

1. Intensive Case services (ICS)

SUMMARY

2. SFY	3. ALLOCATION	4. FUNDING LEVEL	5. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	6. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
2009-10	\$3,000,000		1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION
2008-09	\$850,000			
Total	\$3,850,000.00	\$3,812,685.00		

7.	# noncompliant participants to be served	3,554
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	2,583

8. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1381	230
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	261	83
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	225	39
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	199	42
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	88	59
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	235	110
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	49	15
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	323	22
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	110	34
Cases closed during the report month		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	14	3
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	11	2
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	73	58
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	23	1
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	16	2
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	99	8

9. Spending as of 8/16/10	
2009-10	\$2,649,852
2008-09	\$850,000
Total	\$3,499,852

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$37,216.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	41
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	10

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$15,113.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	14
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	11	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	3	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	1	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$15,113.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$36,942.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	34
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	68

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	106	14
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	46	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	7	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	3	8
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	16	6
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	65	3
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	6	2
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	8	9
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	5	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	9	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$33,643.00
--

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 ICS4 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**

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$6,912.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	20
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	14

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	20	13
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	17	12
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	7	5
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	1
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	3	2
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	8	1
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	1	4
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	2	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	5	1
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	4	7
Cases closed during the report month		
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	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	1	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$11,546.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	7
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	24	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	13	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	14	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	10	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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	7	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$11,546.00
--

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 ICS4 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)

CHAUTAUQUA

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$34,320.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	43
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	10

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	24	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	11	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	22	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	7	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	18	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	2	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	2	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$34,320.00
--

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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)

CHEMUNG

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$18,512.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	44
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	23	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	23	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	19	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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	2	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$18,512.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$14,107.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	9
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$9,122.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	7
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	0	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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)

DELAWARE

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$2,872.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	1
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	2

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	4	2
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	2	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	2	2
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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	1
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$2,872.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$17,979.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	6
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	8
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	0	4
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	10
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	3
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	13
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	0	4
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	0	6
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	0	1
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	0	5
Cases closed during the report month		
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	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	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$17,979.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$228,720.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	99
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	67	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	3	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	63	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	53	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	35	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	21	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	4	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	5	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	4	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	4	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	4	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$228,720.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$6,089.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

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

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	5	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	5	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	4	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	0	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$6,089.00

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 ICS4 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)

FRANKLIN

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$7,156.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	25
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	10

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	9	2
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	11	2
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	8	2
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	10	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	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	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$7,156.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$4,793.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	12
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	7

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$621.00

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$6,150.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	6
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	2	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	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	1	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$1,666.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$6,211.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	51
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	19	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	15	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
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	5	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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 8/16/10 \$6,211.00

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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)

HERKIMER

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$5,891.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	5
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	1

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$19.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$7,842.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	17
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	1

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	14	3
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	10	2
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	6	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	12	3
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	1	1
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	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	1
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	2	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	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$7,842.00

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 ICS4 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)

LEWIS

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$3,985.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	10
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	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
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	0	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$3,985.00

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$8,970.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	17
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	12	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	6	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	9	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	3	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	4	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$3,086.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	41
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	5	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	12	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
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	8	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$2,116.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$187,975.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	68
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	24

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	130	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	12	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	7	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	4	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	18	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	9	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$172,640.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$56,270.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	34
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	15	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	23	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
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	2	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	10	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	3	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	2	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$56,270.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$34,792.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	255
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	29	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	6	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	11	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	3	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	2	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	9	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	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	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$25,936.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	15
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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)

ONONDAGA

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$72,322.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	68
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	14

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	25	1
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	2	1
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	0	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	23	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	20	1
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	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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	3	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$71,555.00
--

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 ICS4 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)
ONTARIO

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$12,857.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

	5. # noncompliant participants to be served	34
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	11	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	11	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
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	4	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	3	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$12,857.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$23,863.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	27
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	7

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	6	10
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	6
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	4	2
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	5
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	2	1
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	1	2
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	2	2
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	0	3
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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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	1
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	0	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	0	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	2

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$23,863.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$7,125.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	14
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	16	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	10	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	3	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	11	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	2	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$7,125.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$10,875.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	13
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$10,875.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$3,726.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	3
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	1

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$32,384.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	26
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$11,729.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	21
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	5	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	4	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	0	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$11,729.00
--

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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)

SARATOGA

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$2,903.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	29
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1	5
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	3
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	2
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	1
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	0	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	2
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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$2,655.00

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$17,277.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	94
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	18	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	18	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	9	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	3	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	5	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	12	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	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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	2	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$17,277.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$3,208.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	4
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	1

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	2	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	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	1	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	1	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	0	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$3,208.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$26,256.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	17
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	5

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	14	8
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	8	4
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	10	6
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	10	5
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	8	4
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	3	1
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	3	0
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	2	2
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	2	1
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$26,256.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$74,959.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	68
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	97	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	29	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	16	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	11	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	4	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	3	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	2	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 8/16/10 \$68,102.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$10,418.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	68
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	7	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	7	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	3	0
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	2	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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 8/16/10 \$10,418.00
--

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$6,714.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	10
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	6	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	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	5	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	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	1	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$6,714.00

Note:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ICS4 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)

TOMPKINS

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$8,695.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

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

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	3	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	1	0

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$8,695.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$12,003.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	10
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10		
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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)

WARREN

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$3,894.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	61
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	41

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	15	10
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	4	1
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	6	5
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	4	4
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	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	6	1
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	1	3
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	5	6
Cases closed during the report month		
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)	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	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$3,893.00

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 ICS4 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)

WASHINGTON

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$3,513.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	7
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	10	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	2	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	2	0
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	2	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
Cases closed during the report month		
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	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 8/16/10 \$3,513.00

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 ICS4 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)

WAYNE

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$7,369.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	15
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	6	14
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	1	0
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	1	1
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	5	14
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	2	15
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	4	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	2	8
Cases closed during the report month		
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	1
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	0	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$7,369.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$85,660.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	204
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	0

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	0	0
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
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	0	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
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	0	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	0	0
Cases closed during the report month		
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 8/16/10 \$0.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$4,016.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

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

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	9	13
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	7	10
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	9	13
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	1	0
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	1	0
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	5	6
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	3	2
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	4
Cases closed during the report month		
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	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	0	1
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	1	1

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$4,016.00

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 ICS4 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

2. ALLOCATION	3. CONTRACT/AWARD CYCLE	4. PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY
\$2,572,412.00	1/1/10-6/30/10	ALLOCATION

5.	# noncompliant participants to be served	1,836
	# not fully engaged participants to be served	2,363

6. Performance/Accountability Outcomes reported for the period through 06/30/10	Noncompliant Participants	Not Fully Engaged Participants
Participants served during the report month		
1 - Unduplicated number of participants served during the report month	1140	291
Participants successfully contacted during report month		
2 - Number of participants contacted by letter/call-in	24	90
3 - Number of participants contacted by phone call	84	4
4 - Number of participants contacted by home visit	37	22
5 - Number of participants contacted by other means	0	65
Engagement outcomes for report month		
6 - Number of participants successfully engaged in work activities for the first time following contact	186	157
7 - Number of participants successfully engaged in necessary treatment for the first time following contact	43	2
8 - Number of participants that remain unengaged without good cause	171	23
9 - Number of participants with newly reported income	36	0
10 - Number of participants that remain engaged in work activities or necessary treatment for a minimum of 3 months following initial placement	84	0
Cases closed during the report month		
11 - Number of cases closed due to income from employment	2	3
12 - Number of cases closed because district was unable to locate the participant	1	2
13 - Number of cases closed for failure to respond to outreach (excludes households that district was unable to locate)	69	112
14 - Number of cases closed because of newly reported income obtained prior to report month	29	0
15 - Number of cases closed at the request of the participant	5	0
16 - Number of cases closed for any reason other than those listed	105	6

7. Spending as of 8/16/10 \$2,572,412.00

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 ICS4 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.