

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, California 95814



June 24, 2002

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE NO. I 43-02

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS
IHSS PROGRAM MANAGERS**REASON FOR THIS
TRANSMITTAL**

- State Law Change
 Federal Law or Regulation
Change
 Court Order
 Clarification Requested by
One or More Counties
 Initiated by CDSS

SUBJECT: ASSEMBLY BILL 1682, CHAPTER 90, STATUTES OF 1999 (AB 1682)
FISCAL AND BUDGET QUESTIONS RAISED BY COUNTIES

REFERENCE: ACIN I-27-02; ACL 00-36; ACL 00-68

In recent months counties have submitted a number of questions regarding the implementation requirements of AB 1682. ACIN I-27-02 provides answers to questions specifically relating to the implementation timeline. The following information responds to additional questions that have been raised about fiscal and budget matters.

FUNDING

- I. ADVISORY COMMITTEES
- II. COUNTY ACTING AS EMPLOYER FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PURPOSES
- III. COUNTIES WITH PUBLIC AUTHORITIES
- IV. WORKER'S COMPENSATION
- V. MISCELLANEOUS

I. ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. **Question:** Clarify funding for the Public Authority (PA) Advisory Committee vs. funding for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Advisory Committee.

Answer: With the enactment of AB 1682, funding for the PA Advisory Committee and IHSS Advisory Committee is the same.

State law [Welfare & Institution Code (W&I Code) 12301.3, 12301.4] requires that each county have an Advisory Committee to provide input on how the county should comply with AB 1682 and to provide advice and recommendations on the IHSS program on an ongoing basis after the county has put in place its AB 1682 employer.

State law (W&I Code 12301.6) also requires that each PA have an Advisory Committee if the PA's board of directors is the county board of supervisors.

(Note: Under W&I Code 12301.3 a county with a PA governing body in place prior to July 1, 2000 is not required to create a separate AB 1682 Advisory Committee, since the county is deemed to have met the composition requirements of the IHSS Advisory Committee.)

State law (W&I Code 12301.4) only allows the State to share in the funding of one of the two committees. A county with an AB 1682 Advisory Committee that elects the PA option must determine if its PA Advisory Committee will also serve as its AB 1682 Advisory Committee or whether the county will operate two Advisory Committees.

As noted above, if a county chooses to operate both Advisory Committees the State can only financially share in one of them. Whether or not the county opts for one or two Advisory Committees the committee designated for AB 1682 purposes will be funded as the State mandated AB 1682 committee and no county funds will be required. Costs for the committee should be claimed to the AB 1682 Advisory Committee item as described in County Fiscal Letter 00/01-48 dated 12/22/00. See also ACL 00-36, question 30.

II. COUNTY ACTING AS EMPLOYER FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PURPOSES

2. **Question:** If a county chooses to act as the employer for collective bargaining purposes only, is the county able to structure a “rate” like a PA that would allow the county to pay for the costs at their normal sharing ratio for such items as liability insurance and contracting, and for someone to negotiate with the union for wages and benefits? Can the county bill items such as those listed above via their IHSS administrative claim?

Answer: No. If the county chooses to act as the AB 1682 employer for employer/employee relations (“collective bargaining”) purposes only, they cannot structure a rate like a PA. Any associated administrative costs incurred by the county are claimed as county IHSS administrative costs on the County Expense Claim (CEC).

Please note that county responsibilities under AB 1682 are not limited to “collective bargaining”. AB 1682 requires the county to act as or create an employer for IHSS providers for the purposes of the Meyer, Milias, Brown Act. This Act governs employer/employee relations involving public employees. This may involve responsibilities beyond collective bargaining. Counties should seek advice of Counsel as to the extent of their duties under the Act. See Also ACL 00-36, question 16.

3. **Question:** When the county acts as the employer for collective bargaining purposes, are the administrative costs to provide IHSS services shared by the federal sharing ratio (at 51.4%), or does the federal sharing only apply to provider wages and benefits? If so, then may the PA have more things included in the federal sharing than when the county acts as the employer?

Answer: It is not clear what is meant by “administrative costs to provide IHSS services “ as used in your question. The level of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) in the IHSS program for federally eligible costs is a constant and is not affected by the means selected by a county to comply with AB 1682. Eligible costs are IHSS program costs that are

associated with the delivery of services to Medi-Cal beneficiaries under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP).

When a county elects to act as the AB 1682 employer the county's costs related to that role qualify for federal funding at the established rate at which federal funds are available on the same basis as other county IHSS program administrative expenses. The federal sharing ratio is 51.4% of the PCSP hours for IHSS services and administrative costs in all modes. The State/county share for IHSS administrative expenses remains at 70% State and 30% County of the non-federal share. The State/county share for service costs is 65% State and 35% County of the non-federal share.

PAs will have different and potentially greater administrative costs than a county serving as the AB 1682 employer because PAs have specific legally required functions that a county operating as the AB 1682 employer does not have. Please note that unlike county administrative costs, the county cost for PA administrative costs is at the same ratio as IHSS services and benefits. The county cost is 35% of the non-federally funded cost. See also ACL 00-68, question 4,9 and 11.

4. **Question:** If the county chooses to act as the employer for collective bargaining purposes in the IP mode, what is the amount of benefits and salary in which the State will share?

Answer: For the Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 the State will share in wage costs up to minimum wage plus 5.31% for provider compensation in the IP mode administered by the county. For the FY 2001-02, 5.31% above minimum wage translates to \$7.11 per hour. See W&I Code §12306.21. A federal share is available above that level. The State has no legal authority to share in the cost of benefits when a county opts to act as the AB 1682 employer. However, the FFP can be claimed for wages and benefits up to 150% of the State minimum wage for PCSP services.

5. **Question:** If a county chooses to act as employer for collective bargaining purposes, is it reasonable to assume that a rate of \$7.11 for providers would last without union involvement?

Answer: If a county acts as the AB 1682 employer the IP mode is maintained in the county. Current law allows the State to share in IP wages under the IP mode in a non-PA county up to \$7.11/hr, i.e., minimum wage plus 5.31%. The State will continue to share in IP wages up to this level as long as the county's board of supervisors approves the wage level and State law is not changed. The current level of State participation is established by the legislature in W&I Code 12306.21. The department cannot speculate whether the law may be changed by the Legislature in future years.

6. **Question:** If there are State funds available to absorb administrative costs for a PA or nonprofit consortium, why would a county not get the same consideration if they choose to be the employer for collective bargaining purposes?

Answer: Counties do get the same consideration. County costs of acting as the AB 1682 employer are treated as county IHSS administrative costs and are funded in the same manner as PA costs through State, county and federal sharing of the cost. The State will

fund 70% of the non-federally funded cost to a county acting as the AB 1682 employer. The county's share is 30% of the non-federally funded costs.

The difference between a county's costs to act as the AB 1682 employer and a PA is that PAs have the legally mandated responsibilities beyond serving as the employer for employer/employee relations purposes. For that reason PAs may have higher administrative costs. The county share of PA costs is 35% of the non-federally funding costs. Funding for administrative costs for a PA is authorized in W&I Code §12301.7. Administrative costs for the PA are part of the PA rate.

7. **Question:** Under the county administration of the IP mode, if a county chooses to pay or bill for a liability policy for IP's, and for an entity or individual to conduct negotiations with the union, would these costs be paid via program money or administrative claim?

Answer: The costs itemized in the question would be allowable and would be claimed as county IHSS administrative costs on the County Expense Claim (CEC).

8. **Question:** Is there any plan for increasing the wage?

Answer: We are not aware of any plan. We cannot speculate.

9. **Question:** What about benefits? Will they be included eventually in the shared amount?

Answer: We are not aware of any plan. We cannot speculate.

III. COUNTIES WITH PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

10. **Question:** How are counties to calculate the start-up and implementation costs associated with AB 1682, which requires all counties to act as, or create, an employer for collective bargaining purposes?

Answer: We do not have a formula to provide you for calculating start-up and implementation costs. Counties have experience estimating program start-up and implementation costs. We can only suggest that AB 1682 be analyzed and costed like any other new program. Please note that under the PA or Non-Profit Consortium option total annual operating costs must be converted to an hourly rate by dividing the total annualized cost by the annual projected paid IHSS hours in the county for the initial year of operations. We suggest that you contact one of the counties with a PA for information about their experience. See also ACL 00-68, question 13.

11. **Question:** How can the cost be reasonable for counties with less hours than large counties?

Answer: See the attached table. It appears that with a few exceptions most counties have a sufficient number of annual paid IHSS hours to generate an hourly PA administrative rate that will support a PA. With low hours the hourly administrative component of the rate will be larger than with high hours. This is an accepted artifact of the rate-setting approach.

12. **Question:** Can the PA counties submit costs for PA claiming through the CEC?

Answer: Generally no. Counties must submit the PA administrative and provider benefit costs using the SOC 448, which is similar to the SOC 432 form used to claim IHSS contract expenses. Counties will use the county expense claim to claim the administrative costs incurred by county employees to support county efforts to determine how to comply with AB 1682 compliance including the development of a PA. Once the PA is operational and has an approved rate all PA costs must be claimed via the SOC 448. If a county provides support services to an operating PA, such as accounting, personnel, payroll, etc. the county should receive reimbursement from the PA for these costs. These costs should, therefore, be included in the PA's administrative rate component.

13. **Question:** Counties would like information on other counties that have worked out a budget for a public authority?

Answer: Contra Costa county has distributed a copy of their PA budget during an AB 1682 workshop. The majority of the existing PA's have annual operating budgets between \$490,000 and \$3,500,000.

14. **Question:** Can the county structure a PA rate that includes all related costs including liability, insurance, negotiations, increased wages and benefits for providers, and enhancements to the program? If not, how will these costs be funded?

Answer: Please refer to the copy of ACL 98-20 which describes the PA rate-setting and claiming process.

The PA rate has four components and includes all eligible PA costs. The four components are provider wage level, taxes on provider wages, PA administrative cost and provider benefits. Under the California Medi-Cal State Plan the PA rate cannot exceed 200% of the State minimum wage (\$13.50/hr). The eligible operating costs of a PA will include items such as insurance, cost of negotiations, PA staff salary, equipment, office space and support services needed customarily associated with operating a public agency. The costs of performing the statutorily mandated PA functions are also eligible costs. These costs form the PA administrative rate.

Wage and benefit costs for IHSS providers under a PA have a specific State sharing formula. In short, under current State law, in FY 2001-02 the State can share in IHSS provider wages up to \$8.50/hr. If a county's IHSS provider wages are less than \$7.50/hr the State can also share in individual health benefits up to \$.60/hr. If a county's IHSS provider wages are \$7.50/hr or greater the State can share in up to an additional \$1.00/hr for individual health benefits as long as the total for wages and benefits does not exceed \$9.10/hr up to \$1.60/hr.

15. **Question:** Can a county that has an interagency contract in place with a PA include administrative costs incurred under the contract as valid PA expenses when it starts invoicing the PA administrative rate following the rate approval? What costs can counties include on their SOC 448 (PA Administrative Expense Claim) when they first get their PA rate approved?

Answer: County costs incurred in developing and managing the county's interagency agreement with their county's PA are allowable county IHSS administrative costs. These costs must be claimed on the CEC. If a county provides support services to their PA they the PA must reimburse county for their costs. The PA needs to include these costs in their administrative rate component calculations. Similarly, if a PA contracts with the county to perform services normally performed by the county in their roles of administering the IHSS program the county should reimburse the PA and then claim these costs on the CEC as a contract expense. The costs of the services provided by the PA for the county should not be included in the PA rate.

Although the PA administrative cost reconciliation with a county is currently done on a quarterly basis, counties typically "front" the PA the funds needed to meet the PA's operating costs. The arrangements governing how the PA's operating cost will be funded by the county should be included in the interagency agreement between the county and the PA. See also ACL 00-68, question 13.

16. **Question:** Is health coverage available for IHSS providers working under a PA with no share-of-cost for the county?

Answer: No. This question may have arisen because some counties have indicated that they have redirected a portion of their indigent health care funds to support health insurance for IHSS providers on the premise that they are already paying for health care services to these individuals through the indigent system. This may reduce the amount of new funds counties must secure to fund health benefits. The redirection of these funds to finance health insurance means that when these individuals subsequently access the county system for health care the county can be assured of reimbursement from the providers' health plan.

17. **Question:** Should the counties treat the PA Administration Reimbursement Rate as a pass-through when using a PA method of service delivery in the IP Mode? (i.e. the county keeps none of this money).

Answer: The PA administrative rate establishes the maximum amount of funding available for the PA's administrative costs in a fiscal year, e.g., it creates a maximum budget for PA administrative costs for the PA. Counties typically "front" the funding to their PA for administrative costs. Counties must then claim for the actual costs billed to them by their PA for the services rendered by the PA. The county will be reimbursed by the State for the State and federal share of these costs.

Counties should monitor their PA costs and adjust their PA rate when necessary to assure that the administration component of the rate provides sufficient funds to cover the PA's annual operating costs. Once a fiscal year ends the State cannot share in PA administrative costs that exceed the product of the administration component of the PA rate and the county's total annual IHSS paid hours.

18. **Question:** How will the State calculate the PA rate for a PA serving multiple counties through a regional agreement?

Answer: The State does not “calculate” the PA rates. Each county in a regional agreement served by a single PA will determine its unique PA rate based on the county’s IHSS provider wage rate, the applicable employer taxes, IHSS provider benefits authorized by the county, and the portion of the PA’s administrative costs allocable to each county served under the agreement. See also ACL 00-68, question 23.

19. **Question:** Are the IHSS providers who will become employees of the PA for collective bargaining purposes subject to applicable State or Federal minimum wage and overtime laws?

Answer: Current IHSS regulations found in the Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) at 30-764 continue to govern overtime by providers. Please note that except for limited purposes, such as the purpose of bargaining for wages and benefits described in AB 1682, IHSS providers are not “employees” of the PA.

20. **Question:** If an increase in wages were agreed to by the PA in bargaining with a recognized employee organization, can the increase be retroactive? In other words, if the State must approve the rate, which takes time, must the salary increase not be effective until after the State has approved the rate?

Answer: A PA wage increase cannot be retroactive. See W&I Code 12306.1(b) which provides that a PA wage increase takes effect commencing on the first day of the month subsequent to the month in which final approval is received from the Department of Health Services. The Department may grant approval on a conditional basis, subject to the availability of funding.

21. **Question:** If the county is required to have the interagency agreement in place, appoint or hire an Employee Relations Director to negotiate with the union, contract with a neutral third party to conduct the union elections and verify the results, how is the county to pay for the costs of implementation prior to having an approved direct rate to cover overhead costs? Aren’t these new State-mandated costs related to AB 1682?

Answer: It is the Department’s position that there are no reimburseable costs mandated by the State in AB 1682 within the meaning of Government Code Section 17514. County costs incurred in connection with preparations for complying with AB 1682, prior to the inception of the PA, may be claimed as IHSS program administrative costs. The county’s share of such costs is 30% of the non-federally funded portion of total costs. These costs would include the costs of developing and executing the interagency agreement and hiring an executive director or employee relations director, if done in advance of the PA becoming operational. When staff is hired for the PA, and begins performing PA work, their costs can be covered by the PA’s approved administrative rate. However, the sharing ratio for PA administrative costs reverts to 65% State and 35% county of the non-federal share.

Please note that we have identified no provision in the Myers, Milias, Brown Act requiring a county to contract with a neutral third party to conduct the union election and verify the results. We suggest you obtain legal advice from your county council on this point.

22. **Question:** Can a PA pay extra compensation to IP providers who:
- a. work with certain high maintenance recipients
 - b. who agree to provide unscheduled emergency provider care
 - c. agree to attend and complete provider training

Secondly, can counties include these costs in their operating budget as an administrative cost? If not, how should these cost be accounted for, and is State and federal cost sharing available?

Answer: Counties have the authority under MPP 30-764 to pay wages above the standard wage in a county. However, these wages are not allowable PA administrative costs and cannot be included in a PA administrative rate. As a practical matter special wage rates cannot be reflected in the PA rate, which can reflect only one wage rate, i.e., the county's base provider wage rate. We have previously advised counties that Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) cannot process multiple wage rates in a county. At this time we do not have a way to process special wage payments that will allow us to identify such payments for the purposes of allocating the costs or to withhold necessary employer taxes and disability insurance payments. Even if these considerations were not relevant it is not clear if the CMIPS special transactions capability would work for every kind of this special wage payment. As a consequence counties should discuss their plans for special provider wages with the Department before making collective bargaining commitments.

Counties should note that under State law the State can currently only share in wages up to \$8.50/hr in PA counties. The county share of cost for wage amounts above \$8.50/hr is 100% of the non-federally funded cost for PCSP services and 100% for IHSS residual services. Additionally, counties are reminded that IHSS regulations govern overtime by IHSS providers. The State will not share in any overtime wage levels negotiated by a PA through collective bargaining that deviate from current IHSS regulation provisions.

IV. WORKER'S COMPENSATION

23. **Question:** Even though the State pays for Worker's Compensation Insurance, does the county worker's compensation rate go up if claims are high in that specific county? Is there any penalty if a county's providers have high claims?

Answer: We are continuing to research this question with CDSS fiscal staff but it is our belief that the allocation of the costs of the Worker's Compensation Insurance is based on county caseloads and caseload mixes. The incidence or cost of worker's compensation claims does not affect a county's share of the cost.

V. MISCELLANEOUS

24. **Question:** How long will CDSS rate approval and authorization take?

Answer: Counties should plan for 30-60 days. In exceptional cases, however, we can expedite approval in a matter of days if all required documentation has been submitted and it supports the requested rate. See also ACL 00-68, question 5.

25. **Question:** A previous estimate of time required to approve a direct rate was 90 days. As the number of counties submitting requests gets larger, will the process take longer? If so, can you estimate how much longer?

Answer: The Department has always asked for 90 days lead time for the approval process for PA rates, but it rarely takes anywhere near that long to get approval once a fully documented request is received. If counties flow their PA rate approval requests to the State sufficiently in advance of the desired effective date, and with all required documentation, then the Department should continue to be able to maintain its current turnaround time. The turnaround time will only be adversely affected if we receive a surge of last minute approval requests. The problem would be compounded if there were multiple last minute requests without adequate documentation. See also ACL 00-68, question 5.

26. **Question:** What information can you provide related to Senate Bill 90 State mandate claims related to AB 1682 implementation?

Answer: There is a county/state mandate claim regarding AB 1682 under submission at the State Mandates Commission. See also ACL 00-36, question 8.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Adult Programs Branch at (916) 653-3850.

Sincerely,

*Original Signed Joseph Carlin for
Donna L. Mandelstam
Dated June 24, 2002*

DONNA L. MANDELSTAM
Deputy Director
Disability and Adult Programs Division

Attachment

SMALL COUNTIES -- ESTIMATED MAXIMUM ANNUAL ALLOWABLE PUBLIC AUTHORITY ADMIN COSTS @ \$13.50 TOTAL PA STATE PLAN RATE CAP

County	(avg) IP cases	(sum)IP hours	\$6.75 wage+ taxes (10%)+ \$.60 benefits	Est. County Share [2]	\$7.50 wage+ taxes (10%) + \$.60 benefits	Est. County Share	\$8.50 wage+ taxes (10%) + \$.60benefits	Est. County Share	\$9.50 wage+ taxes (10%) + \$.60 benefits	Est. County Share	\$10.50 wage + taxes(10%) + \$.60 benefits	Est. County Share	\$11.50 wage + taxes (10%)+ \$.60 benefits	Est. County Share
ALPINE	6	6,841	\$37,420	\$8,237	\$31,811	\$7,003	\$24,286	\$5,346	\$16,760	\$3,690	\$9,235	\$2,033	\$1,710	\$376
MONO	21	39,544	\$216,306	\$47,616	\$183,880	\$40,478	\$140,381	\$30,902	\$96,883	\$21,327	\$53,384	\$11,752	\$9,886	\$2,176
SIERRA	45	52,048	\$284,703	\$62,672	\$242,023	\$53,277	\$184,770	\$40,674	\$127,518	\$28,071	\$70,265	\$15,468	\$13,012	\$2,864
INYO	74	78,176	\$427,623	\$94,134	\$363,518	\$80,022	\$277,525	\$61,092	\$191,531	\$42,162	\$105,538	\$23,232	\$19,544	\$4,302
TUOLUMNE	177	114,121	\$624,242	\$137,416	\$530,663	\$116,816	\$405,130	\$89,182	\$279,596	\$61,548	\$154,063	\$33,914	\$28,530	\$6,280
MODOC	89	122,001	\$667,345	\$146,904	\$567,305	\$124,882	\$433,104	\$95,340	\$298,902	\$65,798	\$164,701	\$36,256	\$30,500	\$6,714
COLUSA	124	137,756	\$753,525	\$165,875	\$640,565	\$141,009	\$489,034	\$107,652	\$337,502	\$74,295	\$185,971	\$40,938	\$34,439	\$7,581
TRINITY	131	153,436	\$839,295	\$184,756	\$713,477	\$157,060	\$544,698	\$119,906	\$375,918	\$82,752	\$207,139	\$45,598	\$38,359	\$8,444
AMADOR	126	159,003	\$869,746	\$191,459	\$739,364	\$162,758	\$564,461	\$124,256	\$389,557	\$85,754	\$214,654	\$47,252	\$39,751	\$8,750
LASSEN	140	186,947	\$1,022,600	\$225,108	\$869,304	\$191,362	\$663,662	\$146,094	\$458,020	\$100,825	\$252,378	\$55,557	\$46,737	\$10,288
PLUMAS	210	188,989	\$1,033,770	\$227,566	\$878,799	\$193,452	\$670,911	\$147,689	\$463,023	\$101,926	\$255,135	\$56,164	\$47,247	\$10,401
MARIPOSA	156	195,881	\$1,071,469	\$235,865	\$910,847	\$200,507	\$695,378	\$153,075	\$479,908	\$105,643	\$264,439	\$58,212	\$48,970	\$10,780
SAN BENITO	214	245,057	\$1,340,462	\$295,079	\$1,139,515	\$250,844	\$869,952	\$191,505	\$600,390	\$132,165	\$330,827	\$72,826	\$61,264	\$13,486
DEL NORTE	286	307,931	\$1,684,383	\$370,787	\$1,431,879	\$315,203	\$1,093,155	\$240,639	\$754,431	\$166,075	\$415,707	\$91,511	\$76,983	\$16,946
SUTTER	331	309,985	\$1,695,618	\$373,261	\$1,441,430	\$317,306	\$1,100,447	\$242,244	\$759,463	\$167,183	\$418,480	\$92,121	\$77,496	\$17,059
CALAVERAS	313	325,163	\$1,778,642	\$391,537	\$1,512,008	\$332,842	\$1,154,329	\$254,105	\$796,649	\$175,368	\$438,970	\$96,632	\$81,291	\$17,895
GLENN	326	334,473	\$1,829,567	\$402,747	\$1,555,299	\$342,372	\$1,187,379	\$261,381	\$819,459	\$180,390	\$451,539	\$99,398	\$83,618	\$18,407
SISKIYOU	369	370,893	\$2,028,785	\$446,601	\$1,724,652	\$379,652	\$1,316,670	\$289,842	\$908,688	\$200,032	\$500,706	\$110,222	\$92,723	\$20,411
NAPA	386	522,889	\$2,860,203	\$629,624	\$2,431,434	\$535,238	\$1,856,256	\$408,622	\$1,281,078	\$282,007	\$705,900	\$155,392	\$130,722	\$28,776
EL DORADO	413	569,347	\$3,114,328	\$685,565	\$2,647,464	\$582,793	\$2,021,182	\$444,928	\$1,394,900	\$307,063	\$768,618	\$169,198	\$142,337	\$31,333
YUBA	717	748,024	\$4,091,691	\$900,714	\$3,478,312	\$765,689	\$2,655,485	\$584,559	\$1,832,659	\$403,428	\$1,009,832	\$222,297	\$187,006	\$41,166
TEHAMA	598	789,504	\$4,318,587	\$950,661	\$3,671,194	\$808,149	\$2,802,739	\$616,974	\$1,934,285	\$425,799	\$1,065,830	\$234,624	\$197,376	\$43,449
NEVADA	503	884,474	\$4,838,073	\$1,065,017	\$4,112,804	\$905,362	\$3,139,883	\$691,190	\$2,166,961	\$477,019	\$1,194,040	\$262,847	\$221,119	\$48,675
SAN LUIS OBISPO	995	988,866	\$5,409,097	\$1,190,718	\$4,598,227	\$1,012,219	\$3,510,474	\$772,769	\$2,422,722	\$533,320	\$1,334,969	\$293,870	\$247,217	\$54,420
PLACER	811	1,076,062	\$5,886,059	\$1,295,713	\$5,003,688	\$1,101,474	\$3,820,020	\$840,911	\$2,636,352	\$580,347	\$1,452,684	\$319,783	\$269,016	\$59,219
MADERA	1,068	1,157,052	\$6,329,074	\$1,393,235	\$5,380,292	\$1,184,377	\$4,107,535	\$904,202	\$2,834,777	\$624,027	\$1,562,020	\$343,851	\$289,263	\$63,676
MARIN	859	1,258,560	\$6,884,323	\$1,515,463	\$5,852,304	\$1,288,282	\$4,467,888	\$983,527	\$3,083,472	\$678,772	\$1,699,056	\$374,017	\$314,640	\$69,262
KINGS	1,069	1,309,090	\$7,160,722	\$1,576,308	\$6,087,269	\$1,340,006	\$4,647,270	\$1,023,015	\$3,207,271	\$706,024	\$1,767,272	\$389,034	\$327,273	\$72,043
MENDOCINO	1,236	1,508,552	\$8,251,779	\$1,816,485	\$7,014,767	\$1,544,178	\$5,355,360	\$1,178,889	\$3,695,952	\$813,599	\$2,036,545	\$448,310	\$377,138	\$83,020
SANTA BARBARA	1,285	1,514,149	\$8,282,395	\$1,823,224	\$7,040,793	\$1,549,907	\$5,375,229	\$1,183,263	\$3,709,665	\$816,618	\$2,044,101	\$449,973	\$378,537	\$83,328
MERCED	2,010	1,521,130	\$8,320,581	\$1,831,630	\$7,073,255	\$1,557,053	\$5,400,012	\$1,188,718	\$3,726,769	\$820,383	\$2,053,526	\$452,048	\$380,283	\$83,713
VENTURA	1,700	1,878,833	\$10,277,217	\$2,262,349	\$8,736,573	\$1,923,204	\$6,669,857	\$1,468,252	\$4,603,141	\$1,013,301	\$2,536,425	\$558,349	\$469,708	\$103,398
TULARE	2,535	1,916,854	\$10,485,191	\$2,308,131	\$8,913,371	\$1,962,123	\$6,804,832	\$1,497,965	\$4,696,292	\$1,033,807	\$2,587,753	\$569,649	\$479,214	\$105,490
HUMBOLDT	1,606	2,058,295	\$11,258,874	\$2,478,444	\$9,571,072	\$2,106,904	\$7,306,947	\$1,608,497	\$5,042,823	\$1,110,089	\$2,778,698	\$611,682	\$514,574	\$113,274
SHASTA	1,854	2,174,446	\$11,894,220	\$2,618,304	\$10,111,174	\$2,225,798	\$7,719,283	\$1,699,265	\$5,327,393	\$1,172,732	\$2,935,502	\$646,199	\$543,612	\$119,667

Notes: 1. The max PA admin funding is derived as follows: (Maximum PA Rate Per State Plan -- \$13.50) less (the wage/tax/benefit factor) times (the total estimated annual hours).

2. County share = (Total\$amount*.744*.5*.35)+(Total\$amount*.256*.35)

3. IP cases and hours are paid IP hours CMIPS management statistics period July - December 2001