



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

Your Partner For A Stronger Arizona

Douglas A. Ducey
Governor

Timothy Jeffries
Director

May 15, 2015

To: Community Action Network
From:  Lynn Larson
DES Assistant Director
Division of Aging and Adult Services
Subject: State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016 Allocation Revisions

The following ALERTS are attached:

<u>ALERT</u>	<u>FUND SOURCE/TYPE</u>
ALERT SFY-16-A2	Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) – SFY 2016 Revised Planning Levels
ALERT SFY-16-B2	Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) – SFY 2016 Revised Planning Levels
ALERT SFY-16-E2	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families – SFY 2016 Revised Planning Levels
ALERT SFY-16-G1	Social Services Block Grant – SFY 2016 Revised Planning Levels
ALERT SFY-16-H1	CenturyLink – SFY 2016 Revised Planning Levels
ALERT SFY-16-I1	Neighbors Helping Neighbors – SFY 2016 Revised Planning Levels
ALERT SFY-16-K2	Technical Assistance – CSBG Matching Funds

During the April 22, 2015 Community Action Network meeting, a reversion to using the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) as the poverty and rural data source in the funding formula for SFY 2016 was recommended and agreed to by the members of the Network. The Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) and the Network will work together in SFY 2016 to reach an agreement on the unemployment and the poverty data source to be used in future years.

The ALERTS are subject to change as additional information is received by the DAAS pertaining to the funding sources identified. ALERTS are available on the DAAS website using the link: <https://www.azdes.gov/daas/alerts>. Scroll down to ALERTS at the bottom of the webpage and select the respective ALERT. Community Action Programs and Services Policies and Procedures are available on the DAAS website at the following link: <https://www.azdes.gov/daas/policy>.

Should you have any questions regarding the attached ALERTS, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

cc: Rhonda Coates, Jane Bruzzese, Diana Gravett, Stephanie Bews, Toi La'shawn Ramey, Tammy Frazee, Nina Sutton, Camille Kowal, Bridget Casey, Matt LeCrone, Rose Larsen, Wes Fletcher, Matthew Lumpkin, and DAAS file



**Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)
for SFY 2016**

The Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) allocated \$4,900,060 of CSBG funding for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016. In the January 30, 2015 ALERT, initial allocations for SFY 2016 were distributed according to the Community Action Programs and Services Funding Formula, which was based on a formula containing updated 2010 Census numbers. The updated source was the 2013 American Community Survey (ACS) for a five-year period (2009-2013) for the poverty and rural factors. As identified in the March 27, 2015 ALERT, the unemployment factor data source is the Special Unemployment Report.

Following subsequent discussions with the Network, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (ADES) agreed to revert to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) as the poverty and rural data source in the funding formula for SFY 2016. ADES and the Network will work together in SFY 2016 to reach an agreement on the data source to be used in future years.

CSBG Funds are allocated to designated Community Action Agencies.

Agency	Allocation
City of Glendale Community Action Program	\$ 179,014
City of Phoenix Human Services Department	\$ 1,303,378
Coconino County Community Services Department	\$ 150,000
Community Action Human Resources Agency	\$ 253,061
Gila County Division of Health and Community Services	\$ 150,000
Maricopa County Human Services Department	\$ 783,483
Mesa Community Action Network	\$ 272,196
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 253,027
Pima County Community Action Agency	\$ 742,974
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	\$ 217,846
Western Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 497,080
Subtotal	\$ 4,802,059
Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc.	\$ 98,001
Total	\$ 4,900,060

No changes were made to the following CSBG discretionary funds that were awarded for SFY 2016 and identified in the January 30, 2015 ALERT.

Agency	Priority Area	Allocation
Arizona Community Action Association	Statewide Coordination and Communication Among Eligible Entities	\$ 55,000
Arizona Community Action Association	Training and Technical Assistance	\$ 100,000
	Total	\$ 155,000

Discretionary funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2016.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

**CSBG
SFY 2016**

Community Action Network Funding Formula
Proposed Funding Components
Fund Source - CSBG (Funding \$4,900,060)

ALERT 16-A2

District	Agency	Served	5% of funds distributed based on urban or rural status	Rural Population Internal Percentage of Persons Below 125% of Poverty	10% of Balance Distributed Based on % of Unemployment	2010 census % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	85% of service \$ distributed based on % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	Total Allocation Using Rural and Poverty Factors	Minimum Funding Variable	Adjusted for \$ 150,000 Minimum Funding Variable	12 Month Total Allocation	Initial 12 Month Total Allocation			
District 1	MesaCAN	Maricopa/Mesa			6.42%	\$ 30,834	6.14%	\$ 250,619	5.55%	\$ 281,453	\$ -	\$ 281,453	\$ (9,257)	\$ 272,196	272,196.00
	CITY OF GLENDALE	Maricopa/Glendale			3.53%	\$ 16,934	4.12%	\$ 168,168	3.65%	\$ 185,102	\$ -	\$ 185,102	\$ (6,088)	\$ 179,014	179,014.00
	CITY OF PHOENIX	Maricopa/Phx			22.25%	\$106,855	30.40%	\$1,240,851	26.60%	\$1,347,706	\$ -	\$1,347,706	\$ (44,328)	\$1,303,378	1,303,378.00
	MARICOPA COUNTY	Maricopa/balance			23.52%	\$112,966	17.08%	\$ 697,163	15.99%	\$ 810,129	\$ -	\$ 810,129	\$ (26,646)	\$ 783,483	783,483.00
District 2	PIMA COUNTY														
		Pima			13.44%	\$ 64,549	17.24%	\$ 703,694	15.16%	\$ 768,243	\$ -	\$ 768,243	\$ (25,269)	\$ 742,974	742,974.00
District 3	COCONINO COUNTY														
		Coconino	\$ 18,416	7.67%	1.52%	\$ 7,317	1.92%	\$ 78,370	3.06%	\$ 104,103	\$ 45,897	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	150,000.00
	NACOG	Totals	\$ 45,883		4.30%	\$ 20,641	4.78%	\$ 195,108	5.16%	\$ 261,632	\$ -	\$ 261,632	\$ (8,605)	\$ 253,027	253,027.00
		Apache	\$ 2,617	1.09%	0.20%	\$ 939	0.27%	\$ 11,021		\$ 14,577		6%	\$ (479)	\$ 14,098	14,098.00
		Yavapai	\$ 31,429	13.09%	3.21%	\$ 15,432	3.28%	\$ 133,881		\$ 180,742		69%	\$ (5,945)	\$ 174,797	174,797.00
	Navajo	\$ 11,837	4.93%	0.89%	\$ 4,270	1.23%	\$ 50,206		\$ 66,313		25%	\$ (2,181)	\$ 64,132	64,132.00	
District 4	WACOG	Totals	\$ 83,508		15.69%	\$ 75,366	8.70%	\$ 355,112	10.14%	\$ 513,986	\$ -	\$ 513,986	\$ (16,906)	\$ 497,080	497,080.00
		La Paz	\$ 4,515	1.88%	0.14%	\$ 669	0.47%	\$ 19,184		\$ 24,368		5%	\$ (802)	\$ 23,566	23,566.00
		Mohave	\$ 35,895	14.95%	3.48%	\$ 16,711	3.74%	\$ 152,657		\$ 205,263		40%	\$ (6,751)	\$ 198,512	198,512.00
		Yuma	\$ 43,098	17.95%	12.08%	\$ 57,986	4.49%	\$ 183,271		\$ 284,355		55%	\$ (9,353)	\$ 275,002	275,002.00
District 5	CAHRA	Pinal	\$ 45,451	18.93%	4.65%	\$ 22,334	4.75%	\$ 193,883	5.16%	\$ 261,668	\$ -	\$ 261,668	\$ (8,607)	\$ 253,061	253,061.00
	GILA COUNTY														
		Gila	\$ 7,588	3.16%	0.61%	\$ 2,948	0.79%	\$ 32,246	3.06%	\$ 42,782	\$107,218	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	150,000.00
District 6	SEACAP	Totals	\$ 39,257		4.05%	\$ 19,462	4.08%	\$ 166,536	4.45%	\$ 225,255	\$ -	\$ 225,255	\$ (7,409)	\$ 217,846	217,846.00
		Cochise	\$ 21,345	8.89%	2.17%	\$ 10,416	2.22%	\$ 90,615		\$ 122,376		54%	\$ (4,025)	\$ 118,351	118,351.00
		Graham	\$ 4,778	1.99%	0.35%	\$ 1,688	0.50%	\$ 20,409		\$ 26,875		12%	\$ (884)	\$ 25,991	25,991.00
		Greenlee	\$ 1,273	0.53%	0.12%	\$ 596	0.13%	\$ 5,306		\$ 7,175		3%	\$ (236)	\$ 6,939	6,939.00
		Santa Cruz	\$ 11,861	4.94%	1.41%	\$ 6,762	1.23%	\$ 50,206		\$ 68,829		31%	\$ (2,264)	\$ 66,565	66,565.00
Totals			\$240,103	100%	100.0%	\$480,206	100.00%	\$4,081,750	98.00%	\$4,802,059	\$153,115	\$4,655,174	\$ (153,115)	\$ 4,802,059	4,802,059.00
								PPEP	2.00%	\$ 98,001			\$ 98,001	98,001.00	
								Totals	100.00%	\$4,900,060				\$ 4,900,060	\$ 4,900,060
GRAND TOTALS														\$ 4,900,060	

PPEP 98,001.00
5% Rural 240,103.00
10% Unemployment 480,206.00
85% Poverty 4,081,750.00
Total 4,900,060.00

Funds less PPEP 4,802,059.00
Total Grant 4,900,060.00



Division of Aging and Adult Services
ALERT

SFY-16-B2

**Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)
for SFY 2016**

The Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) allocated \$18,799,175 of LIHEAP funding for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016 on January 30, 2015. The SFY allocations are based on the projected balance remaining from the current federal grant [Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015] and half of an estimated amount of the next federal grant (FFY 2016). The initial SFY 2016 allocations issued in an ALERT on January 30, 2015 were based on a funding formula containing updated 2010 Census numbers. The updated source was the 2013 American Community Survey (ACS) for a five year period (2009-2013) for the poverty and rural factors. As identified in the March 27, 2015 ALERT, the unemployment factor data source is the Special Unemployment Report.

Following subsequent discussions with the Network, ADES agreed to revert to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) as the poverty and rural data source in the funding formula for SFY 2016. ADES and the Network will work together in SFY 2016 to reach an agreement on the data source to be used in future years.

The following revised initial contract allocations are being made to designated LIHEAP providers.

Agency	Allocation
City of Glendale Community Action Program	\$ 614,258
City of Phoenix Human Services Department	\$ 4,475,369
Maricopa County Human Services Department	\$ 2,644,447
Mesa Community Action Network	\$ 934,227
Pima County Community Action Agency	\$ 769,688
Coconino County Community Services Department	\$ 362,091
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 871,369
Western Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 1,664,284
Community Action Human Resources Agency	\$ 810,777
Gila County Division of Health and Community Services	\$ 142,462
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	\$ 749,953
Subtotal	\$ 14,038,925
Tucson Urban League	\$ 1,719,313
Governor's Office of Energy Policy	\$ 2,953,365
Tohono O'odham Nation	\$ 62,572
Subtotal	\$ 4,735,250
Arizona Community Action Association	\$ 25,000
Total	\$ 18,799,175

These funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2016.

The LIHEAP funds include provider administration, vouchers, and Assurance 16. Please note that Assurance 16 funds are to be used for services that encourage and enable households to reduce their home energy needs and thereby the need for energy assistance, including needs assessments, counseling, and assistance with energy education.



Division of Aging and Adult Services
ALERT

SFY-16-B2

**Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)
for SFY 2016**

There is a 15 percent set aside for low-income residential weatherization to be coordinated through the Governor's Office of Energy Policy. One percent (\$29,534) of the total weatherization allocation is approved for training purposes. This amount is unchanged.

An allocation of \$25,000 is made to the Arizona Community Action Association for Leveraging Activities allowed under the governing legislation. This amount is unchanged.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

**LIHEAP
SFY 2016**

Community Action Network Funding Formula
Proposed Funding Components
Fund Source - LIHEAP (Funding \$18,799,175)

Alert 16-B2

District	Agency	Served	5% of funds distributed based on urban or rural status	Rural Population - Percentage of Persons Below 125% of Poverty	% of Unemployment	10% of Balance Distributed Based on % of Unemployment	2010 census % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	85% of service \$ distributed based on % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	% of Total Allocation	12 Month Total Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation
District 1	CITY OF GLENDALE	Maricopa/Glendale			3.45%	\$ 54,361	4.18%	\$ 559,897	3.90%	\$ 614,258	\$ 614,258
	CITY OF PHOENIX	Maricopa/Phx			21.77%	\$ 343,026	30.85%	\$ 4,132,343	28.40%	\$ 4,475,369	\$ 4,475,369
	MARICOPA COUNTY	Maricopa/balance			23.37%	\$ 368,358	16.99%	\$ 2,276,089	16.78%	\$ 2,644,447	\$ 2,644,447
	MesaCAN	Maricopa/Mesa			6.28%	\$ 98,982	6.24%	\$ 835,245	5.93%	\$ 934,227	\$ 934,227
District 2	PIMA COUNTY	Pima/balance			5.74%	\$ 90,391	5.07%	\$ 679,297	4.88%	\$ 769,688	\$ 769,688
	TUCSON URBAN LEAGUE	Pima/Tucson			7.94%	\$ 125,121	11.90%	\$ 1,594,192	10.91%	\$ 1,719,313	\$ 1,719,313
District 3	COCONINO COUNTY	Coconino	\$ 61,930	7.86%	2.50%	\$ 39,352	1.95%	\$ 260,809	2.30%	\$ 362,091	\$ 362,091
	NACOG	Totals	\$ 154,444			\$ 66,701		\$ 650,224	5.53%	\$ 871,369	\$ 871,369
		Apache	\$ 8,831	1.12%	0.19%	\$ 3,013	0.28%	\$ 37,147		\$ 48,991	
		Navajo	\$ 39,868	5.06%	0.87%	\$ 13,709	1.25%	\$ 167,780		\$ 221,357	
	Yavapai	\$ 105,745	13.42%	3.17%	\$ 49,979	3.32%	\$ 445,297		\$ 601,021		
District 4	WACOG	Totals	\$ 272,196			\$ 245,894		\$ 1,146,194	10.56%	\$ 1,664,284	\$ 1,664,284
		La Paz	\$ 7,328	0.93%	0.31%	\$ 4,815	0.23%	\$ 30,830		\$ 42,973	
		Mohave	\$ 120,771	15.33%	3.49%	\$ 54,932	3.80%	\$ 508,572		\$ 684,275	
		Yuma	\$ 144,097	18.29%	11.81%	\$ 186,147	4.53%	\$ 606,792		\$ 937,036	
District 5	CAHRA	Pinal	\$ 141,831	18.00%	4.55%	\$ 71,695	4.46%	\$ 597,251	5.15%	\$ 810,777	\$ 810,777
	GILA COUNTY	Gila	\$ 25,528	3.24%	0.60%	\$ 9,465	0.80%	\$ 107,469	0.90%	\$ 142,462	\$ 142,462
District 6	SEACAP	Totals	\$ 131,983			\$ 62,478		\$ 555,492	4.76%	\$ 749,953	\$ 749,953
		Cochise	\$ 71,779	9.11%	2.12%	\$ 33,437	2.26%	\$ 302,361		\$ 407,577	
		Graham	\$ 16,073	2.04%	0.34%	\$ 5,420	0.51%	\$ 67,787		\$ 89,280	
		Greenlee	\$ 4,263	0.54%	0.12%	\$ 1,912	0.13%	\$ 17,437		\$ 23,612	
		Santa Cruz	\$ 39,868	5.06%	1.38%	\$ 21,709	1.25%	\$ 167,907		\$ 229,484	
Totals			\$ 787,912	100%	100%	\$ 1,575,824	100%	\$ 13,394,502	100%	\$ 15,758,238	\$15,758,238

ACAA - Leveraging	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
Governor's Office of Energy Policy	\$ 2,953,365	\$ 2,953,365
Tohono O'odham	\$ 62,572	\$ 62,572
Total (ACAA/Commerce/Tohono)	\$ 3,040,937	\$ 3,040,937
Total	\$ 18,799,175	\$18,799,175



Division of Aging and Adult Services
ALERT

SFY-16-E2

**Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
for SFY 2016**

The Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS), has received an appropriation for TANF for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016 in the amount of \$3,724,000. The initial estimated allocations published in the January 30, 2015 ALERT were based on a funding formula containing updated 2010 Census numbers. The updated source was the 2013 American Community Survey (ACS) for a five-year period (2009-2013) for the poverty and rural factors. As identified in the March 27, 2015 ALERT, the unemployment factor data source is the Special Unemployment Report.

Following subsequent discussions with the Network, ADES agreed to revert to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) as the poverty and rural data source in the funding formula for SFY 2016. ADES and the Network will work together in SFY 2016 to reach an agreement on the data source to be used in future years.

The following initial contract allocations are being made to designated Community Action Agencies and the Limited Purpose Agency serving Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers for SFY 2016:

Agency	Allocation
City of Glendale Community Action Program	\$ 150,000
City of Phoenix Human Services Department	\$1,012,131
Coconino County Community Services Department	\$ 150,000
Community Action Human Resources Agency	\$ 183,081
Gila County Division of Health and Community Services	\$ 150,000
Maricopa County Human Services Department	\$ 557,179
Mesa Community Action Network	\$ 204,778
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 180,645
Pima County Community Action Agency	\$ 557,179
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	\$ 165,896
Western Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 338,631
Subtotal	\$3,649,520
Portable Practical Educational Preparation, Inc.	\$ 74,480
Total	\$3,724,000

These funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2016.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

Community Action Network Funding Formula

Proposed Funding Components
Fund Source - TANF (Funding \$3,724,000)

TANF
SFY 2016
2010 Census

Alert 16-E2

District	Agency	Served	5% of funds distributed based on urban or rural status	Rural Population Internal Percentage of Persons Below 125% of Poverty	2010 census % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	95% of service \$ distributed based on % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	% of Total Allocation	Total Allocation Using Rural and Poverty Factors	\$150,000 Minimum Funding Variable	Adjusted for \$150,000 Minimum Funding Variable	12 Month Total Allocation	
District 1	CITY OF GLENDALE	Maricopa/Glendale			4.20%	\$ 145,616	4.03%	\$ 145,616	\$ 4,384	\$ -	\$ 150,000	
	CITY OF PHOENIX	Maricopa/Phoenix			30.99%	\$ 1,074,435	27.18%	\$ 1,074,435	\$ -	\$ 1,074,435	\$ (62,304)	\$ 1,012,131
	MARICOPA COUNTY	Maricopa/balance			17.06%	\$ 591,478	14.96%	\$ 591,478	\$ -	\$ 591,478	\$ (34,299)	\$ 557,179
	MesaCAN	Maricopa/Mesa			6.27%	\$ 217,384	5.50%	\$ 217,384	\$ -	\$ 217,384	\$ (12,606)	\$ 204,778
District 2	PIMA COUNTY	Pima/balance			17.06%	\$ 591,478	14.96%	\$ 591,478	\$ -	\$ 591,478	\$ (34,299)	\$ 557,179
District 3	COCONINO COUNTY	Coconino	\$ 14,343	7.86%	1.92%	\$ 66,567	4.03%	\$ 80,910	\$ 69,090	\$ -	\$ 150,000	
	NACOG	Totals	\$ 34,014			\$ 157,751	4.85%	\$ 191,765	\$ -	\$ 191,765	\$ (11,120)	\$ 180,645
		Apache	\$ 2,080	1.14%	0.28%	\$ 9,708		\$ 11,788		6%	\$ (684)	\$ 11,104
		Yavapai	\$ 24,598	13.48%	3.29%	\$ 114,066		\$ 138,664		72%	\$ (8,041)	\$ 130,623
		Navajo	\$ 7,336	4.02%	0.98%	\$ 33,977		\$ 41,313		22%	\$ (2,396)	\$ 38,917
District 4	WACOG	Totals	\$ 63,738			\$ 295,739	9.09%	\$ 359,477	\$ -	\$ 359,477	\$ (20,846)	\$ 338,631
		La Paz	\$ 1,734	0.95%	0.23%	\$ 7,974		\$ 9,708		3%	\$ (563)	\$ 9,145
		Mohave	\$ 27,992	15.34%	3.75%	\$ 130,014		\$ 158,006		44%	\$ (9,163)	\$ 148,843
		Yuma	\$ 34,012	18.64%	4.55%	\$ 157,751		\$ 191,763		53%	\$ (11,120)	\$ 180,643
District 5	CAHRA	Pinal	\$ 33,210	18.20%	4.44%	\$ 153,937	4.9%	\$ 187,147	\$ -	\$ 187,147	\$ (4,066)	\$ 183,081
	GILA COUNTY	Gila	\$ 5,985	3.28%	0.80%	\$ 27,736	4.0%	\$ 33,721	\$ 116,279	\$ -	\$ 150,000	
District 6	SEACAP	Totals	\$ 31,186			\$ 144,923	4.5%	\$ 176,109	\$ -	\$ 176,109	\$ (10,213)	\$ 165,896
		Cochise	\$ 16,952	9.29%	2.27%	\$ 78,702		\$ 95,654		54.32%	\$ (5,547)	\$ 90,107
		Graham	\$ 3,796	2.08%	0.51%	\$ 17,682		\$ 21,478		12.20%	\$ (1,246)	\$ 20,232
		Greenlee	\$ 1,022	0.56%	0.14%	\$ 4,854		\$ 5,876		3.34%	\$ (341)	\$ 5,535
		Santa Cruz	\$ 9,416	5.16%	1.26%	\$ 43,685		\$ 53,101		30.15%	\$ (3,079)	\$ 50,022
Totals			\$ 182,476	100.00%	100.00%	\$ 3,467,044	98.0%	\$ 3,649,520	\$ 189,753	\$ 3,389,276	\$ (189,753)	\$ 3,649,520
									\$ 3,202,129			
						PPEP	2%	\$ 74,480				\$ 74,480.00
						Totals	100%	\$ 3,724,000				\$ 3,724,000

GRAND TOTALS

		TANF
\$ -	Funds less PPEP	\$ 3,649,520.00
	PPEP	\$ 74,480.00
	5% Rural	\$ 182,476.00
	95% Poverty	\$ 3,467,044.00
	Total Funding	\$ 3,724,000.00
	(Over)/Under	\$ -



Division of Aging and Adult Services
ALERT

SFY-16-G1

**Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)
Locally Planned for SFY 2016**

The State of Arizona’s allotment of the national Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) appropriation is determined by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) based on the portion of the national population that resides in Arizona.

SSBG allocations are made to CSBG eligible entities and allocated based on the proportional share of low-income persons residing in each service area. The locally planned SSBG allocations of \$1,194,236 listed below reflect the adjusted SFY 2016 funding levels.

Maricopa County received an increase of \$20,714 in its SSBG allocation. All four providers within Maricopa County have received an increase for SFY 2016. The following are revised contract allocations:

Agency	Allocation
City of Glendale Community Action Program	\$ 77,890
City of Phoenix Human Services Department	\$ 574,714
Coconino County Community Services Department	\$ 18,305
Community Action Human Resources Agency	\$ 16,096
Gila County Division of Health and Community Services	\$ 8,048
Maricopa County Human Services Department	\$ 316,323
Mesa Community Action Network	\$ 116,279
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 66,581
Pima County Community Action Agency	\$ -
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	\$ -
Tucson Urban League	\$ -
Western Arizona Council of Governments	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,194,236

These funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2016.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

**SSBG
SFY 2016**

Community Action Network Funding
Proposed Funding Components
Fund Source - SSBG (Funding \$1,194,236)
Locally Planned

Alert 16-G1

District	Agency		Served	% of State	Allocation
District I	City of Glendale		Maricopa/Glendale	6.52%	\$ 77,890
	City of Phoenix		Maricopa/Phx	48.11%	\$ 574,714
	Maricopa County		Maricopa/balance	26.49%	\$ 316,323
	MesaCAN		Maricopa/Mesa	9.74%	\$ 116,279
District II	Pima County		Pima/balance	0.00%	\$ -
District III	Coconino County		Coconino	1.53%	\$ 18,305
	NACOG		Multi-county	5.58%	\$ 66,581
District IV	WACOG		Multi-county	0.00%	\$ -
District V	CAHRA		Pinal	1.35%	\$ 16,096
	Gila County		Gila	0.67%	\$ 8,048
District VI	SEACAP		Multi-county	0.00%	\$ -
TOTAL				100%	\$ 1,194,236

DIVISION OF AGING & ADULT SERVICES

Alert 16-G1

SSBG FUNDS FOR SFY 2016

CONTRACTING LEVELS

COUNTY/PROVIDER	SERVICE	TARGET GROUP	SFY-2016 LOCAL PLAN SSBG	SFY-2016 TOTAL FUNDS	SFY-2016 LOCAL SSBG (+)/(-)
DISTRICT I					
MARICOPA					
City of Phoenix	CMT	AFC	\$ 574,714.00	\$ 574,714.00	\$ 10,969.00
City of Glendale	CMT	AFC	\$ 77,890.00	\$ 77,890.00	\$ 1,487.00
Maricopa County	CMT	AFC	\$ 316,323.00	\$ 316,323.00	\$ 6,038.00
MesaCAN	CMT	AFC	\$ 116,279.00	\$ 116,279.00	\$ 2,220.00
DISTRICT 1 TOTAL			\$ 1,085,206.00	\$ 1,085,206.00	\$ 20,714.00

DIVISION OF AGING & ADULT SERVICES

Alert 16-G1

SSBG FUNDS FOR SFY 2016

CONTRACTING LEVELS

COUNTY/PROVIDER	SERVICE	TARGET GROUP	SFY-2016 LOCAL PLAN SSBG	SFY-2016 TOTAL FUNDS	SFY-2016 LOCAL SSBG (+)/(-)
DISTRICT III					
APACHE					
	COUNTY TOTAL		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
COCONINO					
Coconino County	CMT	AFC - Crisis Intervention	\$ 6,745.00	\$ 6,745.00	\$ -
Coconino County	TNS	ELD/PWD Low Income	\$ 11,560.00	\$ 11,560.00	\$ -
	COUNTY TOTAL		\$ 18,305.00	\$ 18,305.00	\$ -
NAVAJO					
NACOG	CMT	AFC - Crisis Intervention	\$ 15,460.00	\$ 15,460.00	\$ -
NACOG	TNS	AFC	\$ 4,548.00	\$ 4,548.00	\$ -
	COUNTY TOTAL		\$ 20,008.00	\$ 20,008.00	\$ -
YAVAPAI					
NACOG	CMT	AFC - Crisis Intervention	\$ 11,644.00	\$ 11,644.00	
NACOG	CMT	AFC - Crisis Intervention	\$ 5,821.00	\$ 5,821.00	
NACOG	TNS	AFC	\$ 29,108.00	\$ 29,108.00	\$ -
	COUNTY TOTAL		\$ 46,573.00	\$ 46,573.00	\$ -
DISTRICT 3 TOTAL			\$ 84,886.00	\$ 84,886.00	\$ -

DIVISION OF AGING & ADULT SERVICES

Alert 16-G1

SSBG FUNDS FOR SFY 2016

CONTRACTING LEVELS

COUNTY/PROVIDER	SERVICE	TARGET GROUP	SFY-2016 LOCAL PLAN SSBG	SFY-2016 TOTAL FUNDS	SFY-2016 LOCAL SSBG (+)/(-)
DISTRICT V					
GILA					
Gila County	CMT	AFC	\$ 8,048.00	\$ 8,048.00	\$ -
	COUNTY TOTAL		\$ 8,048.00	\$ 8,048.00	\$ -
PINAL					
CAHRA	CMT	AFC	\$ 16,096.00	\$ 16,096.00	\$ -
	COUNTY TOTAL		\$ 16,096.00	\$ 16,096.00	\$ -
DISTRICT 5 TOTAL			\$ 24,144.00	\$ 24,144.00	\$ -

DIVISION OF AGING & ADULT SERVICES

Alert 16-G1

SSBG FUNDS FOR SFY 2016

CONTRACTING LEVELS

DISTRICT	INITIAL SFY-2016 LOCAL PLAN SSBG	REVISED SFY-2016 LOCAL PLAN SSBG	SFY-2016 TOTAL SSBG
I	\$ 1,064,492.00	\$ 20,714.00	\$ 1,085,206.00
II	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
III	\$ 84,886.00	\$ -	\$ 84,886.00
IV	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
V	\$ 24,144.00	\$ -	\$ 24,144.00
VI	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 1,173,522.00	\$ 20,714.00	\$ 1,194,236.00

Division of Aging and Adult Services
ALERT

SFY-16-H1

**CenturyLink
Telephone Assistance Program (TAP) for the Medically Needy
for SFY 2016**

The Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) received \$100,000 in CenturyLink funds for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016 to offset the costs associated with administering the CenturyLink Telephone Assistance Program (TAP) for the medically needy. Allocations for SFY 2016 are distributed according to the Community Action Programs and Services Funding Formula. The SFY 2016 initial allocations were based on a funding formula containing updated 2010 Census numbers. The source for the poverty and rural factors was the 2013 American Community Survey for a five-year period. As identified in the March 27, 2015 ALERT, the unemployment factor data source is the Special Unemployment Report.

Following subsequent discussions with the Network, ADES agreed to revert to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) as the poverty and rural data source in the funding formula for SFY 2016. ADES and the Network will work together in SFY 2016 to reach an agreement on the data source to be used in future years.

The following initial contract allocations are being made to the designated Community Action Agencies for SFY 2016:

Agency	Allocation
City of Glendale Community Action Program	\$ 3,923
City of Phoenix Human Services Department	\$ 28,564
Coconino County Community Services Department	\$ 2,178
Community Action Human Resources Agency	\$ 5,148
Gila County Division of Health and Community Services	\$ 905
Maricopa County Human Services Department	\$ 16,852
Mesa Community Action Network	\$ 5,972
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 5,230
Pima County Community Action Agency	\$ 15,845
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	\$ 4,814
Western Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 10,569
Total	\$ 100,000

These funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2016.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

CENTURYLINK

**SFY 2016
2010 Census**

Community Action Network Funding Formula
Proposed Funding Components
Fund Source - CENTURYLINK (Funding \$100,000)

Alert 16-H1

District	Agency	Served	5%		10%		85%		12 Month Total Allocation using SFY 16 estimated funding level	
			of funds distributed based on urban or rural status	Rural Population Internal Percentage of Persons Below 125% of Poverty	% of Unemployment	of Balance Distributed Based on % of Unemployment	2010 census % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	of service \$ distributed based on % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty		% of Total Allocation using SFY 15 estimated funding level
District 1										
	CITY OF GLENDALE	Maricopa/Glendale			3.53%	\$ 353	4.20%	\$ 3,570	3.92%	\$ 3,923
	CITY OF PHOENIX	Maricopa/Phoenix			22.25%	\$ 2,225	30.99%	\$ 26,339	28.56%	\$ 28,564
	MARICOPA COUNTY	Maricopa/balance			23.52%	\$ 2,352	17.06%	\$ 14,500	16.85%	\$ 16,852
	MesaCAN	Maricopa/Mesa			6.42%	\$ 642	6.27%	\$ 5,330	5.97%	\$ 5,972
District 2										
	PIMA COUNTY	Pima/balance			13.44%	\$ 1,344	17.06%	\$ 14,501	15.85%	\$ 15,845
District 3										
	COCONINO COUNTY	Coconino	\$ 393	7.86%	1.52%	\$ 153	1.92%	\$ 1,632	2.18%	\$ 2,178
	NACOG	Totals	\$ 932			\$ 430		\$ 3,868	5.23%	\$ 5,230
		Apache	\$ 57	1.14%	0.20%	\$ 20	0.28%	\$ 238		
		Yavapai	\$ 674	13.48%	3.21%	\$ 321	3.29%	\$ 2,797		
		Navajo	\$ 201	4.02%	0.89%	\$ 89	0.98%	\$ 833		
District 4										
	WACOG	Totals	\$ 1,747			\$ 1,570		\$ 7,252	10.57%	\$ 10,569
		La Paz	\$ 48	0.95%	0.14%	\$ 14	0.23%	\$ 196		
		Mohave	\$ 767	15.34%	3.48%	\$ 348	3.75%	\$ 3,188		
		Yuma	\$ 932	18.64%	12.08%	\$ 1,208	4.55%	\$ 3,868		
District 5										
	CAHRA	Pinal	\$ 909	18.20%	4.65%	\$ 465	4.44%	\$ 3,774	5.15%	\$ 5,148
	GILA COUNTY	Gila	\$ 164	3.28%	0.61%	\$ 61	0.80%	\$ 680	0.91%	\$ 905
District 6										
	SEACAP	Totals	\$ 855			\$ 405		\$ 3,554	4.81%	\$ 4,814
		Cochise	\$ 465	9.29%	2.17%	\$ 217	2.27%	\$ 1,930		
		Graham	\$ 104	2.08%	0.35%	\$ 35	0.51%	\$ 434		
		Greenlee	\$ 28	0.56%	0.12%	\$ 12	0.14%	\$ 119		
		Santa Cruz	\$ 258	5.16%	1.41%	\$ 141	1.26%	\$ 1,071		
Totals			\$ 5,000	100%	100%	\$ 10,000	100%	\$ 85,000	100%	\$ 100,000
TOTALS			\$ 5,000	100%	100%	\$ 10,000	100%	\$ 85,000	100%	\$ 100,000

CENTURYLINK	
5% Rural	\$ 5,000
10% - Unemployment	\$ 10,000
85% Poverty	\$ 85,000
Total	\$ 100,000



Division of Aging and Adult Services
ALERT

SFY-16-11

**Neighbors Helping Neighbors (NHN)
for SFY 2016**

The Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS) estimates receiving \$35,000 in Neighbors Helping Neighbors (NHN) funds for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016 to provide utility assistance services. Funding for NHN in SFY 2015 was \$35,000. NHN funds are utilized in the same manner as Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) Base Funds. Initial allocations for SFY 2016 were distributed according to the Community Action Programs and Services Funding Formula. The SFY 2016 allocations were based on a funding formula containing updated 2010 Census numbers. The source for the poverty and rural factors was the 2013 American Community Survey for a five-year period. As identified in the March 27, 2015 ALERT, the unemployment factor data source is the Special Unemployment Report.

Following subsequent discussions with the Network, ADES agreed to revert to the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS) as the poverty and rural data source in the funding formula for SFY 2016. ADES and the Network will work together in SFY 2016 to reach an agreement on the data source to be used in future years.

The following revised initial contract allocations are being made to the respective contractors for SFY 2016.

Agency	Allocation
City of Glendale Community Action Program	\$ 1,373
City of Phoenix Human Services Department	\$ 9,999
Coconino County Community Services Department	\$ 762
Community Action Human Resources Agency	\$ 1,803
Gila County Division of Health and Community Services	\$ 316
Maricopa County Human Services Department	\$ 5,897
Mesa Community Action Network	\$ 2,086
Northern Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 1,830
Pima County Community Action Agency	\$ 1,703
Southeastern Arizona Community Action Program	\$ 1,684
Western Arizona Council of Governments	\$ 3,705
Subtotal	\$ 31,158
Tucson Urban League	\$ 3,842
Total	\$ 35,000

These funds must be fully expended by June 30, 2016.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact your assigned Contract Specialist.

NHH
SFY 2016
2010 Census

District	Agency	Served	5% of funds distributed based on urban or rural status	Rural Population Internal Percentage of Persons Below 125% of Poverty	% of Unemployment	10% of Balance Distributed Based on % of Unemployment	2010 census % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	85% of service \$ distributed based on % of persons @ or below 125% of poverty	% of Total Allocation using SFY 16 estimated	12 Month Total Allocation using SFY 16 estimated
District 1										
	CITY OF GLENDALE	Maricopa/Glendale			3.53%	\$ 123	4.20%	\$ 1,250	3.92%	\$ 1,373
	CITY OF PHOENIX	Maricopa/Phoenix			22.25%	\$ 779	30.99%	\$ 9,220	28.57%	\$ 9,999
	MARICOPA COUNTY	Maricopa/Balance			23.52%	\$ 823	17.06%	\$ 5,074	16.85%	\$ 5,897
	MesaCAN	Maricopa/Mesa			6.42%	\$ 225	6.27%	\$ 1,865	5.96%	\$ 2,086
District 2										
	PIMA COUNTY	Pima/Balance			5.33%	\$ 186	5.10%	\$ 1,517	4.87%	\$ 1,703
	TUCSON URBAN LEAGUE	Pima/Tucson			8.12%	\$ 284	11.96%	\$ 3,558	10.98%	\$ 3,842
District 3										
	COCONINO COUNTY	Coconino	\$ 138	7.86%	1.52%	\$ 53	1.92%	\$ 571	2.18%	\$ 762
	NACOG	Totals	\$ 326			\$ 150		\$ 1,354	5.23%	\$ 1,830
		Apache	\$ 20	1.14%	0.20%	\$ 7	0.28%	\$ 83		
		Navajo	\$ 70	4.02%	0.89%	\$ 31	0.98%	\$ 292		
		Yavapai	\$ 236	13.48%	3.21%	\$ 112	3.29%	\$ 979		
District 4										
	WACOG	Totals	\$ 611			\$ 552		\$ 2,538	10.59%	\$ 3,705
		La Paz	\$ 17	0.95%	0.14%	\$ 5	0.23%	\$ 68		
		Mohave	\$ 268	15.34%	3.48%	\$ 122	3.75%	\$ 1,116		
		Yuma	\$ 326	18.64%	12.08%	\$ 425	4.55%	\$ 1,354		
District 5										
	CAHRA	Pinal	\$ 319	18.20%	4.65%	\$ 163	4.44%	\$ 1,321	5.15%	\$ 1,803
	GILA COUNTY	Gila	\$ 57	3.28%	0.61%	\$ 21	0.80%	\$ 238	0.90%	\$ 316
District 6										
	SEACAP	Totals	\$ 299			\$ 141		\$ 1,244	4.81%	\$ 1,684
		Cochise	\$ 163	9.29%	2.17%	\$ 76	2.27%	\$ 675		
		Graham	\$ 36	2.08%	0.35%	\$ 12	0.51%	\$ 152		
		Greenlee	\$ 10	0.56%	0.12%	\$ 4	0.14%	\$ 42		
		Santa Cruz	\$ 90	5.16%	1.41%	\$ 49	1.26%	\$ 375		
Totals			\$ 1,750	100%	100%	\$ 3,500	100.00%	\$ 29,750	100.0%	\$ 35,000

Award Amount	\$	35,000
Neighbors Helping Neighbors		
5% Rural Funds	\$	1,750
10% Unemployment	\$	3,500
85% Poverty	\$	29,750
Total	\$	35,000

**Technical Assistance
for SFY 2016**

Technical Assistance ALERTS are generated periodically to update contractual and/or programmatic requirements and/or clarifications. Please ensure that appropriate Community Action Agency (CAA) staff are aware of this technical assistance.

Community Action Program Services (CAPS) – CSBG funds as match funds: The Office of Community Services (OCS) issued Information Memorandum (IM) 139 in March of 2015. The IM provides guidance on the use of Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) funds as a match for AmeriCorps programs. CSBG matching funds must be used for CSBG purposes and in accordance with CSBG requirements.

Activities conducted under the AmeriCorps grant using CSBG funds as match must be used for CSBG purposes as set forth in the CAA's CAP Plan, meet the requirements of CSBG, and be used for allowable CSBG activities. Any use of CSBG funds for matching purposes when applying for other federal grants is contingent upon the authorizing statute of the other federal grant **explicitly permitting federal funds to be used as matching funds**. (See Attachment #1)

OCS issued similar guidance in 2014 regarding CSBG as match for Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), McKinney-Vento program grants. This IM provides guidance on how CSBG funds can be used as a match for the HUD homeless assistance grants under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. The same conditions apply in this instance. (See Attachment #2)

The CSBG Act specifically encourages states and eligible entities to leverage resources and coordinate with other programs for the purpose of eliminating poverty. It is important to note that the allowability of CSBG funds as match is contingent upon the other grants' authorizing statute being currently in force. Grant statutes may be modified from year to year. Eligible entities should include activities conducted under the grant using CSBG as match in their CAP Plans for the program year(s) covered by the grant.

DAAS will provide additional guidance on the use of CSBG for matching or cost sharing funds for other federal programs on a case-by-case basis. Contact the CSBG program specialist for guidance/technical assistance prior to using CSBG as match funds in SFY 2016 for any federal grants not mentioned above.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Diana Gravett, Community Action Program Specialist, at dgravett@azdes.gov or 602-542-6594.

**COMMUNITY SERVICES
BLOCK GRANT**

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
Office of Community Services
Division of State Assistance
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

Information Memorandum

Transmittal No. 139

Date: March 19, 2015

To: State Community Services Block Grant Directors, State Comptrollers, U.S. Territories, Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations, Community Action Agencies, Community Development Corporations, and other non-profit organizations receiving Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funds.

Subject: Use of CSBG Funds to Meet Cost Sharing Requirements for the Corporation for National and Community Service AmeriCorps program.

Related

References: Community Services Block Grant (“CSBG”) Act of 1998, 42 U.S.C. § 9901 *et seq.*; The National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 12501 *et seq.*

Guidance: In general, funds from one Federal program may not be used as matching funds for another Federal program, unless explicitly allowed by statute. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 allows the Corporation for National and Community Service (the Corporation) to provide for required cost sharing “through State sources, local sources, or *other Federal Sources* (other than the use of funds made available under the national service laws)” (emphasis added) (42 U.S.C. § 12571(e)(2)(B)).

Upon review of the CSBG Act, we have determined that it does not prohibit the use of CSBG funds as match for the Corporation’s AmeriCorps program. While the Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance on cost principles (and associated OCS guidance in [CSBG IM-37](#)¹) applies to CSBG-eligible entities and might generally preclude eligible entities from using CSBG funds as a match, OMB guidance does not override the intention of Congress to allow the AmeriCorps program to use Federal funds as match. To the extent that the OMB and OCS guidance conflict with Federal statute, the statute must control. In addition, the CSBG Act specifically encourages States and CSBG-eligible entities to leverage resources and coordinate with other programs for the purpose of eliminating poverty.

¹ CSBG IM-37 “Definition and Allowability of Direct and Administrative Costs, published May 31, 1997.”

Attachment #1

Any CSBG funds used for cost sharing in the AmeriCorps program, however, must be used for CSBG purposes and in accordance with the CSBG requirements, in addition to meeting any other requirements of the AmeriCorps program. Further, the Federal CSBG funds may be used for cost sharing only as long as the AmeriCorps' authorizing statute allowing it is in force, and as long as the CSBG Act does not explicitly prohibit it.

In keeping with requirements of the CSBG Act, funds must be used for allowable activities that must be based on community needs assessments; included in local CSBG plans; and conducted consistent with all established administrative, programmatic, and performance reporting procedures for CSBG funds within the State. OCS encourages collaborative planning between CSBG-eligible entities and other service providers to assure the most innovative and effective uses of CSBG funds to address poverty and revitalize low-income communities. OCS's position in this IM does not modify the requirements of OMB guidance for CSBG-eligible entities or CSBG IM-37 "Definition and Allowability of Direct and Administrative Costs," nor does it change the responsibility of eligible entities to meet these requirements.

Similar to this guidance, OCS has determined that CSBG funds may be used as matching funds for Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs. (See, [IM 135](#), *Use of CSBG Funds to Meet Matching Requirements for Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs.*)

On a case-by-case basis, OCS may provide guidance on the use of CSBG for matching or cost share funds for other Federal programs, provided it is allowed under the other program's legislation and is not prohibited under the CSBG Act. In such situations, CSBG funds must continue to be used for CSBG purposes, meet the requirements of CSBG, and be used for allowable CSBG activities.

If you have questions about this guidance, please contact your assigned OCS CSBG program manager, who may be found at the following link:

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/resource/state-officials-and-program-contacts>

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to assisting low-income families and communities.

/s/
Jeannie L. Chaffin
Director
Office of Community Services

**COMMUNITY SERVICES
BLOCK GRANT**

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
Office of Community Services
Division of State Assistance
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447

Information Memorandum

Transmittal No. 135

Date: June 4, 2014

To: State Community Services Block Grant Directors, State Comptrollers, U.S. Territories, Native American Tribes and Tribal Organizations, Community Action Agencies, Community Development Corporations, and other non-profit organizations receiving Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funds.

Subject: Use of CSBG Funds to Meet Matching Requirements for Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs.

Background: This guidance addresses whether Federal CSBG funds can be used to match the Homeless Assistance grants under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, including (1) the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV, as amended; (2) the Continuum of Care program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV; (3) the Rural Housing Stability Assistance program as authorized under subtitle D of title IV; (4) the Supportive Housing program as formerly authorized under subtitle C of title IV (regulations at 24 CFR part 583); and (5) the Shelter Plus Care program as formerly authorized under subtitle F of title IV (regulations at 24 CFR part 582).

Related

References: Community Services Block Grant (“CSBG”) Act of 1998, 42 U.S.C. § 9901 *et seq.*; Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-8, 123 Stat. 524, 962; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-117, 123 Stat. 3034, 3086 (2009); Section 1101 of Division B of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-10, 125 Stat. 38, 102; Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-55, 125 Stat. 552, 685 (2011); Section 1101 of Division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, Pub. L. No. 113-6, 127 Stat. 198, 412; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, Pub. L. No. 113-76, 128 Stat. 5, Subtitle B of Title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended (the “Act”), 42 U.S.C. § 11371 *et seq.*; Subtitle C of Title IV of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 11381 *et seq.*; Subtitle D of title IV of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 11408 *et seq.*; HHS Block Grant Rules, 45 C.F.R. Part 96; Emergency Solutions Grant Program Rules, 24 C.F.R. Part 576; Continuum of Care Program Rules, 24 C.F.R.

Part 578; Supportive Housing Program Rules, 24 C.F.R. Part 583; and Shelter Plus Care Rules, 24 C.F.R. Part 582.

Guidance: In general, funds from one Federal program may not be used as matching funds for another Federal program, unless explicitly allowed by statute. Recent appropriations acts have included a provision authorizing grantees under HUD’s McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act programs to use other Federal funds as match unless prohibited by the statute of the other program. This authorization, which has been included in appropriations legislation every year since FY 2009, provides that grantees under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs mentioned above “may use (or could have used) as a source of match funds other funds administered by the Secretary and other Federal agencies unless there is (or was) a specific statutory prohibition on any such use of any such funds” (*see, e.g.* Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012).

Upon review of the CSBG Act, we have determined that the Act does not contain a prohibition on the use of CSBG funds as match for the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs. While the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance on cost principles (and associated OCS guidance in [CSBG IM-37](#)¹) applies to CSBG-eligible entities and might generally preclude eligible entities from using Federal funds as a match, the guidance does not override the clear and current intention of Congress to allow HUD McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance grantees to use Federal funds (such as CSBG) as match. To the extent that the OMB and OCS guidance conflict with Federal statute, the statute must control over a contradictory regulatory or policy requirement.

Any CSBG funds used for matching the Homeless Assistance programs, however, must be used for CSBG purposes and in accordance with the CSBG requirements and the requirements of the program they are matching. Further, the Federal CSBG funds may be used as a match only as long as the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act appropriation language allowing it is in force, and the CSBG Act does not explicitly prohibit it.

In keeping with requirements of the CSBG Act, funds must be used for allowable activities that must be based on community needs assessments; included in local CSBG plans; and conducted consistent with all established administrative, programmatic, and performance reporting procedures for CSBG funds within the State.

OCS encourages collaborative planning between CSBG-eligible entities and other homeless service providers to assure the most innovative and effective uses of CSBG funds to address a comprehensive array of housing, employment, and other supportive services. In support of this work, OCS is collaborating with the

¹ CSBG IM-37 “Definition and Allowability of Direct and Administrative Costs,” published May 31, 1997.

Community Action Partnership in the development of a CSBG learning community on effective practices for decreasing family homelessness, which is part of the [Learning Communities Resource Center](#).

OCS's position in this IM does not modify the requirements of OMB guidance for CSBG-eligible entities or CSBG IM-37 "Definition and Allowability of Direct and Administrative Costs," nor does it change the responsibility of eligible entities to meet these requirements.

If you have questions about this guidance, please contact your assigned OCS CSBG program manager.

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to assisting low-income families and communities.

_____/s/_____
Jeannie L. Chaffin
Director
Office of Community Services

**COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK FORMULA
SFY 2016 ALLOCATIONS**

	CSBG	CSBG Discretionary	CSBG Carryover	LIHEAP	LIHEAP Re-distributed	TANF	SSBG	CENTURYLINK	NHN	SFY 2016 ALLOCATION
ACAA	\$ -	\$ 155,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 180,000
CAHRA	\$ 253,061	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 810,777	\$ -	\$ 183,081	\$ 16,096	\$ 5,148	\$ 1,803	\$ 1,269,966
City of Glendale	\$ 179,014	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 614,258	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 77,890	\$ 3,923	\$ 1,373	\$ 1,026,458
City of Phoenix	\$ 1,303,378	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,475,369	\$ -	\$ 1,012,131	\$ 574,714	\$ 28,564	\$ 9,999	\$ 7,404,155
Coconino County	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 362,091	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 18,305	\$ 2,178	\$ 762	\$ 683,336
Gov's Office on Energy Policy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,953,365	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,953,365
Gila County	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 142,462	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 8,048	\$ 905	\$ 316	\$ 451,731
Maricopa County	\$ 783,483	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,644,447	\$ -	\$ 557,179	\$ 316,323	\$ 16,852	\$ 5,897	\$ 4,324,181
MesaCAN	\$ 272,196	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 934,227	\$ -	\$ 204,778	\$ 116,279	\$ 5,972	\$ 2,086	\$ 1,535,538
NACOG	\$ 253,027	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 871,369	\$ -	\$ 180,645	\$ 66,581	\$ 5,230	\$ 1,830	\$ 1,378,682
Pima County	\$ 742,974	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 769,688	\$ -	\$ 557,179	\$ -	\$ 15,845	\$ 1,703	\$ 2,087,389
PPEP	\$ 98,001	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 74,480	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 172,481
SEACAP	\$ 217,846	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 749,953	\$ -	\$ 165,896	\$ -	\$ 4,814	\$ 1,684	\$ 1,140,193
Tohono O'odham	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 62,572	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 62,572
Tucson Urban League	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,719,313	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,842	\$ 1,723,155
WACOG	\$ 497,080	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,664,284	\$ -	\$ 338,631	\$ -	\$ 10,569	\$ 3,705	\$ 2,514,269
<hr/>										
<hr/>										
Totals	\$ 4,900,060	\$ 155,000	\$ -	\$ 18,799,175	\$ -	\$ 3,724,000	\$ 1,194,236	\$ 100,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 28,907,471

ACAA

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Discretionary	\$ 155,000	\$ -	\$ 155,000
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	
LIHEAP	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	
TANF	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURLINK	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NHN	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 180,000	\$ -	\$ 180,000

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

CAHRA

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 281,329	\$ (28,268)	\$ 253,061
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 898,204	\$ (87,427)	\$ 810,777
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 193,025	\$ (9,944)	\$ 183,081
SSBG	\$ 16,096	\$ -	\$ 16,096
CENTURYLINK	\$ 5,681	\$ (533)	\$ 5,148
NHN	\$ 1,988	\$ (185)	\$ 1,803
TOTAL	\$ 1,396,323	\$ (126,357)	\$ 1,269,966

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

CITY OF GLENDALE

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 191,889	\$ (12,875)	\$ 179,014
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 661,039	\$ (46,781)	\$ 614,258
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
SSBG	\$ 76,403	\$ 1,487	\$ 77,890
CENTURYLINK	\$ 4,214	\$ (291)	\$ 3,923
NHN	\$ 1,475	\$ (102)	\$ 1,373
TOTAL	\$ 1,085,020	\$ (58,562)	\$ 1,026,458

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

CITY OF PHOENIX

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 1,302,261	\$ 1,117	\$ 1,303,378
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 4,488,432	\$ (13,063)	\$ 4,475,369
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 1,002,331	\$ 9,800	\$ 1,012,131
SSBG	\$ 563,745	\$ 10,969	\$ 574,714
CENTURYLINK	\$ 28,587	\$ (23)	\$ 28,564
NHN	\$ 10,006	\$ (7)	\$ 9,999
TOTAL	\$ 7,395,362	\$ 8,793	\$ 7,404,155

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

COCONINO COUNTY

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 333,943	\$ 28,148	\$ 362,091
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
SSBG	\$ 18,305	\$ -	\$ 18,305
CENTURYLINK	\$ 2,101	\$ 77	\$ 2,178
NHN	\$ 735	\$ 27	\$ 762
TOTAL	\$ 655,084	\$ 28,252	\$ 683,336

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

GILA COUNTY

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 131,514	\$ 10,948	\$ 142,462
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000
SSBG	\$ 8,048	\$ -	\$ 8,048
CENTURYLINK	\$ 838	\$ 67	\$ 905
NHN	\$ 296	\$ 20	\$ 316
TOTAL	\$ 440,696	\$ 11,035	\$ 451,731

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF ENERGY POLICY

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 2,953,365	\$ -	\$ 2,953,365
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURLINK	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NHN	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 2,953,365	\$ -	\$ 2,953,365

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

MARICOPA COUNTY

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 816,428	\$ (32,945)	\$ 783,483
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 2,762,343	\$ (117,896)	\$ 2,644,447
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 588,104	\$ (30,925)	\$ 557,179
SSBG	\$ 310,285	\$ 6,038	\$ 316,323
CENTURYLINK	\$ 17,583	\$ (731)	\$ 16,852
NHN	\$ 6,154	\$ (257)	\$ 5,897
TOTAL	\$ 4,500,897	\$ (176,716)	\$ 4,324,181

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

MESA CAN

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 293,687	\$ (21,491)	\$ 272,196
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 1,011,533	\$ (77,306)	\$ 934,227
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 221,358	\$ (16,580)	\$ 204,778
SSBG	\$ 114,059	\$ 2,220	\$ 116,279
CENTURYLINK	\$ 6,446	\$ (474)	\$ 5,972
NHN	\$ 2,252	\$ (166)	\$ 2,086
TOTAL	\$ 1,649,335	\$ (113,797)	\$ 1,535,538

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

NACOG

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 255,690	\$ (2,663)	\$ 253,027
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 883,314	\$ (11,945)	\$ 871,369
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 184,631	\$ (3,986)	\$ 180,645
SSBG	\$ 66,581	\$ -	\$ 66,581
CENTURYLINK	\$ 5,356	\$ (126)	\$ 5,230
NHN	\$ 1,873	\$ (43)	\$ 1,830
TOTAL	\$ 1,397,445	\$ (18,763)	\$ 1,378,682

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

PIMA COUNTY

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 741,429	\$ 1,545	\$ 742,974
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 774,113	\$ (4,425)	\$ 769,688
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 545,863	\$ 11,316	\$ 557,179
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURYLINK	\$ 15,827	\$ 18	\$ 15,845
NHN	\$ 1,726	\$ (23)	\$ 1,703
TOTAL	\$ 2,078,958	\$ 8,431	\$ 2,087,389

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

PPEP

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 98,001	\$ -	\$ 98,001
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 74,480	\$ -	\$ 74,480
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURLINK	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NHN	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 172,481	\$ -	\$ 172,481

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

SEACAP

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 197,408	\$ 20,438	\$ 217,846
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 682,463	\$ 67,490	\$ 749,953
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 152,662	\$ 13,234	\$ 165,896
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURYLINK	\$ 4,355	\$ 459	\$ 4,814
NHN	\$ 1,523	\$ 161	\$ 1,684
TOTAL	\$ 1,038,411	\$ 101,782	\$ 1,140,193

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

TOHONO O'ODHAM

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 62,572	\$ -	\$ 62,572
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURYLINK	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NHN	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ 62,572	\$ -	\$ 62,572

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

TUCSON URBAN LEAGUE

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 1,710,081	\$ 9,232	\$ 1,719,313
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURYLINK	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NHN	\$ 3,814	\$ 28	\$ 3,842
TOTAL	\$ 1,713,895	\$ 9,260	\$ 1,723,155

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

WACOG

Fund Source	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	\$ 421,938	\$ 75,142	\$ 497,080
CSBG Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CSBG Carryover	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	\$ 1,421,259	\$ 243,025	\$ 1,664,284
LIHEAP Re-distributed	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	\$ 311,546	\$ 27,085	\$ 338,631
SSBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CENTURLINK	\$ 9,012	\$ 1,557	\$ 10,569
NHN	\$ 3,158	\$ 547	\$ 3,705
TOTAL	\$ 2,166,913	\$ 347,356	\$ 2,514,269

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.

STATE TOTALS

Fund Source	ALERT	DATE ISSUED	SFY 2016 Initial Allocation	SFY 2016 Allocation Increase/(Decrease)	SFY 2016 Revised Allocation
CSBG	ALERT SFY 16-A2	5/15/2015	\$ 4,900,060	\$ -	\$ 4,900,060
CSBG Discretionary	ALERT SFY 16-A	1/27/2015	\$ 155,000	\$ -	\$ 155,000
CSBG Carryover			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LIHEAP	ALERT SFY 16-B2	5/15/2015	\$ 18,799,175	\$ -	\$ 18,799,175
LIHEAP Re-distributed			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TANF	ALERT SFY 16-E2	5/15/2015	\$ 3,724,000	\$ -	\$ 3,724,000
SSBG	ALERT SFY 16-G1	5/15/2015	\$ 1,173,522	\$ 20,714	\$ 1,194,236
CENTURYLINK	ALERT SFY 16-H1	5/15/2015	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000
NHN	ALERT SFY 16-I1	5/15/2015	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ 35,000
TOTAL			\$ 28,886,757	\$ 20,714	\$ 28,907,471

Bolded numbers represent changes in funding.