



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



GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

DATE: August 1, 2019

CHDP Program Letter No.: 19-01

TO: All Child Health and Disability Prevention Program Directors, Deputy Directors, Medical Consultants, Dependent and Independent County Operations Staff, and State Integrated Systems of Care Division Staff

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Allocation for the Child Health and Disability Prevention Program

The purpose of this Child Health and Disability Prevention (CHDP) Program Letter is to provide local CHDP programs with the **Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-2020** State General Fund (SGF) allocations for carrying out CHDP program requirements as set forth in Health and Safety Code, Article 6, Section 124025 et seq. and Article 4.7, Section 14148.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. To conduct administrative activities of the CHDP program from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020, each local program is authorized to spend up to the amount allocated from SGF and the matching Medi-Cal Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) allocation for each funding source within the CHDP program administrative budget. Please see the attached funding allocation table which includes the CHDP SGF, EPSDT, and Title XIX funds.

Each local program is authorized to claim Title XIX Federal Funds to match its own local funds in order to perform EPSDT administrative activities in the CHDP program and, if applicable, matching Title XIX Federal funds to perform EPSDT administrative activities specifically for children and youth in foster care. Please refer to the Integrated Systems of Care Division (ISCD) Plan and Fiscal Guidelines (PFG) for submission of county-city match budgets.

This program letter serves as each local program's approved state CHDP administrative budget and enables each local program to use this letter to develop its budget. There will be no budget approval letters issued from ISCD. Each local program remains responsible for overseeing and tracking its administrative budget expenditures. As in previous years, local programs will only be reimbursed for state expenditures up to their authorized budget allocations.

Local programs should follow the ISCD PFG for budget submissions to ISCD headquarters. The CHDP program budgets are due no later than 60 days from the date of the last ISCD allocation letter (CHDP, Health Care Program for Children in Foster Care, and California Children Services Program) issued to local programs. Local programs must complete, sign, and submit the CHDP Certification Statement as required in the ISCD PFG. 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 SGF allocated.

Local programs are requested to submit electronic copies of duty statements, civil service classification statements, and organizational chart(s) for CHDP budgeted management and staff. Local programs that have questions regarding staffing, personnel changes, duty statements, Memoranda of Understanding, and other budget preparation items should discuss these with the CHDP Nurse Consultant, prior to budget submission. All local programs must adhere to the ISCD PFG for determination of enhanced and non-enhanced designation of staff and their activities as well as the provision for Federal Financial Participation (FFP) determination. Documentation for staff that qualify for enhanced FFP and/or work in more than one program must adhere to the ISCD PFG time study requirements and guidelines.

All quarterly expenditure reports submitted for reimbursement must be based on actual costs as well as accurate and auditable documentation. An audit file must be maintained by each local program 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 claimed expenditures. In addition, documentation of the methods to claim internal and external overhead must also be maintained.

Acceptance of allocated funds constitutes an agreement that the receiving local program and its agency will comply with all federal and state requirements pertaining to the CHDP program and adhere to all applicable policies and procedures set forth by the Department of Health Care Services.

Periodically, the federal program responsible for oversight of state expenditures for the administrative costs in 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 relating to the CHDP program audit exception are the exclusive and sole responsibility of each local program.

If you have any questions regarding the administrative aspects of the CHDP program budget submission, please contact the ISCD Fiscal Support Unit via e-mail at dhcsscdadmin@dhcs.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Stephanie Johnson, Chief
Integrated Systems of Care Division

Attachment: CHDP/EPSTD Case Management Allocation FY 2019/2020

cc: Roy Schutzengel, MD MBA
Medical Director
Integrated Systems of Care Division
1515 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Carol Hazell, RN, Nurse Consultant
Child Health and Disability Prevention Program
Integrated Systems of Care Division
1515 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Annette Lee, Chief
Special Populations Section
Integrated Systems of Care Division
1515 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Barbara Sasaki, Chief
Special Programs Unit
Integrated Systems of Care Division
1515 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

| CHDP/EPST CASE MANAGEMENT ALLOCATION FY 2019/2020 GENERAL FUND AND FEDERAL FUND (EXCLUDES COUNTY FUNDS) June 28, 2019 | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Co/ City No. | CHDP County/City | CHDP/EPST FY 2019/2020BASE BUDGET (Excludes County Funds) | GENERAL FUND for FY 2019/2020 | FEDERAL FUND (Title XIX) for FY 2019/2020 |
| TOTAL | | 33,962,000 | 12,115,250 | 21,846,750 |
| 1 | Alameda | 995,237 | 356,482 | 638,755 |
| 2 | Alpine | 56,568 | 22,138 | 34,431 |
| 3 | Amador | 125,192 | 50,133 | 75,058 |
| 59 | Berkeley | 272,895 | 84,043 | 188,852 |
| 4 | Butte | 428,907 | 160,164 | 268,742 |
| 5 | Calaveras | 111,453 | 46,823 | 64,630 |
| 6 | Colusa | 121,028 | 50,062 | 70,965 |
| 7 | Contra Costa | 810,644 | 224,037 | 586,607 |
| 8 | Del Norte | 142,570 | 48,642 | 93,928 |
| 9 | El Dorado | 260,811 | 105,091 | 155,721 |
| 10 | Fresno | 1,132,109 | 416,419 | 715,690 |
| 11 | Glenn | 175,713 | 68,369 | 107,344 |
| 12 | Humboldt | 426,785 | 144,049 | 282,736 |
| 13 | Imperial | 424,368 | 160,084 | 264,283 |
| 14 | Inyo | 86,589 | 31,061 | 55,528 |
| 15 | Kern | 1,073,873 | 402,303 | 671,570 |
| 16 | Kings | 384,680 | 143,923 | 240,757 |
| 17 | Lake | 239,610 | 93,497 | 146,113 |
| 18 | Lassen | 94,331 | 34,771 | 59,560 |
| 62 | Long Beach | 593,893 | 230,963 | 362,929 |
| 19 | Los Angeles | 5,746,845 | 1,709,068 | 4,037,778 |
| 20 | Madera | 365,485 | 142,851 | 222,634 |
| 21 | Marin | 280,085 | 106,915 | 173,170 |
| 22 | Mariposa | 79,881 | 28,884 | 50,997 |
| 23 | Mendocino | 268,843 | 109,686 | 159,157 |
| 24 | Merced | 676,580 | 242,877 | 433,703 |
| 25 | Modoc | 139,310 | 48,313 | 90,997 |
| 26 | Mono | 71,413 | 28,489 | 42,924 |
| 27 | Monterey | 647,123 | 206,155 | 440,968 |
| 28 | Napa | 179,554 | 70,432 | 109,122 |
| 29 | Nevada | 173,944 | 69,508 | 104,436 |
| 30 | Orange | 1,947,280 | 727,925 | 1,219,355 |
| 63 | Pasadena | 331,446 | 111,163 | 220,282 |
| 31 | Placer | 313,155 | 127,543 | 185,612 |
| 32 | Plumas | 192,934 | 64,387 | 128,548 |
| 33 | Riverside | 1,097,440 | 445,805 | 651,635 |
| 34 | Sacramento | 1,212,372 | 422,165 | 790,207 |
| 35 | San Benito | 220,759 | 87,986 | 132,773 |
| 36 | San Bernardino | 1,525,628 | 569,983 | 955,645 |
| 37 | San Diego | 1,373,640 | 580,606 | 793,034 |
| 38 | San Francisco | 700,293 | 256,154 | 444,139 |
| 39 | San Joaquin | 869,271 | 278,991 | 590,280 |
| 40 | San Luis Obispo | 328,663 | 126,999 | 201,663 |
| 41 | San Mateo | 585,099 | 198,824 | 386,275 |
| 42 | Santa Barbara | 598,275 | 246,860 | 351,415 |
| 43 | Santa Clara | 1,073,444 | 338,654 | 734,790 |
| 44 | Santa Cruz | 378,915 | 141,389 | 237,525 |
| 45 | Shasta | 331,405 | 125,486 | 205,918 |
| 46 | Sierra | 85,441 | 28,146 | 57,296 |
| 47 | Siskiyou | 92,453 | 34,954 | 57,498 |
| 48 | Solano | 393,541 | 141,484 | 252,057 |
| 49 | Sonoma | 476,022 | 179,796 | 296,227 |
| 50 | Stanislaus | 705,660 | 255,699 | 449,962 |
| 51 | Sutter | 226,973 | 105,986 | 120,986 |
| 52 | Tehama | 207,043 | 89,440 | 117,603 |
| 53 | Trinity | 93,676 | 38,432 | 55,245 |
| 54 | Tulare | 637,961 | 237,940 | 400,022 |
| 55 | Tuolumne | 185,365 | 68,150 | 117,215 |
| 56 | Ventura | 808,085 | 303,401 | 504,683 |
| 57 | Yolo | 269,195 | 102,298 | 166,897 |
| 58 | Yuba | 114,247 | 42,371 | 71,876 |
| Total | | 33,962,000 | 12,115,250 | 21,846,750 |
| * Numbers may not add exactly due to rounding. | | | | |