

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
CalWORKs PROGRAM							
GF Impact includes TANF and GF							
<p>Realignment Family Support Subaccount - Significantly Changed This premise reflects funding shifts for CalWORKs grant costs from GF to revenues deposited into the Realignment Family Support Subaccount.</p> <p>AB 85 (Chapter 24, Statutes of 2013) established the Realignment Family Support Subaccount within the Sales Tax Account. Funds deposited in this subaccount consist of county indigent health savings transferred to the Health Subaccount. These funds will be redistributed to counties in lieu of GF for CalWORKs expenditures.</p>	-\$300.0	-\$300.0	-\$900.0	\$0.0	-\$600.0	<p>In FY 2013-14, one-time cash flow GF loan authority is needed for \$225 million to advance funding to counties until funds are deposited into the subaccount.</p> <p>The increase in FY 2014-15 is based on the projection of revenues and funds available for the subaccount.</p>	<p>This premise shifts a funding source and will be seamless to recipients.</p>
<p>Reinvestment - Five Percent Grant Increase - Significantly Changed This premise reflects a five percent increase to the CalWORKs MAP effective March 1, 2014, pursuant to AB 85 (Chapter 24, Statutes of 2013). For an assistance unit of three persons in high cost counties, the MAP will increase from \$638 to \$670 per month. The grant costs are offset by revenues deposited into the Child Poverty and Family Supplemental Support Subaccount. The administrative and employment services costs are funded with TANF.</p> <p>This new subaccount also funds any subsequent grant increases when sufficient revenues are available.</p>	\$0.0	\$3.5	\$15.5	\$3.5	\$15.5	<p>The estimate reflects an updated methodology. The FY 2014-15 reflects a full year of implementation.</p> <p>The FY 2013-14 total cost is \$61.0 million (includes \$57.5 million for grants, \$0.6 million for administration and \$2.9 million for employment services).</p> <p>The FY 2014-15 total cost is \$177.3 million (includes \$168.0 million for grants, \$0.9 million for administration and \$8.4 million for employment services).</p> <p>The projected subaccount funding available will offset all grants in FY 2013-14 and \$161.8 million of grants in FY 2014-15.</p>	<p>All CalWORKs cases will experience a grant increase. The average grant of current CalWORKs cases is estimated to increase by \$23.85.</p> <p>Approximately 2,580 cases in FY 2013-14 will become or remain eligible instead of being discontinued due to having earnings over the current eligibility limit.</p> <p>Aside from the subaccount, counties do not have a share in funding this MAP increase.</p>

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
<p>Standardized Appraisal Tool (AB 74) - Significantly Changed This premise reflects funding for the mandated development of a statewide appraisal tool as a component of the 24-Month Early Engagement Redesign of WTW activities and services.</p> <p>AB 74 (Chapter 21, Statutes of 2013) required the development of a statewide standardized appraisal tool and mandatory training for administration of the tool.</p> <p>The Budget Act of 2013 includes funding for one additional hour of caseworker time, in addition to one-time training and automation costs to customize an appraisal tool for CalWORKs.</p>	\$9.4	\$8.3	\$16.7	-\$1.1	\$7.3	<p>The FY 2013-14 costs include contract costs, which are necessary for customization of the federal tool for CalWORKs, pilot testing, hosting, technical assistance and development of statewide training protocols.</p> <p>In addition, county training cost and the majority of the automation costs are shifted from FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15.</p>	<p>The standardized appraisal tool will provide a robust upfront assessment to all new work-eligible entrants leading to more effective placement in work activities and referral to supportive services.</p> <p>The projected monthly average number of new work-eligible entrants is 19,745 for FY 2013-14 and 20,274 for FY 2014-15.</p>
<p>Stage One Child Care Services and Administration - Significantly Changed Historically, Stage One child care has been budgeted by developing a cost per case based on the most recent year of actual expenditure and caseload data, and then applying a CNI adjustment. The Governor's Budget proposes to remove the CNI adjustment from the Stage One methodology to align the budget with actual child care costs and reimbursements.</p>	\$335.5	\$335.5	\$320.7	\$0.0	-\$14.8	<p>The FY 2013-14 cost is held to the Budget Act of 2013.</p> <p>The decrease in FY 2014-15 is primarily due to removing the CNI adjustment from the Stage One methodology, slightly offset by a higher projected child care caseload.</p> <p>Removing the CNI adjustment results in a decrease of approximately \$18.2 million in FY 2014-15 in Stage One child care compared to the historic methodology.</p>	<p>There is no change to child care services or impact to recipients as this adjustment simply aligns child care funding with counties' actual child care expenditure trends.</p> <p>This funding provides Stage One child care services to an estimated 35,802 children in FY 2013-14 and 36,408 children in FY 2014-15.</p>

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
<p>Parent/Child Engagement Demonstration Pilot Project - New This premise proposes to fund a project that will improve outcomes for CalWORKs' hardest to serve families. The project will connect children with high quality child care, enhance the parenting and life skills of CalWORKs parents and provide an educational preparatory platform for eventual self-sufficiency. The project will serve 2,000 families with children.</p> <p>The project will operate in six counties for three years, from January 1, 2015, through December 31, 2017. The first group of 1,000 parents is anticipated to start the program in March 2015.</p>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$9.9	\$0.0	\$9.9	<p>This new premise would implement on January 1, 2015.</p> <p>The FY 2014-15 costs includes \$0.3 million for grant restorations, \$1.4 million for intensive case management, \$5.6 million for child care, \$2.1 million for parental engagement and participation, \$0.3 million for health and safety requirements and \$0.2 million for project consultant and evaluation.</p>	<p>Approximately 1,000 families will be selected to participate in this project in FY 2014-15, and will receive intensive case management and a licensed child care environment for their children. Participants that cure their sanction will have the adult portion of the CalWORKs grant restored.</p>
<p>Modified Vehicle Asset Limit (AB 74) - Significantly Changed This premise reflects the impact of increasing the vehicle asset limit from \$4,650 to \$9,500 and changing the valuation basis from fair market to equity value, as required by AB 74 (Chapter 21, Statutes of 2013). The policy also allows self-certification of a vehicle's equity value and an exemption for vehicles received as a gift, donation or family transfer.</p> <p>The fiscal impact reflects the net of increased costs associated with cases eligible for CalWORKs under the new limit and savings due to increased earnings and reduction to county administrative workload.</p>	\$0.0	\$1.2	\$2.8	\$1.2	\$2.8	<p>This premise implemented on January 1, 2014. The estimate reflects an updated methodology that includes offsetting grant savings from improved employment outcomes as well as services and child care for newly eligible cases.</p> <p>The FY 2014-15 reflects a full year of implementation.</p>	<p>Approximately 900 cases annually will no longer be denied eligibility or discontinued due to possessing a vehicle above the prior value/equity limit. Applicants and clients will self-certify vehicle values, which will reduce caseworker time in determining applicant eligibility.</p> <p>Approximately 1,600 existing cases are assumed to improve their employment outcomes, resulting in increased earnings and reduced grants.</p>

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
<p>CalWORKs Non-MOE - Significantly Changed This premise reflects a shift of funds for CalWORKs cases with an unaided but federally work eligible adult (including Safety Net cases and cases in which the parent is a drug or fleeing felon) from GF counted toward the TANF MOE requirement to Non-MOE GF. This premise does not include sanctioned cases. These CalWORKs cases will be solely state-funded and will be removed from the TANF WPR calculation.</p>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	This premise shifts \$220.2 million in FY 2013-14 and \$489.7 million in FY 2014-15 for approximately 84,100 cases. Implementation is delayed from July 2013 to December 2013 for approximately 27,000 cases. In addition, a further delay until January 2014 for 30,500 cases and to April 2014 for the remaining 26,600 cases to allow for automation system updates.	This premise shifts a funding source and will be seamless to recipients.
<p>TANF Transfer to CSAC The CDSS transfers TANF funds to CSAC to reimburse the cost of Cal Grants that are awarded to low-income students attending public or private colleges and universities.</p>	\$541.7	\$541.7	\$544.9	\$0.0	\$3.2	The increase in FY 2014-15 is a result of needing to spend more GF (instead of TANF) in CalWORKs to utilize all realignment funds. The available TANF is provided to CSAC.	These funds provide unmarried, low-income students up to the age of 25 with a living allowance and assistance with tuition and fees. Funds not provided by TANF are backfilled by GF and the impact to these students is seamless.

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
CALFRESH, CFAP AND OTHER FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS							
<p>WINS - Significantly Changed This premise provides an additional \$10 per month in food assistance to eligible CalFresh households meeting federal TANF work participation requirements. Statute requires implementation of the WINS program no later than July 1, 2014.</p> <p>The WINS benefit is a separate state MOE-funded program that will enable eligible CalFresh households to count in the WPR. Federal TANF data collection rules apply, including sampling and collection of characteristics data. The WINS will be funded with non-MOE GF until October 1, 2014 due to WPR data collection workload constraints.</p>	\$6.7	\$4.7	\$16.7	-\$2.0	\$10.0	<p>The FY 2013-14 reflects slower growth in CalFresh and fewer cases meeting the work hours threshold for WINS compared to the Budget Act of 2013, partially offset by an increase of ten minutes administration time per case to collect federally required characteristics data.</p> <p>The FY 2014-15 reflects a full year of implementation. Costs for automation are not included in the total for FY 2013-14.</p> <p>The FY 2013-14 funding is 100 percent non-MOE GF. In FY 2014-15, WINS will be partially funded with non-MOE GF (approximately \$3.8 million).</p>	<p>Approximately 14,900 CalFresh households per month (approximately 89,200 cases by June 2014) will participate in FY 2013-14 (reflects current CalFresh cases and new CalFresh cases eligible for the WINS program). An additional 4,900 new households per month (approximately 114,500 cases by June 2015) will participate in FY 2014-15.</p>
<p>Caseload Impact of the ACA - New This premise reflects funding for CalFresh and CFAP caseload increases that are anticipated as a result of the ACA beginning in FY 2013-14. This premise includes households with gross income at or below 130 percent of the FPL. Households with gross income above 130 percent of the FPL are captured in the Categorical Eligibility - Medi-Cal (AB 191) premise below.</p>	\$0.0	\$19.6	\$56.0	\$19.6	\$56.0	<p>This is a new premise that implements January 1, 2014 with the start of the ACA.</p> <p>The costs include approximately \$1.7 million GF in FY 2013-14 and \$5.3 million GF in FY 2014-15 for CFAP administration and benefits.</p>	<p>Approximately 114,000 new CalFresh households are anticipated due to the ACA by June 2014, with an additional 31,000 households enrolling by June 2015.</p>
<p>Categorical Eligibility - Medi-Cal (AB 191) - New This premise provides categorical eligibility for CalFresh to any household that includes a member that is eligible for Medi-Cal, as established by AB 191 (Chapter 669, Statutes 2013), to the extent permitted by federal law. This policy allows gross income limits above 130 percent of the FPL for those households, providing the household meets all other applicable CalFresh eligibility requirements. Gross income limits for this policy vary depending on the Medi-Cal program for which a person is eligible.</p>	\$0.0	\$1.4	\$3.1	\$1.4	\$3.1	<p>This is a new premise that implements January 1, 2014.</p> <p>The costs include CFAP administration and benefits of approximately \$249,000 GF in FY 2013-14 and \$738,000 GF in FY 2014-15.</p>	<p>This policy would allow some recipients who otherwise would have been denied eligibility based on their gross income to be eligible for CalFresh. This will increase the CalFresh caseload by 21,000 households by June 2014, with an additional 5,000 households enrolling by June 2015.</p>

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS							
Kin-GAP Program This program promotes moving dependents/wards from FC to a permanent home with a relative through guardianship.	\$55.0	\$56.5	\$58.8	\$1.5	\$3.8	The increase in both FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 reflects updated caseloads and grants.	The average monthly Kin-GAP caseload is 13,588 in FY 2013-14 and 13,766 in FY 2014-15, a 1.4 percent increase.
Tribal-State Title IV-E Agreements - Significantly Changed This premise reflects the costs when a tribe seeks to implement a tribal CWS program that includes FC, Adoptions and CWS. Federal regulations allow states to enter into agreements with tribes to pass through federal Title IV-E funds for FC maintenance and administration costs. There are currently two tribes, Karuk and Yurok, who have signed CWS agreements in place.	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	This premise reflects the use of GF savings from the enhanced FMAP rate to cover the tribal share of cost of the nonfederal FC and AAP assistance payments. The tribes qualify for the enhanced FMAP rate of 83 percent. The FY 2014-15 change also reflects a full year implementation for the Yurok Tribe.	Because the tribes do not have an extensive economic base, there is a challenge to meet the tribal share of cost. Because tribal children are best served by their own tribes, it is important to support the objective of implementing the tribal/state child welfare agreements. The caseload assumed for the Karuk Tribe is five FC, one AAP, nine CWS and one Adoption cases per month. The caseload assumed for the Yurok Tribe is 12 FC, no AAP, 31 CWS and no Adoption cases per month.
CWS-NS - Significantly Changed This premise reflects the costs associated with the CWS-NS. The system interfaces with other outside organizations that provide services to children within the child welfare system.	\$3.9	\$3.7	\$14.1	-\$0.1	\$10.2	There is a decrease in funding for FY 2013-14 that reflects the movement of workload from FY 2013-14 to FY 2014-15. There is an increase for FY 2014-15 that reflects the movement of funds for the project into FY 2014-15 and additional funding needed for additional (county or specialized) consultants to support tribes, probation and interface partnerships and interoperability as well as baseline adjustments.	There are no consumers impacted by this change.

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
COMMUNITY CARE LICENSING							
FCCHs- Significantly Changed This premise provides funding for two counties to provide FCCH licensing services and processing of serious incident reports.	\$0.7	\$0.2	\$0.1	-\$0.5	-\$0.6	The decrease in both FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 reflects a caseload reduction from Sacramento County giving the licensing function to the state for three quarters of FY 2013-14 and for a full year in FY 2014-15.	There are no consumers impacted by this change. Only the licensing functions are shifting from Sacramento County to the state.
ADULT PROGRAMS							
SSI/SSP Basic The SSI/SSP program is a cash assistance program for low-income aged, blind and disabled persons.	\$2,477.4	\$2,473.6	\$2,495.7	-\$3.8	\$18.3	The change in FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 is due to an updated caseload projection.	The average monthly caseload is 1,297,289 in FY 2013-14 and 1,308,166 in FY 2014-15, a 0.8 percent increase.
IHSS The IHSS program provides domestic services such as housework, transportation, and personal care services to eligible low-income aged, blind and disabled persons. These services are provided to assist individuals to remain safely in their homes and prevent institutionalization.	\$1,874.9	\$1,910.0	\$1,994.1	\$35.1	\$119.2	The increase from the Budget Act of 2013 is due to wage increases and higher average hours per case. The FY 2014-15 increase is due to the FLSA compliance.	The average monthly caseload is 447,702 in FY 2013-14 and 453,417 in FY 2014-15, a 1.3 percent increase.
IHSS County MOE- Significantly Changed Commencing July 1, 2012, counties have a MOE requirement in lieu of paying a share of the non-federal costs for IHSS services, administration and Public Authority administration. County costs that exceed the total county MOE level will be shifted to 100 percent GF. The county MOE level is based on FY 2011-12 expenditures. Beginning in FY 2014-15 an inflation factor of 3.5 percent is applied to the baseline annually .	-\$912.8	-\$959.6	-\$993.9	-\$46.8	-\$81.1	The Budget Act of 2013 displayed a non-add line for the county MOE. The increase in the county MOE in FY 2013-14, which reduces the county costs shifted to GF, is due to final FY 2011-12 expenditures, approved county wage increases in ten counties during FY 2012-13, and additional wage increases in FY 2013-14. In FY 2014-15 a statutory inflation factor of 3.5 percent is applied.	No consumers are impacted by this change.

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
<p>IHSS Basic Services- Significantly Changed This premise reflects the cost of providing IHSS services under the Personal Care Services, IHSS Plus Option and Residual Programs.</p> <p>Due to the IHSS county MOE display change, all nonfederal costs are now reflected as GF. The Budget Act of 2013 reflects \$1,858.1 million GF and \$1,057.6 million county reimbursement for services.</p>	\$2,915.7	\$3,000.7	\$3,035.6	\$85.0	\$119.9	The increase in FY 2013-14 is due to wage increases in 17 counties and higher hours after adjustment for the impact of the 3.6 percent reduction in FY 2012-13. The increase in FY 2014-15 is due to caseload growth and the impact of 17 counties affected by the minimum wage increase effective July 2014.	IHSS providers are impacted by wage increases.
<p>Minimum Wage (AB 10) Impact- New This non-add line represents the costs of increasing California's minimum wage from \$8.00 per hour to \$9.00 per hour in July 2014, as enacted by AB 10 (Chapter 351, Statutes of 2013). As this is a state policy change, all nonfederal IHSS provider wage costs will be GF. Provider wages impacted by this increase are reflected in IHSS basic services. Substantial increases in cost will occur following the January 2016 increase to \$10.00 per hour.</p>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2.9	\$0.0	\$2.9	The increase in FY 2014-15 is due to the minimum wage increase that implements on July 1, 2014.	Providers in 17 smaller counties with wages below \$9.00 per hour are positively impacted by wage increases.
<p>Reduction in Service Hours This premise reflects the savings and administrative costs associated with the reduction in IHSS service hours in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12301.01 and 12301.02. For FY 2013-14, an eight percent reduction to authorized service hours is implemented. This reduction will be lowered to seven percent effective July 2014.</p> <p>Federal savings for cases eligible for CFCO funding are 56 percent. Due to the county MOE, all nonfederal savings will be realized under the GF. The Budget Act of 2013 reflects the nonfederal savings on a non-add line.</p>	-\$176.4	-\$183.6	-\$177.6	-\$7.2	-\$1.2	The increase to savings in both FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 is due to higher average hours per case prior to the reduction, considering adjustment for the impact of the 3.6 percent reduction in FY 2012-13. FY 2014-15 savings are reduced in comparison to FY 2013-14 savings as the seven percent reduction creates a lower impact than the eight percent reduction.	Recipients receive a reduction to their authorized service hours. As there has been a 3.6 percent reduction in place since February 2011, recipients will receive an additional 4.4 percent reduction in FY 2013-14 with reinstatement of one percent starting FY 2014-15.

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

1/13/2014

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
<p>FLSA Regulations Compliance and Provider Backup System- New In September 2013, the United State Department of Labor issued its Final Rule concerning domestic workers under the FLSA. The regulations will be effective January 2015 and contain several significant changes impacting the IHSS program. The state will be required to pay IHSS providers overtime under the FLSA. The regulations also require providers to be compensated for travel time between households if serving multiple recipients, as well as for the provider's "wait time" during recipient's medical visits and for mandatory training. Costs reflect establishment of work week agreements and a Provider Backup System to avoid overtime costs.</p>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$99.1	\$0.0	\$99.1	This new premise will implement in FY 2014-15.	Both providers and recipients will be impacted. Recipients and providers will need to arrange workweek agreements. Providers will be limited to 40 hours per week as IHSS In-Home Operations waiver providers. Some recipients will need to obtain the services of additional providers.
<p>CCI Care Coordination Teams- New The CCI was authorized by SB 1008 (Chapter 33, Statutes of 2012) and SB 1036 (Chapter 45, Statutes of 2012) and subsequently amended by AB 1471 (Chapter 439, Statutes of 2012). SB 1008 requires managed care health plans to establish care coordination teams to coordinate the delivery of services and benefits. If an IHSS recipient consents to participation in a care coordination team, the team shall include the county IHSS social worker.</p>	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.4	This new premise will implement in FY 2014-15.	It is estimated that approximately ten percent of CCI recipients will choose to participate in a CCI Care Coordination Team.
<p>CMIPS II - Significantly Changed This premise reflects the costs for development, support and implementation of the CMIPS II system.</p>	\$43.0	\$44.5	\$24.5	\$1.5	-\$18.5	The increase in FY 2013-14 reflects capacity increase needs for the remaining counties to be phased into the CMIPS II system and system enhancements required for new functionality in the M&O phase of the contract. The decrease in FY 2014-15 is due to scheduled completion of system implementation and the commencement of the M&O phase. There is an ongoing Budget Change Proposal and SPR for this project as well.	Implementation of the new system in November 2013 brought its benefits to recipients, providers and county staff.

* Please refer to page 11 for a full description of acronyms.
 Prepared by Fiscal Forecasting and Policy Branch/CDSS

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary*

GF Impact in Millions

Issue	Budget Act of 2013	2014-15 Governor's Budget		Change from Budget Act of 2013		Reason for Change from Budget Act of 2013	People/Consumer Impacts
		FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15		
AUTOMATION PROJECTS							
WCDS-CalWIN - Significantly Changed The WCDS Consortium is one of the three consortia within the SAWS project. The OSI provides state-level project management and oversight for CalWIN. The WCDS-CalWIN system consists of 18 counties. An increase is required in FY 2014-15 for the shift of M&O costs from CalHEERS and Customer Service Centers to the WCDS-CalWIN M&O budget and a possible increase of up to \$25 million for a new vendor's transitional costs for data center setup, facilities acquisition and preparation, configuration of project software and assumption of existing software licenses. Prior to FY 2014-15, one-time and initial M&O costs for these items were included in the CalHEERS project budget and a separate SAWS customer service center premise, respectively.	\$43.8	\$43.9	\$56.6	\$0.1	\$12.8	The FY 2014-15 increase reflects the shift of M&O costs from CalHEERS and Customer Service Centers to the WCDS-CalWIN M&O budget and a possible increased expenditure for a new vendor's transitional cost, pending a contract award appeal process.	No consumers are impacted by this change.
State Hearings Division Appeals Case Management System - New This premise proposes to fund a new Appeals Case Management System to replace the current compilation of the mainframe database and ad hoc applications that make up the State Hearings System. A new Appeals Case Management System is essential to reduce processing errors, reduce case processing time at both the Division and county levels and help reduce state paid penalties based upon the current State Hearings Division workload. The new Appeals Case Management System will provide the public and counties with an automated mechanism to request and process appeal hearings. These enhancements will result in fewer delays and postponements of hearings. There is a corresponding Budget Change Proposal for state operations.	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$1.6	\$0.0	\$1.6	This is a new premise that implements January 1, 2014. The budget is based on estimated contract expenses and case forecasting.	A new system is necessary in order to ensure the timely handling and processing of hearings, which are growing substantially as a result of ACA, Medi-Cal and CalFresh caseload growth.

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
Local Assistance Estimates
2014-15 Governor's Budget
 Budget Summary

1/13/2014

Acronym	Definition
AAP	Adoption Assistance Program
AB	Assembly Bill
ACA	Affordable Care Act
CalHEERS	California Healthcare Eligibility, Enrollment and Retention System
CalWIN	CalWORKs Information Network
CalWORKs	California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids
CCI	Coordinated Care Initiative
CDSS	California Department of Social Services
CFAP	California Food Assistance Program
CFCO	Community First Choice Option
CMIPS	Case Management, Information and Payrolling System
CNI	California Necessities Index
CSAC	California Student Aid Commission
CWS	Child Welfare Services
CWS-NS	Child Welfare Services -New System
ETV	Education and Training Vouchers
FC	Foster Care
FCCH	Family Child Care Home
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
FLSA	Fair Labor Standards Act

Acronym	Definition
FMAP	Federal Medical Assistance Payment
FPL	Federal Poverty Level
FY	Fiscal Year
GF	State General Fund
IHSS	In-Home Supportive Services
Kin-GAP	Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment
M&O	Maintenance and Operations
MAP	Maximum Aid Payment
MOE	Maintenance of Effort
OSI	Office of Systems and Integration
SAWS	Statewide Automated Welfare System
SB	Senate Bill
SPR	Special Project Report
SSI/SSP	Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
WCDS	Welfare Client Data System
WINS	Work Incentive Nutritional Supplement
WPR	Work Participation Rate
WTW	Welfare-To-Work