



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROY COOPER
GOVERNOR

MANDY COHEN, MD, MPH
SECRETARY

December 23, 2019

SENT VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

The Honorable Joyce Krawiec, Chair
Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on
Health and Human Services
North Carolina General Assembly
Room 308, Legislative Office Building
Raleigh, NC 27603

The Honorable Josh Dobson, Chair
Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on
Health and Human Services
North Carolina General Assembly
Room 307B, Legislative Office Building
Raleigh, NC 27603

The Honorable Donny Lambeth, Chair
Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on
Health and Human Services
North Carolina General Assembly
Room 303, Legislative Office Building
Raleigh, NC 27603

Dear Chairmen:

Session Law 2018-5, Section 11F.1. requires that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, upon completing a comparison of the cash balance and solvency range of each LME/MCO, shall submit a detailed explanation for any such adjustment along with supporting documentation to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Health and Human Services and the Fiscal Research Division within 10 business days after making the adjustment. Pursuant to the provisions of law, the Department is pleased to submit the attached report.

Should you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Kody Kinsley, Deputy Secretary for Behavioral Health and Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities at 919-733-7011.

Sincerely,

Mandy Cohen, MD, MPH
Secretary

Kody H. Kinsley
Deputy Secretary for Behavioral Health & IDD
North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services

cc:	Kody Kinsley	Susan G. Perry	Dave Richard	Ben Money
	Tara Myers	Rob Kindsvatter	Marjorie Donaldson	Zack Wortman
	Matt Gross	Hattie Gawande	Joyce Jones	Lisa Wilks
	Katherine Restrepo	Jared Simmons	Deborah Landry	Luke MacDonald
	Erin Matteson	Theresa Matula	Mark Collins	Jessica Meed
	reports@ncleg.net			

WWW.NCDHHS.GOV

TEL 919-855-4800 • FAX 919-715-4645

LOCATION: 101 BLAIR DRIVE • ADAMS BUILDING • RALEIGH, NC 27603

MAILING ADDRESS: 2001 MAIL SERVICE CENTER • RALEIGH, NC 27699-2001

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY / AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROY COOPER
GOVERNOR

MANDY COHEN, MD, MPH
SECRETARY

December 23, 2019

SENT VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mr. Mark Trogdon, Director
Fiscal Research Division
Suite 619, Legislative Office Building
Raleigh, NC 27603-5925

Dear Director Trogdon:

Session Law 2018-5, Section 11F.1. requires that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, upon completing a comparison of the cash balance and solvency range of each LME/MCO, shall submit a detailed explanation for any such adjustment along with supporting documentation to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Health and Human Services and the Fiscal Research Division within 10 business days after making the adjustment Pursuant to the provisions of law, the Department is pleased to submit the attached report.

Should you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Kody Kinsley, Deputy Secretary for Behavioral Health and Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities at 919-733-7011.
Sincerely,

Mandy Cohen, MD, MPH
Secretary

Kody H. Kinsley
Deputy Secretary for Behavioral Health & IDD
North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services

cc:	Kody Kinsley	Susan G. Perry	Dave Richard	Ben Money
	Tara Myers	Rob Kindsvatter	Marjorie Donaldson	Zack Wortman
	Matt Gross	Hattie Gawande	Joyce Jones	Lisa Wilks
	Katherine Restrepo	Jared Simmons	Deborah Landry	Luke MacDonald
	Erin Matteson	Theresa Matula	Mark Collins	Jessica Meed
	reports@ncleg.net			

**Single Stream Funding Rebase
Session Law, 2018-5, Section 11.F.1**



**Report to
The Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on
Health and Human Services
and
Fiscal Research Division**

By

**North Carolina
Department of Health and Human Services**

December 23, 2019

Reporting Requirements

SINGLE-STREAM FUNDING FOR MH/DD/SAS COMMUNITY SERVICES

Session Law 2018-5, Section 11.F.1. Upon completing a comparison of the cash balance and solvency range of each LME/MCO on December 1, 2018, as required by G.S. 122C-125.2(b), the Secretary of Health and Human Services may adjust the specified recurring and nonrecurring reductions among the LME/MCOs; provided, however, that the Secretary shall submit a detailed explanation for any such adjustment along with supporting documentation to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Health and Human Services and the Fiscal Research Division within 10 business days after making the adjustment.

Summary

In effort to drive accountability of the publicly-funded behavioral health care and IDD supports system, the Department endeavors to create public scorecards to promote transparency and competition towards performance measures and goals. Achieving this requires equity in state funding among the LME/MCOs as the necessary proving ground for competition.

Beginning with State Fiscal Year 2020 (SFY 20), the Department of Health and Human Services is reallocating the single stream funding (SSF) to equitably spread dollars across the Local Management Entities - Managed Care Organizations (LME-MCOs). Consistent with NCGS §§ 143B-137.1, 122C-143.1, and 122C-147.1, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the authority to allocate SSF funds to the LME/MCOs. Pursuant to Session Law 2017-57, Section 11.F.2.(b) and NCGS § 143C-5-4(b)(1) the Secretary also can adjust the specified recurring and nonrecurring reductions among the LME/MCOs.

For SFY 20, the amount of SSF has increased, providing an opportune time to rebalance SSF across the LME-MCOs through a formula that will promote an equitable, need-based allocation of resources. The Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities, and Substance Abuse Services (DMHDDAS) has established an algorithm using a weighting approach, focusing on the three factors most relevant to the core BH/IDD services: Uninsured and poverty rates, as well as rurality of the LME/MCOs' catchment areas.

This approach ensures an equitable, predictable spread of allocations across the LME-MCOs that balances:

- (a) Equitably allocating SSFs consistent with legislative policy and with the State's long-range plans to promote equal accessibility to services for individuals regardless of their catchment area,
- (b) Ensuring that all Single Stream Funds are allocated to where they are most needed and can be utilized.

Methodology

In order to apply the formula, DMHDDAS mapped out for each county in the state: (a) population, (b) population density, (c) uninsured rates, and (d) poverty rates (set at 4x the federal poverty rate), specifically among adults under 65, who are the primary recipients of single stream funded services in North Carolina. This demographic information came from the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey.

The formula first creates separate allocation models based solely on uninsured rates and poverty rates. So, for instance, if an LME/MCO has within it 30% of the state's uninsured adults under 65, the "uninsured" model would allocate to it 30% of the available SSFs.

The formula then adjusts those models slightly based on the rurality of the counties in each LME/MCO's catchment area. Specifically, the NC Rural Center defines county rurality as one having less than 250 people per square mile. Accordingly, the formula proportionally adjusts upward the "effective" uninsured and poverty numbers for counties with population densities below that threshold, based on how far below that threshold each falls. DMHDDSAS then set the size of that effect at 20%.

Having now created separate uninsured and poverty models that account for rurality, the formula produces an initial allocation for each LME/MCO, based on how heavily each model is weighted. In this case, each model was weighted at 50%. The formula also allocates SSF cuts across the LME/MCOs at the same proportional rates as their initial allocations. As an example, if an LME/MCO's initial allocation was 15% of the available SSFs, its portion of the SSF cuts would be 15% of the total value of the cuts imposed on the SSF allocations.

Finally, recognizing that the federal government imposes maintenance of effort requirements that require spending of state dollars to secure federal block grant funding, we ensure each LME-MCO's final allocation is the greater of the 2015 service level requirement or last year's actual SSF expenditures, if it underspent its past allocations. The remaining funds are allocated proportionally among the remaining LME/MCOs according to their respective weights under the formula.

To make this effort as collaborative and transparent as possible, DMHDDSAS engaged with the LME/MCOs during the development of the formula. Each had multiple opportunities to review this approach and provide substantive feedback. In the end, this approach standardizes SSF allocations among the LME/MCOs in a way that is equitable, transparent, and promotes performance-driven competition in the marketplace. We appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Attachment A: SFY 2020 Single Stream Base Allocations

DMHDDSAS Single Stream Fund Allocation

v.2019.11.21

SSF Parameters									
Base									\$312,838,294
Total Cuts									(\$43,940,895)
Available for Allocation									\$268,897,399
Weighting Factors									
Total Population									0
Uninsured									0.5
Poverty									0.5
Rurality Adjustment									
Weight									0.2
Benchmark Density (adults per square mile)									250
Allocation Limit (Y/N)									
Last SFY Expenditures									Y
2015 Service Requirement									N
Exclude									
CASP									Y
Remaining Distribution Method, if Limit(s) is/are Maxed Out (pick only one, Y/N)									
									Y
									N
SSF 2020									
SFY19 SSF Allocation (initial)	A	\$13,372,873	\$42,169,478	\$17,077,566	\$22,858,068	\$13,376,954	\$50,633,838	\$45,719,163	\$205,207,941
SFY19 Actual expenditures	B	\$42,293,384	\$76,366,489	\$21,655,098	\$30,718,205	\$34,156,201	\$37,415,691	\$47,131,364	\$289,736,432
2015 Service Level Req.	C	\$38,535,086	\$70,113,612	\$21,572,071	\$30,990,208	\$25,521,488	\$39,000,613	\$39,285,683	\$265,018,761
SSF BASE	D	\$42,469,913	\$84,426,101	\$26,030,341	\$31,103,207	\$33,406,520	\$46,873,115	\$48,529,099	\$312,838,294
Cuts	E	(\$5,628,727)	(\$11,427,065)	(\$4,375,243)	(\$4,068,335)	(\$4,711,237)	(\$7,872,502)	(\$5,857,786)	(\$43,940,895)
Algorithm Adjustment	F	\$2,891,750	\$5,870,637	(\$4,509,947)	\$2,090,101	\$2,420,391	(\$11,772,360)	\$3,009,428	
Final SSF Allocation	G	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
CASP Allocation	H	\$3,778,469	\$5,877,318	\$2,712,974	\$3,137,778	\$1,021,832	\$8,574,978	\$8,263,120	\$33,366,469
TOTAL SSF Allocation	I	\$36,841,186	\$72,999,035	\$21,655,098	\$27,034,871	\$28,695,282	\$39,000,613	\$42,671,313	\$268,897,399

Attachment B: County Demographics

County	LMF MCO	Actual Population (ages 19-64)	Uninsured Population (ages 19-64)	Population under 400% of Poverty (ages 19-64)	Land area (sq miles)	Persons per square mile (ages 19-64)	Persons per sq mile and Benchmark Density	Δ Persons per sq mile and Benchmark Density	Δ Adjustment to Make Equivalent to Benchmark	Population Adjustment	Net Effective Population with Rurality Weight	Rural Ratio (effective pop/actual pop)
Mecklenburg	Cardinal	653,654	116,568	369,399	523.84	1247.812309	0	0	0	0	653,654	1
Wake	Alliance	634,194	84,006	309,973	835.22	759.3137138	0	0	0	0	634,194	1
New Hanover	Trillium	134,072	21,888	84,193	191.53	700.0052211	0	0	0	0	134,072	1
Durham	Alliance	186,448	33,526	109,483	285.98	651.9616756	0	0	0	0	186,448	1
Forsyth	Cardinal	214,180	38,088	139,092	408.15	524.7580546	0	0	0	0	214,180	1
Gulford	Sandhills	308,209	51,443	200,973	645.7	477.3253833	0	0	0	0	308,209	1
Gaston	Partners	128,034	22,508	87,539	356.03	359.6157627	0	0	0	0	128,034	1
Cabarrus	Cardinal	117,239	15,155	66,053	361.75	324.0884589	0	0	0	0	117,239	1
Cumberland	Alliance	176,617	29,434	128,374	652.32	270.7520849	0	0	0	0	176,617	1
Buncombe	Vaya	151,145	26,334	99,658	656.67	230.1688824	19.83111761	0.086158986	2604.5	153,750	1.017231797	
Catawba	Partners	91,576	15,939	62,043	398.72	229.6749599	20.32504013	0.088494802	1620.8	93,197	1.01769896	
Alamance	Cardinal	91,174	18,049	61,719	423.94	215.0634524	34.93654762	0.162447628	2962.2	94,136	1.032489526	
Orange	Cardinal	84,224	9,418	46,711	397.96	211.6393607	38.36063926	0.181254749	3053.2	87,277	1.03625095	
Union	Cardinal	128,601	18,576	68,148	631.52	203.6372561	46.36274386	0.227673191	5855.8	134,457	1.045534638	
Iredell	Partners	101,669	16,041	60,954	573.83	177.1761672	72.82383284	0.411024993	8357.7	110,027	1.082204999	
Davidson	Cardinal	96,575	16,925	67,031	552.68	174.7394514	75.2605486	0.430701527	8319	104,894	1.086140305	
Pitt	Trillium	109,903	18,547	75,848	651.98	168.5680542	81.43194577	0.483080535	10618.4	120,521	1.096616107	
Henderson	Vaya	61,075	12,500	40,035	373.07	163.7092235	86.29077653	0.527097831	6488.5	67,514	1.105419566	
Lincoln	Partners	48,686	8,213	30,849	297.94	163.40874	86.59125999	0.529905928	5159.8	53,846	1.105981186	
Rowan	Cardinal	80,315	16,113	57,114	511.37	157.0584899	92.94151006	0.591763681	9505.5	89,821	1.118352736	
Johnston	Alliance	110,847	21,496	71,184	791.3	140.0821433	109.9178567	0.784667154	17395.9	128,243	1.156933431	
Lee	Sandhills	34,079	7,625	23,230	254.96	133.6641042	116.3358958	0.870360046	5932.2	40,011	1.174072009	
Wilson	Eastpointe	47,061	9,838	33,705	368.17	127.824103	122.175897	0.955812669	8996.3	56,057	1.191162534	
Wayne	Eastpointe	70,095	14,462	51,167	553.09	126.733448	123.266557	0.972644268	13635.5	83,731	1.194528854	
Cleveland	Partners	56,114	11,472	42,353	464.25	120.8702208	129.1297792	1.068334106	11989.7	68,104	1.213666821	
Harnett	Sandhills	70,581	13,187	49,693	594.99	118.6255231	131.3744769	1.107472266	15633.3	86,214	1.221494453	
Onslow	Trillium	88,620	13,538	63,984	762.74	116.1863807	133.8136193	1.151715188	20413	109,033	1.230343038	
Randolph	Sandhills	83,688	16,774	59,828	782.52	106.9467873	143.0532127	1.337611127	22388.4	106,076	1.267522225	
Watauga	Vaya	32,914	4,503	24,427	312.56	105.3045815	144.6954185	1.374065747	9045.2	41,959	1.274813149	
Burke	Partners	51,985	10,440	39,722	507.1	102.514297	147.485703	1.438684236	14958	66,943	1.287736847	
Caldwell	Vaya	48,338	10,461	36,710	471.57	102.5044002	147.4955998	1.438919691	13910.9	62,249	1.287783938	
Nash	Trillium	54,493	9,771	37,041	540.41	100.836402	149.163598	1.479263392	16121.9	70,615	1.295852678	
Vance	Cardinal	25,562	4,761	20,196	253.52	100.828337	149.171663	1.479461701	7563.6	33,126	1.29589234	
Rockingham	Cardinal	53,769	8,884	38,433	565.55	95.07382194	154.9261781	1.629535606	17523.7	71,293	1.325907121	
Pasquotank	Trillium	21,519	4,313	14,411	226.88	94.84749647	155.1525035	1.635810214	7040.2	28,559	1.327162043	
Davie	Cardinal	23,909	3,896	15,179	264.11	90.52667449	159.4733255	1.761616964	3732.3	33,233	1.35232393	
Stanly	Cardinal	34,631	6,337	24,056	395.09	87.65344605	162.3465539	1.852141145	12828.3	47,459	1.370428229	
Lenoir	Eastpointe	32,877	7,637	24,667	400.59	82.07144462	167.9285554	2.046126471	13454.1	46,331	1.409225294	
Alexander	Vaya	21,133	3,739	15,369	259.99	81.28389553	168.7161045	2.075639994	8772.9	29,906	1.415127999	
Robeson	Eastpointe	77,000	19,588	63,187	949.22	81.11923474	168.8807653	2.081883117	32061	109,061	1.416376623	
Brunswick	Trillium	66,215	13,944	42,736	846.97	78.17868401	167.1821316	2.197802613	29105.5	95,321	1.439560523	
Surry	Partners	41,497	8,361	30,218	532.17	77.97962257	172.0230378	2.206075138	18309.1	59,806	1.441215028	
Franklin	Cardinal	37,530	6,749	24,564	491.68	76.33013342	173.6698666	2.275246469	17078	54,608	1.455049294	
Carteret	Trillium	38,418	7,392	24,297	506.25	75.88740741	174.1125926	2.294354209	17628.9	56,047	1.458870842	
Craven	Trillium	53,388	9,710	35,596	708.96	75.30467163	174.6953284	2.319847157	24770.4	78,158	1.463969431	
Hoke	Sandhills	28,427	6,003	21,140	390.74	72.7517019	177.2482981	2.436345728	13816.4	42,279	1.487269146	
Moore	Sandhills	48,584	8,342	29,995	697.84	69.62054339	180.3794566	2.590894122	25175.2	73,759	1.518178824	
Rutherford	Partners	37,892	7,238	29,386	564.15	67.16653372	182.8334663	2.722091734	20629.1	58,521	1.544418347	
Yadkin	Partners	21,959	4,277	15,610	334.83	65.58253442	184.4174656	2.811990528	12349.7	34,309	1.562398106	
Granville	Cardinal	34,291	4,517	21,940	533.57	64.50890758	185.4910924	2.875433787	19720.3	54,011	1.575086757	
Haywood	Vaya	34,071	6,620	23,059	553.69	61.5343262	188.4655674	3.062765989	20870.3	54,941	1.612553198	
Edgecombe	Eastpointe	30,946	6,413	24,834	505.34	61.23797839	188.7620216	3.082433917	19077.8	50,024	1.616486783	
Stokes	Cardinal	27,390	5,022	19,116	448.86	61.02125384	188.9787462	3.096933187	16965	44,355	1.619386637	
Scotland	Eastpointe	18,902	3,660	15,248	318.85	59.28179395	190.7182061	3.217146334	12162.1	31,064	1.643429267	
McDowell	Vaya	26,114	5,054	20,448	440.61	59.26783323	190.7321668	3.218139695	16807.7	42,922	1.643627939	
Person	Cardinal	23,196	3,655	15,750	392.32	59.12520392	190.8747961	3.228315227	14976.8	38,173	1.645663045	
Currituck	Trillium	15,108	2,803	8,745	261.85	57.69715486	192.3028451	3.332969288	10070.9	25,179	1.666593858	
Chatham	Cardinal	38,092	7,301	20,775	682.19	55.83781644	194.1621836	3.477252441	26491.1	64,583	1.695450488	
Dare	Trillium	21,202	4,924	13,811	383.42	55.29706327	194.7029367	3.521035751	14930.6	36,133	1.70420715	
Richmond	Sandhills	25,584	5,614	19,698	473.82	53.99518805	196.004812	3.630042214	18574.2	44,158	1.726008443	
Wilkes	Vaya	39,206	7,493	30,413	754.28	51.97804529	198.0219547	3.809723002	29872.8	69,079	1.7619446	
Jackson	Vaya	23,165	5,147	17,085	490.76	47.20229848	202.7977015	4.296352256	19905	43,070	1.859270451	
Polk	Vaya	10,901	2,146	7,751	237.79	45.84297069	204.1570293	4.453398771	9709.3	20,610	1.890679754	
Transylvania	Vaya	17,255	4,720	12,719	378.53	45.58423375	204.4157663	4.484352362	15475.5	32,731	1.896870472	
Chowan	Trillium	7,842	1,731	5,424	172.47	45.46877718	204.5312228	4.4982785	7055.1	14,897	1.8996557	
Greene	Eastpointe	11,186	2,750	8,751	265.93	42.06370097	207.936299	4.943366708	11059.3	22,245	1.988673342	
Duplin	Eastpointe	33,797	9,867	26,238	816.22	41.40672858	208.5932714	5.037666085	34051.6	67,849	2.007533213	
Halifax	Cardinal	29,483	5,487	23,150	724.09	40.71731415	209.2826859	5.139894176	30307.9	59,791	2.027978835	
Sampson	Eastpointe	36,525	9,402	28,926	944.74	38.66143066	211.3385693	5.466392882	39932	76,457	2.093278576	
Pender	Trillium	32,861	6,539	21,211	869.8	37.77994941	212.2200506	5.617266669	36917.8	69,779	2.123453334	
Mitchell	Vaya	8,357	1,715	6,211	221.43	37.74104683	212.2589532	5.624087591	9400.1	17,757	2.124817518	
Ashe	Vaya	15,405	3,435	11,476	426.14	36.15009152	213.8499085	5.915611814	18226	33,631	2.183122363	
Macon	Vaya	17,977	4,454	13,123	515.56	34.86888044	215.1311196	6.16971686	22182.6	40,160	2.23943372	
Hertford	Trillium	12,309	2,474	9,034	353.06	34.86376253	215.1362375	6.170769356	15191.2	27,500	2.234153871	
Avery	Vaya	8,445	2,339	6,524	247.09	34.17782994	215.8221701	6.314683245	10665.5	19,111	2.262936649	
Columbus	Trillium	30,551	7,320	22,983	937.29	32.59503462	217.4049654	6.669879873	40754.3	71,305	2.33975975	
Cherokee	Vaya	14,691	4,038	11,140	455.43	32.25742705	217.742573	6.750153155	19833.3	34,524	2.350030631	
Beaufort	Trillium	26,251	4,967	18,881	827.19	31.73515154	218.2648485	6.877699897	36109.3	62,360	2.375539979	
Yancey	Vaya	9,830	2,316	7,581	312.6	31.4459373	218.5540627	6.950152594	13664	23,494	2.390030519	
Casswell	Cardinal	13,194	2,057	9,648	424.92	31.05055069	218.9494493	7.051386994	18607.2	31,801	2.410277399	
Montgomery	Sandhills	14,743	3,675	11,360	491.76	29.98007158	220.0199284	7.338872685	21639.4	36,382	2.467774537	
Perquimans	Trillium	7,148	1,552	5,203	247.09	28.92873042	221.0712696	7.641927812	10924.9	18,073	2.528385562	
Martin	Trillium	13,133	2,400	10,267	461.22	28.47448073	221.5255193	7.779791365	20434.4	33,567	2.555958273	
Anson	Sandhills	14,332	3									

Attachment B: County Demographics

County	LME-MCO	Actual Population (ages 19-64)	Uninsured Population (ages 19-64)	Population under 400% of Poverty (ages 19-64)	Land area (sq miles)	Persons per square mile (ages 19-64)	Persons per sq mile and Benchmark Density	Δ Adjustment to Make Equivalent to Benchmark	Population Adjustment	Net Effective Population with Rurality Weight	Rural Ratio (effective pop/actual pop)
Warren	Cardinal	10,772	2,447	8,666	428.46	25.14120338	224.8587966	8.943835871	19268.6	30,041	2.788767174
Camden	Trillium	5,930	911	3,398	240.56	24.65081477	225.3491852	9.141652614	10842	16,772	2.828330523
Bladen	Eastpointe	19,696	3,842	15,706	874.33	22.5269635	227.4730365	10.09781174	39777.3	59,473	3.019562348
Northampton	Trillium	11,064	2,579	8,643	536.59	20.61909465	229.3809053	11.12468366	24616.7	35,681	3.224936732
Gates	Trillium	6,807	1,091	4,219	340.45	19.99412542	230.0058746	11.50367269	15661.1	22,468	3.300734538
Washington	Trillium	6,912	1,459	5,236	348.14	19.85408169	230.1459183	11.59186921	16024.6	22,937	3.318373843
Pamlico	Trillium	6,596	1,491	4,514	336.54	19.59945326	230.4005467	11.75545785	15507.8	22,104	3.351091571
Graham	Vaya	4,661	1,217	3,885	292.08	15.95795672	234.0420433	14.66616606	13671.8	18,333	3.933233212
Bertie	Trillium	10,982	2,300	8,973	699.27	15.70494945	234.2950506	14.91854853	32767.1	43,749	3.983709707
Swain	Vaya	8,168	2,408	6,202	528	15.46969697	234.530303	15.16062684	24766.4	32,934	4.032125367
Jones	Trillium	5,694	1,418	4,338	470.71	12.09662	237.90338	19.6669301	22396.7	28,091	4.93398602
Tyrrell	Trillium	2,015	602	1,562	389.04	5.179415998	244.820584	47.26799007	19049	21,064	10.45359801
Hyde	Trillium	2,738	529	2,064	612.7	4.4687449	245.5312551	54.9441198	30087.4	32,825	11.98882396

Attachment C: SFY 2020 Single Stream Funding Algorithm

		Alliance	Cardinal	Eastpointe	Partners	Sandhills	Trillium	Vaya	State Total
Last SFY Allocation	A	\$13,372,873	\$42,169,478	\$17,077,566	\$22,858,068	\$13,376,954	\$50,633,838	\$45,719,163	\$205,207,941
2015 Service Level Requirement	B	\$38,535,086	\$70,113,612	\$21,572,071	\$30,990,208	\$25,521,488	\$39,000,613	\$39,285,683	\$265,018,761
Last SFY, Actual Expenditures	C	\$42,293,384	\$76,366,489	\$21,655,098	\$30,718,205	\$34,156,201	\$37,415,691	\$47,131,364	\$289,736,432
Last SFY, CASP Allocations	D	\$3,778,469	\$5,877,318	\$2,712,974	\$3,137,778	\$1,021,832	\$8,574,978	\$8,263,120	\$33,366,469
Last SFY, Expenditures w/o CASP (if excluded)	E	\$38,514,915	\$70,489,171	\$18,942,124	\$27,580,427	\$33,134,369	\$28,840,713	\$38,868,244	\$256,369,963
Limit, Exp vs 2015 w CASP	G	\$38,514,915	\$70,489,171	\$18,942,124	\$27,580,427	\$33,134,369	\$30,425,635	\$38,868,244	\$257,954,885
Rurality Ratio	H	1.02	1.13	1.59	1.16	1.23	1.64	1.57	-
Actual Population (ages 19-64)	I	1,108,106	1,817,781	378,085	579,412	628,227	791,771	576,491	5,879,873
Population with Rurality	J	1,125,502	2,057,231	602,292	672,786	775,127	1,296,810	902,554	7,432,302
Population Model	K	\$ 35,667,338	\$ 65,193,999	\$ 19,086,736	\$ 21,320,700	\$ 24,563,920	\$ 41,096,137	\$ 28,602,100	\$235,530,930
Uninsured	L	168,462	310,005	87,459	104,489	115,947	146,193	115,522	1,048,077
Uninsured with Rurality	M	171,107	350,841	139,323	121,328	143,059	239,444	180,861	1,345,962
Uninsured Model	N	\$ 29,942,073	\$ 61,393,907	\$ 24,380,199	\$ 21,231,226	\$ 25,034,049	\$ 41,800,432	\$ 31,649,044	\$235,530,930
Under 400% Poverty	O	619,014	1,116,740	292,429	398,674	426,974	536,612	411,481	3,801,924
Poverty with Rurality	P	628,732	1,263,844	465,841	462,921	526,815	878,895	644,215	4,871,264
Poverty Model	Q	\$ 30,399,862	\$ 61,108,254	\$ 22,523,943	\$ 22,382,760	\$ 25,472,070	\$ 42,495,558	\$ 31,148,484	\$235,530,930
Algorithm Relative Weight	R	12.8%	26.0%	10.0%	9.3%	10.7%	17.9%	13.3%	100%
Initial Cuts	S	(\$5,628,727)	(\$11,427,065)	(\$4,375,243)	(\$4,068,335)	(\$4,711,237)	(\$7,872,502)	(\$5,857,786)	(\$43,940,895)
Weighted Allocations	T	\$34,445,134	\$69,928,210	\$26,774,406	\$24,896,278	\$28,830,532	\$48,175,970	\$35,846,868	\$268,897,399
Weighted Allocations w/o CASP (if excluded)	U	\$30,170,967	\$61,251,081	\$23,452,071	\$21,806,993	\$25,253,060	\$42,197,995	\$31,398,764	\$235,530,930
Δ with Limit	V	(\$8,343,948)	(\$9,238,090)	\$4,509,947	(\$5,773,434)	(\$7,881,309)	\$11,772,360	(\$7,469,480)	(22,423,955)
Over Limit	W	0	0	\$4,509,947	0	0	\$11,772,360	0	16,282,307
Relative Weight of NOT over limit	X	17.8%	36.1%		12.8%	14.9%		18.5%	100%
Reweight Allocations 1	Y	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
Δ with Limit	Z	(\$5,452,198)	(\$3,367,454)	\$0	(\$3,683,334)	(\$5,460,919)	\$0	(\$4,460,051)	(22,423,955)
Over Limit	AA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Relative Weight of NOT over limit	AB								0%
Reweight Allocations 2	AC	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
Δ with Limit	AD	(\$5,452,198)	(\$3,367,454)	\$0	(\$3,683,334)	(\$5,460,919)	\$0	(\$4,460,051)	-
Over Limit	AE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Relative Weight of NOT over limit	AF								0%
Reweight Allocations 3	AG	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
Δ with Limit	AH	(\$5,452,198)	(\$3,367,454)	\$0	(\$3,683,334)	(\$5,460,919)	\$0	(\$4,460,051)	-
Over Limit	AI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Relative Weight of NOT over limit	AJ								0%
Reweight Allocations 4	AK	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
Δ with Limit	AL	(\$5,452,198)	(\$3,367,454)	\$0	(\$3,683,334)	(\$5,460,919)	\$0	(\$4,460,051)	-
Over Limit	AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Relative Weight of NOT over limit	AN								0%
Reweight Allocations 5	AO	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
Δ with Limit	AP	(\$5,452,198)	(\$3,367,454)	\$0	(\$3,683,334)	(\$5,460,919)	\$0	(\$4,460,051)	-
Over Limit	AQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Relative Weight of NOT over limit	AR								0%
Reweight Allocations 6	AS	\$33,062,717	\$67,121,717	\$18,942,124	\$23,897,093	\$27,673,450	\$30,425,635	\$34,408,193	\$235,530,930
Remaining After Limits	AT								-
Final Allocation + CASP (if excluded)	AU	\$36,841,186	\$72,999,035	\$21,655,098	\$27,034,871	\$28,695,282	\$39,000,613	\$42,671,313	\$268,897,399