I. Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit to social services districts the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) allocations from the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2007-2008 funds. The allocations contained in Attachment A to this memorandum may be used for Independent Living (IL) services expenditures made October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008, and claimed by March 31, 2009, and will be paid up to the amount of the allocation and subject to a twenty percent (20%) state/local match requirement. Unclaimed allocation amounts will be redistributed to other districts that have claims in excess of the allocation, or used to support Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) activities related to implementation of the Chafee Foster Care Independence Act, allowing New York State to maximize its use of funds available under this federal funding stream.

This memorandum also describes the methodology for determining the FFY 2007-2008 allocations.
Local social services districts are advised that districts must be in compliance with all provisions set forth in 02-OCFS-LCM-05 issued on February 28, 2002, including the assurances made to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services listed in Attachment B of that memorandum, to be eligible for reimbursement from CFCIP funds.

II. Allocation Methodology

The FFY 2007-2008 allocation for distribution to social services districts represents 97 percent of the total federal allocation to New York State, resulting in an allocation to districts of $11,214,614. The remainder is being reserved by OCFS for two purposes: (1) to support IL services for youth in direct care in OCFS-operated facilities and rehabilitative services programs (districts are required to meet the IL services needs of eligible youth in OCFS custody placed in authorized voluntary agencies in the same manner and under the same criteria as youth in the custody of the commissioner of social services); and (2) to support OCFS activities related to the Chafee Foster Care Independence Act.

The allocation methodology for the FFY 2007-2008 CFCIP allocations to social services districts is comprised of two parts, taking into consideration the potential IL population and IL expenditures. Half of the available funds are allocated to districts based on each social services district’s potential IL population, which is defined as youth 14 to 21 years of age in care on September 30, 2007. Each local district is allocated an amount equal to its proportion of the potential IL eligible population in relation to the total statewide potential IL eligible population. The remaining half of the allocation is based on each social services district’s proportion of the total statewide IL claims received by March 31, 2008, applied against the FFY 2006-2007 allocations, including expenditures made after September 30, 2007. Each local district is allocated an amount equal to its proportion of the historical claims. The two parts are then added together to get each social services district’s FFY 2007-2008 total CFCIP allocation, which appears in Attachment A.

This approach affords the greatest degree of stability to districts across program years, balancing population size with intensity of programming. OCFS, however, reserves the right to base future allocation methodologies on historical expenditures only.

Local social services districts are reminded that districts may claim expenditures for IL services that are directly provided by the local district staff to program recipients. These services are: academic support services, vocational training, independent living skills, and/or aftercare services. Districts are also reminded that within the service categories listed above, districts may also claim expenditures for independent living supports for youth. This would include, for example, expenditures for: cap and gowns and other fees associated with high school graduation; prom dresses; scholastic aptitude tests including SAT/ACT/PSAT (required for undergraduate admission to many colleges and universities); applications for admission to college or vocational training programs; examinations for attendance at a vocational training program; visits to colleges; clothing for job/college interviews; and car insurance.
Any IL claims that exceed a district’s Chafee IL allocation are subject to 65 percent state reimbursement, provided the district meets its threshold requirement. Therefore, it is important that local social services districts submit all claims for the FFY 2007-2008 CFCIP funds.

III. Claiming


Chafee Foster Care Independence Program funds are available to provide reimbursement of 80 percent of a social services district’s expenditures, up to the amount of the allocation. Districts may meet the 20 percent match for expenditures claimed under the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program by use of in-kind and donated funds as described in 00-OCFS-LCM-32, Federal Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Independent Living Allocations.

For expenditures exceeding the district’s Chafee Foster Care Independence Program allocation, social services expenditures are eligible for 65 percent state reimbursement, provided the district meets its threshold requirement, pursuant to Chapters 53 and 411 of the Laws of 2004 and section 153-k(1) of the Social Services Law. Any donated funds or in-kind services that are a part of those expenditures and claimed for 65 percent state reimbursement are subject to special rules (refer to 02-OCFS-LCM-05, Section V, and 02-OCFS-LCM-20).

IV. Direct Charges

Effective July 1, 2003, the IL Program category was removed from the Schedule D-2 “Allocation for Claiming General Services Administration Expenditures” (LDSS-2347-B). District spending for IL services is now accounted for outside of the State Services Random Moment Study and not subject to the cost allocation formula. In other words, local social services districts may claim expenditures for IL services (academic support services, vocational training, independent living skills, and/or aftercare services) that are directly provided by the local district staff to program recipients. These expenditures should be claimed on Schedule D (LDSS-2347) as an F30 function. From the F30 function, the local districts should report these expenditures in the proper category of service on the Schedule RF-4.

Local district administration costs related to IL cases are considered regular foster care administration (Title IV-E or Non-Title IV-E eligible). Therefore, there should be no costs reported on the administrative or A-87 costs lines on the Schedule RF-4. Local
districts that include administrative or A-87 costs on the RF-4 will need to submit a supplemental claim to correct the error.

V. Contact Names

BRO – Mary Miller (716) 8473145 – Mary.Miller@ocfs.state.ny.us
RRO - Linda Kurtz (585) 238-8201 - Linda.Kurtz@ocfs.state.ny.us
SRO - Jack Klump (315) 423-1200 - Jack.Klump@ocfs.state.ny.us
ARO – Kerri Barber (518)486-7078 – Kerri.Barber@ocfs.state.ny.us
SVRO - Pat Sheehy (845) 708-2499 - Patricia.Sheehy@ocfs.state.ny.us
NYCRO – Patricia Beresford (212) 383-1788- Patricia.Beresford@ocfs.state.ny.us
Bureau of Indian Affairs – Kim Thomas (716) 847-3123 - Kim.Thomas@ocfs.state.ny.us

Questions pertaining to claiming should be directed to the Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance, Bureau of Financial Services:
Regions I-IV: James E. Carroll (518-474-7549) James.Carroll@otda.state.ny.us
Region V:  Michael Borenstein   (631) 854-9704 Michael.Borenstein@otda.state.ny.us
Region VI: Marian Borenstein   (212) 961-8250 Marian.Borenstein@otda.state.ny.us

Questions pertaining to the allocations should be directed to:
Deborah J. Hanor (518) 474-1361 Deborah.Hanor@ocfs.state.ny.us

Issued By:
/s/ Nancy W. Martinez
/s/ Thomas S. Tipple

Name: Nancy W. Martinez
Title:    Director
Division/Office: Strategic Planning and Policy Development

Name: Thomas S. Tipple
Title:    Deputy Commissioner
Division/Office: Administration
### DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS

**CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM (CFCIP) FUNDS**

10/1/07 to 9/30/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>99,019</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>127,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegany</td>
<td>24,403</td>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broome</td>
<td>97,739</td>
<td>Oswego</td>
<td>78,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattaraugus</td>
<td>19,061</td>
<td>Otsego</td>
<td>21,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>20,895</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>7,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chautauqua</td>
<td>24,952</td>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td>42,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemung</td>
<td>58,147</td>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>59,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenango</td>
<td>8,771</td>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
<td>31,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>24,496</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>41,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>59,216</td>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>85,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland</td>
<td>34,275</td>
<td>Schoharie</td>
<td>8,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>44,491</td>
<td>Schuyler</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>86,381</td>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>8,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>407,533</td>
<td>Steuben</td>
<td>52,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>251,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>33,905</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>41,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>22,353</td>
<td>Tioga</td>
<td>14,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>28,532</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>25,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>30,840</td>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>90,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>18,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>32,603</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>20,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>449,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>17,163</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>18,469</td>
<td>Yates</td>
<td>8,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>306,201</td>
<td>St. Regis Mohawk</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>21,988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>215,197</td>
<td>Upstate Totals</td>
<td>3,637,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>33,954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>135,377</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>7,577,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>155,596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>18,496</td>
<td>Statewide Totals</td>
<td>11,214,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>