



Office of Children and Family Services

ANDREW M. CUOMO
Governor

SHEILA J. POOLE
Acting Commissioner

August 14, 2015

Dear Chief Executive Officer,

Thank you for submitting Nassau County's Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Program (STSJP) plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016. Your plan has been reviewed by the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) and I am pleased to inform you that your county's STSJP plan has been **approved**.

Nassau County is eligible to receive 62% State reimbursement for STSJP expenditures up to the capped STSJP allocation amount. Your municipality will continue to receive 49% State reimbursement for eligible detention services expenditures up to the capped allocation amount. If your municipality shifts a portion of its detention allocation into its STSJP plan, your municipality will receive 62% State reimbursement if such shifted funds are spent on STSJP eligible expenditures. Nassau County may make an initial detention allocation shift or increase the amount of the detention allocation shift until December 31, 2015. If Nassau County plans to shift its detention allocation for STSJP eligible expenses, please submit a request on official letterhead to Cara Korn and email it to stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov outlining the amount that will be shifted and the type of programming or services the re-purpose detention funds will be used for under STSJP. An amend STSJP plan will also need to be submitted, if (Nassau county) shifts its detention allocation for STSJP eligible expenses

All STSJP claims must be submitted electronically via the Juvenile Detention Automated System (JDAS) for the service period April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016. Questions on all aspects of claiming process should be directed to Daniel Hulihan at (518) 473-4511 or at Daniel.Hulihan@ocfs.ny.gov.

Thank you for your continued partnership as we reform the juvenile justice practices in New York State by safely engaging youth and their family through innovating alternative to placement and detention programs.

If you have any questions, please email us at stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov and write "STSJP Plan Questions" in the subject line so that we may best assist you in a timely manner. You can direct all STSJP inquiries to Cara Korn at (518) 408-3999 or Cara.Korn@ocfs.ny.gov and Shawn Chin-Chance at (212) 961-4110 or Shawn.Chin-Chance@ocfs.ny.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joseph Mancini".

Joseph Mancini
Associate Commissioner
DJJOY Office of Community Partnerships

NEW YORK STATE
OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
**SUPERVISION AND TREATMENT SERVICES FOR JUVENILE PROGRAM (STSJP)
FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016 ANNUAL PLAN**

STSJP Plans are due to the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) by 06 / 29 / 2015

Plans should be submitted to: ocfs.sm.stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov

Please ensure that the title “**Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Plan**” and your municipality name are in the subject field to facilitate the timely review of your STSJP Plan. **Note:** Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 replaces the term State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2015-16 and FY 2015 replaces the term SFY 2014-15.

Please direct any STSJP Plan questions to either:

Shawn.Chin-Chance@ocfs.ny.gov PH. 212-961-4110

Cara.Korn@OCFS.ny.gov PH. 518-408-3999

SECTION ONE- Municipal Information	
NAME OF MUNICIPALITY: Nassau County	
STSJP LEAD AGENCY: Nassau Probation	STSJP LEAD PERSON: John D. Fowle, Director
STSJP LEAD PHONE NUMBER: 516-571-4676	STSJP LEAD E-MAIL: jfowle@nassaucountyny.gov

SECTION TWO – List of Programs and Services to be Funded

In this section, list the exact name of each program who have received STSJP funds, along with the projected amount of STSJP funds to be used for each. If this is a rollover program, please answer questions that are relevant to the funded program:

Program One-Name	Family and Children's Association Juvenile Justice Services	Type of Program	ATD
Total Program Expenses	\$ 238,000	Rollover Funded Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1. Please indicate specific zip codes that your plan targets:	11550	11580	
	11590	11510	
	11575	11735	
	11553	11554	
	11520	11801	

2. How will the program reduce the number of youth who are detained or in residential placement?

Family and Children's Association program staff work directly in the community with at-risk youth at a number of points of contact with the juvenile justice system. FCA programming incorporates interventions, clinical and non-clinical, that Nassau believes have been clearly demonstrated to improve outcomes as measured by a reduction in the number of youth who fail to appear in court and/or are arrested during the pendency of their charges, and/or ultimately require placement in a residential facility. FCA programming funded under STSJP includes three case managers who connect youth and family to services, two respite beds in a group home, educational advocacy to reconnect/maintain juveniles in their home school districts (with school attendance being the best predictor of detention risk, per OCFS and Vera research in developing the DRAI), court date reminders and/or transportation, family mediation, and evidence-based programs including Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Strengthening Families. Often, services are put in place within days of a juvenile's arrest and release on a Family Court Appearance Ticket (FCAT), issued either by the police at the stationhouse immediately following arrest, or by a Probation Officer at the Juvenile Detention Center several hours later.

FCA's community-based model offers staff the opportunity to provide immediate attention to the behaviors and problems that put the youth at-risk for deeper system penetration. FCA's Juvenile Justice Team, funded by STSJP, consists of a supervisor, who has a Master's degree and is a licensed Marriage and Family Therapist, and two case managers, both of whom hold Bachelor's degrees and are bilingual. The Team functions as mentors and role models to the young people and, often, the parents and guardians as well. The Team works closely with the schools to track attendance and any disciplinary problems that may arise, and collaborates with other community-based service providers (i.e., after-school and recreational programs and behavioral health services) to facilitate timely and appropriate referrals. Moral Reconciliation Therapy, which helps youth gain insight into the choices they make and the consequences of their behavior, and Strengthening Families, a group program for youth and their parents that works to improve family interaction, are provided in-house by FCA, as well as family mediation.

3. How will the program be family focused?

FCA's Family Mediation improves communication and interaction between youth and their parents or guardians. Strengthening Families and parenting skills training help families become better-equipped to care for their at-risk youth in the home. Respite care - available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year, reduces family tension by offering both the parent and child a cooling off period, triggering intervention of a Family Mediator if not already in place to work to reduce the parent-child conflict. Once the youth returns home, the family can continue to participate in mediation to help resolve future difficulties.

4. Can the program be replicated across multiple locations?

While STSJP funded programs are focused on those Nassau municipalities contributing the greatest number of JD arrests, every Nassau JD is eligible to receive these services, and the model lends itself to replication in other jurisdictions.

5. What is the projected number of youth that are served by this STSJP funded program?
 40 to 50 youth

6. If program is being used as an Alternative to Detention (ATD) and an Alternative to Placement (ATP), how will it serve both populations of youth?
 STSJP funding makes respite services available from the time of arrest through the time of case separation. Respite, providing safe housing and adult supervision, combined with family mediation is an alternative to detention for youth who are amenable to release on an FCAT following arrest but who cannot immediately return home, including where there is a history of family violence and/or the victim is in the home. Post-petition, juveniles can be referred to respite by their Probation Officer when time out of the home will reduce the likelihood of violative behavior and potential placement.

7. If the program was used during FY 2015, please assess whether the service or program achieved the projected reductions in detention utilization and/or residential placements and other performance outcomes.
 Of the 100 individual JDs who received Program One services in 2014-2015 following their arrest and initial release, 22 youth were later detained (18 at JDC) or placed (4 at OCFS) at some point during the case processing. While the diversion rate is 78%, it is noted that on October 1, 2014 services for JDs who were not immediately released by police via FCATs following arrest and which were previously funded under a DCJS grant were shifted to STSJP. It is believed that additional data analysis will confirm that these youth are generally higher needs individuals, accounting for their 63% diversion from detention and placement rate as a group, dropping the overall success rate of Program One to 70% of the JDs receiving services avoiding subsequent detention or placement.

8. What were the barriers if not met? NA-goals were met

Did the program receive STSJP funds for FY 2015? Yes No **If Yes, answer the questions below:**

1. When did the program start using FY 2015 STSJP Funds? 2014

2. What was the average length of stay for youth in program or service? 60 days

3. How many youth received services in the program during FY 2015? 100

Program Two -Name	Probation Officer FCAT Standby	Type of Program	ATD
Total Program Expenses	\$ 10,033	Rollover Funded Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1. Please indicate specific zip codes that your plan targets:	11550	11580	
	11590	11510	
	11575	11735	
	11553	11554	
	11520	11801	

2. How will the program reduce the number of youth who are detained or in residential placement?
 Intake Probation Officers are on duty during Court hours and available to complete detention screens as needed. Via STSJP funding, specially-trained POs are on call weekdays from 5 PM to 12 AM and weekends and holidays from 8 AM to 12 AM. They respond to JDC upon notification that a youth has been arrested and is at imminent risk of detention because Police were unable to issue a Family Court Appearance Ticket. The Probation Officer responds to JDC and completes the Detention Risk Assessment Instrument, which informs the Probation Officer's decision to release the youth via a Probation FCAT or detain the youth pending immediate referral to the Presentment Agency.

3. How will the program be family focused?
 All juveniles released via Probation FCAT are referred to FCA for Program One services, which are family focused.

4. Can the program be replicated across multiple locations?

While STSJP funded programs are focused on those Nassau municipalities contributing the greatest number of JD arrests, every Nassau JD is eligible to receive these services, and the model lends itself to replication in other jurisdictions.

5. If the program was used during FY 2015, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes?

Between 4/1/14 and 3/31/15, Police were unable to issue FCATs following 66 JD arrests. (There were 378 total JD arrests in calendar year 2014, yielding a Police FCAT rate of 83%.) Probation Officers subsequently wrote FCATs for 24 of these 66 juveniles (36%). Thirty of the 66 detention screens (45%) were completed off-hours, generating 15 of the 24 Probation FCATs (63%). All 24 youth received Program One services provided by FCA, resulting in 15 of the 24 (63%) having their cases successfully adjusted, compared to an overall 45% adjustment rate in Nassau in calendar year 2014. Nassau's results appear to support the premise that timely and appropriate services reduce juvenile justice system penetration.

6. What were the barriers if not met?

One significant barrier to improved outcomes is the frequency with which a Probation Officer overrode the DRAI, impacting 31 of 66 detention decisions during the 2014-2015 period. Reasons for overrides were not available adult (10), victim in residence (5), nature of offense (5), flight risk (3), and the victim requested an Order of Protection (2). As part of Nassau's JDAI participation, we have set up a subcommittee to examine our overrides and suggest solutions.

7. If program was used as an ATD and an ATP, how was it used to serve both populations of youth?

N/A

8. What is the projected number of youth that will be served by this STSJP – funded program? 60

Did the program receive STSJP funds for FY 2015? Yes No **If Yes, answer the questions below:**

1. When did the program start using FY 2015 STSJP Funds? 2014

2. What was the average length of stay for youth in program or service? 4 hours

3. How many youth received services in the program during FY 2015? 66

Program Three -Name	Electronic Monitoring	Type of Program	ATD/ATP
Total Program Expenses	\$ 10,000	Rollover Funded Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1. Please indicate specific zip codes that your plan targets:	11550	11580	
	11590	11510	
	11575	11735	
	11553	11554	
	11520	11801	

2. How will the program reduce the number of youth who are detained or in residential placement?

The program reduces the number of youth who are detained or placed by allowing the judges the option of utilizing house arrest and remote alcohol monitoring as a condition of the juvenile's return home or to a respite bed provided by FCA as part of Program One. Typically, the juveniles are not allowed to leave their home without their parent unless they are attending school and/or treatment. All out of home times are reconciled by the PO and the youth's parents/guardians. Youth who fail to adhere to their schedule are brought back to court for additional planning/sanctions.

3. How will the program be family focused?

All juveniles placed under electronic monitoring are referred to FCA for Program One services, which are family focused.

4. Can the program be replicated across multiple locations?

While STSJP funded programs are focused on those Nassau municipalities contributing the greatest number of JD arrests, every Nassau JD is eligible to receive these services post-arrest and through the time of case closure, and the model lends itself to replication in other jurisdictions.

5. If the program was used during FY 2015, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes?

Nineteen unique individuals were placed on electronic monitoring on 26 occasions between 4/1/14 and 3/31/15. Four of these juveniles were also held in secure detention and two others in nonsecure detention at some point during their case processing with lengths of stay ranging from 3 days to 119 days. Of the six who were detained, three were ultimately placed with OCFS, one was placed on probation, one received an ACOD and the last transferred to Kings Family Court for disposition.

6. What were the barriers if not met?

It appears that on some occasions EM was imposed where the juvenile would have otherwise been released, inconsistent with the goal of ATD to permit the release of juveniles who would otherwise be detained, Nassau Probation is arranging to meet with our two JD judges, Chief Clerk, and representatives from Annie E. Casey to review a number of issues including the purpose of EM.

7. If program was used as an ATD and an ATP, how was it used to serve both populations of youth?

Electronic monitoring is an effective alternative to detention, allowing select juveniles to be released home or to respite during the pendency of a JD petition, and an equally effective alternative to placement, imposed as a condition of probation, or as a graduated sanction in response to a violation or probation.

8. What is the projected number of youth that will be served by this STSJP – funded program? 20

Did the program receive STSJP funds for FY 2015? **Yes** **No** **If Yes, answer the questions below:**

1. When did the program start using FY 2015 STSJP Funds? 2014

2. What was the average length of stay for youth in program or service? 32 days

3. How many youth received services in the program during FY 2015? 26

NEW YORK STATE
 OFFICE OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
SUPERVISION AND TREATMENT SERVICES
FOR JUVENILE PROGRAM (STSJP)
FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016 ANNUAL PLAN - ADDENDUM

Program Four-Name	Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Coordinator (JDAI)	Type of Program	ATD
Total Program Expenses	\$ 83,333	Rollover Funded Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1. Please indicate specific zip codes that your plan targets:		11550	11580
		11590	11510
		11575	11735
		11553	11554
		11520	11801
		2. How will the program reduce the number of youth who are detained or in residential placement? JDAI's fundamental goal is ensuring similarly situated youth achieve similar outcomes. An immediate objective is reducing wherever possible the number of youth in secure and non-secure detention through expanding the capacity of community-based programming. The JDAI coordinator facilitates the ongoing assessment of Nassau's juvenile justice system and the institutionalization of necessary change, works with local stakeholders collecting and analyzing data that is presented at the quarterly JDAI collaborative meetings, and represents Nassau on the State JDAI Committee.	
3. How will the program be family focused? N/A			
4. Can the program be replicated across multiple locations? JDAI coordinators can be found in all six of the New York State JDAI pilot counties.			
5. If the program was used last SFY, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes? N/A			
6. What were the barriers if not met? N/A			

7. If program was used as an ATD and an ATP, how was it used to serve both populations of youth?
 A primary function of the JDAI Coordinator is to help assess the efficacy of existing ATD and ATP programming, identify gaps, and propose and develop additional alternatives.

8. What is the projected number of youth that will be served by this STSJP – funded program? 40-50 youth

Did the program receive STSJP funds FY 2015? Yes No If Yes, answer the questions below:

1. When did the program start using FY 2015 STSJP Funds? 2014

2. What was the average length of stay for youth in program or service? N/A

3. How many youth received services in the program during FY 2015? 66

Program Five-Name			Type of Program
Total Program Expenses	\$	Rollover Funded Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1. Please indicate specific zip codes that your plan targets:			
2. How will the program reduce the number of youth who are detained or in residential placement?			
3. How will the program be family focused?			
4. Can the program be replicated across multiple locations?			
5. If the program was used last SFY, were the performance outcomes met and describe the outcomes?			

SECTION THREE – Analysis of Communities

Provide an analysis that identifies the neighborhoods or communities from which the greatest number of juvenile delinquents, juvenile offenders and persons in need of supervision (PINS) are remanded to detention or residentially placed. Are these the communities and neighborhoods served in the previous years' approved plan, if not, what has changed?

Nassau is a diverse County with a population of 1.3 million people. As is true of many counties, a small number of Nassau communities are home to the largest number of consumers of social welfare and justice system services. Generally, these are minority communities faced with significant socio-economic issues that negatively impact the quality of the outcomes when their residents interact with these systems, in particular the justice system.

Since 2010, consistent with state and national trends, Nassau has seen the number of juvenile arrests drop by 50%, from 750 to 378 in 2014. Continuing system reform efforts, including those funded in part by OCFS and DCJS, will seek to leverage this decline by further increasing the rate at which juveniles are diverted from court and decreasing the rates at which they are detained and placed.

SECTION FOUR – Disparity

In this section, please provide information indicating whether the use of detention or residential placement in your service area exhibits a significant racial or ethnic disparity or disproportionality. Please note that when looking for disparity, highlight, with the use of accurate data, youth who given comparable levels of need, do not receive equal utilization of services. Seek out all decision points to illustrate usage. When looking for disproportionality, identify any population groups who are underrepresented in a larger population and then overrepresented in a subset population. For example, population group A represents 15 percent of the general population but represents 75 percent of the detention population. If you currently do not measure these variables, please include your plan for data collection for Racial and Ethnic Disparities across your system. If no disparities or disproportionalities exist in your system simply state that in the space below.

Disproportionate minority representation (DMR) in Nassau's juvenile justice system largely parallels that seen in Nassau's welfare systems, including Foster Care, Child Protective Services, Preventive and TANF. As the total number of arrests declines, the disproportionate impact on some of Nassau's communities increases. In 2014, Hempstead, Westbury, Uniondale, Freeport and Roosevelt accounted for 41% of the total juvenile delinquency arrests. While White youth represent 63% of the county's population, they represented only 22% of the youth arrested. Approximately 18% of the JDs were Hispanic, roughly equal to their percentage of the total population. African American youth represented 57% of the 378 arrests, but only about 12% of the overall population. With continued STSJP support, including partial funding of Nassau's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, Nassau has started to refocus our view away from DMR, which is the result of the complex interplay between a large number of factors outside the justice system, and more on Racial and Ethnic Disparity, which focuses on the impact of individual and institutional bias impacting outcomes from the time of arrest forward, including which youth are detained and/or placed. For example, in 2014 83% of the 217 Black youth arrested were issued FCATs by Police and eligible for Probation Intake adjustment services, compared to 80% of White youth and 88% of the Hispanics, with an overall average of 83%, which suggests race and ethnicity did not influence who received FCATs. Of the 37 Black youth transported to JDC by the Police, another 8, or 22%, were issued FCATs by Probation, compared to 11 of the 18 White youth (61%) and 3 of the 8 Hispanic youth (38%), with an overall Probation FCAT rate of 36%. While the numbers of youth in each category are small, it appears that Black youth and then Hispanic youth did not fare as well as White JDs. Perhaps more important, with every youth released via FCAT having an opportunity to have his or her case adjusted, with an overall adjustment rate of 45% in Nassau in 2014, Black youth had a 40% rate, White youth 50% and Hispanic youth 51%. While the range of positive outcomes has narrowed significantly over the past three years, further data analysis is required to assess whether these differences in adjustment rates are the result of RED or case specific circumstances that can be addressed through additional services and programs.

If such disproportionality exists, describe how the service/program proposed for funding will address this disparity.

Case management, school advocacy, family mediation and referrals for behavioral health care, in combination with respite services where indicated, will continue to support Nassau's overall efforts to reduce disproportionality by (1) offering alternatives to detention and placement for all youth and (2) providing services that mitigate some of the risk factors (poor peer influences, inadequate role models, few opportunities for pro-social activities) that are more prevalent in our lower income/ higher needs communities.

SECTION FIVE – Strategy

Justification and Overall Strategy – The purpose of STSJP funds is to establish supports and services for youth who, absent these services, are likely to be detained or placed. Funds should therefore be clearly targeted to meet the needs of the types of youth who in the past have been admitted to detention or residential placement. With this specific purpose in mind, describe the strategy devised by your collaborative partners (list your collaborative partners) to address the STSJP Funding objective through the programs chosen in Section Two.

Nassau County's STSJP plan has evolved over the years through the continued collaboration of key local stakeholders, notably Probation, the Nassau Office of Youth Services, Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition, the Family Court Judges and Family and Children's Association. Our system of supports for juveniles - from the time of arrest through the time of discharge from probation - recognizes the clear need to identify the risk factors that drive the need for detention and recidivism. Local and state level data continues to inform our development of an intervention model that balances the needs of at-risk juveniles with public safety while ensuring similarly situated youth achieve similar outcomes.

SECTION SIX – Outcomes

Performance Outcomes – For FY 2016, provide the projected performance outcomes for your proposed services and programs, being sure to include: An estimate of the anticipated reductions in detention utilization and residential placements.

Nassau anticipates that 60 youth will be diverted from detention and residential placements as a result of STSJP services.

Other projected positive outcomes for youth who participate in the services and programs:

(1) An increase in the number of non-detained youth appearing in court and avoiding reoffending; (2) a reduction in parent-juvenile conflicts, reducing the risk of family violence and recidivism for those youth with a history of family violence; (3) an increase in school engagement/attendance; (4) an increase in timely referrals for mental health and/or substance abuse services; (5) an increase in at-risk youth engaged in pro-social activities that will further decrease the likelihood of juvenile justice involvement.

Are there any changes in allocations or practices planned for FY 2016 based on experiences in FY 2015, please list those changes:

Given the generally positive results achieved in SFY 2015, Nassau has not made any changes to its STSJP plan.

SECTION SEVEN– Comments

Nassau County has been committed to juvenile justice reform since County Executive Ed Mangano launched our JJ Task Force in April 2011. The Task Force evolved into our Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition, and more recently our Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Collaborative. We also maintain a leadership role on the Nassau/Suffolk Regional Youth Justice Team, and are one of six Columbia University Juvenile Justice -Translational Research on Interventions for Adolescents in the Legal System (JJ-TRIALS) pilot sites.

Our first identified JJR goal was and remains the collection and analysis of valid and reliable local data. The data we continue to receive from OCFS and DCJS frequently does not clearly reflect what is occurring at the county level, and where it does is often dated by the time it is available. Over the years we have worked (and are now again working) with Dr. Megan Kurlycheck from SUNY Albany under contract with DCJS to better understand how we collect data, what additional data we need to collect, how to manage the data via our Probation case management system (Caseload Explorer), and, perhaps most important, what the data tells us about our current system and the impact of reform initiatives.

To this end, Nassau recommends that OCFS considers two changes to STSJP:

1) OCFS should consider being more prescriptive in who provides STSJP services and how they are provided. If the ultimate goal of juvenile justice reform is that similarly situated youth achieve similar outcomes, OCFS should pay counties to provide services that are evidence-based and programming with measurable outcomes that are demonstrated to achieve this goal. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting what works and what does not work. Presumably, OCFS would not fund a county's use of a Scared Straight or similar model. The outcome research is clear. While it is desirable to establish as many "justice laboratories" as possible across the state to encourage new and potentially promising approaches, it makes it extremely difficult for each county to collect performance data that is meaningful at the state level and still useful at the local level. Perhaps the clearest example is requiring counties to collect data on a grant cycle basis. While understandable from a grant management perspective, counties almost always collect local data on a calendar basis. The issues this presents is reflected in this very application. It is frustrating to have to analyze data both ways. It also makes the data less useful when trying to compare grant cycle metrics to calendar year metrics. Perhaps OCFS can find a way to extend the 2015-16 cycle through the end of 2016 on a pro-rated basis and begin the next cycle January 1, 2017. This would also give counties time to prepare contracts and secure local approvals before beginning to spend down the grants.

2) The application process is unwieldy and untimely, as reflected in the number and length of the statewide phone conferences and the continued inability of OCFS to confront the primary issues. Counties are placed in the position of spending STSJP dollars before contracts are fully executed and legislative approval secured, and delaying reimbursement to service vendors. The alternative would be to forfeit the funding outright, which some counties have apparently elected to do. OCFS should consider a reimbursement stream similar to that provided by DCJS to local Probation Departments. DCJS defines the types of services to be provided, each county describes via a templated application how the services will be delivered locally, each Probation Director certifies the services will be provided in that manner, and DCJS provides quarterly reimbursement checks.

SECTION EIGHT– Plan Amounts

Instructions:

- A. Enter all program expenses in Program Services tab.
- B. Specify State Reimbursements for this plan (lines 6-9)

Expenses

1. Program Expenses (from Program Services)	321,819	
2. State Reimbursement (Line 1* 0.62)		199,528

Available Reimbursements

3. STSJP Allocation	258,033
4. Detention Allocation	2,720,332
5. JDAI	83,333

Reimbursements for this Plan

6. STSJP Allocation	159,980
7. Detention Allocation being shifted to STSJP (if applicable)	0
8. JDAI (if applicable)	39,548
9. FY 2015 Rollover (if applicable)	0
10. Total Reimbursements (Lines 6-9)	199,528

State and Local Totals

11. State Share Amount (Line 10)	199,528
12. Local Share Amount (Subtract Line 11 from 10)	122,291

SECTION NINE– Approval

Approval of the Chief Executive Officer

As STSJP Lead for Nassau County Municipality, I certify that the CEO Charles Ribando, Deputy County Executive for Public Safety has reviewed and approved the 2015-2016 plan.

Date: 06 / 29 / 2015 STSJP Lead ALPHA\$77 STSJP Lead John D. Fowle
 User ID: _____ Printed Name: _____

INSTRUCTIONS:

Instructions for properly processing an STSJP plan.

- a. Once you have opened a copy of the OCFS-2121 form, please immediately use the "Save As" function in Microsoft Word to save a copy of the document on your computer.
- b. Please save your STSJP plan using the following format; (Municipality Name 2015-2016 STSJP Plan)
- c. Work from the "saved" plan document using it to record all of your municipality's information. Please use the document OCFS- 2121A to document additional STSJP programs.
- d. Once you have satisfactorily completed entering the required data, save the document.
- e. Section Nine must be completed prior to OCFS review of STSJP Plan.
- f. Upload completed plan and send it to OCFS via the STSJP email address at ocfs.sm.stsjp@ocfs.ny.gov

Approval of the OCFS STSJP Program Lead

As OCFS STSJP reviewer, I certify that I approve of this Supervision and Treatment Services for Juveniles Program Plan for Nassau Municipality and 2015-2016 fiscal year.

Date: 8/14/15 User ID: MJ0687 Printed Name: Shawn Chin-Chance