



DAVID MAXWELL-JOLLY  
*Director*

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency  
Department of Health Care Services



ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER  
*Governor*

August 20, 2009

CHDP Program Letter No.: 09-10

To: ALL CHILD HEALTH AND DISABILITY PREVENTION (CHDP)  
PROGRAM DIRECTORS, DEPUTY DIRECTORS, STATE CHILDREN'S  
MEDICAL SERVICES (CMS) BRANCH STAFF AND REGIONAL OFFICE  
STAFF

Subject: Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-2010 Allocations for the Health Care Program for  
Children in Foster Care (HCPCFC)

The purpose of this CHDP Letter is to provide CHDP local programs with their HCPCFC FY 2009-2010 allocations, which is the state share of the Medi-Cal Title XIX funds. The State General funds are to be matched with Federal Title XIX funds to supplement the HCPCFC Administrative Budget and are based on the Federal Financial Participation (FFP) guidelines found in the CMS Plan and Fiscal Guidelines (PFG). It is still anticipated that the revised PFG will be posted later in August.

The allocation is based on caseload data obtained from the Child Welfare System/Case Management System as of January 2009. This proportion is then applied toward the total State dollars available to determine the county allocation. See the attached funding allocation table. Each local CHDP Program is to carry out the HCPCFC program as set forth in the CMS PFG.

Overall the HCPCFC FY 2009-2010 allocation has increased due to recent legislation, ABX4 4, which passed in July 2009. The HCPCFC is now a mandated program and is no longer optional. The HCPCFC FY 2009-2010 allocation includes every county and city CHDP program. There were no other substantial program changes to the HCPCFC. The legislation clarifies existing language pertaining to the HCPCFC public health nurse responsibilities but does not change the duties of the HCPCFC PHN. Please refer to the following link <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov> and select "California Law"; "Welfare and Institutions Code"; enter "Section 16501.3"; and select "search" for more information on the legislation.

This Program Letter will serve as each local program's approved State General Fund portion of the HCPCFC No County/City Match Administrative Budget and enable each local program to use this letter to develop its budgets. **There will be no budget approval letters issued from the CMS Branch.** Each local program remains

responsible for oversight and tracking its administrative budget expenditures. As in previous years, local programs will only be reimbursed for No County/City Match expenditures up to their authorized budget allocations. Each local program is authorized to claim Title XIX Federal funds to match its local funds in order to perform Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment administrative activities specifically for children and youth in foster care. Please refer to the CMS PFG for submission of county/city match budgets.

Local programs should follow the CMS PFG for budget submissions to the CMS Branch and Regional Offices. Budgets for the HCPCFC program are due 60 days from the date of this Program Letter. Local programs that have previously utilized budget approval letters to submit to the county's authorized personnel will be able to utilize the attached County Allocation notice as documentation and verification of the State General Funds allocated.

Local programs that have questions regarding staffing, personnel changes, duty statements, Memoranda of Understanding, and other budget preparation items should discuss these with their Regional Office Nurse Consultant or administrative staff prior to submitting the budgets. All local programs must adhere to the CMS PFG for determination of enhanced and non-enhanced designation of staff and their activities as well as the provision for FFP determination. Documentation for those staff that qualify for enhanced FFP and/or work on more than one program must adhere to the CMS PFG (Section 8) for time study requirements and guidelines.

All quarterly expenditure reports submitted for reimbursement must be based on accurate and auditable documentation. An audit file must be maintained by each county to support all quarterly expenditure reports and shall include, but not be limited to: time studies, when required and performed during at least one representative month of the quarter for each budgeted position for which FFP is claimed; documentation in support of training and travel costs; and other documents as required to support the claimed expenditures. In addition, documentation of the methods to claim internal and external overhead must be also maintained.

Acceptance of allocated funds constitutes an agreement that the receiving local agency will comply with all federal and state requirements pertaining to the HCPCFC Program and adhere to all applicable policies and procedures set forth by the Department of Health Care Services and the CMS Branch. Periodically the federal program responsible for oversight of state expenditures for the administrative costs for the management of the Medicaid program will conduct programmatic audits. Finding of a federal audit exception and subsequent liability for repayment of federal Medicaid funds

CHDP Program Letter No.: 09-10  
Page 3  
August 20, 2009

relating to the HCPCFC program audit exception, are the exclusive and sole responsibility of each local program.

**ORIGINAL SIGNED BY LUIS R. RICO, ACTING CHIEF**

Luis R. Rico, Acting Chief  
Children's Medical Services Branch

Attachment (Funding Allocation Table)

FY 2009-2010	
CHILD HEALTH AND DISABILITY PREVENTION PROGRAM HEALTH CARE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE (HCPCFC) BUDGETS	
County	09/10 Allocation <b>\$5,865,200</b>
1 Alameda	\$212,182
2 Alpine	\$2,000
3 Amador	\$3,743
4 Butte	\$58,378
5 Calaveras	\$12,557
6 Colusa	\$3,568
7 Contra Costa	\$149,280
8 Del Norte	\$8,390
9 El Dorado	\$23,380
10 Fresno	\$203,702
11 Glenn	\$7,747
12 Humboldt	\$19,725
13 Imperial	\$40,662
14 Inyo	\$5,127
15 Kern	\$173,911
16 Kings	\$22,695
17 Lake	\$12,093
18 Lassen	\$7,555
19 Los Angeles	\$1,786,213
20 Madera	\$20,328
21 Marin	\$15,858
22 Mariposa	\$4,288
23 Mendocino	\$24,153
24 Merced	\$39,194
25 Modoc	\$5,573
26 Mono	\$2,375
27 Monterey	\$41,733
28 Napa	\$14,040
29 Nevada	\$10,915
30 Orange	\$268,366
31 Placer	\$27,999
32 Plumas	\$5,390
33 Riverside	\$367,755
34 Sacramento	\$277,949
35 San Benito	\$7,472
36 San Bernardino	\$348,390
37 San Diego	\$421,581
38 San Francisco	\$152,978
39 San Joaquin	\$117,226
40 San Luis Obispo	\$32,371
41 San Mateo	\$52,738
42 Santa Barbara	\$60,240
43 Santa Clara	\$158,752
44 Santa Cruz	\$28,320
45 Shasta	\$50,035
46 Sierra	\$2,000
47 Siskiyou	\$12,684
48 Solano	\$34,457
49 Sonoma	\$49,688
50 Stanislaus	\$46,369
51 Sutter	\$21,437
52 Tehama	\$15,769
53 Trinity	\$5,142
54 Tulare	\$78,536
55 Tuolumne	\$7,592
56 Ventura	\$58,012
57 Yolo	\$34,651
58 Yuba	\$20,042
59 City of Berkeley	\$10,761
62 City of Long Beach	\$86,733
63 City of Pasadena	\$42,658
Total	\$5,835,461

Alameda caseload is minus Berkeley caseload

Los Angeles caseload is minus Long Beach and Pasadena caseloads