

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**SUMMARY**

2. SFY	3. ALLOCATION	4. FUNDING LEVEL	5. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	6. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
2008-09	\$3,000,000		1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION
2007-08	\$4,875,524			
2006-07	\$3,437,929			
Total	\$11,313,453.00			

7.	# noncompliant participants to be served	10,450
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	7,598

8. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1572	742
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	426	146
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	301	220
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	207	216
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	107	54
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	300	235
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	71	307
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	363	139
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	66	7
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	99	32
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	15	7
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	10	36
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	60	159
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	19	2
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	17	3
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	103	48

9. Spending as of 12/31/09	
2008-09	\$2,137,543
2007-08	\$4,875,524
2006-07	\$3,437,929
Total	\$10,450,996

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ALBANY**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$109,362.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	120
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	30

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	67	14
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	75	14
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	52	14
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	5	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	14	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	4
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	8	3
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	7	2
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	6	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	2	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	2	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	5	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$77,750.00
---

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ALLEGANY**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$44,410.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	40
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	13	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	4	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$44,410.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**BROOME**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$108,556.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	100
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	200

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	87	7
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	43	7
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	10	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	10	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	52	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	6	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	8	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	4	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	2	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	5	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$100,886.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)  
CATTARAUGUS**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$20,311.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	60
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	40

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	13	18
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	13	18
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	5	5
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	1
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	2
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	5	2
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	3
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	3	10
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	1
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	2	1
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$20,311.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**CAYUGA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$33,929.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	20
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	13	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	3	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	9	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	7	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	6	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$29,028.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**CHAUTAUQUA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$100,852.00	1/5/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	125
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	30

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	39	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	21	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	9	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	7	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	23	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	3	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$89,341.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**CHEMUNG**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$54,399.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	130
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	13	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	13	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	2	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	12	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	6	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	3	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$54,399.00
---

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.



**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**CLINTON**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$20,949.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	25
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	5	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	0	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	5	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	2	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$20,000.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**CORTLAND**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$14,069.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	20
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	4	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	2	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	0	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$8,150.00
--

Note:

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**DELAWARE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$8,441.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	4
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	6

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	4	2
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	3	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	2	1
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$2,329.00
--

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**DUTCHESS**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$52,832.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	18
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	5	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	5	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	2	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$52,832.00
---

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ERIE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$672,114.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	290
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	17	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	17	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	45	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	38	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	26	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	8	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	7	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$569,334.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ESSEX**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$17,893.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	60
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	7	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	6	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	3	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	3	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$17,893.00
---

Note:

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**FRANKLIN**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$21,028.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	74
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	28

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	9	3
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	10	3
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	6	2
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	1
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	5	2
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$21,028.00
---

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**FULTON**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$14,085.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	35
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	20

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	4	3
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	0	1
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	4	2
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	1
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	1
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	1
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$5,018.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.



**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**GENESEE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$18,072.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	19
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	0	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$2,759.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**GREENE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$18,251.00	1/1/09-8/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	150
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	7	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	6	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	5	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	2	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$18,251.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**HERKIMER**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$9,608.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	14
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	4

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	8	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	12	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	11	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	2	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	2	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	7	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$8,700.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**JEFFERSON**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$23,043.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	50
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	4

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	10	9
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	6	4
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	7	7
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	9	9
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	1
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	4	8
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	2	3
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	2
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	3	2
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	1
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	2	1
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$23,043.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**LEWIS**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$11,711.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	30
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	2	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	2	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$11,711.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**LIVINGSTON**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$26,358.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	50
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	11	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	6	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	4	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	9	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	7	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	6	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$26,358.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**MADISON**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$9,067.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	120
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	4	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	2	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	2	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	2	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$3,696.00
--

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**MONROE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$524,438.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	200
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	72

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	132	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	28	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	11	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	9	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	8	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	17	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	4	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	6	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	3	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$400,194.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.



**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**NASSAU**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$165,355.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	100
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	10	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	13	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	6	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	4	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$165,355.00
--

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**NIAGARA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$102,240.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	750
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	23	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	3	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	11	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	4	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	4	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	6	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	9	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	3	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	3	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$102,240.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ONEIDA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$65,916.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	45
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	16	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	11	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	8	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	5	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	4	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	12	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$49,700.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ONONDAGA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$212,524.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	200
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	42

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	25	3
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	14	2
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	7	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	23	3
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	17	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	1
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	2	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$200,460.00
--

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

<b>1. Intensive Case services (ICS)</b>
<b>ONTARIO</b>

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$37,781.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

	5. # noncompliant participants to be served	100
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	17	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	15	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	5	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	3	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	4	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	2	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$37,781.00
---

**Note:**

- |  |
|--|
| <p>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</p> <p>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</p> <p>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</p> |
|--|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ORANGE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$70,122.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	80
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	20

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	8	3
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	4	2
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	4	1
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	1
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	2
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	1
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	1
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$70,122.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ORLEANS**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$20,938.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	40
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	7	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	4	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	2	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	2	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$20,938.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**OSWEGO**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$31,958.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	38
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	9	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	4	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	3	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$21,249.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.



**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**OTSEGO**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$10,949.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	8
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	2

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	0	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	0	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$1,455.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**RENSSELAER**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$46,178.00	1/1/09-9/18/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	75
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	9	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	8	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	3	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$45,855.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ROCKLAND**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$34,466.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	63
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	7	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	3	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	2	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$34,464.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**SARATOGA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$8,530.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	84
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1	1
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	1
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	0	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	1
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$8,041.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**SCHENECTADY**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$50,771.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	275
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	24	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	24	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	12	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	6	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	5	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	15	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	8	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	3	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	2	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$50,771.00
---

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**SENECA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$9,426.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	11
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	2

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	2	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	2	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	3	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$2,749.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**STEUBEN**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$77,156.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	50
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	16

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	10	5
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	4	2
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	4	4
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	8	3
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	7	2
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	1
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	2	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	2	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	1
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	1
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$77,156.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**SUFFOLK**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$220,273.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	200
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	99	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	31	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	17	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	12	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	4	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	3	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	3	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	4	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	6	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$196,593.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.



**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**SULLIVAN**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$30,613.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	200
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	7	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	3	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	3	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$27,285.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**TIOGA**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$19,729.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	30
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	9	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	4	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	2	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	3	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	5	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	3	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$19,729.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**TOMPKINS**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$25,552.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	60
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	8	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	5	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	0	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	3	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$25,552.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**ULSTER**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$35,273.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	30
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	20	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	9	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	6	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	4	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	5	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	7	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	7	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	3	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$35,246.00
---

**Note:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</li> <li>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</li> <li>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</li> </ol> |
|---|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**WARREN**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$11,442.00	7/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	180
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	120

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	15	10
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	12	5
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	9	7
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	1
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	4	4
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	1
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	9	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	4
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	1
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$10,644.00
---

**Note:**

- |  |
|--|
| <p>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</p> <p>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</p> <p>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</p> |
|--|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**WASHINGTON**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$10,322.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	20
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	4	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	1	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	1	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$10,322.00
---

**Note:**

- |  |
|--|
| <p>1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.</p> <p>2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.</p> <p>3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.</p> |
|--|

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**WAYNE**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$21,655.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	45
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	13	17
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	3	2
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	9	14
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	2
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	4	6
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	2	1
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	9	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	5	16
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	2
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	1
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$21,655.00
---

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**WESTCHESTER**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$249,718.00	3/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	600
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	55	0
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	54	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	41	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	25	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	16	0
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	3	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	25	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	3	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	0	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	0
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	1	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	0	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	6	0

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$41,904.00
---

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.



**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)**

**WYOMING**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$11,800.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	12
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	13

<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	12	10
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	11	10
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	12	10
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	1
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	4	4
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	2
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	2
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	2
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	1	1
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	0
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	0
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	1	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	1	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$7,140.00
--

**Note:**

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.

**1. Intensive Case services (ICS)  
NEW YORK CITY**

<b>2. ALLOCATION</b>	<b>3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE</b>	<b>4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY</b>
\$7,559,169.00	1/1/09-12/31/09	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	5,400
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	6,949

	<b>Noncompliant Participants</b>	<b>Not Fully Engaged Participants</b>
<b>6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 12/31/09</b>		
<b>Participants served during the report month</b>		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	818	670
<b>Participants successfully contacted during report month</b>		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	10	106
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	49	190
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	28	184
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	48
<b>Engagement outcomes for report month</b>		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	171	211
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	38	299
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	136	133
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	16	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	42	0
<b>Cases closed during the report month</b>		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	0	2
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	0	35
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	25	157
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	12	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	2	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	64	44

7. Spending as of 12/31/09 \$7,559,169.00
--

Note:

1. Statewide summary report does not include information for districts (Chenango, Columbia, Hamilton, Montgomery, Putnam, St. Lawrence, Schoharie, Schuyler and Yates) that chose not to operate an ICS3 program.
2. County specific information may be revised based on county plan approved by OTDA.
3. The number of participants served and the outcomes identified represent the respective monthly average.