

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES  
Advisory Meeting  
October 15, 2003  
Sacramento County  
Department of Human Services  
2007 19<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento California

1. Welcome - Joeana Carpenter greeted everyone. She asked that all participants introduce themselves.
2. Agenda Review - Joeana reviewed the agenda and no items were added.
3. Summary Review - Joeana asked everyone review the summary. No changes were made.
4. Food Stamps – Joeana emphasized the significance of PMC supervisors reviewing the list that was distributed last meeting of federal cases dropped code 3, and determining if the case reviews either can be completed or dropped code 2 NSTR. She reiterated how the case completion rate is factored in calculating the final error rate. Cathy Rockdashil reported that one case was completed as a correct case. Rob Biesmeirer believed that one case could be changed because of an on-going SIU investigation.

Counties with a 100% completion rate were asked to share their best practices. Evalyn Epps stated that reviewers in Monterey check to see if stamps have been returned, as this occurred in two cases that were originally designated as non-cooperation cases. They also check to see if the recipient is institutionalized, and ask the resident at the case record address (when the recipient has moved) if he/she knows of the household's whereabouts. When household non-cooperation is apparent, a discontinuance notice is immediately sent. Lynette Marston said that in San Joaquin the QC reviewers do reminder phone calls.

Q5i Simplified (Food Stamps only) – Richard Trujillo indicated that the draft shared with counties in June is still being considered; however, implementation was delayed because of the late state budget, which in turn delayed the signing of a new contract with Data Builders. It is anticipated that the new contract will be signed next week and the plan is to implement the new version with the January sample. A draft transmittal covering such issues as narration will be provided beforehand. A draft transmittal will be sent out sometime before November 30. There will be training in January so that you will be able to use this version with the January 2004 sample.

Timeliness of Application – Richard stated that Q5 Item 010-0029 is a federally required item that was implemented over a year ago and must be completed for all cases, including drops. Instructions for completing this item are in the FNS-310 handbook, Appendix C. Since FNS is allowing states to re-review the accuracy of their submissions and because timeliness of processing application could result in bonus funding, PMC supervisors are instructed to check all Federal cases for this Federal Fiscal Year. He indicated that a process for identifying and making any changes to item 010-0029 will be sent out early November. He indicated he would want any changes made by November 30. Richard will email again a Q & A from FNS which was sent out via the Q5 Users egroup in August which shows the documentation requirements for this item. He also reminded the supervisors to review to the Federal 7-day timeframe.

*Action Item:* Instructions for identifying coding changes to Q5 Item 010-0029 (Timeliness of Application) will be sent out early November with a due date to process changes by November 30.

Revised FNS-310 – Richard indicated that the changes to the FNS 310 were sent via the Q5 Users egroup. The changes are highlighted on the appropriate pages. Appendix C has been completely rearranged, but the only programming required is the addition of two new codes. San Joaquin has set up the revisions so that changes are by chapter and start on a new page. Lynette Marston offered to issue this version via the Users' egroup.

Proposed renewal of the Data Builders is for a two-year contract. Currently, the Enterprise project is on hold; pending approval by the Department of Finance. Development of Enterprise will take at least one year after approval.

5. Quarterly/ Reporting/Quality Control Procedures – Lisa Kim/Dave Bailey/Hopie Rios/Pat Cruise.

In response to a question, Dave stated that the issue of netting versus sequencing of multiple changes voluntarily reported mid-quarter had not been resolved. Errors will still be cited if the QR-7 is received too late to provide ten-day notice so the allotment is not changed in the issuance month. Fresno asked if Federal-state differences resulting from Saldivar are passed on to the counties. Joeana said they are passed on because these are aid paid pending errors and can be avoided via county policy. Fresno also asked if, therefore, Saldivar should be ignored and cases reviewed using the Federal standards. Joeana stated that counties must follow the procedures set forth in the relevant transmittal. (Michael will send a note out with the transmittal number.)

Lisa was asked if there is a discrepancy between ACL 03-18 page 12 and the draft Questions and Answers (8) concerning the inclusion/exclusion of a variance when late QR-7 information which would result in a decrease

cannot be acted upon in the first month of the next quarter. (The ACL changes policy by establishing an over issuance in these instances.) She stated there is no conflict as the establishment of an over issuance claim is not linked to the error determination process. FNS will do more research on mid-quarter voluntary changes reported late and will provide this information next month. The Quarterly Reporting discussion ended with Lisa making the point that so long as the eligibility worker documents what he/she did and how they did it, this will be accepted unless unreasonable. Dave suggested that QC work with Policy to keep policies and regulations as loose as possible. Joeana asked that counties develop three scenarios (either using the template or text) and send them to Warren by October 29. The main topic for discussion at the next PMC meeting will be the application of the draft QC procedures to these scenarios. This is an opportunity for counties to provide input prior to issuance of the final QR/QC procedures. We need county input to ensure the procedures are reasonable, usable and complete.

*Action Item:* Supervisors with the help of their staff develop three scenarios and send them to Warren by October 29.

FNS-310 Training Questions and Answers: Lisa distributed the questions and answers resulting from the three training sessions. The following points came out during that discussion:

- a. The review of the household's resources when the household is categorically eligible is being reviewed by FNS headquarters, but any changes to the handbook will not occur until FFY 2004.
- b. Only Federal sample cases are factored into the state's completion rate.
- c. If a change is discovered by the county's Fraud unit, the variance is included if the information was known by the household at the time of the interview or if later, was acted upon by the worker.
- d. When the client decides to cooperate and provides "later better" information after the case has been submitted as a drop code 3 based on non-cooperation, follow the procedures set forth in chapter 4 of the FNS 310. Dropped cases can be changed up to the end of the Federal Fiscal Year.
- e. CDSS has decided not to use the 15 percent ABAWD exemption retroactively.
- f. CALWIN and C-4 systems errors will not be held harmless as the system is considered an extension of the EW and the error could have been detected using a manual budget. As a follow-up to this, Los Angeles asked specifically if there would be an error if the EW correctly input the data into the LEADER system, but the system then generates an incorrect allotment. Dave stated that when an automated system makes a calculation error, it is considered a certification error. However, if the system produces the correct allotment amount but the issuance agent disburses the wrong amount, this would be an issuance (not a certification) error.

Additionally, when the automated eligibility system is programmed incorrectly so that the wrong amount is authorized, this is also a certification error.)

- g. Kern County's "cheat sheet" for INS codes has still not been approved by the Food Stamp Branch.
  - h. Q5iclass 600 is optional but must be completed once started.
  - i. In determining whether or not income should be considered fluctuating, FNS will allow maximum latitude in the budgeting process if the rationale for the resulting actions is documented. (The example was weekly income of \$200, \$225, \$220, and \$205 for the month.)
6. Clean-Up Errors Joseph Brown and Frank Andersen indicated that the work participation rate (WPR) which is primarily based upon data from the Q5i has dropped to 22 percent up to the third. This is of great concern because TANF reauthorization will require a higher WPR with no caseload reduction credit. In the second year, this could result in a minimum penalty of \$187 million plus \$182 million increased Maintenance-of-Effort cost. Efforts are underway to align the WTW-30 methodology with that of the Q5i. Since the Q5i is the primary data source, we want coding accuracy and, whenever possible, the use of those codes that positively impact the participation rate. In light of the above, T48 coding errors were discussed. The examples used in the discussion along with the correct answers will be sent along with county-specific lists of cases to be corrected. Please review these examples with your staff. Send any questions to Warren.

*Action Item:* PMC Supervisors are to take back to their staff the information and examples on coding items T28, T30, and T48.

7. CalWORKs - Richard Trujillo indicated that two new TANF Active Case Review numbers will be used beginning in November.
8. Regional Report, Rob: Counties would like to meet every month using the one-day format. Since some counties are having difficulty getting management agreement to attend these meetings. The counties would also like definitions to be included with the flowchart in the Secondary Case Reviews transmittal, and would like a discussion of secondary cases at the next meeting. Some counties are receiving a Case Listing by Review Number log and asked that this be provided to all counties. Joeana will take back to DTVU. Joeana responded that the PMC meetings would continue to be held monthly. She stated she is not in the position to send a letter of support concerning the Regional meetings, as she does not attend these meetings so it would not be appropriate for her to do this. However, she would write a letter in support of PMC meeting if requested.
9. Next Meeting: The next meeting, which will primarily focus on Quarterly Reporting, is scheduled for November 18, at 9 A.M.