87.00 per case.

## METHODOLOGY:

For FY 2008-09 the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties are held at the Budget Act of 2008 Appropriation level. The Title IV-E Waiver counties base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.

The estimate is calculated by multiplying the amount of time by the frequency of activity per year by social worker rate and by the number of cases. In addition, the background check cost is added to the total.

# Child Relationships
# (AB 408 Amended by AB 1412)

## FUNDING:

For FY 2008-09 the foster care federal discount rate is 73 percent, and for FY 2009-10 the federal discount rate is 71 percent. After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, costs are shared 50 percent federal and the nonfederal portion is funded 70 percent with General Fund and 30 percent county funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

For FY 2009-10 the change is due to the change in the federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due to transitioning from Phase III to ongoing costs.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| Total | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $6,310 | $6,112 |
| Federal | 2,303 | 2,170 |
| State | 2,805 | 2,760 |
| County | 1,202 | 1,182 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| AB 408 | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,833 | $1,738 |
| Federal | 669 | 617 |
| State | 815 | 785 |
| County | 349 | 336 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Relationships
# (AB 408 Amended by AB 1412)

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| AB 1412 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $4,477 | $4,375 |
| Federal | 1,634 | 1,597 |
| State | 1,990 | 1,945 |
| County | 853 | 833 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Personalized Transition Plan (P.L. 110-351)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise represents costs associated with the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act [Public Law (P.L.). 110-351, HR 6893] that was signed into law on October 7, 2008. Section 202 of this federal bill mandates states to provide the foster child one final Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP) 90 days before emancipating from foster care.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on January 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- It is assumed that there are approximately 7,761 youth age 16 and older.
- It takes a social worker one hour to complete the TILP with the foster child.
- The hourly social worker cost is $72.60.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

The cost is derived by multiplying the one hour it will take the social worker to complete the TILP by the social worker hourly cost.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund (GF), the nonfed costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The change is due to updated caseload information.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

# Personalized Transition Plan (P.L. 110-351)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $282 |
| Federal | 0 | 100 |
| State | 0 | 127 |
| County | 0 | 55 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

## DESCRIPTION:

Assembly Bill 340 (Chapter 464, Statutes of 2007) requires the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), in consultation with stakeholders and interested parties, to implement a three-year pilot program in up to five counties, to establish a single comprehensive resource family pilot approval process for foster care and adoption. This single process would replace the existing separate processes for licensing foster family homes, approving relatives and non-related extended family members, and approving adoptive families.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16519 and 16519.5.
- For this estimate, all three approval functions (adoption, relative, licensing) are performed by the five selected counties. The caseloads for this premise will be identified once the counties for the pilot have been selected.
- The number of hours to perform approvals is increased up to the level of an adoption approval.
- Duplicative processes for approvals and background checks are eliminated, thus creating savings.
- Placements are more stable, eliminating secondary placements for Foster Family Home (FFH) cases, thus creating savings.
- State administrative hearing reviews for licensing cases will be replaced by less-costly county grievance reviews.
- Costs include additional one-time social worker training and county start-up costs of $361,000. On-going training for new staff as a result of turnover is estimated at $4,000 annually.
- FFH cases will require annual reassessments.

<u>Child Welfare Services (CWS)</u>

- The annual cost of a social worker is $129,074. The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.
- The number of hours to perform relative/NREFM home approvals is 15 hours.
- Sixty percent of cases placed in FFHs experience at least one placement change within the first 12 months of placement. Social workers typically spend 18 hours on activities associated with finding an alternate placement for these cases.
- Approximately 20 percent of FFH cases that are denied will appeal. These appeals will require eight hours of social worker review.

# Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

Adoptions

- The hourly cost of an adoption worker is $72.60.
- The number of hours to perform an adoptive home approval is 24 hours.
- The cost to conduct background checks is $87 per check.
- There are two persons per home that require a background check.

Community Care Licensing (CCL)

- The hourly cost of a licensing worker is $70.68.
- The number of hours to perform a FFH home approval is 15.47 hours.

## METHODOLOGY:

CWS

The approval costs for CWS cases are calculated by taking the difference between the number of hours required for a relative/NREFM approval and an adoptive home approval, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker (number of cases X 9 hours X $72.60). Costs to perform the FFH approvals are calculated by multiplying the FFH caseload by the number of hours for each approval, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker (number of cases X 24 hours X $72.60). Savings for the elimination of secondary placements are calculated by multiplying 60 percent of the FFH placements by the number of hours of social worker activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker (number of cases X 60 percent X 18 hours X $72.60). Grievance review costs for the FFH cases are calculated by taking 20 percent of the denied cases, multiplied by the number of hours per review, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker (number of cases X 20 percent X 8 hours X $72.60). Training and start-up costs are then added in the amount of $361,000.

Adoptions

Savings are calculated for the elimination of approval and background check processes [(number of cases X 24 hours X $72.60 per hour) + ( number of cases X 2 per home X $87 per background check)].

CCL

Savings are calculated for the elimination of approval processes (number of cases X 15.47 hours X $70.68).

# Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

## Funding:

CWS

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

Adoptions

Savings are shared based on actual sharing ratios for the five selected counties.

CCL

The federal/state sharing ratio will be determined by actual expenditure data.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The implementation date has been delayed from April 1, 2009 to July 1, 2010.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| CWS | | |
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Adoptions | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| CCL | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# AB 1512 Health Benefit Determination

## DESCRIPTION:

Assembly Bill 1512 (Chapter 467, Statutes of 2007) requires the county child welfare agency or probation department responsible for the child's placement to determine, in consultation with the foster parent, whether a foster child who is currently enrolled in a county organized health system (COHS) and placed in an out-of-county placement should remain in the COHS. This bill requires that the determination be made one working day after the out-of-county placement begins. If the decision is to disenroll the child from the COHS, the placing county would also be required to request the disenrollment within two working days after the out-of-county placement begins. This bill requires that if the foster child is to be disenrolled from a COHS because of an out-of-county placement, the placing county would request the disenrollment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on January 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 14093.09.
- There are currently eight counties that have adopted the COHS. They are: Monterey, Napa, Orange, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Yolo.
- There are seven counties interested in adopting the COHS model. They are: Lake, Marin, Mendocino, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, and Ventura.
- The hourly social worker cost is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

The cost is derived by multiplying the two hours it will take the social worker to make the determination by the social worker hourly cost.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 72 percent is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09. The FY 2009-10 change is due to a decrease in the federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Implementation began January 1, 2009. The Budget Year costs represent a full year of costs.

# AB 1512 Health Benefit Determination

## Expenditures:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $171 | $325 |
| Federal | 64 | 117 |
| State | 107 | 208 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# AB 2985 – Foster Youth Identity Theft

## DESCRIPTION:

Assembly Bill 2985 (Chapter 387, Statutes of 2006) requires a County Welfare Department (CWD) to request a credit check from a credit reporting agency for every foster child upon his/her 16th birthday. When a credit report contains negative information or evidence of identity theft, the CWD must refer the child to an approved credit counseling organization from a list developed by the California Department of Social Services, in consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association and other stakeholders.

This premise reflects costs associated with requesting and evaluating a credit check and referring a child to an approved credit counseling organization.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10618.6.
- A credit check from a credit reporting agency is $15.00.
- The hourly cost for one social worker hour is $72.60. The standard time to process each credit check is one hour. To process each referral to a credit counseling organization is one additional hour.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 approximately, 11,000 foster children are 16 years of age or older. One percent will not receive a free credit check. Ten percent will be referred to a credit counseling organization.
- All foster children 16 and older received their credit report in FY 2008-09.
- In FY 2009-10 approximately, 3,500 foster children will be turning 16, and approximately 1,700 foster children 16 years of age or older will enter foster care.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost of obtaining credit reports is derived by multiplying the number of children not eligible to receive a free credit report by $15.00.

The estimated social worker cost is derived by multiplying the number of credit reports requested and evaluated, and the number of referrals, by the social worker hourly cost.

The Title IV-E Waiver counties base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 71 percent is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund.

# AB 2985 – Foster Youth Identity Theft

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change in FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change reflects a decrease in caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects a caseload decrease. All foster children 16 and older received their credit report in FY 2008-09. The FY 2009-10 costs are associated with providing children their credit report who will be turning 16 and new children entering foster care 16 or over.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,153 | $355 |
| Federal | 421 | 126 |
| State | 732 | 229 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the new federal law (Public Law 109-288, known as the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006) which requires states to increase the percentage of foster children that are visited monthly to 90 percent by the year 2011 in order to continue receiving full Title IV-B funding. In addition, a majority of those visits must occur in the child's home. States are required to submit a plan for approval by the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) that indicates their goals for improvement each Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). If states do not meet their goals each and every year they will be penalized accordingly. Currently, Probation Officers (PO) do not have access to the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). In order to capture information about the PO visits, the PO will need access to CWS/CMS.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Public Law 109-288.
- It is assumed that it will take a social worker 15 minutes to input the Foster Family Agency and Out-of-State placement monthly visit information in the CWS/CMS.
- It is assumed that it will take a social worker two hours monthly to visit the foster child and record the information into CWS/CMS.
- It is assumed that it will take a social worker four hours monthly to visit the out-of-county foster child and record the information in CWS/CMS.
- There are approximately 27,000 visits where information will need to be put into CWS/CMS.
- There are approximately 69,000 visits that need to be conducted to bring California into compliance with visiting foster children monthly.
- There are approximately 4,300 out-of-county visits that need to be conducted to bring California into compliance with visiting foster children monthly.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.
- There are approximately 175 Probation Officers who need access to CWS/CMS.
- The one time start up cost for the Citriz Secure ID Token for Probation Officers to access CWS/CMS is $70.00.
- The monthly fee for the token is $27.00.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

# Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of hours, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. For the Probation Officers the number of Probation Officers is multiplied by the one-time start up cost. The number of Probation Officers is then multiplied by the monthly fee for the token, multiplied by twelve to get the yearly costs.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 71 percent for FY 2009-10 is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county. Some Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) funding is available for this new mandate (see the "PSSF premise for additional information).

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The number of missed visits has decreased and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $10,820 |
| Federal | 0 | 3,841 |
| State | 0 | 4,885 |
| County | 0 | 2,094 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with submitting demographic and outcome data on foster youth who receive Independent Living Program (ILP) services and those who age-out of foster care. All states are required to submit this data pursuant to the final regulations from the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) regarding implementation of the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD). ACF has given states two and one half years to develop methodology and capacity for collecting data on all ILP services and foster youth cohorts. ACF has given states until October 1, 2010, to fully implement the regulation requirements and begin collecting required data.

The principle data collection method for the NYTD is a survey of current and former foster youth at ages 17, 19, and 21 years old. The surveys will be conducted through a contract with a university. Counties are required to inform 17 year olds in foster care of the purpose and scope of the survey, maintain periodic contact with former foster youth to meet federal response requirements, and secure consent forms from youth for participation in the follow-up survey.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 1356.
- Social workers will spend one hour informing the youth about the survey.
- There are approximately 3,812 youth aged 17 who will be participating in the survey.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of hours, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. The amount budgeted for the university contract is $600,000.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E, and the nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The change is due to updated caseload information.

# Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $877 |
| Federal | 0 | 311 |
| State | 0 | 512 |
| County | 0 | 54 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Registered Sex Offender Check

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs to minimize the risk of predictable and preventable harm to vulnerable children in out-of-home care by detecting the presence/residence of a Registered Sex Offender (RSO) in prospective and approved licensed facilities and prospective and approved relative/Nonrelative Extended Family Member (NREFM) homes.

On an annual basis the California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) will compare transmitted Department of Justice (DOJ) sex offender files against the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) placement information for county-licensed Foster Family Homes (FFH), Family Child Care Homes (FCCH), and county-approved relative and NREFM homes. County welfare departments will then be responsible for investigating any address matches, with the exception of relatives and NREFM homes for the 20 small counties which will be investigated by CCLD.

County welfare departments will also check all prospective licensure applicants and relative/NREFM homes against the Megan's Law Public Website and investigate all address matches. When a match resulting from the annual or prospective check is verified, county welfare departments will take appropriate action, which may include licensure and placement denial, removal of children and finding a new placement, and grievance reviews for relatives/NREFMs.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2009.

**Child Welfare Services (CWS)**

Prospective Relative/NREFM Check

- The caseload is 19,549 based on relative and NREFM placement data for Calendar Year (CY) 2008.
- The time required to check each home against the Megan's Law Public Website is estimated at 0.33 hours (20 minutes).
- The match rate is 0.10 percent based on the Bureau of State Audits May 2008 report, which will result in 20.2 matches each year.
- An investigation will be performed on each match and will require an estimated 6.75 hours.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

Annual Check

- The relative placement caseload, excluding the 20 small counties, is 25,674 based on placement data for January 2009. The relative placement caseload for the 20 small counties is 424 cases.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors' Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children are placed per home.

# Registered Sex Offender Check

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The match rate is 0.10 percent, which will result in 18.1 matches each year, and includes 0.3 matches for the 20 small counties.
- An investigation will require an estimated 6.75 hours for each match, excluding the 20 small counties.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

Grievance Review

- The total number of relative/NREFM homes that are disapproved is estimated at 36.3 based on the number of all matches for prospective and annual checks each year.
- It is assumed that 20 percent of those disapproved homes will request a review.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of eight hours to review each case.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

Removal and Finding New Placement

- It is assumed that each address match will be verified and will result in license revocation and home disapproval.
- It is estimated that there are approximately 1.56 children placed per relative home, and approximately 16.7 relative/NREFM homes disapproved each year, resulting in 26.1 children being removed.
- It is estimated that there are approximately 2.5 children placed per FFH, and approximately 8 licenses revoked each year, resulting in 20 children being removed . It is assumed that the removal and finding new placement will take an average of 18 hours per removal.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

**Community Care Licensing (CCL)**

Annual Check

- The FFH caseload for FY 2009-10 is 6,668. The FCCH caseload for FY 2009-10 is 3,751.
- The match rate is 0.10 percent.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH licensing worker 30.90 hours and an FCCH license worker 33 hours to investigate each address match.
- It is assumed that 41 percent of the matches will require administrative action.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH and FCCH licensing worker 31 hours for each administrative action.
- The hourly cost of an FFH licensing worker is $70.68.
- The hourly cost of an FCCH licensing worker is $66.30.

# Registered Sex Offender Check

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

Application Check

- There were approximately 2,945 FFH and 578 FCCH applications received in Calendar Year 2008.
- The time required to check each home against the Megan's Law Public Website is estimated at 0.33 hours (20 minutes).
- The match rate is 0.10 percent based on the Bureau of State Audits May 2008 report.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH licensing worker 30.90 hours and an FCCH licensing worker 33 hours to investigate each address match.
- It is assumed that 41 percent of the matches will require administrative action.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH and FCCH licensing worker 31 hours for each administrative action.
- It is assumed that it will take a licensing worker 20 minutes to check an address against the Megan's Law Public website.
- The hourly cost of an FFH licensing worker is $70.68.
- The hourly cost of an FCCH licensing worker is $66.30.

## METHODOLOGY:

**CWS**

For relative and NREFM prospective checks, the caseload is multiplied by the time required for each check, plus the number of matches multiplied by the total hours per investigations, all multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker ([(19,549 cases x 0.33 hours) + (19.55 matches x 6.75 hours)] x $72.60).

For annual checks, the number of homes, excluding the 20 small counties, is multiplied by the match rate, the total hours per investigation, and the hourly cost of a social worker (16,458 homes x 0.001 match x 6.75 hours x $72.60).

For grievance reviews, total matches for all counties are multiplied by the percent requesting review, the number of hours per review, and the hourly cost of a social worker (36.3 homes x 0.20 reviews x 8 hours x $72.60).

For removal and new placement activities, the total number of children removed is multiplied by the hours required to remove the child and find a new placement and the hourly cost of a social worker (46.1 children x 18 hours x $72.60).

# Registered Sex Offender Check

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

**CCL**

For FFH applications, the caseload is multiplied by the time required for each check, plus the number of matches (2,945 cases x 0.001 match) multiplied by the total hours per investigation, plus the number of administrative actions (2,945 cases x 0.001 match x 0.41) multiplied by the number of hours per action, all multiplied by the hourly cost of an FFH licensing worker ([(2,945 cases x 0.33 hours) + (3 matches x 30.9 hours) + (1 action x 31 hours)] x $70.68).

For FFH annual checks, the caseload is multiplied by the match rate, the total hours per investigation, plus the number of administrative actions (6,668 cases x 0.001 match x 0.41) multiplied by the number of hours per action, multiplied by the hourly cost of an FFH licensing worker ([(6,668 cases x 0.001 match x 30.9 hours) + (3 actions x 31 hours)] x $70.68).

For FCCH applications, the caseload is multiplied by the time required for each check, plus the number of matches (578 cases x 0.001 match) multiplied by the total hours per investigation, plus the number of administrative actions (578 cases x 0.001 match x 0.41) multiplied by the number of hours per action, all multiplied by the hourly cost of an FCCH licensing worker ([(578 cases x 0.33 hours) + (1 match x 33 hours) + (0.41 action x 31 hours)] x $66.30).

For FCCH annual checks, the caseload is multiplied by the match rate and the total hours per investigation, plus the number of administrative actions (3,751 cases x 0.001 match x 0.41) multiplied by the number of hours per action, all multiplied by the hourly cost of an FCCH licensing worker ([(3,751 cases x 0.001 match x 33 hours) + (2 actions x 31 hours)] x $66.30).

## FUNDING:

For CWS, after the foster care federal discount rate of 72 percent is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent General Fund (GF). For CCL - FFH the sharing ratio is 39.12 percent federal Title IV-E and 60.88 percent GF based on actual expenditure data from Calendar Year 2008. FCCH costs are 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The caseload and foster care federal discount rate have decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

# Registered Sex Offender Check

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $682 |
| Federal | 0 | 239 |
| State | 0 | 443 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| CWS | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $555 |
| Federal | 0 | 200 |
| State | 0 | 355 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

(In 000's)

| CCL | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $127 |
| Federal | 0 | 39 |
| State | 0 | 88 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Increase Family Case Planning Meetings to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide counties with the funding necessary to increase efforts to engage families and youth in case planning to meet the requirements of the state's federal Program Improvement Plan. This premise will fund additional social worker positions throughout California to increase the number of facilitated case planning meetings that include parents, extended family members, community service providers and others in order to strengthen reunifications and decrease foster care reentries.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2009
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload is projected at 12,429 based on the number of youths that exited foster care to reunification during Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08. Each case will receive three case planning meetings each year.
- Case planning meetings require an average of 2.7 hours.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of meetings per year, the number of social worker hours, and the hourly cost of a social worker (12,429 x 3 meetings x 2.7 hours x $72.60).

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 71 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the caseload and foster care federal discount rate have decreased.

# Increase Family Case Planning Meetings to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $7,309 |
| Federal | 0 | 2,595 |
| State | 0 | 3,300 |
| County | 0 | 1,414 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Notification of Relatives (P.L. 110-351)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to notify relatives when a child has been removed from parental custody as mandated by the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351) which was signed into law on October 7, 2008. Section 103 of this federal bill requires that counties perform due diligence to identify and provide notice to all adult relatives within 30 days of removal, with the exception of potentially abusive relatives. Relatives will be notified that the child has been or is being removed from parental care, the options they have under federal, state, and local laws and the requirements to become a foster family home.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on January 1, 2010.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- An average of two hours of social worker time is required per case to identify and provide a notice to all adult relatives.
- The annual caseload is projected at 21,703 based on Calendar Year 2008 new out-of-home placements.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of social worker hours and the hourly cost of a social worker (21,703 x 2 hours x $72.60).

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 71 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The caseload has increased and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements on January 1, 2010.

# Notification of Relatives (P.L. 110-351)

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $1,575 |
| Federal | 0 | 559 |
| State | 0 | 711 |
| County | 0 | 305 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Increase Relative Search and Engagement

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide counties with resources necessary to increase family finding and engagement efforts statewide in compliance with the state's federal Program Improvement Plan. Relative placements are more stable than non-relative placements, reduce foster care reentry rates, and reduce the isolation and negative consequences on youth who exit the foster care system. The additional resources would facilitate the location of relatives as a placement option for children who are not currently placed with relatives upon entry into foster care, and would establish strong familial connections for youth in non-relative placements approaching emancipation.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2009
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- There are approximately 12,896 new entries into foster care not placed with relatives based on data for Calendar Year 2007. An average of eight hours of social worker time per case will be required to search for and engage relatives.
- There are approximately 3,408 youths age 16 and above not currently placed with relatives and that have been in foster care for at least 18 months based on data as of June 30, 2008. An average of 27.5 hours of social worker time per case will be required to search for and engage relatives.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the respective number of social worker hours and the hourly cost of a social worker ((12,896 x 8 x $72.60) + (3,408 x 27.5 x $72.60)).

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 71 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the caseload and foster care federal discount decreased.

# Increase Relative Search and Engagement

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | $14,294 |
| Federal | 0 | 5,074 |
| State | 0 | 6,454 |
| County | 0 | 2,766 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Child Welfare Services Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

Child Welfare Services (CWS) provides case management and services for abused and neglected children and their families. The program also provides for training and technical assistance for administrators and staff. This proposal is a reduction to the total General Fund (GF) for CWS. Due to lower revenue projections, budget reductions are needed to balance the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 budget. This proposal is included as one of the May Revision Reduction Solutions.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements July 1, 2009.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The amount of the GF reduction for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties is $53,794,000 with a corresponding percentage reduction in county funds. There will be no reduction in federal funding reflected in order to maintain sufficient federal spending authority.
- The amount of GF reduction for the Title IV-E Waiver counties is $16,855,000. There will be no reduction in the federal or county shares due to the funding cap established within the Title IV-E Waiver agreements.
- The reduction excludes 100 percent federally funded premises.
- The reduction applies to the following programs: CWS Basic Costs; Federal Budget Bill - Loss of FFP; Augmentation to CWS; CWS/CMS System Support Staff; Emergency Assistance Case Management; Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements; Gomez v. Saenz; State Family Preservation; Extended Independent Living Program; Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers; Transitional Housing for Foster Youth; Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends; Recruitment & Retention of Social Workers; Total Child Welfare Training Program; Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program; Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate; Foster Parent Training and Recruitment; Minor Parent Services and Investigations; Foster Care - Infant Rate (SB 500); Kinship Support Services; Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds; CWS/CMS Staff Development; CWS/CMS Application; Supportive & Therapeutic Options Program; Group Home Monthly Visits; Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667); Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774); Background Checks; Relative Home Approvals; Multiple Relative Home Approvals; Grievance Review for Relatives; Live Scan Technology; Health Services for Children in Foster Care; Health Oversight & Coordination (P.L. 110-351); County Self-Assessment & SIP Development; Federal Child & Family Services Review; Data Requirements for New Activities; Peer Quality Case Reviews; Child Fatality & Near Fatality PQCRs; Statewide Standardized Training; CWS DR, SA, and PYS; CWS Outcome Improvement Project; Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of FC Act of 2006; Adam Walsh Child Protection & Safety Act of 2006; Child Relationships (AB 408 amended by AB 1412); Personalized Transition Plan (P.L. 110-351); SSI/SSP FC Application (AB 1331); Health Benefit Determination (AB 1512); Foster Youth Identity Theft (AB 2985); Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits; Chafee Federal NYTD; Registered Sex Offender Check; Increase Family Case Planning Meetings; Notification of Relatives (P.L. 110-351); and Increase Relative Search and Engagement.

# Child Welfare Services Reduction

## METHODOLOGY:

The GF reduction is the amount determined as necessary to balance the FY 2009-10 budget.

## FUNDING:

For the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, the reduction is shared 77 percent GF and 23 percent county funds. For the Title IV-E Waiver counties, the reduction is 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Total** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $0 | -$86,728 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -70,649 |
| County | 0 | -16,079 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |
| **Item 151** | | |
| Total | $0 | -$69,873 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -53,794 |
| County | 0 | -16,079 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |
| **Item 153** | | |
| Total | $0 | -$16,855 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -16,855 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Adoptions Program – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs associated with agency (relinquishment) and independent adoptions for 30 counties. Although only 28 counties provide adoptive services, these costs include funding for independent adoptions and services in two adjacent counties. Relinquishment and agency adoption include:

1. Agency (Relinquishment) Adoptions - Placements through a licensed adoption agency in which a child to be adopted has been relinquished by his or her legal parents or in which, due to abuse or neglect, parental rights have been terminated by court action.
2. Independent Adoptions - Placements in which the parents place a child directly with an adopting family or persons of their choice.

The 1996 Adoptions Initiative (Assembly Bill 1524, Chapter 1083, Statutes of 1996) was introduced to maximize adoption opportunities for children in public foster care and reduce the foster care population. Counties were funded based on performance agreements that increased the number of adoption social workers in an effort to double the number of statewide adoptive placements. As a result of the Adoptions Initiative, the annual number of foster children who were placed in an adoptive home increased from 3,000 to over 7,200.

Previously, this premise was separated from the Adoptions Initiative premise in order to illustrate the fiscal impact of the Initiative. However, since achieving the goal of doubling the number of statewide adoptions, this premise now combines the Adoptions Initiative with the Adoption Program basic costs to fund the program with 560.55 full-time equivalents (FTEs).

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16100 through 16106.
- The counties are funded with 560.55 FTEs in each Fiscal Year (FY).
- The statewide average annual unit cost of an adoption worker was held at $128,564 for each FY.
- Additional federal spending authority in the amount of $7,045,459 for FY 2008-09 and $11,016,662 for FY 2009-10 is included based on actual historical expenditure data.
- The Improving Adoptions Outcomes Appropriation has been rolled into the Adoptions Basic Costs.
- The savings associated with increasing the Independent Adoptions fees is reflected in the Adoptions Basic Costs.

## METHODOLOGY:

- Estimates are individually calculated for each county that performs its own adoptive services by multiplying the number of FTEs by the county's annual adoption worker unit cost.
- Additional federal funds are included to bring the federal spending authority up to a level based on actual historical expenditure data.

# Adoptions Program – Basic Costs

## FUNDING:

The sharing ratio for FY 2008-09 is 42.80 percent federal and 57.20 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2006-07. The sharing ratio for FY 2009-10 is 42.11 percent federal and 57.89 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2007-08. The nonfederal share is 100 percent General Fund (GF). Additional federal funding is included in the amount of $7,045,459 for FY 2008-09 and $9,941,591 for FY 2009-10 to provide sufficient federal spending authority to a level based on actual historical expenditure data.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10, the amount of additional federal spending authority has decreased based on updated actual expenditures.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The nonfederal sharing ratio has increased and the amount of additional federal funding has increased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $90,042 | $93,049 |
| Federal | 42,566 | 45,013 |
| State | 47,476 | 48,036 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Older Foster Youth Adoption Project

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to establish a three year project in four counties to provide preadoption and postadoption services as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006). These services are aimed at ensuring the successful adoption of children and youth who have been in foster care 18 months or more, are at least nine years of age, and are placed in an unrelated foster home or in a group home.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1808.
- AB 1808 specifies San Francisco and Los Angeles Counties as two of the participating counties. The two additional counties selected are Alameda and Kern Counties based on criteria developed by the California Department of Social Services and the County Welfare Directors Association.

## METHODOLOGY:

As specified in AB 1808, $750,000 General Fund (GF) is made available for San Francisco County and $1,250,000 GF is made available for Los Angeles County. Also, $2,000,000 is made available for the other two counties, less costs to implement the pilot in one State District Office ($300,000 GF).

## FUNDING:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, the federal share of cost is 42.80 percent and the GF share is 57.20 percent based on FY 2006-07 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program. For FY 2009-10, the federal share of cost is 42.11 percent and the GF share is 57.89 percent based on FY 2007-08 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The federal sharing ratio has decreased based on the Adoptions Basic program.

# Older Foster Youth Adoption Project

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $6,468 | $6,391 |
| Federal | 2,768 | 2,691 |
| State | 3,700 | 3,700 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing private agency adoption reimbursement payments (PAARP) to private adoption agencies for expenditures associated with adoptive placements of special needs children. Assembly Bill (AB) 1524 (Chapter 1083, Statutes of 1996) established a $3,500 compensatory limit per placement of special needs children. AB 1225 (Chapter 905, Statutes of 1999) increased the compensatory limit per placement to $5,000 per adoptive placement of a special needs child. Senate Bill (SB) 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007) increased the compensatory limit per placement to $10,000 per placement of a special need child for which the adoptive home study approval occurred on or after July 1, 2007.

Once the child is placed, a claim is submitted to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) for an individual child by the private adoption agency. CDSS program staff review the claim, verify federal eligibility, and forward the claim(s) to the Office of the State Controller for direct issuance of a reimbursement payment to the private adoption agency. Fiscal control is maintained by CDSS program staff.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was originally implemented on July 1, 1992.

The AB 1225 reimbursement payment increase went into effect on July 1, 1999.

The SB 84 reimbursement payment increase went into effect on February 1, 2008, for all qualifying placements.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16120 through 16122.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, the caseload is projected at 4,163 based on actual caseload data, at a cost of $5,000 per adoptive placement. For FY 2009-10, the caseload is projected at 4,727 based on actual caseload data, at a cost of $10,000 per adoptive placement. The reimbursement increase to $10,000 will result in additional adoptive placements that phased-in beginning in October 2008 and will result in additional costs in the Adoption Assistance Payment (AAP) program and savings in the Foster Care (FC) grants, FC administration and Child Welfare Services (CWS) administration. AAP program costs are based on the average Foster Family Homes (FFH) grant of $729.59.
- FC grant savings for Non-Title IV-E Waiver counties are based on cases moving from FFH and Foster Family Agencies (FFA). The weighted average grant amount is $845.75.
- For the Non-Title IV-E waiver counties, CWS administrative savings of $349 in FY 2008-09 and $371 in FY 2009-10 per permanent placement case each month will be realized as a result of the additional cases exiting the child welfare system. For FY 2008-09 there are 3,397 casemonths of savings. For FY 2009-10 there are 14,378.
- FC and AAP administrative savings are the average cost per case based on actual data.

# Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

## METHODOLOGY:

- To determine the PAARP basic cost, the projected number of private agency adoptive placements was multiplied by the reimbursement cost per placement.
- The AAP estimate was calculated by multiplying the average federal and nonfederal FFH grant by the projected 5,154 casemonths in FY 2008-09. The projected cumulative casemonth impact for FY 2009-10 is 22,212.
- The estimated savings in foster care for the Non-Title IV-E Waiver counties was calculated by multiplying the average federal and nonfederal FFH and FFA weighted average by the projected 3,397 casemonths in FY 2008-09, and 14,278 casemonths in FY 2009-10.
- CWS administrative savings are calculated by applying the permanent placement cost per case to total casemonths avoided due to cases exiting from the child welfare system.
- Net FC and AAP administrative savings are calculated by multiplying the average cost per case by the projected casemonths.

## FUNDING:

The Adoptions program, AAP program, FC program, FC administration and CWS administrative costs/savings are shared at the same ratios as in their respective programs.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change in the Current Year (CY) for FC 141 savings, and CWS 151 savings. The CY FC 101 savings and AAP 101 cost estimate increases are based on updated grants. The Budget Year (BY) changes for FC 101, AAP 101, FC 141, and CWS 151 reflect updated caseloads and grants. The Adoptions program change for the CY and the BY reflects an increased caseload.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in the FC Item 101, FC Item 141, CWS Item 151 savings and the increase in AAP Item 101 costs reflect the cumulative impact of ongoing costs. For the Adoptions program the change reflects an increased caseload.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 – Foster Care Savings** | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$2,873 | -$12,160 |
| Federal | -1,436 | -6,080 |
| State | -575 | -2,432 |
| County | -862 | -3,648 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 101 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **AAP – Grant Costs** | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $3,760 | $16,206 |
| Federal | 1,880 | 8,103 |
| State | 1,410 | 6,077 |
| County | 470 | 2,026 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 141 –** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Foster Care Admin Savings** | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$218 | -$1,085 |
| Federal | -109 | -542 |
| State | -76 | -380 |
| County | -33 | -163 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **ITEM 151 – CWS Admin Savings** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | -$1,186 | -$5,337 |
| Federal | -433 | -1,895 |
| State | -527 | -2,409 |
| County | -226 | -1,033 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

| **ITEM 151 – Adoptions Cost** | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | 41,630 | $47,270 |
| Federal | 18,203 | 20,670 |
| State | 23,427 | 26,600 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursement | 0 | 0 |

# Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with using the services of local community organizations to increase the pool of minority adoptive families in an effort to place more minority children. The program is administered via contracts between the California Department of Social Services and private providers; counties are not directly involved.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1982.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Federal Multiethnic Placement Act.
- The Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment program will fund three contracts with private providers in the Current Year and the Budget Year.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The estimate for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 is based on anticipated and actual executed contracts.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for FY 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the adjustment is due to updating the foster care federal discount rate.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change to the total. The funding adjustment is due to updating the foster care federal discount rate.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $447 | $447 |
| Federal | 167 | 161 |
| State | 280 | 286 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# County Counsel Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of the parental rights termination proceedings for those counties that do not provide their own adoption services. For these counties, Senate Bill 243 (Chapter 1485, Statutes of 1987) transferred the function of terminating parental rights for court dependents from the State Attorney General's Office to the county counsels, effective January 1, 1990.

Cost elements of the parental rights termination function are primarily attorney and paralegal costs; however, they also include minor costs such as publication of notices, process server fees, court reporter fees, sheriff fees, and expert witness fees.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1990.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institution Code sections 16100 through 16106.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, the average cost per case is $4,144 based on actual data from FY 2006-07. For FY 2009-10, the average cost per case is $4,039 based on actual data from FY 2007-08.
- For those counties that report expenditures, the projected number of children freed for adoption by county counsels is 409 for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for FY 2008-09.

## METHODOLOGY:

The average cost per case was derived by dividing the expenditures by the number of children freed during that same period. The average cost per case was then multiplied by the projected number of children to be legally freed for adoption.

## FUNDING:

For FY 2008-09, after the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund (GF). For FY 2009-10, the state and federal share is based on the actual sharing ratio for FY 2007-08 expenditures.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change is due to the change in the sharing ratio.

# County Counsel Costs

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to the change in the sharing ratio and a decreased cost per case.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,693 | $1,650 |
| Federal | 635 | 823 |
| State | 1,058 | 827 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs to reimburse families for nonrecurring adoption expenses associated with adopting special needs children. These costs may include, but are not limited to, legal fees, court filing fees, special medical examinations, and psychological evaluations. Only families adopting special needs children are eligible for reimbursement of these one-time costs.

The California maximum reimbursement amount is $400 with a 50 percent federal sharing ratio. Assembly Bill 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993) made this cap permanent.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1990.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16120.1.
- The maximum reimbursement that can be applied to each case is $400.
- Approximately 68 percent of all adopted children can be classified as special needs children.
- Based on actual caseload and expenditure data, an average of 40.45 percent of eligible cases will submit claims in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 40.62 percent will submit claims in FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was developed by multiplying the projected number of adoptions by the percentage that would qualify as special needs cases (7,218 adoptions x 68 percent). This number was then multiplied by the average percentage of submitted claims, and then by the maximum reimbursement amount.

## FUNDING:

The funding for these reimbursements is 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund. There is no county share.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the projected number of adoptions is increased.

# Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The percentage of submitted claims has increased.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $680 | $798 |
| Federal | 340 | 399 |
| State | 340 | 399 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with implementing Assembly Bill (AB) 2198 (Chapter 1014, Statutes of 1998) which provides special training and services to facilitate the adoption of children who are HIV positive or who have a condition of symptoms resulting from substance abuse by the mother. Specifically, this funding will provide recruitment, special training and respite care to families adopting court dependent children who are either HIV positive or assessed as being prenatally exposed to alcohol or a controlled substance. This program is similar to the Child Welfare Services Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (Options for Recovery) authorized by AB 67 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 1997).

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16135 through 16135.30.
- This program is available to any county requesting participation pursuant to established procedures and to the extent funds are available. There are currently ten counties (El Dorado, Mendocino, Monterey, Riverside, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, and Stanislaus) that are participating in this program.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and 72 percent for FY 2009-10.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate for this program was developed by calculating the costs for each of the three separate components (respite care, training, and recruitment). The total program funding is approximately $1,849,000, based on the $1,000,000 General Fund (GF) appropriation in AB 2198 for the implementation of this program.

## FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible recruitment activities are funded with 50 percent federal funds and 50 percent nonfederal funds. The nonfederal funds are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible training costs are funded with 75 percent federal funds and 25 percent nonfederal funds. The nonfederal funds are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

Respite care is funded with 70 percent GF and 30 percent county funds.

# Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change was due to an adjustment of the foster care federal discount rate.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $1,871 | $1,849 |
| Federal | 442 | 420 |
| State | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| County | 429 | 429 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with conducting home studies for non-California residents who file a petition for either an agency or independent adoption in the county where the child resides. Assembly Bill (AB) 746 (Chapter 1112, Statutes of 2002) requires a review to be conducted and an endorsed home study report to be completed by either the California Department of Social Services or a California licensed adoption agency. This home study report would need approval in the nonresident petitioner's state.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Family Code sections 8714 through 8715, 8802, and 8807.
- AB 746 would result in an increase of 33 more out-of-state adoptions.
- Each new case would require, on average, 2.5 visits per year.
- It would take 16 hours, including travel, to conduct each visit.
- Travel costs are estimated to be $624 (including per diem) per visit.
- The average hourly cost for a social worker is $72.60.

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was developed by first multiplying the number of new cases by the average number of visits required (33 new cases x 2.5 visits per case = 82.5 total visits). The average cost of the social worker ($72.60 per hour x 16 hours per visit = $1,162) was added to the travel costs ($1,162 cost of social worker + $624 travel costs = $1,786). This total cost was then multiplied by the number of total visits (82.5 total visits x $1,786 cost per visit = $147,345).

## FUNDING:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, the federal share of costs is 42.80 percent and the General Fund (GF) share is 57.20 percent based on FY 2006-07 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program. For FY 2009-10, the federal share of costs is 42.11 percent and the GF share is 57.89 percent based on FY 2007-08 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the sharing ratios have been updated based on actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

# Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The sharing ratios have been updated based on actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $148 | $147 |
| Federal | 63 | 62 |
| State | 85 | 85 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Adoption Opportunity Grant

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an annual $350,000 in federal grant funds that the California Department of Social Services will receive for five years, on behalf of Sacramento County, to help promote adoptive placements and to provide services to children in foster care. Services include building a culture of permanence in partner agencies through the enhancement of existing protocols, training and collaborations; implementing changes in current services by engaging project youth in recruitment plans and activities to increase permanency; developing and implementing marketing strategies to increase recruitment of adoptive families; and addressing system barriers by identifying focus issues and enhancing partnerships between advocates, policy makers, and legislators. Sacramento County will contract with Sierra Adoptions Services to provide these services. Sierra Adoptions Services will provide the 11.93 percent nonfederal match required for the grant.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented during Fiscal Year 2003-04.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Senate Bill 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004).

## METHODOLOGY:

The amount of funding reflects the federal grant award on a state Fiscal Year basis.

## FUNDING:

Funding is 88.07 percent federal share with an 11.93 percent county match.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The federal grant expired on September 30, 2008.

# Adoption Opportunity Grant

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $100 | $0 |
| Federal | 88 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 12 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Adoptions Incentives (P.L. 110-351)

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise, formerly known as "Improving Adoptions Incentives (HR 6893)", represents the amount of federal funding that the state is eligible to receive as a result of P.L. 110-351 the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act, which was signed into law on October 7, 2008. This program is designed to reward states with incentive funds for increasing their finalized adoptions in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). The amount of incentive funds is determined by the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS). AFCARS data are submitted to the federal government twice a year.

The federal incentive money is capped at $43 million for the states cumulatively for each FFY. California will receive the incentive payment one year later and will have 24 months to expend the funds. The incentive money must be used to provide basic adoptive services.

There is an additional incentive payment available to states if the state's adoption rate exceeds its highest recorded foster child adoption rate since 2002.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- The number of finalized adoptions in FFY 2007 was 7,481 and 7,580 for FFY 2008.
- Each additional foster child adoption qualifies for an incentive payment of $4,000.
- A special needs child qualifies for an additional incentive payment of $4,000.
- An older child (age nine and older) qualifies for an additional incentive payment of $8,000.
- Based on the FFY 2008 AFCARS data California would be eligible for incentives for 99 increased adoptions, 76 older child adoptions, and 22 special needs adoptions.
- California's highest adoption rate is FFY 2007 at 8.73 percent. California will receive $1,000 for each adoption that exceeds this rate. No incentive will be received for FFY 2008.

## METHODOLOGY:

The incentive is derived from multiplying the increase number of adoptions by the incentive rate.

## FUNDING:

The incentives are 100 percent federal funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

# Adoptions Incentives (P.L. 110-351)

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Federal funding begins in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $1,093 |
| Federal | 0 | 1,093 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# County Third Party Contracts

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (CAPIT) program. Assembly Bill 1733 (Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982) established CAPIT to fund prevention and intervention services for children at risk of abuse and/or neglect. Contracts with community-based public and private agencies utilize CAPIT funds to provide services to high-risk children and their families, as well as training and technical assistance to funded agencies. The program includes a local assistance contract component of approximately $1.0 million which funds innovative, child-centered approaches for the prevention of child abuse and neglect.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 18960 through 18965.
- These funds are used to fulfill federal Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant matching and leveraging requirements.

## METHODOLOGY:

Total funding is divided among county allocations, innovative services, and training and technical assistance/state support as follows:

- County Allocations: Counties are allocated a total of $12,356,000. Small counties receive a preset minimum funding level, and the remaining distribution uses a formula that considers a county's child population (under age 18), children receiving public assistance, and child abuse reports.
- Innovative Services Contracts: There is $1,039,000 appropriated for innovative services contracts. A competitive bid process determines the grantees of innovative services contracts.
- Training and Technical Assistance (T&TA)/State Support: The funding is $306,200 to ensure that the programs effectively serve high-risk children and their families, provide for regional training on various child abuse issues and periodic statewide training institutes, and provide state support for the program. Of the $306,200, $200,000 is appropriated for a statewide nonprofit consortium. The T&TA/State Support amount is not included in the local assistance budget because none of these are eligible activities for Title IV-E funding.

## FUNDING:

The CAPIT funding is 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for the Current Year or the Budget Year.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# County Third Party Contracts

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $13,395 | $13,395 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 13,395 | 13,395 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Federal Grants

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal grants associated with assisting local and private agencies in the development and strengthening of child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment programs. These federal grants include those under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). The CAPTA grants consist of Title I (consisting of the former Parts A and B) and Title II, otherwise known as the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant. Approximately 50 percent of each annual CBCAP grant award is allocated to the counties. The CBCAP grant was formerly known as the Community-Based Family Resource and Support (CBFRS) grant.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) received the Linkages Grant. CDSS in collaboration with the Child and Family Policy Institute of California will enhance, expand, and measure the impacts of Linkages. Linkages is a strategic effort involving nearly 30 counties in California to improve coordination between California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) and Child Welfare Services (CWS). The mission of Linkages is to deepen and broaden collaboration and coordination of CalWORKs and CWS at the county level to better serve families and improve outcomes. Through training and support, Linkages will also work towards increasing the number of counties co-locating services, support counties in developing strategies to serve at least one identified underserved population, and strengthen data collection practices and counties' use of data for continuous improvement of service delivery and systems integration.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18958.
- Project funding is contingent upon continued receipt of federal grant awards.
- CBCAP grant awards are contingent upon using Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (CAPIT) funds to fulfill nonfederal matching and leveraging requirements.

## METHODOLOGY:

The CAPTA federal grants average approximately $3 million annually and have a lifetime limit of five years to fully expend the annual grant. This allows states flexibility in the use and support of multi-year projects. The Linkages Grant is $400,000 annually and has a lifetime limit of five years to fully expend the annual grant.

# Federal Grants

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

The total reflects the following federal grants:

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| • CAPTA Title I Grants | $4,740,000 | $ 5,920,000 |
| • CAPTA Title II – CBCAP Grants | $3,630,920 | $ 4,340,155 |
| | $8,370,920 | $ 10,260,155 |
| • Linkages Grant | $400,000 | $400,000 |

## FUNDING:

Funding for these projects is 100 percent federal grant funds. The Linkages grant is 90 percent federal grant funds with a 10 percent match using CAPIT funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09. The change in FY 2009-10 reflects the use of previously unspent federal grant funds.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to the use of previously unspent federal grant funds being used in the Budget Year.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $8,771 | $ 10,660 |
| Federal | 8,771 | 10,660 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# State Children's Trust Fund Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the revenue available for the State Children's Trust Fund (SCTF) in California. The SCTF provides funding for innovative child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention projects utilizing deposits generated from birth certificate surcharges, state income tax designations, and private donations. Project funding is awarded through proposals submitted to the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18969.
- The Office of the State Controller accounts for deposits to the SCTF and advises CDSS as to the availability of funds.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects the current funding available for the SCTF, as provided by OCAP.

## FUNDING:

The SCTF is used to research, evaluate, and disseminate information to the public, and to establish public-private partnerships with foundations and corporations to increase public awareness about child abuse and neglect via media campaigns, and to seek continued contributions to the fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $3,755 | $3,755 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 3,755 | 3,755 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# County Services Block Grant – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding provided to the counties. The CSBG provides funds for Adult Protective Services (APS) and APS administrative costs. The CSBG may also be used to fund related optional services and activities to the extent funds are available.

Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care (NMOHC) administrative costs related to the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) program have also been included in this premise since Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01. These NMOHC costs were previously reflected in the "Small Programs (non-CalWORKs) Block Grant" premise.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13004 through 13007.
- The General Fund (GF) is block granted at $10.5 million.
- The county match ($10.9 million) reflects the FY 1996-97 CSBG county expenditure level. Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) required the counties to maintain their FY 1996-97 APS expenditure level for CSBG purposes.
- The Title XIX reimbursement rate is assumed to be 37.04 percent, based on the actual federal reimbursement percentage claimed on county administrative expense claims for the past four quarters.

## METHODOLOGY:

- In the Current Year (CY), estimated costs are computed by adding the GF block grant, the county match , the Title XIX reimbursements and NMOHC costs ($10,500,000 + $10,936,000 + $17,895,332 + $455,045 = $39,786,377).
- In the Budget Year (BY), the estimated costs are computed by adding the GF block grant, the county match, the Title XIX reimbursements and the NMOHC costs ($10,500,000 + $10,936,000 + $17,895,332 + $418,724 = $39,750,056).

## FUNDING:

- GF for CSBG is block granted at $10.5 million with county participation at the maintenance of effort level.
- NMOHC is funded with 100 percent GF.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
  - Health-related activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.
  - Health-related activities performed by non-skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

# County Services Block Grant – Basic Costs

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY and BY increase reflects a change in Title XIX reimbursements.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease is due to a decrease in the NMOHC admin cost.

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $39,786 | $39,750 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 10,955 | 10,919 |
| County | 10,936 | 10,936 |
| Reimbursements | 17,895 | 17,895 |

# Adult Protective Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the funds available over and above the funds provided in the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) for the provision of Adult Protective Services (APS). Senate Bill (SB) 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) established a statewide mandated APS program and provided these additional funds for expanded APS activities. The county share of APS expenditures are held at the Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97 county match level for the CSBG. The APS program has been funded in whole or in part under CSBG since the 1984 Budget Act. The APS program, administered by the county welfare departments, provides assistance to elderly and dependent adults who are functionally impaired, unable to meet their own needs, and who are victims of abuse, neglect, or exploitation.

The APS program, as defined in SB 2199, requires the counties to respond to reports of elder and dependent adult abuse on a 24-hour emergency response basis. Among the services required by SB 2199 are investigations, needs assessments, and case management services. SB 2199 also provides for necessary tangible resources such as food, emergency shelter care, in-home protection, transportation, and the use of multidisciplinary teams.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

- This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.
- The enhanced APS program became effective May 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act, commencing Welfare and Institutions Code section 15600.
- This program received a $20 million General Fund (GF) augmentation in the 1998 Budget Act to provide counties with additional resources needed to implement the statewide mandated APS program. An additional $25.3 million GF augmentation was provided in the 1999 Budget Act.
- Effective FY 1998-99, counties are assumed to have no share of the APS costs of this premise beyond their share in APS under the CSBG. SB 2199 held county costs to the FY 1996-97 CSBG expenditure level.

## METHODOLOGY:

The GF estimated expenditures are held at the FY 2002-03 levels and the Federal Title XIX reimbursement is based on actual expenditures for FY 2007-08.

## FUNDING:

- The program is funded with GF and Title XIX reimbursements.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
  - Health-related activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.

# Adult Protective Services

## FUNDING (CONTINUED):

- Health-related activities performed by non-skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Current Year and the Budget Year increase reflects a change in Title XIX reimbursements.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $99,038 | $99,038 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 50,179 | 50,179 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 48,859 | 48,859 |

# APS Contract for Training Curriculum

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of a multi-year contract with a qualified institution, agency or consultant to:

- Develop a comprehensive statewide training curriculum for county Adult Protective Services (APS) workers that will be owned by the state and shared with county APS agencies;
- Present the training curriculum to all APS workers, which includes scheduling and arranging training in all regions of the state and producing all required training materials; and,
- Periodically update the curriculum and its content to reflect changes to APS laws, policies and practices, and provide updated training to APS workers.

The purpose of the training will be to educate county APS workers on the new APS program standards, requirements and mandates established by passage of Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998), and subsequent legislation. The training is intended to promote statewide uniformity and consistency in the administration and delivery of services under the APS program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2001.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act, commencing Welfare and Institutions Code section 15600.
- The cost for ongoing training activities is estimated to be $176,000 annually.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding for this premise reflects the amount of the contract.

## FUNDING:

The federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 12.5 percent of the total funding. The nonfederal share is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# APS Contract for Training Curriculum

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Contracts | 2009-10 Contracts |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $176 | $176 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 154 | 154 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 22 | 22 |

# Reduce Adult Protective Services Program by Ten Percent

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings from reducing the funds available for the provision of Adult Protective Services (APS) by ten percent effective July 1, 2008. This premise was necessitated by budget balancing reductions.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This premise reflects reductions in APS and County Services Block Grant (CSBG) Basic funding.
- The county match ($10.9 million) required by Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) is not impacted.

## METHODOLOGY:

The savings reflect ten percent of the projected expenditures for APS and CSBG for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

- The program is funded with General Fund and Title XIX reimbursements.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
  - Health-related activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.
  - Health-related activities performed by non-skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for the Current Year or the Budget Year.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Reduce Adult Protective Services Program by Ten Percent

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$11,432 | -$11,432 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | -6,127 | -6,127 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | -5,305 | -5,305 |

# Community Care Licensing - Foster Family Homes

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing basic funding for Foster Family Home (FFH) licensing and recruitment services. The California Community Care Facilities Act authorizes counties to provide FFH licensing services. There are currently 38 counties providing FFH licensing and recruitment services. FFHs in the remaining 20 counties are licensed by the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) Community Care Licensing (CCL) program. For these counties, funds are provided for the purpose of recruiting FFH providers.

Effective Fiscal Year (FY) 2003-04, CDSS implemented a Targeted Visits protocol to streamline the annual review process of licensed care facilities to focus on facilities in which health and safety may be at greatest risk, or those facilities that require an annual visit as a condition of federal funding. A random sample (30 percent for FY 2009-10) of the remainder of the facilities is subject to annual unannounced visits. Current law requires that all facilities be visited at least once every five years and if the number of citations increases by ten percent over the prior year, the number of unannounced visits must also increase by ten percent.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code sections 1500 through 1519.
- The workload standards used to determine Full Time Equivalents (FTE) for targeted visits for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 is 120 cases per worker.
- The worker to supervisor ratio used to determine the total number of FTEs is 6.35:1.
- The average statewide unit cost is held at the FY 2002-03 unit cost of $125,663.
- Mendocino County plans to return their licensing function back to CDSS CCL District Office effective July 1, 2009.

## METHODOLOGY:

**FY 2008-09**

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on an updated FY 2008-09 average caseload of 7,300. This caseload was divided by the workload standards of cases per worker to derive the number of nonsupervisory FTEs (7,300 cases ÷ 120 cases per worker = 60.83 FTEs). The FTEs were expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to determine the total number of FTEs ([60.83 FTEs ÷ 6.35 supervisor ratio] + 60.83 FTEs = 70.41 FTEs). The total number of FTEs is then multiplied by the unit cost (70.41 x $125,663). The federal and General Fund (GF) sharing ratio was applied.

The total estimate was derived by adding the recruitment-only allocation to the FFH program estimate ($8,848,359 + $877,764). Then, an additional $3,632,926 in federal spending authority, based on a three-year average of actual expenditures, was included. The recruitment-only amount is held at the FY 2005-06 funding level. The FFH portion of the *Gresher v. Anderson* premise ($27,000 total funds) is included in this premise.

# Community Care Licensing - Foster Family Homes

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

**FY 2009-10**

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on an updated FY 2009-10 average caseload of 6,668. This caseload was divided by the workload standards of cases per worker to derive the number of nonsupervisory FTEs (6,668 cases ÷ 120 cases per worker = 55.57 FTEs). The FTEs were expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to determine the total number of FTEs ([55.57 FTEs ÷ 6.35 supervisor ratio] + 55.57 FTEs = 64.32 FTEs). The total number of FTEs is then multiplied by the unit cost (64.32 x $125,663). The federal and GF sharing ratio was applied.

The total estimate was derived by adding the recruitment-only allocation to the FFH program estimate ($8,082,305 + $877,764). Then, an additional $3,632,926 in federal spending authority, based on a three-year average of actual expenditures, was included. The recruitment-only amount is held at the FY 2005-06 funding level. The FFH portion of the *Gresher v. Anderson* premise ($27,000 total funds) is included in this premise.

## FUNDING:

Based on actual expenditure data from FY 2007-08, the sharing ratio for FY 2008-09 is 40.3 percent federal Title IV-E and 59.7 percent GF. For FY 2009-10, the sharing ratio is 39.1 percent federal Title IV-E and 60.9 percent GF. Additional federal spending authority is included based on actual expenditures.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change is due to Mendocino returning its caseload to the state and caseload decline.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects a caseload decline and Mendocino returning its caseload to the state.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 County Admin. | 2009-10 County Admin. |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $13,386 | $12,620 |
| Federal | 7,579 | 7,174 |
| State | 5,807 | 5,446 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Family Child Care Homes – Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing basic funding to three counties for Family Child Care Home (FCCH) licensing services and processing serious incident reports. FCCH programs in the remaining 55 counties are licensed by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Community Care Licensing (CCL) District Offices. The California Community Care Facilities Act authorizes participating counties to provide FCCH licensing services. Also, FCCH licensees are required to report any injury to a child requiring medical treatment, the death of any child, or any unusual incident or child absence that threatens the physical or emotional health or safety of any child while the child is in the care of the licensee.

Effective Fiscal Year (FY) 2003-04, CDSS implemented a Targeted Visits protocol to streamline the annual review process of licensed care facilities to focus on facilities in which health and safety may be at greatest risk, or those facilities that require an annual visit as a condition of federal funding. A random sample (30 percent for FY 2009-10) of the remainder of the facilities is subject to annual unannounced visits. Current law requires that all facilities be visited at least once every five years and if the number of citations increases by ten percent over the prior year, the number of unannounced visits must also increase by ten percent.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code sections 1500 through 1519.
- The workload standard used to determine Full Time Equivalents (FTE) for targeted monitoring visits for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 is 257 cases per worker.
- The worker to supervisor ratio used to determine FTEs is 6.35:1.
- The average statewide unit cost is held at the FY 2002-03 level of $117,885.
- Mendocino County plans to give their licensing function back to CDSS CCL District Offices effective July 1, 2009.

## METHODOLOGY:

### FY 2008-09

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on the FY 2008-09 projected caseload of 3,821. This caseload was divided by the workload standard of 257 cases per worker to determine the number of nonsupervisory FTEs (3,821 caseload ÷ 257). The FTEs were then expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to derive the total number of FTEs ([14.87 FTEs ÷ 6.35 supervisor ratio] + 14.87 FTEs = 17.21 FTEs). The average statewide unit cost was then multiplied by total FTEs.

The total estimate was derived by adding $80,000 General Fund (GF) for the Serious Incident Reporting. For FY 2008-09 the FCCH portion of the *Gresher v. Anderson* premise ($10,000 GF) is included in this premise.

# Family Child Care Homes – Basic Costs

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

**FY 2009-10**

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on the FY 2009-10 projected caseload of3,751. This caseload was divided by the workload standard of 257 cases per worker to determine the number of nonsupervisory FTEs (3,751 caseload ÷ 257). The FTEs were then expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to derive the total number of FTEs ([15.45 FTEs ÷ 6.35 supervisor ratio] + 15.45 FTEs = 17.88 FTEs). The average statewide unit cost was then multiplied by total FTEs.

The total estimate was derived by adding $80,000 GF for the Serious Incident Reporting. For FY 2009-10 the FCCH portion of the *Gresher v. Anderson* premise ($10,000 GF) is included in this premise.

## FUNDING:

The funding includes reimbursements from the California Department of Education (from the federal Child Care Development Block Grant fund) to cover a portion of the costs of conducting comprehensive site visits. The remaining costs are funded 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change for FY 2008-09. For FY 2009-10 the change is due to Mendocino returning its caseload to the State and caseload decline.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects a caseload decline and Mendocino returning its caseload to the State.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $2,119 | $2,082 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 1,801 | 1,764 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 318 | 318 |

# Fee-Exempt Live Scan

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for fingerprinting and search requirements associated with certain fee-exempt providers pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998). SB 933 also mandated that a second set of fingerprints be submitted in order to search the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Assembly Bill (AB) 1659 (Chapter 881, Statutes of 1999) added certain categories of licensed fee-exempt providers for FBI background checks.

This premise also includes the reimbursement cost for processing applications referred by the California Department of Education (CDE) and licensed fee-exempt providers.

The Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) is responsible for processing the applications pursuant to AB 753 (Chapter 843, Statutes of 1997). CCLD contracts with the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network to process the fingerprint and index search file activities. Additionally, CCLD contracts with Sylvan/Indentix, a private vendor, for the Live Scan fingerprinting. The Live Scan fingerprint process is an electronic technology that transfers images of fingerprints and personal information to DOJ in a matter of seconds.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11324.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding is suspended for Fiscal Years 2008-09 and 2009-10.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Fee-Exempt Live Scan

## EXPENDITURES:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 Contracts | 2009-10 Contracts |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Court Cases

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for attorney fees and settlements resulting from lawsuits pertaining to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), Budget Item 151 – Social Service Programs, specifically, Child Welfare Services, Special Programs, and Community Care Licensing.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The attorney fees and settlement costs for these court cases are anticipated to be paid in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The estimate for settlement costs and attorney fees is based in part on actual payments for specific cases in the Current Year (CY), and a projection of costs that are anticipated to be paid in CY and the Budget Year.

## FUNDING:

The legal fees and settlement amounts are funded 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The change is based on updated actual information.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is based on updated actual information.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | County Admin. | County Admin. |
| Total | $150 | $1,500 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 150 | 1,500 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Special Programs – Other Specialized Services

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Foster Care Burial and Repatriated Americans Programs. Foster Care burial costs are reimbursements by the state that are provided to foster parents for the costs of a burial plot and funeral expenses, up to $5,000 per burial, for a child receiving foster care at the time of death.

The Repatriated Americans Program provides temporary help to needy United States citizens returning from foreign countries because of destitution, physical or mental illness, or war.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

**Foster Care Burial**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11212.

**Repatriated Americans**

Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 10553 and 10554.

## METHODOLOGY:

**Foster Care Burial**

The estimated costs for the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY) are held at the Fiscal Year 1999-00 General Fund (GF) expenditure level of $186,000.

**Repatriated Americans**

The estimated costs for the CY and the BY are held at the Budget Act of 2000 Appropriation level of $75,000.

## FUNDING:

The Foster Care Burial program is funded with 100 percent GF. The Repatriated Americans Program is funded with 100 percent federal funds through a special Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Repatriate Program Direct Loan, which are provided to individuals on a repayable basis.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Special Programs – Other Specialized Services

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $261 | $261 |
| Federal | 75 | 75 |
| State | 186 | 186 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Eligibility/Extension of Dog Food Allowance

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with providing a monthly dog food allowance to recipients of federal Social Security Disability Insurance, Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payments (SSI/SSP), and In-Home Supportive Services program participants who have incomes at or below the federal poverty level. Existing law provides that eligible individuals with guide, signal, or service dogs are eligible for a dog food allowance of $50 per month.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statutes: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12553 and 12554.
- Recipients will receive a monthly dog food allowance of $50.

## METHODOLOGY:

The Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) estimates are based on year-to-date actual costs and projected caseload growth.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The increase in the CY and BY reflects caseload growth.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This increase reflects caseload growth.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| | Grant | Grant |
| Total | $523 | $554 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 523 | 554 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Access Assistance/Deaf Program: Basic Costs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Office of Deaf Access, Access Assistance/Deaf Program. Assembly Bill 2980 (Chapter 1193, Statutes of 1980) established the Access Assistance/Deaf Program in 1980. The Deaf Access Program serves approximately 2.9 million deaf and hearing-impaired Californians through regional contractors. Assistance under this program enables deaf and hearing-impaired persons to access needed social and community services, e.g. employment services, counseling, interpreting services, education on deafness and advocacy. Currently, eight regional contractors provide services to the hearing-impaired in all 58 counties.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10621.
- The program funding of $3,304,000 was augmented by $2,500,000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 1998-99 for program expansion.
- In FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the program is funded with $2,996,000 in Title XX funds (for more detail, see Title XX premise description).

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated costs for both the Current Year and the Budget Year are held at the FY 1998-99 Appropriation level.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded with General Fund (GF). The Title XX block grant allocated to the program reduces the amount of GF in the program.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $5,804 | $5,804 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 5,804 | 5,804 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Access Assistance/Deaf Program Reduction

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects savings from reducing the Office of Deaf Access, Access Assistance/Deaf Program costs by ten percent effective July 1, 2008.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

This premise reflects savings from reducing Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 expenditures.

For details regarding funding for this program please see (Access Assistance/Deaf Program: Basic Cost premise description)

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is ten percent of the projected FY 2008-09 expenditures.

## FUNDING:

The savings for this premise reflects a ten percent reduction to the General Fund and the Title XX block grant.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | -$581 | -$581 |
| Federal | -300 | -300 |
| State | -281 | -281 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Refugee Social Services

## DESCRIPTION:

Refugee social services (RSS) are provided to refugees through county welfare departments and contracting agencies. The services are funded through an annual block grant allocation by the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR). The funds are used to provide employment-related services, such as employability assessment, on-the-job training, English language training, and vocational training.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13275-13282.
- The federal grant includes $10.1 million in standard funds.
- A contract for $2.4 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and $4.9 million in FY 2009-10 to serve unaccompanied refugee minors (URM) is included in the total funding.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding is based on a federal award.

## FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change in Budget Year reflects an increase in the Southern California URM program's contract.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $12,518 | $14,925 |
| Federal | 12,518 | 14,925 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Refugee Programs – Targeted Assistance

## DESCRIPTION:

This program provides services to refugees to enable them to be placed in employment or to receive employment training. The goal of this program is to assist refugees in attaining self-sufficiency. Targeted Assistance (TA) grants are made available to high refugee-impacted counties. Program components include employment services, work experience, vocational training, vocational English-as-a-second-language, on-the-job training, economic development, skills upgrading, and extreme and unusual needs. In addition to regular TA funds, the federal government can award TA discretionary funds to the State for specific local projects. Local agencies develop project proposals in response to a federal announcement. The federal government selects the projects to be funded.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was implemented on October 1, 1983.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13275-13282.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 allocations include $263,125 in discretionary funding to serve elderly refugees.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding is based on a federal award.

## FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $3,892 | $3,892 |
| Federal | 3,892 | 3,892 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Refugee School Impact Grant

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal funding granted to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to provide services to school-age refugee children and their families. The funding for this grant provides a pass-through from the CDSS to the California Department of Education (CDE). Services provided through local educational agencies include intensive and innovative educational interventions to assist refugee children with improving English fluency and progressing toward grade-level proficiency.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 92.
- A federal grant provides $1,700,000 per year to serve school-age refugee children and their families. This is the third year of a five-year project period that began in August 2006.
- A Memorandum of Understanding between CDE and CDSS outlines the working relationship between the two departments and assigns responsibilities to each regarding the implementation of the grant.
- The services funded under this grant are for the following counties: Alameda, Fresno, Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

## METHODOLOGY:

The funding is based on a federal award.

## FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The Budget Year (BY) change reflects an increase of $228,000 that was carried forward from Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08 to FY 2009-10.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY change reflects an increase of $228,000 that was carried forward from FY 2007-08 to FY 2009-10.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,700 | $1,998 |
| Federal | 1,700 | 1,998 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## DESCRIPTION:

On March 31, 2006, the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) approved the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP). The approved waiver allows Title IV-E funds, which are restricted to board and care costs and child welfare services administration, to be used for services and supports to avoid over reliance on out-of-home care and reunify families more expeditiously. The intent of the CAP is to test a "capped allocation" strategy which would block grant a portion of the federal Title IV-E and General Fund (GF) administrative and assistance costs. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) worked with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) and interested counties to refine a practice and fiscal model that could be implemented under the waiver. The CAP allows up to 20 counties to participate in the five year demonstration project.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Two counties, Los Angeles and Alameda, are participating in the project.
- An annual capped allocation for federal Title IV-E and GF has been established.
- Participating counties are required to provide funding equal to their Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 actual expenditures.

## METHODOLOGY:

- The federal base allocations are based on the county's average Title IV-E actual expenditure claims for administration and assistance submitted for Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2003, 2004, and 2005. An annual two percent growth on the federal funds for administration and assistance is provided beginning in FFY 2006.
- The GF base allocation for Foster Care (FC) Assistance is capped based on actual expenditures for FY 2005-06.
- The GF base allocations for Child Welfare Services (CWS) and FC Administration are based on specified FY 2006-07 allocations. An annual two percent growth above the base allocations is provided beginning in FY 2007-08.
- After the GF base allocations for FC Assistance and CWS Administration are calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant are used in lieu of eligible GF.
- All base allocations for FC Assistance, FC Administration, and CWS Administration are reflected separately in Budget Item 153 with total growth above the base amounts reflected in the IV-E Waiver Adjustment line.

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- Additional GF is provided above the base for either new premises or premises not included in the base calculations that do not impact caseload and is reflected separately in the Non-Base Premises lines for FC Assistance, FC Administration, and CWS Administration.
- For FC Assistance, the Non-Base Premises 101 line for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 reflects costs for Dual Agency, the Five Percent Foster Care Rate Increase and Educational Stability.
- For FC Administration, the Non-Base Premises 141 line for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 reflects costs for FC Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application.
- For CWS Administration, the Non-Base Premises line for FY 2008-09 reflects costs for *Gomez v. Saenz*; State Family Preservation; Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate; Criminal Record Check for FR; Caregiver Court Filing; CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA), and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS); CWS Outcome Improvement Project (OIP); Safe and Timely Interstate Placement Act of 2006; Peer Quality Case Reviews; FC SSI/SSP Application; Foster Youth Identity Theft; and Foster Parent Training and Recruitment special advertising campaign. The Non-Base Premises line for FY 2009-10 reflects costs for *Gomez v. Saenz*; State Family Preservation; Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate; Criminal Record Check for FR; Caregiver Court Filing; CWS DR, SA, and PYS; CWSOIP; Safe and Timely Interstate Placement Act of 2006; Peer Quality Case Reviews; FC SSI/SSP Application; Foster Youth Identity Theft, Personalized Transition Plan (HR 6893), Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits, Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database, Increase Family Case Planning, Notification of Relatives (HR 6893) and Increase Relative Search and Engagement.
- The methodology for the Foster Care 101 - Ten Percent Reduction GH, FFA, SCA, and SCI is located in the “Ten Percent Reduction GH, FFA, SED, SCA, and SCI” premise write-up.
- The methodology for the CWS 151 – CWS Reduction is located in the “CWS Reduction “ premise write-up.

## FUNDING:

Funding consists of the federal Title IV-E and GF capped allocations along with the required county funding. The FC Assistance base allocation consists of $16.8 million in Title XX funds that are used in lieu of GF. The CWS base allocation consists of $24.2 million in Title XX funds that are used in lieu of GF.

This premise is impacted by the temporary FMAP increase of 6.2 percent between October 1, 2008 through December 31, 2010. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provides increased federal funding to offset GF and county funds. For additional information see the ARRA premise.

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

The CY GF savings is a result of the ARRA allocating additional federal funds in lieu of GF. The increase for CWS 151 Non-Base premises in the CY and the BY is due to the addition of the State and Family Preservation and Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate funds being added.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The IV-E Waiver Adjustment reflects three years of the two percent growth and the Non-Base Premises lines have been increased for new premises. The increase in CWS 151 Non-Base Premises reflects new premises. The increase in FC 101 Non-Base Premises is a result of added costs from the Education Stability premise and 141 Non-Base Premises decreases are a result of updated caseload and grants. The BY reflects a full year of additional federal funds due to the ARRA.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's):

| **Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver** | 2008-09 Services/Admin And Grants | 2009-10 Services/Admin And Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $1,175,067 | $ 1,167,969 |
| Federal | 488,330 | 502,148 |
| State | 319,414 | 301,608 |
| County | 367,323 | 364,213 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| **Item 153 IV-E Waiver Adjustment** | 2008-09 Services/Admin And Grants | 2009-10 Services/Admin And Grants |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $ 38,402 | $ 50,891 |
| Federal | 30,917 | 39,552 |
| State | 7,485 | 11,339 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

**(IN 000'S):**

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Grants | Grants |
| **Foster Care 101 - Base** | | |
| Total | $ 505,933 | $ 505,933 |
| Federal | 177,536 | 177,536 |
| State | 121,805 | 121,805 |
| County | 206,592 | 206,592 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Admin. | Admin. |
| **Foster Care 141 - Base** | | |
| Total | $ 38,061 | $ 38,061 |
| Federal | 19,845 | 19,845 |
| State | 12,432 | 12,432 |
| County | 5,784 | 5,784 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Services/Admin. | Services/Admin. |
| **CWS 151 - Base** | | |
| Total | $ 557,438 | $ 557,438 |
| Federal | 244,484 | 244,484 |
| State | 148,678 | 148,678 |
| County | 164,276 | 164,276 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's):

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Grants | Grants |
| **Foster Care 101 – Non-Base Premises** | | |
| Total | $ 6,189 | $ 6,234 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 6,189 | 6,234 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Admin. | Admin. |
| **Foster Care 141 – Non-Base Premises** | | |
| Total | $ 72 | $ 54 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 72 | 54 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's):

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Admin. | Admin. |
| **CWS 151 – Non-Base Premises** | | |
| Total | $ 28,972 | $ 34,475 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 28,972 | 34,475 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Grants | Grants |
| **FC 101 – Ten Percent reduction GH, FFA, SCA, and SCI.** | | |
| Total | $ 0 | -$8,262 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -8,262 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Grants | Grants |
| **CWS 151 – CWS Reduction** | | |
| Total | $ 0 | -$16,855 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | -16,855 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

## EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's):

| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| **Item 153** | Grants | Grants |
| **Federal Stimulus Package FMAP increase (FC 101)** | | |
| Total | $ 0 | $ 0 |
| Federal | 15,548 | 20,731 |
| State | -6,219 | -8,292 |
| County | -9,329 | -12,439 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures Community Colleges – Expansion of Services to TANF Eligibles

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the state maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the California Community Colleges (CCC) for the purpose of assisting students who are California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program recipients, including those transitioning from CalWORKs, to achieve long-term self-sufficiency through coordinated student services offered at community colleges.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, an adjustment has been made to reflect that California is not expected to meet the federal work participation rate (WPR) for the CalWORKs program in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007. When the state fails to meet the WPR, the MOE level increases from 75 percent to 80 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the WPR and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is $2.9 billion in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

The state may count both local and state expenditures made by California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS), Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care, or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, all otherwise countable expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total state program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

Services provided by CCC include work-study, other educational-related work experience, job placement services, child care services, and coordination with county welfare offices to determine eligibility and availability of services. Current CalWORKs recipients may utilize these services until their educational objectives are met, but for no longer than two years. Based on these expenditure requirements, these funds would meet the federal requirements for counting toward TANF MOE.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 263.2 and 263.4.
- It is assumed the eligible MOE expenditures will be $38.8 million in FY 2008-09 and $20.6 million in FY 2009-10.

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures Community Colleges – Expansion of Services to TANF Eligibles

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- These funds are required to be expended for educational-related services for CalWORKs program eligible recipients only.

## METHODOLOGY:

For FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10, the estimate reflects the anticipated MOE-eligible expenditures.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change to the current year however, due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the FY 2009-10 budget resulting in a lower amount of MOE from Community Colleges.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Due to lower revenue projections and increased caseload driven costs, budget reductions are needed to balance the FY 2009-10 budget resulting in a lower amount of MOE from Community Colleges.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $38,832 | $20,581 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 38,832 | 20,581 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures CDE Child Care Programs

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the state maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the California Department of Education (CDE) for child care programs that provide services for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. This premise also reflects expenditures for those who are income eligible but not participating in CalWORKs/TANF.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the TANF program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, an adjustment has been made to reflect that California is not expected to meet the federal work participation rate (WPR) for the CalWORKs program in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007. When the state fails to meet this rate, the MOE level increases to 80 percent from 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the WPR and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is $2.9 billion in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

The state may count both local and state expenditures made by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care, or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, all otherwise countable expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total state program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

Before the implementation of federal welfare reform, California received federal funding for child care through Title IV-A of the Social Security Act and the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). Title IV-A funds were used to provide child care for families on welfare, transitioning off welfare, and those at risk of going on welfare. CCDBG funds were used to provide child care for the working poor. As a part of federal welfare reform under P.L. 104-193, these two federal child care funding streams were merged into the new Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). In order for states to receive a portion of the CCDF, they are required to spend a level of funding equal to their FFY 1994 nonfederal share of child care expenditures under the old Title IV-A program ($85.6 million in California). Federal regulations allow state expenditures for child care to satisfy both the CCDF MOE and TANF program MOE, provided that these expenditures meet the MOE requirements for both grants. In addition, if a state has additional child care expenditures that have not been used toward meeting the CCDF MOE requirement or to receive federal matching funds, these expenditures may count toward the state's TANF MOE, provided that the benefiting families meet the state's definition for TANF eligibility. All other TANF MOE requirements and limitations, as set forth in federal regulations, must also be met.

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures CDE Child Care Programs

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 263.2 and 263.3.
- Based on estimated General Fund (GF) expenditures for CalWORKs recipients and CalWORKs eligible families in CDE child care programs, it is assumed that eligible MOE expenditures totaling $598.6 million will be counted towards the state's base TANF MOE requirement in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- Federal regulations allow state expenditures for child care to satisfy both the CCDF MOE and the TANF MOE, provided that these expenditures meet the MOE requirements for both grants.
- All TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families meet CCDF eligibility requirements and would, therefore, meet both the CCDF and TANF MOE expenditure requirements.
- The total "double-countable" expenditures cannot exceed the MOE level for the CCDF ($85.6 million).

## METHODOLOGY:

For FYs 2008-09 and 2009-10, the estimate reflects the anticipated amount of MOE-eligible expenditures to be counted towards the base MOE requirement.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures
# CDE Child Care Programs

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $598,598 | $598,598 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 598,598 | 598,598 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures State Disregard Payment to Families

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the state maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) for the $50 State Disregard Payment to Families for current recipients of benefits under the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, an adjustment has been made to reflect that California is not expected to meet the federal work participation rate (WPR) for the CalWORKs program in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007. When the state fails to meet this rate, the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) level increases from 75 percent to 80 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the WPR and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is $2.9 billion in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

The state may count both local and state expenditures made by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, then the expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, then countable current year expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total state program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

In addition to the CalWORKs grant, custodial parents also receive the first $50 of the current month's child support payment collected from the noncustodial parent. Forwarding the disregard portion of the collection to the family instead of retaining it to reduce the state's cost of the CalWORKs grant results in cost increases (lost collection revenues).

In 1996, the federal government discontinued federal financial participation (FFP) in the disregard payment to the family (P.L. 104-193). With the passage of the federal Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) (P. L. 109-171), FFP has been reinstated as of October 1, 2008. In California, the FFP ratio is 50 percent federal, 50 percent state. In addition, the DRA changed the amount that states may disregard and pass through to families. Effective October 1, 2008, states may disregard up to $100 per month for one child, and up to $200 for families with two or more children, in child support payments collected on behalf of a TANF or foster care family.

This premise reflects the cost for the state to fund 100 percent of the $50 disregard payment to the custodial parent through September 2008 (before the FFP is reinstated), and 50 percent of all future disregard payments.

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures State Disregard Payment to Families

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This program was originally implemented in FY 1984-85.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11475.3 and Family Code section 17504.
- It is assumed the eligible MOE expenditures claimed by DCSS will be $16 million in FY 2008-09 and $12 million in FY 2009-10. The estimate is based on projected expenditures from DCSS.
- The child support payment data are based on the counties' monthly CS 35 Reports and the Child Support Services Supplement to the CS 34 Monthly Report of Collections and Distributions.
- Through September 2008, the state will pay the full $50 disregard without any FFP.
- Beginning October 2008, the $50 disregard share of cost will be split 50/50 between the state and the federal government.

## METHODOLOGY:

The cost of the disregard is reported monthly on the CS 35 Report. The disregard is paid when the child support collection is distributed.

## FUNDING:

For the purpose of counting program expenditures toward the MOE, this program is funded with 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009 :

The Current Year and the Budget Year (BY) estimate reflects updated projections from DCSS.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The anticipated expenditures for the BY decreased due to updated information from DCSS and a full year of the change due to the DRA.

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures State Disregard Payment to Families

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $15,982 | $11,987 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 15,982 | 11,987 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures After School

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the state maintenance of effort (MOE) associated with expenditures made by the California Department of Education (CDE) for students attending After School programs as made available by the CDE. It is assumed that state expenditures for After School programs are countable toward the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) MOE requirement under Purpose Three of TANF.

The After School Education and Safety (ASES) program is the result of the 2002 voter approved initiative, Proposition 49. The ASES program funds the establishment of local after school education and enrichment programs. These programs are created through partnerships between schools and local community resources to provide literacy, academic enrichment, and safe, constructive alternatives for students in kindergarten through ninth grade. Funding is designed to: 1) maintain existing before- and after-school program funding, and 2) provide eligibility to all elementary and middle schools throughout California that submit quality applications.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the TANF program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09, an adjustment has been made to reflect that California is not expected to meet the federal work participation rate (WPR) for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007. When the state fails to meet this rate, the MOE level increases to 80 percent from 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the WPR and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is $2.9 billion in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.

The state may count both local and state expenditures made by California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and other departments on behalf of TANF/ CalWORKs eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS), Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care, or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, then the expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable Current Year (CY) expenditures exceed the total state program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 2006.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 263.2 and 263.4.
- All MOE eligible General Fund (GF) expenditures spent on After School programs will be counted towards the MOE requirement in the year it is spent.
- It is assumed the eligible MOE expenditures will be $60.7 million in FY 2008-09 and $38.6 million in FY 2009-10.

# Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures After School

## METHODOLOGY:

The estimate reflects the anticipated MOE-eligible expenditures for FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 that will be counted towards the base TANF MOE requirement.

## FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent GF.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in the Budget Year reflects the anticipated amount of $38.6 million to count toward the base MOE.

## Expenditures:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $60,667 | $38,568 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | $60,667 | 38,568 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# General Fund Maintenance of Effort Work Participation Rate Adjustment

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects adjustments made on the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) federal reports for prior Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) that reduce the state's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement from 80 percent of the base year expenditures to 75 percent. These adjustments are the result of meeting the federal work participation rates (WPR) for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program.

CDSS assumes an 80 percent MOE requirement until notified by the federal government that the state has met the federal work participation rates. This typically occurs after the end of the FFY. After notification by the federal government, CDSS files an amended federal report for that past FFY to reflect the lower MOE expenditure level of 75 percent. California is not expected to meet the WPR for FFY 2007; therefore, the state will have to meet the 80 percent MOE requirement in FY 2008-09.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The WPR adjustment is not made until after the federal government has notified the state that it has met the rate for the FFY. This does not occur until after the end of the FFY for which the adjustment is being made.

## METHODOLOGY:

California is not expected to meet the WPR in FFY 2007; therefore the state will have to meet the 80 percent MOE requirement in FY 2008-09.

## FUNDING:

The funding is 100 percent General Fund.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

# General Fund Maintenance of Effort Work Participation Rate Adjustment

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

# Total TANF Reserve

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that are held in reserve to meet unanticipated pressures in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. Expenditures as determined by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) are subject to Legislative notification and approval by the California Health and Human Services Agency and the Department of Finance.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The reserve was originally established by the Budget Act of 2000.
- The Total TANF Reserve funds are used to meet unforeseen program needs in the CalWORKs program.

## METHODOLOGY:

The reserve has been eliminated to zero due to existing budget pressures.

## FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent federal TANF funds.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

There is no change.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## RESERVE:

| (in 000's) | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $0 | $0 |
| Federal | 0 | 0 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Emergency Contingency Funds

## DESCRIPTION:

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 is a multi-year, federal economic stimulus program. With respect to programs under the purview of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), the purposes of the funds are to:

- Preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery
- Assist those impacted by the recession
- Stabilize state and local government budgets

The ARRA includes a provision which provides $5 billion in new funding for basic assistance, subsidized employment and non-recurring short term benefits. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Emergency Contingency Funds (ECF) are available in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 and FFY 2010 to state's with 1) Caseload Increases, 2) Increased Expenditures for Non-Recurrent Short Term Benefits, and/or 3) Increased Expenditures for Subsidized Employment. Through the ECF, a state can be reimbursed for 80 percent of expenditures in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 that exceed the state's expenditures in each of these areas in FFY 2007 or FFY 2008, whichever has the lower expenditures in each of these areas. State's are eligible for up to 50 percent of the state's TANF block grant over the two-year period. The maximum amount that California would be eligible for is $1.8 billion; however, this amount is not guaranteed since ECF will be dispersed on a first come first serve basis.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Section 403 (c) of the Social Security Act.
- This premise includes ECF funds for increased basic assistance costs only. CDSS is continuing to work with the counties and the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) to determine the amount of ECF funds the state may be eligible to receive for subsidized employment and non-recurring short term benefits.
- California will use FFY 2007 as the base year for basic assistance ECF.
- Base Year expenditures reflect actual quarterly expenditures as submitted on the ACF 196 for FFY 2007.
- Expenditures for FFY 2009 reflect actual quarterly expenditures as submitted on the ACF 196 for the first quarter. The second, third, and fourth quarters are projected and are consistent with the caseload used in the development of the state budget.
- Expenditures include grant assistance payments allowed under the Federal TANF program as well as other basic assistance payments reported on the ACF 196 and claimed as state MOE. Other basic assistance payments include Department of Child Support Services disregard payments, Cal Learn payments, California Food Assistance Program, Kin-GAP, State Supplemental Payment (SSP) Maintenance of Effort (MOE), and Tribal TANF MOE.

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Emergency Contingency Funds

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The base quarterly expenditures will be compared to the projected quarterly expenditures for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-09 and FY 2009-10.
- One hundred percent of the basic assistance ECF funds received in FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 will be used to offset general fund dollars, above the base TANF Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement, that otherwise would have been used to fund the CalWORKs Program.
- As authorized by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), a portion of the funding received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) will be used to provide support for the California Recovery Task Force (CRTF) and for the ARRA oversight and administrative activities of the various departments administering those funds. Pursuant to Executive Order S-02-09, CRTF is charged with tracking the ARRA funding coming into the state; helping cities, counties, non-profits, and others access the available funding; ensuring that the funding provided to the state is spent efficiently and effectively; and maintaining a Web site that is frequently and thoroughly updated so Californians can track the stimulus dollars. The mechanism for accessing these federal funds and for allocating them to the CRTF and state entities administering ARRA funds is under development and is not available to include in this estimate. Consequently, a future Section 28.00 request may be submitted in the coming months to properly increase the department's federal funds reimbursement authority to fund the cost of accountability and related administrative and transparency activities.

## METHODOLOGY:

**((in 000's)**

| | July - Sept | Oct – Dec | Jan-Mar | April-May | | Total ECF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Base Expenditures | $0 | $778,802 | $773,815 | | $772,309 | |
| FY 2008-09 Projections | $0 | $845,449 | $880,202 | | $923,291 | |
| Difference | $0 | $66,647 | $106,387 | | $150,982 | |
| 80% | $0 | $53,318 | $85,109 | | $120,785 | $259,212 |

| | July - Sept | Oct – Dec | Jan-Mar | April-May | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Base Expenditures | $770,716 | $778,802 | $773,815 | | $772,309 | |
| FY 2009-10 Projections | $917,963 | $768,044 | $782,542 | | $813,153 | |
| Difference | $147,247 | -$10,758 | $8,727 | | $40,844 | |
| 80% | $117,797 | $0 | $6,982 | | $32,675 | $157,454 |

# American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 Emergency Contingency Funds

## FUNDING:

The funds represent federal ECF provided through the ARRA.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

This is a new premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

As a result of the CalWORKs Budget Reduction proposals, the amount of ECF for basic assistance that California will be eligible for in the BY is reduced.

## EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

| | 2008-09 Grant | 2009-10 Grant |
|---|---|---|
| Total | $259,212 | $157,454 |
| Federal | 259,212 | 157,454 |
| State | 0 | 0 |
| County | 0 | 0 |
| Reimbursements | 0 | 0 |

***This page left intentionally***

***blank for spacing***

# Cost-of-Doing-Business

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the provision contained in Assembly Bill 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) which requires the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to estimate the costs for county administration using county-specific cost factors in the programs' budgeting methodology and requires county certification of "reasonable" costs for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Administration, Food Stamp, Foster Care, In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), and Child Welfare Services (CWS).

The statute requires CDSS to develop, in consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association, a survey process to collect reasonable county specific cost data. CDSS shall identify in its budget documents the estimates developed and the difference between these estimates and proposed funding levels.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10507.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 estimated difference between the raw data as reported on the counties' cost-of-doing-business survey and the proposed funding levels, inclusive of the CWS augmentations.

## FUNDING:

Funding will vary depending on program area.

## CHANGE FROM BUDGET BILL OF FEBRUARY 2009:

Cost-of-doing-business data is only displayed in the May Revision process. The FY 2009-10 estimated difference between the data as reported by the counties' cost-doing-business survey and the proposed funding levels is inclusive of each program's associated premise.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2009-10 estimate is based on the data as reported in the cost-of-doing-business survey submitted by the counties in May 2009. Year-to-year changes are primarily due to the impact of changes in caseload, county staffing, and the inclusion of the CWS augmentations.

# Cost-of-Doing-Business

Cost-of-Doing-Business
County Request vs. May 2009 Budget
(Dollars in thousands)

| FY 2009-10 | TOTAL | FEDERAL | STATE/TANF | COUNTY | REIMB (Title XIX) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CalWORKS-Admin | $111,863 | $0 | $111,863 | $0 | $0 |
| CalWORKS-EmpSvcs | ($118,906) | $0 | ($118,906) | $0 | $0 |
| Food Stamp Admin | ($38,885) | ($17,888) | ($16,479) | ($4,518) | $0 |
| Foster Care Admin | $12,297 | $4,631 | $7,259 | $407 | $0 |
| IHSS Admin | $58,090 | $0 | $20,488 | $8,785 | $28,817 |
| CWS | $353,474 | $134,866 | $164,584 | $33,175 | $20,849 |
| Adoptions | $25,038 | $4,807 | $20,231 | $0 | $0 |
| **NET DIFFERENCE** | **$402,971** | **$126,416** | **$189,040** | **$37,849** | **$49,666** |

Note: Costs reflect the statewide difference between the data as reported in the county surveys and the proposed funding levels. The amounts above include $99.6 million General Fund augments (58 counties) in the proposed CWS budget.