Table of Contents

State Food Stamp Policy Choices Under Welfare Reform:

Findings of 1997 50-State Survey

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

Office of
Analysis and
Evaluation

Table of Contents

Contract No.: 53-3198-6-020
Tracking State Food Stamp Choices
And Implementation Strategies
Under Welfare Reform

State Food Stamp Policy Choices Under Welfare Reform: Findings of 1997 50-State Survey

May 1998

Authors:

Vivian Gabor
Christopher Botsko

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive-2nd Floor
Alexandria, VA 22302

Project Officer:
Alana Landey

Submitted by:

Health Systems Research, Inc.
1200 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Project Director:
Vivian Gabor

Do not reproduce without permission of Project Director and FNS.

This work was prepared as one task of a competitively awarded contract; the total amount of the contract is $359,599.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the many people involved in conducting the survey and compiling this report on State food stamp policy choices under welfare reform. We would particularly like to thank the many State food stamp officials who took the time out of their busy schedules to talk with us about their States' food stamp policy choices. We also thank Arik Ben-Avi from Health Systems Research who played a major role in designing and conducting the survey and to Karen Bagley and Beth Zimmerman who interviewed many State food stamp officials from across the country. Thanks to Denise Perry and Victoria Cole for their diligence and hard work in scheduling the telephone interviews and to Daniel Kent who expertly produced the report. A special thanks also to Jim Ohls from Mathematica Policy Research who provided extremely useful advice throughout the development of the study, including detailed comments on the draft survey instrument.

We especially want to thank Alana Landey, the project officer from the Food and Nutrition Service. Ms. Landey has been very generous with her time and provided very helpful methodological and policy input, as well as editorial advice, throughout the development of the survey and the writing of this report. We also express our appreciation to Steven Carlson, Art Foley and Carolyn Foley of the Food and Nutrition Service for their useful comments during the development of the data collection plan and on the draft of this summary report.

NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2660 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9419 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

Listing of Tables iii

Executive Summary viii

A. State Choices on Implementation of ABAWD Provision ix
B. State Choices on Food Stamp Program Sanctions x
C. Treatment of Drug Felons and Fleeing Felons xi
D. Databases Used to Verify Client Information xii
E. State/Local Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants xii
F. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process xii

Chapter I. Introduction and Background 1

A. Policy Context 2
B. Research Objectives 4

Chapter II. Data Collection Methodology 6

A. Survey Development 6
B. Selection of Survey Respondents 7
C. Overview of the Interview Process and Content 8

Chapter III. Survey Findings 11

A. State Choices Regarding Implementation of the Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents Provision 11
B. State Choices Regarding Food Stamp Program Sanctions 20
C. State Choices Regarding Treatment of Drug Felons and Fleeing Felons 30
D. Databases Used by States to Verify Food Stamp Client Circumstances 31

E. State/Local Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants 32
F. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process 34

Chapter IV. Next Steps: Future Data Collection Plans for this Study 36

A. Case Studies in Selected States 36
B. Tracking Changes in State Food Stamp Choices Over Time 37

Table of Contents

Listing of Tables

I. State ABAWD Implementation Choices

I.A. ABAWD Waivers

I-1. Summary of State Decisions on Implementation of FNS-Approved ABAWD Waivers A-1

I.B. State Policies on Determination of Individuals' ABAWD Status

I-2. Summary of Key State Policy Choices Regarding Determination of Adults as "Medically Certified as Physically or Mentally Unfit for Employments" A-2

I-3. Stringency of Criteria and Procedures Used to Determine ABAWD Disability Exemption Compared to Those Used to Determine Work Registration Disability Exemption A-3

I-4. Summary of State ABAWD Policy Choices Regarding Documentation of Disability A-6

I-5. Information by State on Methods Accepted for Determining Exemption From ABAWD Work Requirements Due to Disability A-7

I-6. Summary of State Choices on Types of Health Professionals Authorized to Provide Certification that a Client is Physically or Mentally Unfit for Employment A-10

I-7. Information by State on Type of Health Professionals Authorized to Provide Certification of Disability for Determination of ABAWD Status A-11

I-8. Summary of State Policy Choices Regarding Types of Disability Benefits Acceptable as Certification of Food Stamp Participants' Inability to Work A-15

I-9. Information by State on Type of Disability Benefits Accepted as Certification of Food Stamp Participants' Inability to Work A-16

I-10. Information by State on Relative Stringency of State and Private Disability Determinations Compared to SSI and VA Disability Programs A-20

I-11. State Definitions of "Dependent Child" in Determining ABAWD Status (Among The 3 States Using Definition Other Than "a Child Under Age 18") A-24

I-12. Summary of State Choices on the Number and Type of Adults in the Household Who Can Be Exempted From ABAWD Requirements as "Adult Caretakers with Dependents" A-25

I-13. Information by State on Number and Type of Adults in the Household Who Can be Exempted as "Adult Caretakers with Dependents" A-26

I.C. State Choices on New ABAWD Exemption in Balanced Budget Act of 1997

I-14. Status of State Implementation Decisions on New ABAWD Exemptions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (as of 11/97) A-29

I-15. Information by State on Status of State Implementation Decisions on ABAWD Exemptions in Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (as of 11-97) A-30

I-16. Information by State on New Policies for 15 Percent ABAWD Exemption A-33

I.D. Workfare Programs and Policies for ABAWDS

I-17. Information by State on Length of Time Workfare Program Has Been Operating for Food Stamp Program Participants (Among 25 States Operating Workfare Programs for ABAWDS In All or Part of the State) A-36

I-18. Characteristics of State Workfare Programs for ABAWDS (Among the 25 States Operating Such Programs) A-37

I-19. Information by State on Workfare Programs for ABAWDS (Among the 25 States Operating Such Programs) A-38

I-20. Information by State on Policies Regarding Verification of Hours Worked in Self-Initiated Workfare Programs (Among the 12 States With Self-Initiated Workfare Programs For ABAWDS) A-40

I.E. State Tracking Systems for ABAWDS

I-21. Summary of Methods Used by States to Track ABAWDSs A-41

I-22. Information by State on Methods Used to Track ABAWDs A-42

I.F. Follow-up Studies on Disqualified ABAWDS

I-23. Description of State Follow-Up Studies on Disqualified ABAWDS A-46

I.G. State Data on ABAWDs

I-24. State Estimates of the Number of Participants Waived from the ABAWDS Requirement In a Typical Month A-47

I-25. State Estimates of the Number of Participants Subject to the ABAWD Work Requirements in a Typical Month A-49

I-26. State Estimates of the Cumulative Number of Participants Disqualified From Food Stamps Because of the ABAWD Requirements, Since ABAWD Implementation A-51

I-27. State Estimates of the Number of ABAWDS Working at Least 20 Hours Per Week In a Typical Month A-53

I-28. State Estimates of the Number of ABAWDS In Employment and Training (E & T) Programs In a Typical Month A-54

I-29. State Estimates of the Number of ABAWDS In Workfare In a Typical Month A-55

II. State Food Stamp Program Sanctions

II.A. Food Stamp Employment and Training(FSET) Sanctions

II-1. Summary of State Choices on Food Stamp Employment and Training Sanctions A-56

II-2. Information By State on Food Stamp Employment & Training Sanction Choices and Estimate of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month A-57

II-3. Information by State on Duration of Sanctions for the Violation of Food Stamp Employment and Training Requirements A-63

II-4. States with Minimum FSET Sanction Periods Longer Than Federal Minimum Requirements Or With Permanent Disqualification For the Third E & T Violation A-67

II.B. New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions (Non-FSET)

II-5. Number of States Choosing Each of Five New Optional Food Stamp Sanctions A-68

II-6. States Choosing New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions A-69

II-7. State Estimates of Participants In a Typical Month Who Are Newly Subject to An Optional Food Stamp Sanction A-73

II-8. Information by State on Requirements of Other Means-Tested Programs For Which Violation Results in Comparable Food Stamp Disqualification A-75

II-9. Information by State on Length of Minimum Food Stamp Disqualification for Violating Requirements of Other Mean-Tested Programs A-77

II-10. Information by State on TANF Requirements for Which Violation Results in a Food Stamp Benefit Reduction A-79

II-11. Characteristics of Food Stamp Benefit Reductions Imposed for Non-compliance with TANF Rules A-81

II-12. Information by State on Sanction Policy Choices for Parents Who Are in Arrears in Paying Court-ordered Child Support A-82

II-13. Information by State on Sanction Policy Choices for Parents Failing to Cooperate with State Child Support Agency A-83

II-14. Food Stamp Sanction Policy Choices for Adults Failing to Ensure that Minor Dependent Children are Attending School A-84

II-15. Information by State on Status of Intrastate Systems Used to Track Sanctioned Individuals and/or Household A-85

III. Drug Felon and Fleeing Felon Provisions

III. A. Drug Felons

III-1. Summary of State Choices on Food Stamp Program Drug Felon Provision of PRWORA A-87

III-2. Information by State on State Policy Choices Regarding Food Stamp Program Disqualification for Drug Felons A-88

III-3. Information by State on Food Stamp Sanctions for Drug Felons (Among the 11 States That Have Opted Out of the Provision Making All Drug Felons Permanently Ineligible and Imposed Special Conditions on Drug Felons) A-91

III-4. Information by State on Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Drug Felons A-93

III.B. Fleeting Felons

III-5. Information by State on Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Fleeing Felons A-98

IV. Databases Used by States to Verify Food Stamp Client Information

IV-1. Information by State on Use of IEVS and SAVE Verification Systems Before and After Federal Welfare Reform A-103

IV-2. Information by State on Use of Other Databases to Verify Food Stamp Household Circumstances, Before and After Welfare Reform A-107

V. State-Funded Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants

V-1. Information by State on State-Funded Food Assistance Program for Legal Immigrants Who Have Become Ineligible Under PRWORA A-111

VI. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process

VI-1. Information by State on Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process A-114

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In August 1996 Congress passed and the President signed a new federal welfare reform law, titled *The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996* (PRWORA). This legislation, which replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grant to States, retained the federal entitlement nature of the Food Stamp Program. At the same time, PRWORA provided States with an array of Food Stamp Program policy options, particularly in areas that are designed to promote personal responsibility through work requirements and participant sanctions. Most of the food stamp provisions of PRWORA went into effect in Fall 1996, although the two major eligibility restrictions — for able-bodied adults without dependents and legal aliens — were largely implemented in 1997.

The potential for significant variations in State Food Stamp Programs became evident soon after passage of PRWORA. In order to begin understanding the choices being made by State Food Stamp Programs, FNS commissioned Health Systems Research, Inc. (HSR) to conduct a study titled *Tracking State Food Stamp Choices and Implementation Strategies Under Welfare Reform.*

This report presents data collected by HSR in the first phase of the study. A telephone survey was conducted with State food stamp agency officials from 50 States and the District of Columbia in November and December of 1997. Data collected reflects information on the policy choices States had in place at the time of the survey and does not reflect changes made since the survey was completed. Additional data will be collected in the next phase of the study, through case studies with State and local food stamp officials in selected States.

The telephone survey addressed State choices in the following six subject areas:

- Implementation of the new provision that imposes time limits and work requirements for able- bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDS),
- Food stamp sanctions,
- Treatment of drug felons and fleeing felons,
- Databases used to verify client information,
- State-funded food assistance programs for legal immigrants, and
- Changes in coordination of the food stamp and TANF application process.

Highlights of the key survey findings are summarized in sections A through F below.

A. State Choices on Implementation of ABAWD Provision

Overall, the States varied greatly in the implementation policy choices they made with regard to the new ABAWD provision. This included variations in choices regarding exemptions for those unable to work, development of work programs for ABAWDs, and the ability to track information on ABAWDs. Key survey findings in this subject area include:

- ***Criteria and procedures for determining inability to work***. Nearly three-fourths (34) of the 47 States with statewide policy guidance on determining disability for ABAWDs reported that the stringency of the criteria and procedures they use to determine ABAWD disability exemptions were about the same as the criteria and procedures used for determining the food stamp work registration exemption. Eight States reported that these criteria and procedures were more stringent and five States reported that they were less stringent.

- ***Definition of adult caretakers.*** Thirty-one States reported that all adults in a household could potentially be exempt from the time limit and work requirements when there is a dependent child in the household. One State reported that all adult relative caretakers could be exempt. Sixteen States reported that one or both parents could be exempt. Two States permitted only one parent to be exempt.

- ***Balanced Budget Act optional ABAWD exemptions.*** At the time of the survey, 37 of the State food stamp agencies had made a decision regarding the new optional ABAWD exemptions authorized under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Of these States, 22 had decided to implement the new exemption. Eleven of the 15 States that had decided not to implement the new ABAWD exemptions were States that in 1997 had no ABAWD waivers or had waived less than 15 percent of their ABAWD caseload from the time limit and work requirement provisions.

- ***Workfare programs.*** Twenty-five States reported having workfare programs for ABAWDs. Prior to enactment of PRWORA, 16 of these 25 States had a workfare program in place in at least part of their State, and for at least some categories of food stamp participants. Of the 25 States with workfare programs for ABAWDs, 13 reported that the largest proportion of slots were with public sector organizations; 12 reported that they had self-initiated workfare programs, allowing clients to locate their own workfare slots with community organizations. Of note, however, is the fact that of States that reported monthly estimates of the number of ABAWDS in their workfare programs, the majority reported having only 90 or fewer ABAWDs in workfare slots.

- ***Tracking systems.*** Twenty-five of the States reported that they had automated systems for tracking the work status and time limits of ABAWDs. Thirty-four States reported they had an automated system to track ABAWDs if they applied for food stamps elsewhere within the State.

B. State Choices on Food Stamp Program Sanctions

The States varied greatly in the number and type of optional food stamp sanctions selected in the first year of PRWORA implementation. The survey results indicate that most States are moving cautiously in this area of food stamp policy. Key findings on the extent and nature of State choices in this area are provided below.

- ***Food stamp employment and training sanctions.*** Under PRWORA, States have the option to disqualify only the head of the food stamp household if he/she does not comply with the food stamp E & T requirements. Under prior law, States were required to disqualify the entire food stamp household in these cases. Twenty-seven States reported disqualifying only the head of the household if he/she does not comply with the food stamp E & T requirements. Twenty-one States continued to disqualify the entire household if the person who did not comply was the head of the household. Three States reported sometimes sanctioning the individual and sometimes the entire household, depending on circumstances.

- ***Comparable disqualification for noncompliance with another means-tested program.*** Thirteen States chose this new option. Of these 13 States, 11 utilized the option for TANF program violations, including violations of work requirements. Two States utilized the option for both TANF and GA work requirement violations.

- ***Reduction of food stamp benefits when household is sanctioned in TANF.*** Seven States selected this optino, with three States using this sanction policy in combination with the comparable disqualification option.

- ***Disqualification for failure to cooperate with child support or for child support payment in arrears.*** Eight States chose one or both of these options, with six States applying the sanction to all food stamp cases, and two States limiting the sanction to only TANF cases.

- ***Sanction for failure to ensure minors attend school.*** Four States selected this sanction option, with two States reducing the household benefits and two States disqualifying the parent of the minor child.

- ***Patterns in State choices for work-related food stamp sanctions.*** When examining State choices specific to work-related food stamp sanctions, two groupings of States were identified as reflecting either a consistent pattern of "more stringent" or "more lenient" sanction policy approaches. The States identified as taking a "more stringent" approach were Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Michigan, North Dakota, and Ohio. The States identified as taking a "more lenient" approach were: Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, and West Virginia.

C. Treatment of Drug Felons and Fleeing Felons

- ***Eligibility of drug felons.*** The survey results reveal that 21 States had opted out of the federal provision in PRWORA that makes all drug felons ineligible for food stamps. Ten of these 21 States had opted out entirely, while 11 States did sanction some categories of drug felons.

- ***Systems for identifying fleeing felons.*** 47 States had an "ask the client" approach to identifying fleeing felons, who are ineligible for food stamps. Nine of these States also tracked arrest warrants or other court records and four States verified the client's information against another State or Federal database.

D. Databases Used to Verify Client Information

The survey revealed that all States were continuing to use most of the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) and only one State discontinued the use of the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) Program.

E. State/Local Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants

At the time of the survey, 11 States had a State-funded food assistance program for legal immigrants in place. Of these 11 States, nine States tied income eligibility for the new program to 100 percent of federal food stamp eligibility and five States provided the assistance only to children under age 18, the disabled, and/or the elderly.

F. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process

It is likely that changes in the focus of welfare policy may have affected coordination between food stamps and cash welfare in ways that can only be observed at the local level. Hence, it is not surprising that only seven States reported that they have policies in place that may affect the coordination of the TANF and food stamp application process.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

Introduction and Background

In October 1996, Health Systems Research, Inc. (HSR) was awarded a contract by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to conduct a study on State Food Stamp Program policy choices since enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). This study, titled *Tracking State Food Stamp Choices and Implementation Strategies under Welfare Reform,* is designed to describe for FNS the State food stamp policy choices and implementation strategies used by their local offices in the wake of the new flexibility provided to States by both PRWORA of 1996 and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA).

HSR will prepare four written products in conjunction with this study, as listed below:

- A technical memorandum was provided to FNS in the winter of 1997, summarizing new State food stamp policy options and waivers under PRWORA and existing information available on State choices under these options and waivers.

- The summary descriptive report on State food stamp policy choices presented here, which is based on a telephone survey of State food stamp officials conducted by HSR in November and early December 1997.

- An analytical report examining the policy implications of State food stamp policy choices as well as local implementation strategies. Data for the latter will be gathered by HSR through site visits to State and local food stamp offices later this year.

- A report to FNS with recommendations for designing a systematic approach for collecting information on an ongoing basis about State food stamp policy choices.

This report is divided in two sections. The body of the report contains an overview of the methodology and a summary of the findings from the HSR telephone survey of State food stamp officials regarding their State food stamp policy choices. Appendix A contains data tables displaying detailed State-by-State responses and national summary findings on the extent and nature of the States' choices. Appendix B contains a copy of the survey instrument.

This introductory chapter summarizes the policy context for this study and its research objectives.

A. Policy Context

The Food Stamp Program, administered by FNS, is a major component of the Nation's nutrition security strategy and a central element of America's antipoverty efforts. The primary objective of the Food Stamp Program is to increase the food purchasing power of low-income individuals and families so they may obtain a nutritious diet. The program accomplishes its mission by providing food assistance in the form of coupons that are redeemable for food at authorized retail stores or through electronic benefit transfer (EBT) cards that directly transfer the participant's food stamp benefits to authorized grocers at the check-out counter.

The Food Stamp Program is structured as a Federal entitlement program. Food stamp benefits are available to all persons who meet the Federally determined eligibility criteria related to income level, the value of assets, and certain nonfinancial criteria such as work registration. Unlike other Federal income maintenance programs, the Food Stamp Program has historically not had categorical eligibility criteria such as the presence of a child, a disabled person, or an elderly adult in the household.

Although primarily Federally funded, the program is administered by State and local governments. Program benefits are fully funded by the Federal government, and administrative costs are shared by the Federal government and State and local governments

that administer the program. States are responsible for certifying applicant households and arranging for issuance of the correct amount of food stamp benefits to them.

For more than 20 years, Federal food stamp law and regulations have explicitly defined eligibility to participate in the program, the process and rules of benefit determination, and the recipient work requirements. As a result, policies and implementation of eligibility requirements, benefit determination, and work rules have varied little among the States. However, in recent years, States have had increased flexibility to make choices in the Food Stamp Program in two significant ways:

- Through greater State options in PRWORA and the BBA; and
- Through FNS-approved waivers from the Federal food stamp requirements.

With the enactment of PRWORA, States began initiating major changes to their cash assistance programs for families through the new Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grant program. These changes are focused on creating strict time limits and more work requirements for program eligibility. Similarly, PRWORA provided States with an array of options for re-engineering the Food Stamp Program, particularly in the area of work requirements and participant sanctions. A natural result of this new flexibility is that a variety of State policies related to food stamp disqualification practices, benefit determination, and work-related time limits and sanctions have replaced more uniform national standards.

While the potential for significant variations in State policy became evident soon after passage of PRWORA, States were not required to report all of their new choices to FNS. To obtain this information in a systematic fashion and to assist FNS in developing a long-term tracking system on State food stamp policy choices, FNS contracted with HSR to conduct two phases of primary research in Fiscal Year 1998: a telephone survey of State food stamp agency officials and site visits to selected State and local food stamp offices. This information is needed by FNS and by the States not only to assess how different States have responded to the new policy choices available, but also to provide information to public policy makers about the potential implications of specific policy changes in the Food Stamp Program under welfare reform.

Such information is needed as the States and Federal government assess the impacts of welfare reform and consider future rule changes and the policy direction of the program.

This report is based on the findings of the first phase of research, whose objectives are described in the following section.

B. Research Objectives

The overall objective of this report is to provide FNS and the States information on the extent and nature of State food stamp policy choices in response to new State options granted under the PRWORA and the BBA. Given the rapid changes in State cash assistance programs related to work requirements and time limits, a secondary research objective is to describe any overarching patterns that emerge in State food stamp policy choices.

The information in this report will enable State policy makers to take advantage of each other's experience as they anticipate making future decisions on food stamp policy options. This information can also form the basis for future evaluative research to examine the extent to which new State food stamp policy choices under PRWORA and the BBA have resulted in any of the following consequences:

- Loss of food stamp benefits and eligibility for low-income individuals or families,
- Changes in participation in the Food Stamp Program by eligible households,
- Changes in work activity among nonworking or part-time employed food stamp recipients,
- Changes in the coordination and simplification of the application and eligibility determination processes for food stamp and TANF families; and/or
- Food insecurity among affected individuals.

Finally, the experience gained from this survey and from interviews with State food stamp officials in selected States during our next phase of data collection will assist HSR in working

with FNS in the coming year to build a long-term tracking system capable of monitoring State food stamp choices as they evolve under welfare reform.

This chapter has reviewed the policy context driving this study designed to track State food stamp choices and implementation strategies under welfare reform, as well as the research objectives for the recently completed HSR telephone survey of State officials. The next chapter provides an overview of the survey methodology. Chapter III presents the findings of the survey. Chapter IV discusses recommendations for future data collection efforts on State food stamp choices, based on findings from the telephone survey.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

CHAPTER II

Data Collection Methodology

This report on State food stamp policy choices under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA) is based on information provided to Health Systems Research (HSR) by State food stamp agency officials during a telephone survey that was conducted between 3 November and early December 1997. The survey was designed to collect information on the policy choices States had in place at the time of the survey and does not reflect changes they may have made since the survey was completed.[1] This chapter provides an overview of the data collection methods, including a description of how the survey instrument was developed, how the survey respondents were selected, and the process and content of the interviews.

A. Survey Development

In recognition of the large number of new choices available to States in Federal Fiscal Year 1997 under the PRWORA and additional choices made available in Federal Fiscal Year 1998 under the BBA, HSR and the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) made extensive efforts to prioritize the data items for inclusion in the telephone survey in order to prevent duplication of effort and minimize the burden on State food stamp officials.

In spring 1997, FNS and HSR worked together to identify specific food stamp provisions for which FNS was most interested in knowing the extent and nature of State choices. This prioritization was made utilizing the following three criteria:

---

1 Where States did volunteer information about future changes in their food stamp choices, we noted the fact in the footnotes to the tables provided in Appendix A.

- Avoidance of duplication of information that is already required to be provided to FNS;

- Selection of policy choices that relate to understanding how States have modified their programs in response to the goals and objectives of welfare reform; and

- Inclusion of additional information requested by the national Food Stamp Program office, including States' choices in tracking systems for ABAWDs and the new optional food stamp sanctions, and States' choices regarding methods for documenting whether a client is a fleeing felon and thus ineligible for food stamps.

As a result of this prioritization process, the survey was limited to six areas of State food stamp policy choices, as described below in Section C.

After selecting the data items for inclusion in the telephone survey, HSR designed several draft instruments that were reviewed and edited by FNS staff. HSR pretested the survey instrument with food stamp officials responsible for policy development, program administration, and food stamp work programs in three State food stamp agencies. Modifications again were made to the data collection instrument and reviewed by FNS. The final data collection plan and survey instrument were approved by the Federal Office of Management and Budget in October 1997.

B. Selection of Survey Respondents

This survey collected information directly from State food stamp agency personnel in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. In order to ensure that the information reported to HSR reflected current State food stamp choices in a variety of policy areas, it was important to identify the appropriate State respondents. Accordingly, the following four-step process was used to select and prepare the appropriate State food stamp policy staff for the telephone interview:

- FNS wrote to each regional FNS office to explain the purpose of the study. Regional Food Stamp Program representatives were asked to contact the State

food stamp directors in their regions to inform them that HSR would soon be contacting them.

- HSR sent a letter to each State food stamp agency director describing the overall objective of the study and providing an overview of the content and logistics of the telephone survey.

- These letters were followed up with a telephone call to each State Food Stamp Program director or his/her designated representative. The purpose of this call was to further describe the goals and content of the survey as needed. These directors or their designees were then provided a detailed summary of the questionnaire and a list of data questions that would necessitate special data runs or calculations.

- After the State had identified the appropriate person or persons to respond to all of the survey topic areas and to participate in the telephone survey, interviews were scheduled. In States where more than one person was needed for the interview, several staff usually participated in one joint conference call interview. In a few cases, the survey was conducted in segments, with separate telephone interviews with a number of specialized staff.

C. Overview of the Interview Process and Content

1. Interview Process

As described above, telephone interviews were conducted with one or more State food stamp officials. In nearly every State, the Food Stamp Program director or administrator was one of the respondents. Interviews were conducted by four HSR staff with policy expertise on food stamp policy and the new PRWORA legislation. Interviewers were provided an initial training on the content and process of the survey, including appropriate follow-up probes to clarify responses when necessary. Each interviewer received extensive supervision by the HSR Project Director throughout the interview process. On occasions when a State's responses were unclear or inconsistent despite thorough probes, the Project Director followed up to clarify their responses.

2. Interview Content

The content of the questionnaire addressed the following six food stamp policy areas:

- ***ABAWDS.*** The survey sought information about States' implementation policies for the new Food Stamp Program time limits and work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDS). The greatest number of new options under PRWORA focus on ABAWDs, and the greatest number of questions in the survey concerned this subject area.

- ***Sanctions.*** The survey sought information about State choices regarding food stamp employment and training (E & T) sanctions and five new optional sanctions (i.e., comparable disqualification, benefit reduction for violation of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) requirements, sanctions for parents in arrears in payment of child support, sanctions for noncompliance with child support, and sanctions for not ensuring that minor children attend school). Questions regarding these sanctions comprised the second largest section of the survey.

- ***Drug Felons and Fleeing Felons.*** The survey asked about State choices regarding the eligibility of drug felons for the Food Stamp Program and the tracking and identification of drug felons and fleeing felons.

- ***Databases Used to Verify Client Information.*** The survey asked about the databases States used before welfare reform and the databases they currently use to verify food stamp clients' income and other information.

- ***State/Local Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants.*** The survey asked whether States opted to provide alternative food assistance for legal immigrants now ineligible for the Federal Food Stamp Program and sought descriptive information about these programs.[2]

- ***Coordination of the Food Stamp and TANF Application Process.*** This short section of the survey asked State food stamp officials whether the food stamp and TANF application processes occur in a single location at the local level and whether the State still requires a joint application and interview for determining eligibility for both programs, now that this coordination is no longer mandatory.

---

[2] Note that both the President and many Members of Congress have indicated support for legislation that would restore food stamp eligibility for some or all legal immigrants.

For each focus area, the survey asked not only whether the State selected the new options available under the law but also how it designed the selected policy options. Specifically, survey questions were crafted to obtain the following information about individual State food stamp choices:

- The components of each statutory option that the State chose;
- Descriptive information on the specific State activities initiated under an option;
- Whether or not the optional activities were targeted to certain populations and, if so, to which populations; and
- State efforts to track information on individuals affected by particular sanctions and time limits.

To obtain information on the size of the population affected by the State choices, the interviewers asked State officials to estimate the number of food stamp recipients affected by the ABAWD provisions and by each sanction option selected by a State.

The survey contained 156 questions. However, no State was required to respond to all 156 questions, because large groups of follow-up questions could be skipped if a respondent noted that the State had not chosen a particular policy option. As noted earlier, a copy of the survey instrument is contained in Appendix B.

This chapter has reviewed the design of the telephone survey, the selection of the respondents, the data collection process, and the content of the survey. The following chapter presents the survey findings.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

CHAPTER III

Survey Findings

This chapter presents a profile of the extent and nature of State food stamp policy choices under major new options available to the States under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA). The total number of States making each food stamp policy choice, and a discussion of overarching patterns across States is presented in text here and is illustrated in more detail in the 53 data tables contained in Appendix A.

The data are presented in Sections A through F separately for each of the six broad policy areas that are the focus of the study. Within each section, there is an overview of the specific State choices (both options in the law and implementation options) that were the subject of the survey, followed by a summary of the findings on the number and range of State choices in each area.

In addition, in the sections on State able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWD) policy choices and State Food Stamp Program sanction options—the two largest sections of the survey— there is a brief discussion of any overarching patterns that may have been revealed when States' responses to multiple questions were compared.

A. State Choices Regarding Implementation of the Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents Provision

This first and largest section of the survey included questions about many aspects of State choices regarding the policies they have for implementing the ABAWD provision. This provision imposes time limits on receipt of food stamps and work requirements on able-bodied

adults between the ages of 18 and 50 who are not responsible for a dependent child or are otherwise exempt from the work registration requirements of the Food Stamp Act.

1. Findings on State Implementation of FNS-Approved Waivers

a. The State Choices

States are permitted to request waivers from Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) to exempt certain areas of their State from the ABAWD provision. These waivers specifically allow States to exempt able-bodied adults without dependents from the time limits and work requirements in those geographic areas that meet FNS' waiver criteria because they lack a sufficient number of available jobs for ABAWDs. During the first year of this provision, 43 States applied for and received approval from FNS to waive some or all of the State from the ABAWD provision.

b. Survey Findings

- Although 43 States had FNS-approved ABAWD waivers, 7 of these States had not applied the waiver in some or all of their approved local jurisdictions.

2. How States Choose to Determine Whether an Adult is "Able-bodied"

a. State Choices

Adults who are physically or mentally unable to work are not considered "able-bodied" for the Food Stamp Program and are thus not subject to the new three-month time limits and work requirements in the ABAWD provision. However, the law does not specify how States should determine if an adult is able to work. The survey results reveal that States' policies vary considerably in this area, as illustrated by the findings below.

b. *Survey Findings*

- Three States (Alaska, Hawaii and Rhode Island) report that there is no statewide policy guidance on how local food stamp offices should determine whether an adult is able to work.[3]

- Each of the 47 States with statewide policy guidance on how to determine whether an adult is able to work reports that it permits persons with temporary disabilities (such as a broken limb) to be exempt from the ABAWD requirements.

- All 47 States routinely utilize written documentation or receipt of disability benefits as verification that a person is unable to work, but they vary greatly in the kind of documentation or disability benefits required.

- Nearly three-fourths (34) of the 47 States with any statewide policy guidance on ABAWD disability determination report that the stringency of the criteria and procedures they use to determine ABAWD disability exemption are about the same as the criteria and procedures used for determining disability for the food stamp work registration exemption. Officials from eight States report that the criteria and procedures they use to determine disability for exemptions for ABAWDS are more stringent than they use to determine disability for the food stamp work registration exemption. The remaining five States report that they are less stringent.

- Washington and South Dakota allow local offices to document that a client is unable to work if the client says he or she is unable to work, without required written documentation. Not surprisingly, both of these States also reported that their criteria and procedures for determining the ABAWD disability exemption were more lenient than those used to determine their food stamp work registration exemption.

- More than half (25) of the States with statewide policy guidance on ABAWD disability determination allow food stamp office staff to document the exemption based on direct observation of a client's obvious disability, without required written documentation.

- All of the States with statewide policy guidance allow receipt of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) to certify a food stamp adult as unable to work and thus exempt from the ABAWD

---

[3] The District of Columbia did not respond to the survey questions on ABAWDs because it is implementing an FNS-approved waiver that exempts 100 percent of the District from the ABAWD provision. It plans to continue this waiver in 1998.

requirements. Forty-five of 47 States allowed receipt of Veterans Affairs (VA) disability benefits to certify this exemption.

- Over half of the States reported that they accept non-Federal disability insurance, such as workers compensation, State disability insurance (where such a program exists) or private disability insurance, as verification that a person is unable to work.

3. How States Define "Dependent Children" and "Caretaker Adults" for the ABAWD Provision

a. State Choices

While the law exempts able-bodied adults ages 18-50 who are responsible for the care of a dependent child from the new food stamp time limits and work requirements, State agencies can decide how many and which adults can potentially be exempt as "caretakers." States can also determine the definition of a "dependent child."[4]

b. Survey Findings

- Forty-eight States defined a dependent child for the ABAWD exemption as "a child living in the household under age 18." The two exceptions are Maryland, which reported that a dependent child was defined as a child under age 18 or under age 20 if the child was included in a TANF household; and Nebraska, which reported that a dependent child is defined as a child under age 22.

- Thirty-one States have broadly interpreted the adult caretaker to include "all adults in a household" with a dependent child.[5]

- In all but three of the remaining States, both parents could be defined as caretakers for the ABAWD exemption. Massachusetts allowed all relatives in the household to be defined as caretakers. Nebraska and North Dakota

---

4 This flexibility may change when final regulations are issued for the food stamp provisions of PRWORA.

5 Among these 31 States there apparently is some discrepancy about how the policy choice is implemented. While there was no specific follow-up question about this policy choice, we learned during the interviews that some States implement this policy choice by automatically exempting all adults in the household if there is a dependent child in the household, while other States allow all adults to be exempt, but only if the applicant demonstrates that all adults share in the caretaking role for the dependent child or children.

permitted only one parent in the household to be defined as a caretaker for this exemption.

4. Balanced Budget Act Optional ABAWD Exemptions

a. State Choices

The BBA permits States to grant their own exemptions from the food stamp time limits for ABAWDs, in addition to those exemptions required under Federal law. States may grant exemptions for up to 15 percent of the number of people who would be denied food stamps under the time limits and can use their own criteria to award these exemptions.

b. Survey Findings

- At the time of the survey, two-thirds (37) of the State food stamp agencies had made a decision regarding the new ABAWD exemptions. Of these States, 22 had decided to implement the new exemption and 15 had decided not to do so.

- Eleven of the 15 States that had already decided not to implement the new ABAWD exemptions were States that in 1997 had no ABAWD waivers or had waived less than 15 percent of their ABAWD caseload from the time limit and work requirement provisions.[6]

- Of those 22 States that had decided to implement the new exemptions, 11 had not yet decided on the criteria they will be using, five States had selected geographic criteria, one State had selected a lower age cut-off limit at age 45, and five States had decided on more complex criteria for exemptions based on individual circumstances.

5. Workfare Programs and Policies

a. State Choices

The work requirements for ABAWDs allow non-exempt adults aged 18-50 to be eligible for food stamp benefits for only 3 months in a 36-month period, unless they have a job in which

---

6 The information on States with no ABAWD waivers was obtained from FNS. The list of States with waivers exempting less than 15 percent of their ABAWD caseload from the time limits and work requirement provisions was obtained from estimates prepared by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) for FNS in fall 1997.

they work a total of at least 80 hours per month (or 20 hours per week), are participating in a workfare program, or are enrolled in an approved employment and training program for at least 20 hours per week.[7] States have the option under their Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) Program to provide workfare programs for ABAWDs anywhere in the State. States also have some flexibility regarding the nature of these programs, as long as they do not require participants to work more hours than the dollar value of their monthly food stamp benefit divided by the minimum wage.

b. Survey Findings

- Twenty-five States reported having workfare programs for ABAWDs. Two-thirds (sixteen) of these States had workfare programs for food stamp participants prior to the enactment of PRWORA. (These programs may have expanded or changed in nature since PRWORA.)

- Twelve of the 25 workfare States reported having self-initiated workfare programs for ABAWDs. All required documentation of hours worked.[8]

- In 15 of these States workfare was offered to ABAWDs, but was never mandatory. In six States workfare was mandatory in only some cases or some local jurisdictions and, in the remaining four States with workfare programs, this specific kind of work activity was mandatory for all unemployed ABAWDs. In three of these four mandatory workfare States (Nebraska, North Carolina and Wisconsin), the State did not have any ABAWD waivers in 1997.

- Thirteen of these States reported that the largest proportion of their available workfare slots for ABAWDs were with public sector organizations.

- Three States report that workfare positions are available only for a limited number of months per year for ABAWDs.

---

7 If an ABAWD is disqualified under the time limit, finds employment for at least 80 hours a month, but then is subsequently laid off, he or she is eligible for a second three months of consecutive food stamp benefits without meeting the minimum ABAWD work requirements.

8 State comments during the survey indicated that some may have been applying definitions of self-initiated workfare that differ from the FNS definition.

6. State Tracking Systems for ABAWDs

a. State Choices

The law does not require States to set up any specific kinds of new systems to track the work and food stamp participation of ABAWDs. However, most States and local food stamp offices have implemented various new systems to determine whether an ABAWD has used up his or her three-month limit and whether he or she is meeting the new work requirements, as indicated by the survey findings summarized below.

b. Survey Findings

- Twenty-five of the States reported that all ABAWDs were certified for three months or less.
- All States had developed a system to track the work status and time limit status of ABAWDs. Half of the States had an automated system, while the remaining States relied on manual recording in the case files (9 States) or some combination of manual and automated tracking (16 States).
- Forty-six States had, or were planning to have, a system to track ABAWDs if they changed residences and applied for food stamps elsewhere within the State. No State had, or was planning to have, any formal systems to track the status of ABAWDs across State lines.

7. Follow-Up Studies on ABAWDs

a. State Choices

There has been much public debate about the potential impact of the ABAWD work requirements and time limits on food stamp recipients. The survey asked States whether they planned to conduct follow-up studies to determine what is happening to ABAWDs who are ineligible for food stamps because of the ABAWD time limits and work requirements. States that indicated plans for such studies were then asked to describe the kinds of data they plan to collect and how they intended to carry out these studies.

b. Survey Findings

- Seven States reported plans to conduct follow-up studies to determine what has happened to ABAWDs disqualified from food stamps because they exceeded the time limit. Only one State, Missouri, had begun such a study. It is being conducted through a contract with the University of Missouri.

8. State Data on ABAWDs

In order to capture information about the extent of the population affected by the new ABAWD provision, the survey asked States whether they collected quantitative data on clients impacted by it. If a State respondent told the interviewer that the State food stamp agency did collect such data, this was noted, and then he or she was asked to provide estimates and describe the general data system used to make the estimates.

The majority of the States did not provide estimates of the requested data on ABAWDs. If given more time, some State respondents indicated that they would be able to provide these estimates, but they could not provide the data at the time of the survey because of competing demands on their information systems and staff resources. Table III-1 on the following page tabulates the number of States that were able to provide each kind of data requested.

9. Overarching Patterns

When HSR examined the States' responses on ABAWD implementation across the individual policy areas discussed above, no significant patterns or associations were found in the States' responses that could categorize groups of States as having consistently lenient or consistently stringent policies in implementing the ABAWD provisions.

The indicators of leniency or stringency in States' implementation of the ABAWD provisions included: 1) how the State reported that its criteria and procedures for determining inability to work for the ABAWD provision compared to its criteria and procedures for determining the food stamp work registration exemption; 2) how limited or broad the State policies were

Type of Data Request	*Number of States Providing Estimates*
Number of ABAWDs Subject to the ABAWD Work Requirements	28
Number of ABAWDs Waived from ABAWD Requirements (through FNS-approved waivers)	25
Cumulative Number of Participants Disqualified from Food Stamps Due to ABAWD Requirements (since ABAWD implementation)	24
Number of ABAWDs Working at Least 20 Hours Per Week (or 80 Hours per Month)	10
Number of ABAWDs in Food Stamp Employment and Training Programs	12
Number of ABAWDs in Workfare Programs	11[10]

regarding documentation of disability for the ABAWD provision; and 3) the number and type of adults in a household that the State allowed to be exempted as "adult caretakers" of dependent children.

Analysis of the data also revealed no consistent patterns within States nor patterns across States when the association between the State food stamp workfare policy choices for ABAWDs and the stringency or leniency of their policies on determining ABAWD exemptions were examined.

Lastly, when the extent of the FNS-approved ABAWD waivers in each State was compared to the State's responses on key indicators of stringency or leniency in ABAWD implementation,

---

9 All data requests were for estimates in a typical month, except where otherwise noted.

10 This represents 11 of the 25 total States with workfare programs for food stamp recipients.

again no strong associations within State responses to varying questions nor consistent patterns across States were found in these two areas of policy choices.[11]

As States have more time to implement PRWORA and as they learn what works best for administrators, caseworkers and clients, their implementation policies may change. As a result, future patterns in State implementation of the ABAWD provision may develop.

For more detailed information on the States' responses to the ABAWD questions in the survey see Tables I-1 through I-29 in Appendix A.

B. State Choices Regarding Food Stamp Program Sanctions

The second major section of the survey instrument focused on six different types of sanctions. In each case, PRWORA gives States the option to implement that particular sanction and, in some cases, the flexibility to decide to whom to apply it, how long to apply it and for what specific program violations the sanction applies. The survey questions asked States about their choices in all of these aspects of the sanctions. The questions were focused on six optional food stamp sanctions, as described in separate subsections below.

1. Food Stamp Employment and Training Sanctions

a. The State Choices

PRWORA allows a State to choose whether to disqualify either the head of household or the whole household if the head of household fails to comply with a State's FSET requirements. (Prior to PRWORA, States were required to sanction the entire food stamp household in such circumstances.) PRWORA also gives States greater flexibility in the length of the employment and training sanctions they choose, provided that they fall within specific Federal standards for the minimum and maximum lengths of sanctions. The survey asked each State which FSET

[11] The extent of each State's ABAWD waivers was determined based on estimates prepared by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) for FNS, based on waivers FNS approved for 1997.

sanction option they selected; the duration of the minimum and maximum sanctions for a participant's first, second, and subsequent FSET violations; whether the State tracked information on sanctioned individuals or households; and approximately how many participants are affected by the sanctions in a typical month.

b. Survey Findings

- This is one case where taking the new option has meant decreasing the severity of the sanction. Over half (27) of the States made the new, more lenient, choice to disqualify only the head of household if he/she does not comply with the FSET requirements. Twenty-one States chose the more severe penalty of sanctioning the entire household. Three States (Illinois, Massachusetts and Minnesota) reported that in some cases the whole household is sanctioned, and in others only the noncompliant head of household.

- Over one-quarter (14) of the States selected either minimum FSET sanction periods longer than Federal minimum sanction requirements or selected the new option to permanently disqualify a food stamp participant for his or her third violation of the FSET requirements.

- When data on States that sanctioned the entire household were cross-tabulated with data on States selecting longer sanction periods, only five States (Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, and New Mexico) were found to have chosen the more stringent options in both cases (i.e., sanctioning the entire household <u>and</u> choosing minimum sanction periods longer than the Federal minimum requirements).

- Nearly all of the States reported they had, or planned to have, a tracking system to ensure that participants subject to FSET sanctions do not receive benefits until their sanction period is completed. Only five States reported they do not plan to have an information system to track this.

- Forty-two States indicated they currently have a tracking system to identify and track food stamp participants sanctioned under FSET; however, only 17 of the States were able to provide estimates for a typical month of the number of individuals or the number of households disqualified from the Food Stamp Program because the head of household failed to comply with food stamp E & T requirements.

2. Optional Comparable Food Stamp Disqualification for Noncompliance with Another Means-tested Program

a. State Choices

PRWORA gives States the option to disqualify a food stamp participant if he or she is disqualified from another means-tested program and to use the disqualification rules for the other means-tested program in applying the food stamp disqualification. This includes the option to disqualify food stamp recipients for failure to comply with the work requirements of another program, such as TANF or General Assistance (GA), even if under the Food Stamp Program rules they are otherwise exempt from work requirements.

The survey asked States whether they selected this new sanction option. If they did, the survey interviewers asked a series of follow-up questions regarding which other means-tested programs they included in the comparable disqualification option, which specific program violations result in a comparable food stamp disqualification, and the minimum length of the disqualification period. Finally, States who chose this option were asked whether they had a tracking system to identify sanctioned participants, and they were asked to provide estimates of the number of participants disqualified under this sanction in a typical month, if such data were available.

b. Survey Findings

- Thirteen States chose the new comparable disqualification option.
- Of these States, all but one, Arizona, utilized the comparable disqualification option for TANF program violations. Two States utilized the option to disqualify food stamp recipients for violations of TANF requirements and for violations of GA program violations. Arizona utilized the option only for State Medical Assistance recipients who failed to cooperate with child support authorities.
- Of the 12 States choosing the comparable disqualification option for TANF requirements, 11 included work requirements as a primary requirement for which violation resulted in comparable food stamp disqualifications. Such policies usually were selected in order to impose a food stamp sanction on the parent who is otherwise exempt from food stamp work requirements (i.e., with a

child under age six) or to impose a longer minimum sanction period than the State's FSET sanction policies allowed.

- Seven of the thirteen States had or planned to have an automated tracking system that collects information on this sanction and is able to identify sanctioned individuals to prevent their participation in the Food Stamp Program in another part of the State. No State was planning an interstate tracking system to monitor sanctioned participants across State lines.

- Little information is available on the size of the caseloads affected by this new sanction option, given that only three States provided estimates for these figures.

3. Option to Reduce Food Stamp Benefits When Households are Sanctioned in TANF

a. State Choices

The law requires a household's food stamp benefits to be frozen if its TANF income is reduced due to a TANF program violation. PRWORA gives States the additional option to reduce a household's food stamp benefits up to 25 percent for violation of a TANF program requirement.

The survey asked States whether they selected this sanction option. For those States choosing this option, the interviewers asked the State officials which specific TANF program requirements in their State also resulted in a food stamp benefit reduction. Officials were then asked several questions to determine how these reductions are calculated. Finally, the officials were asked if they have a system to track sanctioned households and to estimate the number of participants sanctioned in a typical month, if this estimate was available.

b. Survey Findings

- Seven States selected the option to reduce food stamp benefits when a household is sanctioned for noncompliance with a TANF rule.

- Among the States selecting this option, three were using it in combination with the comparable disqualification option:

- In Tennessee, TANF/food stamp households who were exempt from food stamp work requirements had their benefits reduced for noncompliance with TANF work requirements, while TANF/food stamp households subject to food stamp work requirements were subject to the comparable disqualification sanction period, which is three months for the first violation (i.e., longer than the State's FSET sanction period).

- In Michigan, benefits were reduced for the first four months of noncompliance with the specified TANF rules and, after the fourth month of noncompliance, comparable disqualification occurs.

- In Mississippi, a combination of both sanctions were in place at the time of the survey. However, the respondent told HSR that the State was reconsidering how or whether they will continue the comparable disqualification sanction.

■ Six of the seven States imposed the benefit reduction sanction based on household income after the TANF penalty was imposed. The exception was Iowa, which reported that the State imposes the food stamp benefit reduction based on household income before the TANF benefits are reduced.

■ Among States selecting this option, reduction rates varied from ten percent of the food stamp benefits in one State to 20 percent in two States and 25 percent in four States.

■ Six of the seven States selecting this option used it for violation of a TANF work requirement, while four States use the sanction when a client violated the State's TANF child immunization requirement. A smaller number of States used the sanction for violation of a school attendance requirement, for failure to attend non-work related classes (such as parenting or nutrition classes), for failure to meet requirements specific to minor parents, or for missed appointments with the TANF worker during the certification period.

■ Five of the seven States had, or were planning, a tracking system to identify individuals subject to this sanction throughout the State. However, only Michigan, Mississippi, and Tennessee provided estimates of the number of participants affected by this sanction in their State.

4. Optional Food Stamp Disqualification for Parents Who Fail to Cooperate with Child Support or Those in Arrears on Child Support Payment

a. State Choices

Under PRWORA, States have two new sanction options related to child support. One option allows States to disqualify noncustodial parents for being in arrears in their child support payments. A second option allows States to disqualify custodial and/or noncustodial parents for failing to cooperate with the State child support agency unless they have good cause for noncompliance.

The questions in this section of the survey asked the State officials whether they selected either or both of these options, and whether the sanction was applied to TANF-only households or to all food stamp households in their State. The interviewers also asked for additional information on how the sanction was applied. Finally, the State officials were asked whether they had an information system to track sanctioned individuals and to provide estimates of the number of participants affected in a typical month by each child support sanction they selected, if such estimates were available.

b. Survey Findings

- Eight States had chosen one or both of these options. Seven States disqualified food stamp households for failure to cooperate with State child support. Three States disqualified those with child support payment in arrears. Wisconsin and Ohio applied both child support sanction options.
- Two States limited the sanction to TANF cases. The other six States selecting this option applied the sanction to all food stamp households.
- Three of seven States choosing to sanction food stamp participants for failure to cooperate with child support disqualified non-custodial parents as well as custodial parents.
- While most of the States tracked these sanctions in an automated system, only three States were able to provide estimates of the number of parents sanctioned under these provisions.

5. Optional Sanction for Failure to Ensure Minors Attend School

a. State Choices

PRWORA provides States the option to sanction adults in a food stamp household or the whole household if the adults in the family fail to ensure that their minor dependent children attend school. Under this option, States can select either disqualification or benefit reduction as the sanction.

b. Survey Findings

- Respondents from four States reported selecting this sanction option. These States imposed the sanction on TANF participants only and not on all families participating in the Food Stamp Program.
- Under this sanction option, two States (New York and Wyoming) disqualified the adults in the household.
- The other two States (Kentucky and Mississippi) sanctioned the whole household by reducing the food stamp benefits 25 percent.

6. Overarching Patterns in States' Sanction Policy Choices

We analyzed the States' responses to determine how States varied in the extent and type of optional sanctions they have chosen and to identify any patterns in State choices. When State choices on all the new optional food stamp sanctions, including the child-support related sanctions and sanctions for minors not attending school, were analyzed no distinctive patterns emerged. However, when we focused on States' choices related specifically to work-related sanctions and the extent of their waivers from the Federal three-month time limit for ABAWDs—two areas of food stamp policy options that are most closely tied to the central goals of welfare reform—States clearly fell into certain patterns at the extremes.

To examine each State's approach regarding work requirements for food stamp clients, we analyzed the survey data to answer the following three questions.

- Did the State sanction TANF/food stamp participants with either the comparable disqualification and/or food stamp benefit reduction sanction if the participant does not comply with the TANF work requirements?

- What sanction options had the State taken for the food stamp employment and training program?
- What percent of the State's food stamp caseload was waived from the time limits and work requirements by FNS-approved State waivers?[12]

Our cross-tabulations of the survey data revealed two groupings of States whose food stamp choices in 1997 reflected a consistent pattern in their orientation to work-related sanctions. Seven States were consistent in their "more stringent" approach and nine States were consistent in their selection of the "more lenient" approach.

States fell into the grouping of "more stringent" if they made the following three choices:

- The State chose either the comparable disqualification or food stamp benefit reduction sanction option for noncompliance with TANF work requirements;
- The State chose to sanction the entire food stamp household when the individual head of the household fails to comply with food stamp E & T requirements or the State chose to implement a food stamp E & T sanction period of longer duration than the Federal minimum requirements; and
- In 1997, the State had no waivers to the food stamp time limits and work requirements for ABAWDs or had approved waivers for less than 15 percent of its ABAWD caseload.

The seven States in this group are Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Ohio. These States' policy choices in the areas of comparable food stamp sanctions for TANF program violations, food stamp E & T sanctions, and ABAWD waivers are depicted below in Table III-2.

Using the same cross-response analysis, we identified which States were "more lenient" in their sanction approach. States were determined to be most lenient if their choices reflected the following pattern:

---

12 Information on the percentage of the caseload waived from the ABAWD requirement was the measure of the extent of a State's ABAWD waiver. The percentages HSR examined were those estimated by MPR for FNS, based on waivers FNS approved for 1997.

Table of Contents

- The State had not chosen any comparable disqualification or food stamp benefit reduction sanction options for violation of any other program's work requirements;
- The State chose to disqualify the individual head of household rather than the entire household for noncompliance with FSET work requirements; and
- In 1997, the State waived at least 40 percent of the ABAWD caseload from the ABAWD time limit/work requirement.[13]

State	***Food Stamp Sanction for Noncompliance with TANF Work Requirement***	***Food Stamp Employment and Training Sanction Choice***	***Percent of ABAWD Population in Waived Areas***
Idaho	Comparable Disqualification	Entire Household[14]	Did Not Implement Waiver
Iowa	Benefit Reduction	Entire Household & Exceeds Minimum	No Waiver
Kansas	Comparable Disqualification	Entire Household	No Waiver
Michigan	Benefit Reduction with Disqualification After Four Months of Non-cooperation	Exceeds Minimum	No Waiver
Mississippi	Benefit Reduction & Comparable Disqualification[15]	Entire Household & Exceeds Minimum	No Waiver
North Dakota	Comparable Disqualification	Entire Household	12 Percent
Ohio	Comparable Disqualification	Entire Household[14]	Did Not Implement Waiver

13 Forty-percent was selected as the cut-off criteria because this it represents 125 percent of the mean proportion of the total national caseload waived from the ABAWD requirements in 1997.

14 Idaho and Ohio officials reported that the State will soon sanction only the individual head of household.

15 Mississippi officials reported that the State is reconsidering the imposition of comparable disqualifications.

Table of Contents

Nine States were found to have made all of these three "more lenient" food stamp policy choices. These States are Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, and West Virginia. The specific food stamp policy choices that characterize them as "more lenient" are depicted below in Table III-3.

State	***No Comparable Disqualification or Reduction in Food Stamp Benefits for Violation of Another Program's Work Requirements***	***Food Stamp Employment and Training Sanction Choice***	***Percent of ABAWD Population in Waived Areas***
Alaska	√	Sanction Individual Head of Household	57%
District of Columbia	√	" "	100%
Hawaii	√	" "	41%
Illinois	√	" "	46%
Maryland	√	" "	49%
New York	√	" "	56%
Pennsylvania	√	" "	69%
Washington	√	" "	51%
West Virginia	√	" "	80%

It is important, however, to emphasize the limited data on which these two groupings of States were made. While the groupings accurately portray State policy choices, they may not accurately reflect how the policies are being implemented. For example, States that have many new work-related sanctions that appear "more stringent" in their sanction approach may not have been disqualifying or penalizing food stamp clients in great numbers, because they provided employment and training services in sufficient quantity and quality to prevent the

sanctions from being imposed. On the other hand, some States that appear "more lenient" in their policy choices may have made affirmative decisions not to take certain options, while others simply had not yet addressed the issue fully, given pressing policy decisions required in their cash welfare programs.

For more detailed information on State-specific choices in regards to food stamp sanction options, see Tables II-1 through II-15 in Appendix A.

C. State Choices Regarding Treatment of Drug Felons and Fleeing Felons

1. State Choices

Under PRWORA, drug felons are permanently ineligible for food stamps unless the State passes a law to opt out of the provision by exempting some or all individuals, limiting the sanction, or a combination of both. The questions in the survey are designed to determine whether or not States have opted out of the Federal drug felon provision and, if so, whether they have done so in whole or part. For States that have opted out of the provision only partially, the survey interviewers collected information on how they have modified the provision. In addition, State officials were asked what information sources they used to identify individuals as drug felons.

Also under PRWORA, States are required to make all food stamp applicants or recipients identified as fleeing felons ineligible for the program. While this provision was not a new "option" under PRWORA, it was included in the survey at the request of the FNS Food Stamp Program office to determine what methods States are using to identify an applicant or a program participant as a fleeing felon.

2. Survey Findings

- Twenty-one States had passed a State law opting out of the drug felon provision. Ten States had opted out entirely and did not disqualify or penalize drug felons, while eleven States did sanction some categories of drug felons.

- Of the 11 States which opted out of the drug felon provision but still imposed a modified sanction, six States exempted certain subgroups from the disqualification (most often felons participating in substance abuse treatment programs) and four selected to reduce the length of the disqualification period, reduce benefits, and/or impose other special conditions on drug felons. One State (Rhode Island) had not yet decided how it would implement the sanction, if at all.

- In the first year of implementation of the new food stamp fleeing felon and drug felon eligibility provisions, by far the method most often selected to identify an applicant or recipient as a fleeing felon was to "ask the client." Forty-seven States used the "ask the client" approach to identify either fleeing felons or both drug felons and fleeing felons.

- Of the 47 States that had an "ask the client" approach to identifying fleeing felons, 34 States did not report having any Statewide system to verify clients' self-reports. Of the 13 States that had an "ask the client" approach and a verification system, nine States reported verifying an individual's fleeing felon status through tracking arrest warrants or other court records and four States reported verifying against another State or Federal database.

- The large majority of the States had or planned to have a tracking system to identify fleeing felons who try to participate in the program in other parts of the State, though 15 States reported no plans to develop such a tracking system at the time of the survey.

For more detailed information on State responses regarding their choices for drug felons and fleeing felons see Tables III-2 through III-5 in Appendix A.

D. Databases Used by States to Verify Food Stamp Client Circumstances

1. State Choices

Prior to PRWORA, States were required to use two income and eligibility verification systems to validate food stamp client circumstances and obtain information on changes in food stamp client circumstances. This included the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) for verifying households' financial information and the Systematic Alien Verification for

Entitlements (SAVE) Program for verifying the immigration status of individuals in a household.[16]

The survey questions asked State officials whether they were continuing to use, had discontinued, or had never used each of these systems. Questions were then asked about additional databases utilized by the State to match and verify food stamp client information.

2. Survey Findings

- All States were continuing to use most of the IEVS databases, though seven States had discontinued using one or two of these six databases.
- Only one State reported discontinuing the use of SAVE, though four States reported that they had never used this system.
- When asked about additional databases used to verify food stamp client information, 16 States reported using State prison records, 35 States reported using their State Department of Motor Vehicles database to check for motor vehicles, and 43 States reported matching between State child support records and food stamp records.

For State-specific information on databases used to verify food stamp client information see Tables IV-1 and IV-2 in Appendix A.

E. State/Local Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants

1. State Choices

Under a provision of PRWORA, 940,000 million legal immigrants were made ineligible for food stamps in Federal Fiscal Year 1997. However, States were not prevented from creating their own food assistance programs for legal immigrants with State funds. Beginning in June

---

16 The IEVS system includes the following six databases: State Wage Information Collection Agency database (SWICA); the Internal Revenue Service's Unearned Income database; the Unemployment Insurance (UI) database; the Beneficiary Data Exchange Database (BENDEX); the State Data Exchange database (SDX); and Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reporting System (BEERS). SAVE is a single database established in coordination with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

1997, as a result of language in the *FY 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act*, States were specifically provided the option to purchase food stamps from the Federal government for use in State-funded food assistance programs for legal immigrants.[17]

The survey questions were designed to determine whether the States had initiated a State-funded program for legal immigrants, what immigrant populations were eligible for this new program, the income eligibility criteria, the form of the assistance, what agency administered the program at the direct service level, the size of the average household benefit, and the number of participants served in a typical month.

2. Survey Findings [18]

- Approximately one-fourth (13) of the States had initiated, or were planning to initiate, an assistance program for legal immigrants who became ineligible for food stamps under PRWORA. Eleven States had a program in place at the time of the survey, one State (Texas) was planning to start a program in February 1998, and one State (Illinois) was strongly considering a program.

- Nine of the eleven States tied the income eligibility for this program to Food Stamp Program income eligibility. As an exception to this rule, Minnesota provided benefits only to legal immigrants on TANF, SSI, or GA.

- Five of the 11 States limited the assistance to children under age 18, the disabled, and/or the elderly.

- Nine of the eleven States had taken the option to purchase Federal food stamps for this population. Colorado and Minnesota were providing cash benefits. Minnesota, through a second food assistance program for legal immigrants, provided vouchers for the purchase of specific Minnesota-grown foods.

---

17 Under the *FY 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act*, States were also afforded the option to purchase food stamps for ABAWDs disqualified because of the three-month food stamp time limit. Because no State started such a program, this option is not discussed in this report, nor are these survey results presented in the data tables in Appendix A.

18 As noted in Chapter One, both the President and Members of Congress have indicated support for legislation that would restore food stamp eligibility for some or all legal immigrants. If such legislation is enacted, the nature and extent of these State-funded food assistance programs for immigrants will be more limited then today.

More information on the State-funded food assistance programs for legal immigrants can be found in Table V-1 in Appendix A.

F. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process

1. State Choices

PRWORA eliminated the Federal legal standards for local food stamp office operations. One of the previous Federal requirements was for States to have a single application for the Food Stamp Program and the cash assistance to families program (now TANF). States were also required to offer households a joint application process for these two programs. The survey asked four questions to assess how States currently coordinate and/or co-locate the food stamp and TANF application process. The issue is particularly significant for its implications for food stamp access, because at the applicant's first point of contact with the welfare office many States now emphasize finding "work first" and some provide diversion assistance to prevent dependency on TANF. In either of these cases the processing of the TANF application may be delayed until the applicant utilizes the employment services and clients' access to food stamps may be affected.

2. Survey Findings

Seven States reported that they had some new policies in place that affected the coordination of the TANF and food stamp application process. Regarding the application form itself, the respondent from the District of Columbia noted that there was no single application form for both TANF and food stamp applicants and respondents from Idaho and Oregon indicated that there was no State requirement for a joint TANF and food stamp application interview, though the respondents thought that joint interviews were usually conducted at local offices.

Of greater significance for the accessibility of the Food Stamp Program and potential interest for program managers are those changes in the TANF and food stamp application processes reported by officials from the States of South Dakota, Texas, Utah and Wisconsin. These State responses are summarized below.

- ***South Dakota.*** The State respondent reported that in many South Dakota communities, the TANF application process originated outside of the welfare office in a Job Services office, whereas the food stamp application was processed at the local Social Services office. While State policy required Job Services offices to offer households the option to begin the food stamp application process at the Job Services site, the State respondent did not now how routinely this joint application process was actually occurring.

- ***Texas.*** In response to interest from local offices, Texas implemented a group interview process in several counties to streamline the application process for both food stamps and TANF. Group interviews were followed up by shorter individual client interviews to document circumstances and determine eligibility.

- ***Utah.*** Utah accepted public benefit applications at new employment centers rather than the traditional welfare office. While this had not changed the co-location and coordination of the TANF and food stamp applications for individual households, the Utah State respondent noted that the food stamp application process overall had changed as employment services were now initiated at the first point of contact with the welfare office, simultaneous to the processing of the application.

- ***Wisconsin.*** In a small number of counties in Wisconsin (including Milwaukee County, where a large segment of the State caseload resides), private agency personnel processed TANF applications and public employees processed the food stamp application. In some of the local offices in these counties, the two application processes occurred at a single location though they were conducted by two separate employees. In other areas, the TANF and food stamp application interviews were conducted at separate sites.

It is likely that changes in the focus of welfare policy may have affected coordination between food stamps and cash welfare in ways that can only be observed at the local level. Hence, it is not surprising that a limited number of States reported changes in the coordination of their food stamp and TANF application processes.

In this chapter, we provided a summary of the extent and nature of food stamp choices States have made in six policy areas where States have been recently afforded greater flexibility. As noted above, the complete data from the survey have been tabulated and are presented in a series of tables, organized by policy area, in Appendix A.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER IV

Next Steps: Future Data Collection Plans for this Study

Health Systems Research, Inc. (HSR) and the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) recognize that additional information is needed to understand the operational aspects of States' new food stamp policy choices under welfare reform. As indicated earlier, an additional data collection phase of this study is planned in order to capture more detail on how some States are actually implementing the choices they have made. Plans are also needed to develop a system to track how State choices change over time. In this chapter, we summarize the next steps planned for this study.

A. Case Studies in Selected States

To better understand the implications of the new State food stamp choices under welfare reform, later this year HSR will be conducting case studies in eight to ten States across the country. The purpose of these case studies will be to clarify the intended goals of the State Food Stamp Program policy choices, how these are translated at the local level, and perceptions of the impact of these choices on the responsiveness and accessibility of the program, including their success in helping food stamp clients make the transition to work. To obtain this information, HSR will interview State and local food stamp office staff about their perspectives on implementation of State food stamp choices under welfare reform. Of particular importance will be the collection of information from local food stamp officials to assess the changing role of the food stamp caseworker under welfare reform, and how the local approach to specific program elements may have changed. Areas of interest include the food stamp application process, employment and training services, sanctions, and other program operation strategies.

HSR and FNS have developed the following four research questions that will guide the case study phase of this project:

- Why do State officials say they have made certain food stamp policy choices or sets of choices regarding the promotion of employment for food stamp recipients?
- How have State and local officials attempted to translate their policy intentions to local office operations?
- How do local office staff perceive these State policy choices have affected local office procedures, including the application and eligibility determination process and the employment and case management services provided for food stamp clientele?
- How do local office staff perceive that these changes have affected the responsiveness and accessibility of the program for low-income clients? Specifically, how do staff perceive: 1) the success of different policies in helping people move to employment; and 2) the impact of these and other welfare reform policies on Food Stamp Program participation?

B. Tracking Changes in State Food Stamp Choices Over Time

Because the results of this survey only reflect food stamp policy choices made by States a little more than one year after the enactment of PRWORA, FNS wants to be able to continue tracking State food stamp choices over a longer period of time. To do so, FNS will need to develop a data collection system that can be responsive to program and policy makers who must evaluate the impact of State food stamp choices on the program's operations and clients.

During the first year of PRWORA implementation, States focused a great deal of attention and resources on changing the nature of their cash assistance programs for families under the new TANF block grant. As a result, many States had little time to consider the food stamp policy options available to them. Several State officials told HSR interviewers that during this first year after PRWORA the only decisions they made in their food stamp policies were those mandated by Federal law.

Given the currently evolving nature of State welfare reform policies, it is possible that the food stamp choices many States made in the first year after PRWORA will change significantly in subsequent years. State choices in the future are likely to reflect a more deliberate strategic planning process that clearly and consistently defines the States' intent for the role of the Food Stamp Program in their overall welfare reform policy. For example, more definitive patterns may emerge in State choices based on the extent to which the States view the program as a tool of welfare reform to promote work and self-sufficiency or as a safety-net program intended primarily to meet the basic nutrition assistance needs of its participants. State and Federal policy makers will need to keep abreast of the extent and nature of the choices States are making in the Food Stamp Program in order to understand the costs, benefits and policy implications for both program administrators and clients.

To address the need for ongoing information on State food stamp policy choices, HSR will be working with FNS on recommendations for an approach and a model for continued tracking of these State choices. The recommendations will be based upon a balance of several factors including: 1) the capacity of FNS to automate and standardize tracking systems with Regional offices, 2) the future need to develop a cost-efficient ongoing reporting system to track changes in State food stamp policy choices, 3) the need for such a system to provide information to State and FNS officials in a timely manner, and 4) the extent to which such a system poses a burden on the States.

The results of this first Summary Report serve as a baseline for future FNS tracking efforts. The goal of a long term tracking system would be not only to provide State-specific information on changes in food stamp policy choices over time, but also to identify large variations or patterns in State choices as they emerge. These in turn can be used to analyze the factors affecting changes in program participation, program costs, and other aspects of FSP operations under welfare reform.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Appendix A : Data Tables on State Food Stamp Policy Choices Under Welfare Reform: Results from HSR 1997 State Telephone Survey

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I. State ABAWD Implementation Choices

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.A. ABAWD Waivers

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I. State ABAWD Implementation Choices

I.A. ABAWD Waivers

Summary of State Selection of Implementation of FNS-Approved ABAWD Waivers	
ABAWD Waiver Implementation Choice	***Number of States***
Have FNS-Approved ABAWD Waivers (as of 11/97)	43[a]
Implementing Waivers in All Approved Areas	36
Not Implementing in All Approved Areas	7[b]

[a] Includes the District of Columbia which is waived completely. Excludes New Hampshire where a waiver was pending.

[b] These States are Idaho, Indiana, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Texas and Virginia.

Table of Contents

I.B. State Policies on Determination of Individuals' ABAWD Status

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.B. State Policies on Determination of Individuals' ABAWD Status

Policy Choices	Number of States
Total Number of States Providing Guidance to Local Offices On This Issue	47[a]
Stringency of Criteria and Procedures Used to Determine ABAWD Disability Exemption Compared to Those Used to Determine Work Registration Disability Exemption	
ABAWD Criteria and Procedures More Stringent	8
ABAWD Criteria and Procedures About the Same	34
ABAWD Criteria and Procedures Less Stringent	5
Length of Disability State Allows for ABAWD Disability Exemption	
Exempt Only Permanently Disabled Adults	0
Exempt Either Permanently or Temporarily Disabled Adults	47 (all)

[a] This table count excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

Table of Contents

State[a]	ABAWD Criteria and Procedures Compared to Those for Work Registration		
	ABAWD More Stringent	The Same	ABAWD Less Stringent
Alabama	√		
Arizona		√	
Arkansas			√
California		√	
Colorado	√		
Connecticut		√	
Delaware		√	
Florida		√	
Georgia			√
Idaho		√	
Illinois		√	
Indiana	√		
Iowa		√	
Kansas			√
Kentucky		√	
Louisiana		√	
Maine		√	
Maryland		√	
Massachusetts		√	

[a] This table count excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

Table of Contents

State[a]	ABAWD Criteria and Procedures Compared to Those for Work Registration		
	ABAWD More Stringent	The Same	ABAWD Less Stringent
Michigan		√	
Minnesota		√	
Mississippi		√	
Missouri		√	
Montana		√	
Nebraska		√	
Nevada	√		
New Hampshire	√		
New Jersey		√	
New Mexico	√		
New York		√	
North Carolina		√	
North Dakota		√	
Ohio		√	
Oklahoma		√	
Oregon	√		
Pennsylvania		√	
South Carolina		√	
South Dakota			√
Tennessee		√	
Texas		√	

Table of Contents

[illegible] (cont.) [illegible] State on [illegible] Determination [illegible] Work Registration [illegible] on Determination [illegible]			
	ABAWD Criteria and Procedures Compared to Those for Work Registration		
State[a]	***ABAWD More Stringent***	***The Same***	***ABAWD Less Stringent***
Utah	√		
Vermont		√	
Virginia		√	
Washington			√
West Virginia		√	
Wisconsin		√	
Wyoming		√	

Table of Contents

Policy Choices on Documentation of Disability	Number of States[a]
Allow Food Stamp Office Staff to Document Exemption Based on Direct Observation of a Client's Obvious Disability	25
Allow Client Self-reports to Document Exemption	2
Accept a Written Statement From a Health Professional as Documentation that a Client is Unfit for Employment	47 (all)
Require Health Professionals to Complete a Specific Form Created by the State Agency to Document that a Client is Unfit for Employment	3

[a] This table count excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

Table of Contents

State[a]	Methods Accepted for Determining ABAWD Exemption			
	Client Self Report	*Food Stamp Office Staff Observations*	*Written Statement From Health Professional*	*Specific State Form Filled Out By a Health Professional*
Alabama			√	
Arizona		√	√	
Arkansas		√	√	
California		√	√	
Colorado			√	
Connecticut			√	
Delaware			√	
Florida		√	√	
Georgia		√	√	
Idaho		√	√	
Illinois		√	√	
Indiana			√	
Iowa		√	√	
Kansas			√	
Kentucky		√	√	
Louisiana		√	√	
Maine		√	√	
Maryland		√	√	
Massachusetts			√	

[a] This table excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

Table of Contents

State[a]	Methods Accepted For Determining ABAWD Exemption			
	Client Self Report	*Food Stamp Office Staff Observations*	*Written Statement From Health Professional*	*Specific State Form Filled Out By a Health Professional*
Michigan		√	√	
Minnesota			√	√
Mississippi		√	√	
Missouri		√	√	
Montana		√	√	
Nebraska		√	√	
Nevada			√	
New Hampshire			√	√
New Jersey			√	
New Mexico			√	
New York			√	
North Carolina			√	
North Dakota			√	
Ohio			√	
Oklahoma		√	√	
Oregon			√	
Pennsylvania			√	
South Carolina			√	
South Dakota	√	√	√	
Tennessee		√	√	
Texas		√	√	√

Table of Contents

State[a]	Methods Accepted For Determining ABAWD Exemption			
	Client Self Report	*Food Stamp Office Staff Observations*	*Written Statement From Health Professional*	*Specific State Form Filled Out By a Health Professional*
Utah			√	
Vermont		√	√	
Virginia		√	√	
Washington	√	√	√	
West Virginia	Did not know	Did not know	√	
Wisconsin			√	
Wyoming		√	√	

Table of Contents

[illegible]

Type of Health Professionals Authorized to Provide Certification	*Number of States*[a]
Any Health Professional	19[b]
An M.D.	28
A Ph.D. Psychologist	22
A Licensed Therapist	13
A Nurse	5
A Health Professional in a Drug or Alcohol Treatment Program	13
Other Health Professionals	8

[a] This table excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

[b] States indicating that any health professional is authorized to provide certification are excluded from the count in the other categories of health professionals.

Table of Contents

Table I-7.
Information by State on Types of Health Professionals
Authorized to Provide Certification of Disability for Determination of ABAWD Status
(Among the 47 States with Statewide Policy on Determination of ABAWD Status)

	Type of Health Professional						
State[a]	***Any***[b]	***M.D.***	***Ph.D. Psychologist***	***Licensed Therapist***	***Nurse***	***Drug or Alcohol Treatment Program Professional***	***Other***
Alabama		√	√				Certified psychologist
Arizona		√	√	√			Doctors of Osteopathy and Naturopathy, chiropractors, and physician's assistants using MDs letterhead
Arkansas		√	Did not know	Did not know		√	Certain agencies providing rehabilitative services
California		√	√				
Colorado	√						
Connecticut		√					
Delaware		√	√	√	√	√	
Florida		√	√	√	√	√	
Georgia	√						

a This table excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

b States indicating that they authorize <u>any</u> health professional to provide certification of a disability are checked <u>only</u> in this column.

Table of Contents

Table 1.2 (cont.)
Information by Section of Types of Health Professionals Authorized to Provide Certification of Disability (Among the 27 States with Information Available on Their Policy and Procedures for Certification)

State[a]	Type of Health Professional						
	Any[b]	*M.D.*	*Ph.D. Psychologist*	*Licensed Therapist*	*Nurse*	*Drug or Alcohol Treatment Program Professional*	*Other*
Idaho	√						
Illinois	√						
Indiana	√						
Iowa	√						
Kansas		√	√	√	√	√	Doctor of Osteopathy; If mentally retarded a public or private agency serving the mentally retarded.
Kentucky[c]		√					
Louisiana	√						
Maine		√	√				
Maryland	√						
Massachusetts		√	√	√	√	√	
Michigan		√					

[c] Kentucky did not specify during the survey whether or not a Ph.D. psychologist, a licensed therapist, or a nurse is authorized to provide certification. Thus they may or may not be allowing these health professionals to provide certification of the ABAWD disability exemption.

Table of Contents

Table I-7. (cont.)
Information by State on Types of Health Professionals
Authorized to Provide Certification of Disability for Determination of ABAWD Status
(Among the 47 States with Statewide Policy on Determination of ABAWD Status)

	Type of Health Professional						
State[a]	***Any[b]***	***M.D.***	***Ph.D. Psychologist***	***Licensed Therapist***	***Nurse***	***Drug or Alcohol Treatment Program Professional***	***Other***
Minnesota		√	√	√		√	Chiropractor for back problems
Mississippi		√	√	√		√	
Missouri		√	√	√		√	
Montana		√	√	√			
Nebraska		√	√	√			
Nevada	√						
New Hampshire	√						
New Jersey	√						
New Mexico	√						
New York		√	√	√		√	Medical providers under the supervision of an authorized health professional
North Carolina		√	√		√	√	
North Dakota		√					
Ohio		√	√	√			

Table of Contents

State	Type of Health Professional						
	Any	*M.D.*	*Ph.D. Psychologist*	*Licensed Therapist*	*Nurse*	*Drug or Alcohol Treatment Program Professional*	*Other*
Oklahoma	√						
Oregon	√						
Pennsylvania		√					
South Carolina	√						
South Dakota	√						
Tennessee	√						
Texas		√	√				Physician's Assistant
Utah		√	√				
Vermont		√	√			√	
Virginia		√	√				Any licensed or certified psychologist
Washington	√						
West Virginia		√	√	Did not know		√	
Wisconsin	√						
Wyoming		√	√	√		√	

Table of Contents

Policy	Number of States[a]
Allows Receipt of Any Disability Payments to Certify a Client as Exempt	47
Allows Receipt of SSI Benefits to Document Exemption	47
Allows Receipt of Veteran's (VA) Benefits to Document Exemption	45[b]
Allows Receipt of SSDI Benefits to Document Exemption	47
Allows Receipt of Worker's Compensation Benefits to Document Exemption	33
Allows Benefits Under State Disability Program to Document Exemption	25
Allows Receipt of Private Disability Benefits to Document Exemption	31

a This table count excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

b Five of these States—Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Pennsylvania and New Mexico —indicated that they allow use of VA disability to certify that an adult is unable to work and thus exempt from theABAWD provisions, however these States only accept receipt of VA disability if the recipients are defined as 100% disabled under the VA program. There is a possibility that other States limit exemptions to VA recipients who meet similar criteria, but did not mention this during the interview.

Table 2.0
[illegible]
Type [illegible]
(Among the 37 States with [illegible])

State[a]	Type of Disability Benefits					
	SSI	*Veteran's Benefits[b]*	*SSDI*	*Worker's Compensation*	*State Disability Program*	*Private Disability Benefits*
Alabama	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Arizona	√	√	√	√	No State program	
Arkansas	√	√	√	√	√	√
California	√	√	√	√	√	√
Colorado	√	√	√		√	
Connecticut	√	√	√		√	
Delaware	√	√	√		√	
Florida	√	√	√	√	√	√[c]
Georgia	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Idaho	√	√	√	√	√	√
Illinois	√	√	√	√	√	√

a This table excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because under a waiver the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision.

b Five of these States—Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Pennsylvania and New Mexico —indicated that they allow use of VA disability to certify that an adult is unable to work and thus exempt from theABAWD provisions, however these States only accept receipt of VA disability if the recipients are defined as 100% disabled under the VA program.

c Florida noted that this would be on a case by case basis and not at all automatic.

Table of Contents

State[a]	Type of Disability Benefits					
	SSI	*Veteran's Benefits[b]*	*SSDI*	*Worker's Compensation*	*State Disability Program*	*Private Disability Benefits*
Indiana	√	√	√		No State program	
Iowa	√	√	√	Did not know	No State program	√
Kansas	√	√	√	√	√	√
Kentucky	√	√	√		√	
Louisiana	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Maine	√	√	√		No State program	
Maryland	√	√	√	√	√	√
Massachusetts	√	√	√		√	√
Michigan	√		√			
Minnesota	√	√	√		No State program	
Mississippi	√	√	√	√	No State program	
Missouri	√	√	√	√	√	
Montana	√	√	√		√	√
Nebraska	√	√	√	√	√	√
Nevada	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
New Hampshire	√	√	√		√	√

Table of Contents

State[a]	Type of Other Benefits Accepted as Certification of Disability					
	SSI	*Veteran's Benefits*[b]	*SSDI*	*Worker's Compensation*	*State Disability Program*	*Private Disability Benefits*
New Jersey	√	√	√	√	√	√
New Mexico	√	√	√		√	√
New York	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
North Carolina	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
North Dakota	√	√	√	√	√	
Ohio	√	√	√	√	√	√
Oklahoma	√	√	√	√	√	
Oregon	√	√	√	√	√	Did not know
Pennsylvania	√	√	√	√	√	√
South Carolina	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
South Dakota	√	√	√	√[d]	No State program	√
Tennessee	√	√	√	√	No State program	
Texas	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Utah	√	√	√	√	√	√

[d] South Dakota requires that recipient is unable to do any kind of work not just certain types.

Table of Contents

Table I-9. (cont.)
Information by State on
Type of Disability Benefits Accepted as Certification of Food Stamp Participants' Inability to Work
(Among the 47 States with Statewide Policy on Determination of ABAWD Status)

	Type of Other Benefits Accepted as Certification of Disability					
State[a]	***SSI***	***Veteran's Benefits***	***SSDI***	***Worker's Compensation***	***State Disability Program***	***Private Disability Benefits***
Vermont	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Virginia	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Washington	√	√	√	√	√	√
West Virginia	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Wisconsin	√	√	√	√	No State program	√
Wyoming	√		√		No State program	

Table of Contents

State	Stringency of State Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs			Stringency of Private Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs				
	State More Stringent	*Same Stringency*	*State Less Stringent*	*Private More Stringent*	*Same Stringency*	*Private Less Stringent*	*No State Standard for Private Disability Criteria*	*Respondent Did Not Know*
Alabama	No State Program							√
Arkansas		√					√	
California			√					√
Colorado			√			√		
Connecticut			√	Does Not Accept as Certification of Inability to Work (for ABAWDs)				
Delaware		√		Does Not Accept as Certification of Inability to Work (for ABAWDs)				
Florida	√							√
Georgia	No State Program						√	
Idaho		√						√
Illinois		√						√

[a] This table excludes Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island because these States leave decisions regarding disability determination to the local offices, and excludes the District of Columbia because the entire jurisdiction is exempted under a waiver from the ABAWD provision. Arizona, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Wyoming are excluded because they neither accept State disability benefits nor private disability benefits to document food stamp participants' inability to work for determination of ABAWD status.

Table of Contents

Table I-10. (cont.)
Information by State on
Relative Stringency of State and Private Disability Programs Compared to SSI and VA Programs*

State	*Stringency of State Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs*			*Stringency of Private Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs*				
	State More Stringent	*Same Stringency*	*State Less Stringent*	*Private More Stringent*	*Same Stringency*	*Private Less Stringent*	*No State Standard for Private Disability Criteria*	*Respondent Did Not Know*
Iowa	No State Program							√
Kansas		√						√
Kentucky	Respondent Did Not Know			Does Not Accept as Certification of Inability to Work (for ABAWDs)				
Louisiana	No State Program				√			
Maryland			√					√
Massachusetts		√						√
Missouri			√	Does Not Accept as Certification of Inability to Work (for ABAWDs)				
Montana			√			√		
Nebraska			√					√
Nevada	No State Program							√
New Hampshire	√						√	
New Jersey		√						√
New Mexico			√					√

Table of Contents

State	Stringency of State Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs			Stringency of Private Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs				
	State More Stringent	*Same Stringency*	*State Less Stringent*	*Private More Stringent*	*Same Stringency*	*Private Less Stringent*	*No State Standard for Private Disability Criteria*	*Respondent Did Not Know*
New York	No State Program				√			
North Carolina	No State Program							√
North Dakota		√		Does Not Accept as Certification of Inability to Work (for ABAWDs)				
Ohio			√					√
Oklahoma	√			Does Not Accept as Certification of Inability to Work (for ABAWDs)				
Oregon		√						√
Pennsylvania	Did Not Know							√
South Carolina	No State Program					√		
South Dakota	No State Program					√		
Texas	No State Program						√	
Utah			√					√
Vermont	No State Program							√
Virginia	No State Program							√

Table of Contents

Table I-10. (cont.)
Information by State on
Relative Stringency of State and Private Disability Programs Compared to SSI and VA Programs
(Among the 25 States Using State Disability and the 33 States Using Private Disability as Certification for ABAWD Disability Exemption)

	Stringency of State Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs			*Stringency of Private Disability Determinations Compared to SSI or VA Programs*				
State[a]	*State More Stringent*	*Same Stringency*	*State Less Stringent*	*Private More Stringent*	*Same Stringency*	*Private Less Stringent*	*No State Standard for Private Disability Criteria*	*Respon-dent Did Not Know*
Washington			√					√
West Virginia	No State Program							√
Wisconsin	No State Program						√	
Total[b]	3	9	11	0	2	4	5	22

[b] While 25 States accept State disability benefits as documentation of a food stamp client's inability to work for the purpose of the ABAWD provision, the column total of States responses regarding stringency of State disability totals only 23 because respondents from two States did not know the stringency of their State disability program's definition of disability.

Table of Contents

[illegible]	[illegible]
State	***Other Definition***
Maryland	Under age 18, or under age 20 if included in a TANF grant
Nebraska	Under age 22

Table of Contents

Policy	Number of States[a]
Only One Parent in the Household Can Be An Exempt Caretaker	2
All Parents in the Household Can Be Exempt Caretakers	16
All Adult Relatives in the Household Can Be Exempt Caretakers	1
All Adults in the Household Can Be Exempt Caretakers	31

[a] The District of Columbia is excluded because the entire jurisdiction is covered by an ABAWD waiver.

Table of Contents

State[a]	Adult Caretakers in Household Who Can be Exempt			
	Only One Parent	*All Parents*	*All Adult Relatives*	*All Adults*
Alabama		√		
Alaska				√
Arizona				√
Arkansas		√		
California		√		
Colorado				√
Connecticut		√		
Delaware				√
Florida		√		
Georgia		√		
Hawaii		√		
Idaho				√
Illinois				√
Indiana		√		
Iowa				√
Kansas		√		
Kentucky				√
Louisiana				√
Maine				√
Maryland		√		
Massachusetts			√	
Michigan				√

[a] The District of Columbia is excluded from the table because the entire jurisdiction is exempt under a waiver from the ABAWD provision.

Table of Contents

[illegible] (Continued)
[illegible] State on
[illegible] Adult Who Can [illegible]
[illegible] with Dependents

State	Adult Caretakers in Household Who Can be Exempt			
	Only One Parent	*All Parents*	*All Adult Relatives*	*All Adults*
Minnesota				√
Mississippi				√
Missouri				√
Montana				√
Nebraska				√
Nevada		√		
New Hampshire		√		
New Jersey				√
New Mexico	√			
New York				√
North Carolina		√		
North Dakota	√			
Ohio				√
Oklahoma		√		
Oregon				√
Pennsylvania				√
Rhode Island				√
South Carolina				√
South Dakota				√
Tennessee				√
Texas				√
Utah				√
Vermont		√		
Virginia				√

Table of Contents

[illegible] (cont.) [illegible] State an[illegible] [illegible]hold Who [illegible] [illegible] with Depend[illegible]				
	Adult Caretakers in Household Who Can be Exempt			
State	***Only One Parent***	***All Parents***	***All Adult Relatives***	***All Adults***
Washington				√
West Virginia				√
Wisconsin				√
Wyoming		√		

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.C. State Choices on ABAWD Exemptions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.C. State Choices on New ABAWD Exemption in Balanced Budget Act of 1997

Status of State Implementation Decisions on New ABAWD Exemptions	Number of States[a]
Made a Decision on Implementation of the ABAWD Exemptions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997	37
Currently Implementing	3
Planning to Implement	19
Not Planning to Implement	15
Were Undecided on Implementation of the ABAWD Exemptions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (as of 11/97)	13

[a] The District of Columbia is excluded because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

Table of Contents

State[a]	States Which Have Made a Decision			Undecided States
	Currently Implementing	*Planning to Implement*	*Not Planning to Implement*	
Alabama			√	
Alaska		√		
Arizona				√
Arkansas			√	
California	√			
Colorado		√		
Connecticut		√		
Delaware			√	
Florida				√
Georgia		√		
Hawaii				√
Idaho		√		
Illinois		√		
Indiana			√	
Iowa		√		
Kansas		√		
Kentucky				√
Louisiana				√
Maine	√			
Maryland		√		
Massachusetts			√	
Michigan				√

[a] The District of Columbia is excluded because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

Table of Contents

State	States Which Have Made a Decision			Undecided States
	Currently Implementing	*Planning to Implement*	*Not Planning to Implement*	
Minnesota	√			
Mississippi			√	
Missouri				√
Montana			√	
Nebraska		√		
Nevada		√		
New Hampshire		√		
New Jersey				√
New Mexico			√	
New York		√		
North Carolina		√		
North Dakota			√	
Ohio			√	
Oklahoma			√	
Oregon				√
Pennsylvania				√
Rhode Island		√		
South Carolina		√		
South Dakota		√		
Tennessee				√
Texas				√
Utah		√		
Vermont			√	
Virginia			√	

Table of Contents

State	States Which Have Made a Decision			Undecided States
	Currently Implementing	*Planning to Implement*	*Not Planning to Implement*	
Washington		√		
West Virginia				√
Wisconsin			√	
Wyoming			√	

Table of Contents

Table I-16.
Information by State on
New Policies for 15 Percent ABAWD Exemption
(Among the 22 States That Have Decided to Implement the New Balanced Budget Act Exemption)

State	*Criteria for Exemption*	*Length of Exemption*	*Allocations Among Local Areas*
Alaska	Persons who face substantial physical/mental barriers to work (as judged by their caseworkers), but cannot get documentation for another exemption	Depends on the case	Distributed according to each area's percent of the total State caseload
California	They are not going to have Statewide criteria	Local offices will decide	No decisions have been made
Colorado	Currently exempts those with physical/mental health problems who cannot obtain a written statement. Plan to exempt the homeless.	Indefinite	For homeless exemption only they will allocate based on the proportion of the homeless population in each area
Connecticut	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
Georgia	Homeless people with no mailing address and no affordable means of transportation and who have no recent connection to the workforce	3 months	They are monitoring the numbers, but so far counties are not exceeding the State maximum
Idaho	Must be willing to participate in a workfare program (even if no workfare slots are available at the time)	Depends on the case	Distributed according to each area's percent of the total State caseload
Illinois	Specific geographic areas	12 months	The total allocation will go to four offices in Cook County with areas not covered by the State's FNS-approved waiver.
Iowa	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
Kansas	Undecided	Indefinite	Undecided

Table of Contents

Table I-16. (cont.)
Information by State on
New Policies for 15 Percent ABAWD Exemption
(Among the 22 States That Have Decided to Implement the New Balanced Budget Act Exemption)

State	*Criteria for Exemption*	*Length of Exemption*	*Allocations Among Local Areas*
Maine	Specific geographic areas	Indefinite	Geographically limited
Maryland	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
Minnesota	Persons determined to be unemployable during the employment and training program; women residing in a battered women's shelter; people involved in court-ordered services that keep them from working more than 4 hours a day; and people residing more than 2 hours round-trip from all suitable employment.	Indefinite	Not planning to make local allocations since the State does not expect to reach the 15 percent limit.
Nebraska	Exemptions for people over age 45	Indefinite	Geographically limited
Nevada	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
New Hampshire	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
New York	Undecided	Depends on the case	Undecided
North Carolina	Specific geographic areas	12 months	Undecided
Rhode Island	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
South Carolina	Specific geographic areas	12 months	Undecided
South Dakota	Specific geographic areas	Indefinite	Geographically limited
Utah	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided
Washington	Undecided	Undecided	Undecided

Table of Contents

I.D. Workfare Programs and Policies for ABAWDs

Table of Contents

I.D. Workfare Programs and Policies for ABAWDS

Information by State on Length [illegible] Food [illegible] (Among 25 States [illegible] In [illegible]	[illegible]1-17. [illegible] Workfare Programs Has Been Operating for [illegible] Program Participants [illegible] Workfare Programs for ABAWDS [illegible] of the State)
Workfare Programs Operating for <u>More Than Twelve Months</u>[a] (16 Programs Total)	
State	***Length of Time State Has Been Operating a Workfare Program for Food Stamp Recipients***
Arkansas	Over 8 years
California	At least 10 years
Colorado	Since 1992 or 1993
Florida	11 years in one county, 2 years in another, 9-10 months statewide
Georgia	Since at least 1987
Idaho	Several years in 4 out of 44 counties, becoming statewide in January 1998
Illinois	10 years
Minnesota	17 years
Mississippi	8 years
North Carolina	At least 10 years
New Jersey	Since early 1970s
Nevada	3-4 years
New York	Since 1993
Pennsylvania	10 years
South Dakota	10 years
Wisconsin[b]	Over 5 years

a While these States had workfare programs for food stamp recipients prior to PRWORA they may have expanded scope and/or changed the nature of these programs for ABAWDS.

b Wisconsin's workfare program is in one county only.

Table of Contents

[illegible]
Workfare Programs Operating for Less Than Twelve Months (9 Programs)[c]
State / ***Length of Time State Has Been Operating a Workfare Program for Food Stamp Recipients***
Arizona	11 months
Connecticut	8 months
Michigan	11 months
Nebraska	6 months
New Hampshire	11 months
Ohio	6-7 months
Oregon	9 months
Vermont	8 months
Washington	7 months

[c] South Carolina indicated that it was hoping to offer a workfare program by January 1, 1998.

Table of Contents

Policy	Number of States
Is Workfare Program Participation Mandatory or Voluntary for ABAWDs?	
Mandatory for All	4
Participation is Voluntary	15
Mandatory for Some, Voluntary for Others	4
Policy Varies by Local Program	2
Largest Category of Employers for Workfare Positions[a]:	
Public Organizations	13
Private Nonprofit Organizations	4
Equally Distributed Between Public and Private Employers	5
For-profit Businesses	1
Has Limits on the Number of Months Per a Year that an ABAWD Can Be Enrolled in a Workfare Program	3
Have Self-initiated Workfare Programs for ABAWDs	12
Require Verification of Number of Hours Worked in Self-initiated Workfare Programs	12

[a] Respondents from two States did not know which category of employers was the largest group.

Table of Contents

Table I-19.
Information by State on Workfare Programs for ABAWDS (Among the 25 States Operating Such Programs)

State	*Is Program Mandatory or Voluntary?*				*Largest Category of Workfare Employers*			*Limit on Number of Months Per Year that ABAWDs can be enrolled (if any limits exist)*
	Mandatory for All	*Mandatory for Some*	*Voluntary for All*	*Varies by Local Program*	*Public*	*Private Nonprofit*	*Equal Distri-bution*	
Arizona			√		√			6 months
Arkansas		√			√			
California				√	√			
Colorado		√			√			
Connecticut			√			√		
Florida		√					√	
Georgia			√		√			
Idaho		√					√	
Illinois			√		For-profit Businesses			6 months
Michigan			√			√		
Minnesota			√		√			
Mississippi			√				√	6 months[a]

[a] Mississippi plans to have no limit on workfare participation beginning in early 1998.

Table of Contents

Table I-19 (cont.)
Information by State on Workfare Programs for ABAWDs Under 2002 [illegible] (Including Small Programs)

State	Is Program Mandatory or Voluntary?				Largest Category of Workfare Employers			Limit on Number of Months Per Year that ABAWDs can be enrolled
	Mandatory for All	Mandatory for Some	Voluntary for All	Varies by Local Program	Public	Private Nonprofit	Equal Distri-bution	
Nebraska	√				√			
Nevada			√		√			
New Hampshire			√		√			
New Jersey	√				Did not know which is largest			
New York			√			√		
North Carolina	√				√			
Ohio				√	Did not know which is largest			
Oregon			√		√			
Pennsylvania			√		√			
South Dakota			√			√		
Vermont			√				√	
Washington			√				√	
Wisconsin[b]	√				√			

[b] Program operates in only one county.

Table of Contents

I.E. State Tracking Systems for ABAWDs

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

State	Does State Require Verification of the Number of Hours Worked?	How Does State Require Documentation of Hours in Self-Initiated Workfare Programs?
California	Yes	Counties decide
Colorado	Yes	All types of verification accepted
Connecticut	Yes	Direct contact with agency where ABAWD is placed
Florida	Yes	There are two forms. A time sheet signed by a supervisor and a job description/agreement
Georgia	Yes	Specific attendance sheet form filled out by employer
Illinois	Yes	Form completed by employer
Michigan	Yes	Specific form
Minnesota	Yes	Either written form or telephone verification
North Carolina	Yes	Time sheet filled out by employer
New Hampshire	Yes	No Information Provided
Ohio	Yes	Form approved by FNS is provided to recipient. Employer is responsible for returning it to the county.
Oregon	Yes	Employer is asked to provide documentation for client to bring to caseworker.

Table of Contents

I.E. State Tracking Systems for ABAWDS

Summary of Methods States to Track ABAWDs	
State Methods to Track ABAWDs	***Number of States[a]***
Length of Typical Certification Period for Households with ABAWDS:[b]	
Three Months or Less	25
Longer than Three Months	21
Typical Certification Periods Vary in Length	3
Type of System Used to Determine Whether a Client Subject to the ABAWD Requirement has Exceeded His or Her Time Limit:	
Automated System	25
Combination of Automated and Manual System	16
Manual System	9
Intrastate Tracking Systems for ABAWDs: [c]	
State Has a System	34
State is Planning a System	12
State is Not Planning to Have a System	4

a The District of Columbia is excluded because the entire jurisdiction is exempt from the ABAWD provision under a waiver.

b The Iowa respondents did not know the length of the typical certification period for ABAWDs

c No State reported having or planning any formal systems to track ABAWDs across State lines.

Table of Contents

Table 1-22
Information by State on Methods Used to Track ABAWDs

State[a]	Length of Typical Certification Period for Households with ABAWDS in Months			Type of System Used to Determine Whether a Client Subject to ABAWD Requirements has Exceeded His or Her Time Limit			Intrastate System for Tracking ABAWDS		
	3 Or Less	*More than 3*	*Varies in Length*	*Automated*	*Combination*	*Manual*	*Has a System*	*Planning a System*	*Not Planning a System*
Alabama		√				√		√	
Alaska		√				√	√		
Arizona	√			√			√		
Arkansas		√		√					√
California		√		√			√		
Colorado		√		√			√		
Connecticut	√			√				√	
Delaware		√		√			√		
Florida	√			√			√		
Georgia	√				√		√		
Hawaii		√				√		√	
Idaho	√				√		√		
Illinois	√			√			√		

[a] The District of Columbia is excluded because the entire jurisdiction is covered under a ABAWD waiver.

Table of Contents

Table I-22. (cont.)
Information by State on Methods Used to Track ABAWDs

State	*Length of Typical Certification Period for Households with ABAWDS in Months*			*Type of System Used to Determine Whether a Client Subject to ABAWD Requirements has Exceeded His or Her Time Limit*			*Intrastate System for Tracking ABAWDS*		
	3 Or Less	*More than 3*	*Varies in Length*	*Automated*	*Combination*	*Manual*	*Has a System*	*Planning a System*	*Not Planning a System*
Indiana		√		√			√		
Iowa	Did not know					√		√	
Kansas		√			√		√		
Kentucky		√		√					
Louisiana	√			√					
Maine	√				√				
Maryland	√				√				√
Massachusetts	√				√		√		
Michigan	√				√		√		
Minnesota		√		√			√		
Mississippi			√	√			√		
Missouri	√			√			√		
Montana	√				√				√
Nebraska		√				√		√	
Nevada		√		√				√	

Table of Contents

Table 1-22 (cont.)
Information by State on Selected Topics, 2002

State	Length of Typical Certification Period for Households with ABAWDS in Months			Type of System Used to Determine Whether a Client Subject to ABAWD Requirements has Exceeded His or Her Time Limit			Intrastate System for Tracking ABAWDS		
	3 Or Less	*More than 3*	*Varies in Length*	*Automated*	*Combination*	*Manual*	*Has a System*	*Planning a System*	*Not Planning a System*
New Hampshire	√					√		√	
New Jersey	√					√		√	
New Mexico	√					√		√	
New York	√				√			√	
North Carolina		√			√		√		
North Dakota		√			√		√		
Ohio		√		√					√
Oklahoma	√			√			√		
Oregon			√		√		√		
Pennsylvania	√				√		√		
Rhode Island		√		√			√		
South Carolina		√				√		√	
South Dakota		√		√			√		
Tennessee	√			√			√		
Texas	√			√			√		

Table of Contents

State	Length of Typical Certification Period for Households with ABAWDS in Months			Type of System Used to Determine Whether a Client Subject to ABAWD Requirements has Exceeded His or Her Time Limit			Intrastate System for Tracking ABAWDS		
	3 Or Less	*More than 3*	*Varies in Length*	*Automated*	*Combination*	*Manual*	*Has a System*	*Planning a System*	*Not Planning a System*
Utah		√			√			√	
Vermont		√		√			√		
Virginia	√				√		√		
Washington	√			√			√		
West Virginia			√	√			√		
Wisconsin	√				√		√		
Wyoming	√			√			√		

I.F. Follow-up Studies on Disqualified ABAWDs

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.F. Follow-up Studies on Disqualified ABAWDS

State	*Description of Information Collection Planned*
Alaska	The State plans to collect information on a very informal basis.
Idaho	The State intends to conduct a survey or other person-to-person follow-up. The State is interested in collecting information on disqualified ABAWDs' education and job readiness levels.
Iowa	No specific plans yet
Maine	The State legislature requested a study by a contractor, but provided no funds. Thus, the State will need public or private funding before they begin. Plans are still unclear but respondent indicated that the State is interested in looking at the effect of the ABAWD requirements on Maine's economy and on non-profit social service organizations that provide community service jobs to fulfill the ABAWD work requirements.
Missouri	The University of Missouri is currently conducting a mixed-mode survey (telephone survey with an in-person component for individuals who cannot be reached by telephone). This will be a set of one-time interviews with approximately 500 persons who were disqualified in the first six months. The findings from the survey will be provided to the State in early 1998. Survey includes questions on life circumstances such as whether the respondent has had to move and food availability after disqualification.
New York	The State collects information through its automated welfare management system. This includes information on ABAWD status and on when each disqualified ABAWD has lost or reestablished eligibility.
South Carolina	State plans to conduct a monthly telephone survey with randomly selected disqualified households. The State is not yet sure what information will be collected or by whom, but the information collected is likely to include data on ABAWDs' work status, changes in household composition, and residence. The State is currently conducting a similar follow-up survey on disqualified TANF households.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.G. State Data on ABAWDs

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

I.G. State Data on ABAWDs

State	Number of Participants Waived	Source of Estimate
Alaska	900	Automated system
Colorado	220	Automated system
Florida	14,971	Automated system
Georgia	1,491	Automated system
Hawaii	3,636	Manual review of case records
Illinois	46,000	Automated system
Indiana	797	Automated system
Kentucky	26,656	Automated system
Maine	2,595	Estimate is based on a snapshot of the food stamp caseload in August 1996 and last year's FNS estimate of the total number of ABAWDs in the State.
Maryland	10,749	Automated system
Minnesota	1,116	Automated system
Missouri	4,000	Automated system
Nebraska	64	Automated system
Nevada	4,800	Automated system
New Jersey	29,969	Manual review of case records
New York	75,000	Automated system
North Carolina	Did not provide an estimate	Manual review of case records
Oklahoma	2,472	Automated system
Oregon	2,000	Automated system
Pennsylvania	32,981	Automated system
Rhode Island	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
South Carolina	7,476	Automated system

Table of Contents

State	Number of Participants Waived	Source of Estimate
South Dakota	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Tennessee	10,159	Automated system
Texas	12,144	Automated system
Vermont	39	Automated system. (Note that the estimate is based on automated participant data adjusted by State population figures.)
Virginia	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Washington	34,282	State uses a combination of automated systems to calculate this estimate.

Table of Contents

State	Number of Participants Subject to ABAWD Work Requirements	Source of Estimate
Alaska	1,100	Automated system
Colorado	3,404	Automated system
Delaware	2,000	Automated system
Florida	23,546	Automated system
Georgia	8,721	Automated system
Hawaii	1,834	Manual review of case records
Idaho	931	Automated system
Illinois	3,000	Automated system
Indiana	2,004	Automated system
Iowa	1,879	Automated and manual system: State by had to pull out data on participants fitting the ABAWD characteristics because the system has no special code for ABAWDs.
Kentucky	27,738	Automated system
Louisiana	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Maine	4,542	Estimate based on FNS quality control data for FY 1996.
Maryland	12,942	Automated system
Michigan	31,577	Automated system
Minnesota	8,356	Automated system
Mississippi	7,289	Automated system
Missouri	3,000	Automated system
Nebraska	2,100	Automated system
New Hampshire	800	Manual review of case records

Table of Contents

State	Number of Participants Subject to ABAWD Work Requirements	Source of Estimate
New Jersey	8,291	A combination of automated system and manual review of case records
New York	15,000	Automated system
North Carolina	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Oklahoma	14,000	Automated system
Oregon	6,500	Automated system
Rhode Island	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
South Dakota	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Tennessee	25,624	Automated system
Texas	76,960	Automated system
Vermont	500	Automated system
Virginia	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Washington	2,400	Estimate is based on the proportion of the caseload who fit the criteria of ABAWDs subject to the work requirement one year ago with an adjustment for difference between the caseload then and the caseload in October 1997.
Wisconsin	7,673	Automated system

Table of Contents

State	Cumulative Number of Participants Disqualified Due to ABAWD Requirements	Source of Estimate
Alaska	600	Automated system
Arkansas	2,814	Manual review of case records
Colorado	405	Automated system
Connecticut	6,155	Automated system
Delaware	970	Automated system
Georgia	234	Automated system
Hawaii	Did not provide an estimate	Manual review of case records
Idaho	517	Ad hoc automated reporting system
Indiana	2,289	Automated system
Iowa	2,624	Automated system
Kansas	1,093	Automated system
Kentucky	5,231	Automated system
Louisiana	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Maine	4,000	Automated system. The State receives a weekly printout that lists disqualifications by type. They can identify which ones have been identified as ABAWDs. However, this estimate may be high if an ABAWD was disqualified more than once for different reasons.
Maryland	1,906	Automated system
Michigan	7,631	Automated system
Minnesota	8,467	Automated system
Mississippi	Did not provide an estimate	State respondent indicated that the cumulative total was expected to be available in mid-December 1997.

Table of Contents

State	Cumulative Number of Participants Disqualified Due to ABAWD Requirements	Source of Estimate
Missouri	2,300	Automated system
Nebraska	425	Automated system
New Jersey	800	Manual review of case records
New York	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
North Dakota	500	Automated system
Ohio	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Oklahoma	7,000	Automated system
Pennsylvania	Did not provide a cumulative estimate	Automated system
Rhode Island	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
South Dakota	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Tennessee	15,599	Automated system
Utah	1,248	Automated system. (Based on a computer report on closed cases.)
Vermont	1,500	Automated system

Table of Contents

State	Number of ABAWDs Working at Least 20 Hours Per Week	Source of Estimate
Colorado	186	Automated system
Delaware	446	Automated system
Hawaii	435	Manual review of case records
Indiana	114	Automated system
Kentucky	533	Automated system
Massachusetts	350	Manual review of case records
Michigan	5,800	No response provided
Minnesota	732	Automated system
Mississippi	1,265	Automated system
Missouri	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Nebraska	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Ohio	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Oregon	160	Automated system
Rhode Island	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
South Dakota	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Tennessee	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Texas	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system

Table of Contents

State	Number of ABAWD Participants in an E & T Programs	Source of Estimate
Colorado	273	Automated system
Connecticut	38	Manual review of case records
Delaware	96	Automated system
Hawaii	Did not provide an estimate	Manual review of case records
Indiana	186	Automated system
Kentucky	101	Automated system
Massachusetts	400	Manual review of case records
Michigan	1,680	Automated system
Minnesota	343	Combination of automated system and a manual review of case records
Mississippi	100	Automated system
Missouri	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
New Jersey	2,068	Manual review of case records
Ohio	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Oregon	200 (JTPA only)	Manual review of case records based on participation in JTPA only. This estimate is likely an underestimate since it only counts ABAWDs participating in JTPA slots.
South Dakota	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Tennessee	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Texas	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Vermont	55	Manual review of case records

Table of Contents

State	Number of Participants in Workfare	Source of Estimate
Colorado	72	Automated system
Connecticut	25	Manual review of case records
Florida	74	Automated system
Illinois	5,000[a]	Automated system
Minnesota	361	Combination of automated system and manual review of case records
Mississippi	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Nebraska	243	Automated system
New Jersey	500	Manual review of case records
North Carolina	Did not provide an estimate	Manual review of case records conducted by counties, who then report the information to the State
Ohio	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Oregon	90	Automated system
South Dakota	Did not provide an estimate	Automated system
Vermont	13	Manual review of case records
Washington	300	State Department of Employment Security compiles data from individual field offices and provides totals to the Food Stamp Program
Wisconsin	50	Based on report from the county that operates the only workfare program in the State.

[a] Illinois' workfare program for ABAWDs is in Chicago and was designed for food stamp recipients who collect General Assistance. Chicago is exempt from the ABAWD requirements.

Table of Contents

II. State Choices on Food Stamp Program Sanctions

Table of Contents

II.A. Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) Options

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

II. State Choices on Food Stamp Program Sanctions

II.A. Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) Sanctions

Policy	Number of States
Sanction for Individual Head of Household or Whole Household if Individual Head of Household Does Not Comply with FSET Requirements	
State Disqualifies the Entire Household	21
State Sometimes Disqualifies the Whole Household and Sometimes the Individual Head of Household	3
State Only Disqualifies the Head of Household	27
Existence of Intrastate Tracking System on FSET Sanctions:	
State Has a Tracking System	42
State is Planning a Tracking System	4
State Does Not Plan to Track This Information	5

Table of Contents

Table II-2.
Information by State on
Food Stamp Employment & Training (FSET) Sanction Choices
and Estimates of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month

State	*Who is Disqualified When the Head of Household Fails to Comply with the Employment and Training Requirement?*			*Number of Individual Heads of Household Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*		*Number of Entire Households Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*	
	Entire Household	*Varies by Case*	*Individual Head of Household Only*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*[a]	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*[a]
Alabama	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
Alaska			√	50	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Arizona	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
Arkansas			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
California			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
Colorado			√	1,955	1,448	Not applicable	
Connecticut			√	18	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Delaware	√			Not applicable		120	Can't distinguish
District of Columbia			√	58	58	Not applicable	
Florida	√			Not applicable		3,385	Can't distinguish

[a] "Can't distinguish" in this column is used when the State respondent indicated that they are unable to distinguish between first-time violators and repeat violators when providing an estimate of the number of individuals or households disqualified for failing to comply with E & T program requirements.

Table of Contents

Table II-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
Food Stamp Employment & Training (FSET) Sanction Choices
and Estimates of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month

State	*Who is Disqualified When the Head of Household Fails to Comply with the Employment and Training Requirement?*			*Number of Individual Heads of Household Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*		*Number of Entire Households Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*	
	Entire Household	*Varies by Case*	*Individual Head of Household Only*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*
Georgia	√			Not applicable		1,607	Can't distinguish
Hawaii			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
Idaho	√[b]			Not applicable		135	Can't distinguish
Illinois		√[c]		1,600[d]	Can't distinguish	1,600[d]	Can't distinguish
Indiana			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
Iowa			√	97	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Kansas	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
Kentucky			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
Louisiana	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know

b In February or March of 1998 Idaho will begin sanctioning only the individual head of household.

c Respondent indicated that the local field offices decide whether the individual or household is disqualified.

d Count is number of cases with either a household or individual disqualification. Illinois cannot distinguish between types of disqualifications in this count.

Table of Contents

Table II-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
Food Stamp Employment & Training (FSET) Sanction Choices
and Estimates of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month

State	*Who is Disqualified When the Head of Household Fails to Comply with the Employment and Training Requirement?*			*Number of Individual Heads of Household Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*		*Number of Entire Households Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*	
	Entire Household	*Varies by Case*	*Individual Head of Household Only*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*
Maine	√			Not applicable		32	Can't distinguish
Maryland			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
Massachusetts		√[e]		Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
Michigan			√	73	72	Not applicable	
Minnesota		√[f]		Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
Mississippi	√			Not applicable		212	Can't distinguish
Missouri			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
Montana			√	Don't know	--	Not applicable	
Nebraska	√			Not applicable		265	Can't distinguish

[e] For the first and second FSET violation, only the individual head of household is disqualified. For the third FSET violation, Massachusetts disqualifies the entire household for 6 months and the individual for 12 months.

[f] Minnesota disqualifies the entire household if the head of household is the primary wage earner and only the individual head of household in the less common cases when he or she is not the primary wage earner.

Table of Contents

Table II-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
Food Stamp Employment & Training (FSET) Sanction Choices
and Estimates of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month

State	*Who is Disqualified When the Head of Household Fails to Comply with the Employment and Training Requirement?*			*Number of Individual Heads of Household Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*		*Number of Entire Households Disqualified in a Typical Months Due to FSET Sanctions*	
	Entire Household	*Varies by Case*	*Individual Head of Household Only*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*
Nevada			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
New Hampshire			√	67	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
New Jersey	√			Not applicable		500	486
New Mexico	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
New York			√	500	Don't know	Not applicable	
North Carolina			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	
North Dakota	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
Ohio	√[g]			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
Oklahoma	√			Not applicable		447	Can't distinguish
Oregon			√	12	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Pennsylvania			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	

[g] In 1998, Ohio will begin sanctioning only the individual.

Table of Contents

Table II-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
Food Stamp Employment & Training (FSET) Sanction Choices
and Estimates of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month

State	*Who is Disqualified When the Head of Household Fails to Comply with the Employment and Training Requirement?*			*Number of Individual Heads of Household Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*		*Number of Entire Households Disqualified in a Typical Months Due to FSET Sanctions*	
	Entire Household	*Varies by Case*	*Individual Head of Household Only*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*
Rhode Island	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
South Carolina	√			Not applicable		341	Can't distinguish
South Dakota			√	80	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Tennessee			√	1,385	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Texas	√			Not applicable		Could not provide within time limits of survey	
Utah	√			Not applicable		Don't know	Don't know
Vermont			√	90	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	
Virginia	√			Not applicable		Could not provide within time limits of survey	
Washington			√	Could not provide within time limits of survey		Not applicable	
West Virginia			√	Don't know	Don't know	Not applicable	

Table of Contents

Table II-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
Food Stamp Employment & Training (FSET) Sanction Choices
and Estimates of Persons/Households Sanctioned in a Typical Month

State	*Who is Disqualified When the Head of Household Fails to Comply with the Employment and Training Requirement?*			*Number of Individual Heads of Household Disqualified in a Typical Month Due to FSET Sanctions*		*Number of Entire Households Disqualified in a Typical Months Due to FSET Sanctions*	
	Entire Household	*Varies by Case*	*Individual Head of Household Only*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*	*Estimated Total*	*Estimated Number of First-Time Violators*
Wisconsin			√	Don't know[h]	Don't know	Not applicable	
Wyoming			√	86	Can't distinguish	Not applicable	

[h] Wisconsin will be putting a new tracking program in place by January 1998 that will be able to access information on the number disqualified and will be able to distinguish first-time from repeat violators.

Table of Contents

Table II-3.
Information by State on
Duration of Sanctions for the Violation of Food Stamp Employment and Training Requirements

State	*1st Violation*		*2nd Violation*		*3rd Violation*	
	Minimum	*Maximum*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*
Alabama	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Alaska	1 month	1 month	3 months	3 months	6 months	6 months
Arizona	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Arkansas	Until compliance	3 months	6 months	6 months	12 months	12 months
California	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Colorado	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Connecticut	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Permanent	Permanent
Delaware	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
District of Columbia	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Florida	1 month	1 month[a]	3 months	3 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Georgia	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Hawaii	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Idaho	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Illinois	Until compliance	2 months	Until compliance	2 months	Until compliance	2 months
Indiana	2 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance

[a] These maximum sanctions are for the whole household. Heads of households are disqualified until compliance.

Table of Contents

Table II-3. (cont.)
Information by State on
Duration of Sanctions for the Violation of Food Stamp Employment and Training Requirements

State	1st Violation		2nd Violation		3rd Violation	
	Minimum	*Maximum*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*
Iowa	2 months	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Kansas	Until compliance	Until compliance	2 months	Until compliance	2 months	Until compliance
Kentucky	2 months	Until compliance	4 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Louisiana	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Maine	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Maryland	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Massachusetts[b]	3 months	3 months	6 months	6 months	12 months	12 months
Michigan	1 month	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Minnesota	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Mississippi	2 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Missouri	Until compliance	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Montana	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Nebraska	1 month	1 month[a]	3 months	3 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Nevada	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
New Hampshire	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance

b For the first and second FSET violation, only the individual head of household is disqualified. For the third FSET violation, Massachusetts disqualifies the entire household for 6 months and the individual for 12 months.

Table of Contents

Table II-3. (cont.)
Information by State on
Duration of Sanctions for the Violation of Food Stamp Employment and Training Requirements

State	1st Violation		2nd Violation		3rd Violation	
	Minimum	*Maximum*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*	*Minimum*	*Maximum*
New Jersey	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	Permanent[c]
New Mexico	Until compliance	2 months[a]	Until compliance	6 months[a]	Until compliance	Permanent[c]
New York	2 months	Until compliance	4 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
North Carolina	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
North Dakota	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Ohio	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Oklahoma	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Oregon	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Pennsylvania	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Rhode Island	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
South Carolina	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
South Dakota	1 month	1 month	6 months	6 months	12 months	12 months
Tennessee	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance
Texas	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Utah	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance

[c] These maximum sanctions are for the individual. The maximum sanction for the whole household in these two States is six months.

Table of Contents

Table II-3. (cont.)
Information by State on
Duration of Sanctions for the Violation of Food Stamp Employment and Training Requirements

	1st Violation		*2nd Violation*		*3rd Violation*	
State	***Minimum***	***Maximum***	***Minimum***	***Maximum***	***Minimum***	***Maximum***
Vermont	1 month	1 month	3 months	3 months	6 months	6 months
Virginia	1 month	6 months[a]	3 months	6 months[a]	6 months	6 months[a]
Washington	1 month	Until compliance	2 months	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance
West Virginia	3 months	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance
Wisconsin	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance
Wyoming	1 month	Until compliance	3 months	Until compliance	6 months	Until compliance

Table of Contents

Table II-4. States with Minimum FSET Suspension Periods Longer Than Federal Minimum Requirements Or With Permanent Disqualification For the 3rd FSET Violation	
Arkansas	Michigan
Connecticut	Mississippi
Indiana	New Jersey
Iowa	New Mexico
Kentucky	New York
Louisiana	South Dakota
Massachusetts	West Virginia

II.B. New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions (Non-FSET)

Table of Contents

Table II-5.
Number of States Choosing Each of Five New Optional Food Stamp Sanctions

Optional Sanction Policy	*Number of States*
Comparable Disqualification of Food Stamp Participants If They Fail to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-tested Programs	13
Reduction of Food Stamp Benefits for Non-compliance With TANF Rules	7
Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate With State Child Support Agency	7
Disqualification of Parents Who Are in Arrears on Child Support	3
Sanction of Food Stamp Households If the Adult Fails to Ensure Children Attend School	4

Table of Contents

Table II-6.
States Choosing New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions

State	*Food Stamp Sanction*				
	Comparable Disqualification For Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-tested Programs	*Reduction of Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*	*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency*	*Disqualification for Being In Arrears on Child Support*	*Benefit Reduction or Disqualification for Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arizona	√				
Arkansas					
California	√				
Colorado					
Connecticut		√			
Delaware[a]					
District of Columbia					
Florida					
Georgia					
Hawaii					

[a] Delaware is requesting permission from FNS to implement a mix of benefit reductions and disqualifications for TANF violations.

Table of Contents

Table II-6. (cont.)
States Choosing New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions

State	Food Stamp Sanction				
	Comparable Disqualification For Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-tested Programs	*Reduction of Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*	*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency*	*Disqualification for Being In Arrears on Child Support*	*Benefit Reduction or Disqualification for Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*
Idaho[b]	√		√		
Illinois	√				
Indiana					
Iowa		√			
Kansas	√		√		
Kentucky		√			√
Louisiana					
Maine	√		√		
Maryland					
Massachusetts					
Michigan	√	√	√		
Minnesota					

b Prior to November 1997, Idaho had implemented the comparable disqualification option, but was moving to a Simplified Food Stamp Program under which they will still have a comparable disqualification for violation of a TANF work requirement.

Table of Contents

Table II-6. (cont.)
States Choosing New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions

State	*Food Stamp Sanction*				
	Comparable Disqualification For Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-tested Programs	*Reduction of Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*	*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency*	*Disqualification for Being In Arrears on Child Support*	*Benefit Reduction or Disqualification for Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*
Mississippi	√	√	√		√
Missouri					
Montana		√			
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey					
New Mexico					
New York					√
North Carolina					
North Dakota	√				
Ohio	√		√	√	
Oklahoma				√	
Oregon					

Table of Contents

Table II-6. (cont.)
States Choosing New Optional Food Stamp Program Sanctions

State	Food Stamp Sanction				
	Comparable Disqualification For Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-tested Programs	*Reduction of Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*	*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency*	*Disqualification for Being In Arrears on Child Support*	*Benefit Reduction or Disqualification for Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*
Pennsylvania					
Rhode Island					
South Carolina					
South Dakota	√				
Tennessee	√	√			
Texas					
Utah					
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia					
Wisconsin			√	√	
Wyoming	√				√

Table of Contents

Table II-7.
State Estimates of Participants In a Typical Month Who Are Newly Subject to An Optional Food Stamp Sanction (Among the 20 States Choosing One or More of the Optional Sanctions)[a]

State	*Food Stamp Sanction*					
	Comparable Disqualification for Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-Tested Programs	*Reduction in Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*	*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency*	*Disqualification for Being In Arrears on Child Support*	*Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*	
					Reduction	*Disqualification*
Arizona	Don't know	--	--	--	--	--
California	Don't know	--	--	--	--	--
Connecticut	Don't know	--	--	--	--	--
Idaho	Don't know	--	Don't know	--	--	--
Illinois	2,300	--	--	--	--	--
Iowa	--	--	--	--	--	--
Kansas	Don't know		81	--	--	--
Kentucky	--	Don't know	--	--	Don't know	--
Maine	8	--	Don't know	--	--	--
Michigan	359	318	140	--	--	--
Mississippi	--	113	21	--	--	31

[a] For sanctions not selected by a State there is a notation of "--".

Table of Contents

Table II-7. (cont.)
State Estimates of Participants In a Typical Month Who Are Newly Subject to An Optional Food Stamp Sanction
(Among the 20 States Choosing One or More of the Optional Sanctions)

State	*Food Stamp Sanction*					
	Comparable Disqualification for Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-Tested Programs	*Reduction in Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*	*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency*	*Disqualification for Being In Arrears on Child Support*	*Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*	
					Reduction	*Disqualification*
Montana	--	Don't know	--	--	--	--
New York	--	--	--	--	Don't know	--
North Dakota	Don't know	Don't know	--	--	--	--
Ohio	Don't know	--	Don't know	Don't know	--	--
Oklahoma	--	--	--	Don't know	--	--
South Dakota	Don't know	--	--	--	--	--
Tennessee	--	1,717	--	--	--	--
Wisconsin	--	--	Don't know	Don't know	--	--
Wyoming	Don't know	--	--	--	Don't know	--

Table of Contents

Table II-8.
Information by State on
Requirements of Other Means-Tested Programs For Which Violation Results in Comparable Food Stamp Disqualification
(Among the 13 States Choosing This Option)

State	*TANF Requirements*							*Other Programs*
	Work Require-ment	*Child Immunization Requirement*	*School Attendance*	*Non-Work Related Classes*	*Requirements Specific to Minor Parents*	*Missed Appointments*	*Other (Specified Below)*	*General Assistance or Other Program Requirements (Specified Below)*
Arizona								√[a]
California	√							√[b]
Idaho	√							
Illinois						√	√[c]	
Kansas	√				√			
Maine	√			√	√			√[d]
Michigan	√[e]		√		√			

[a] Medical Assistance (MA) recipients (including those who qualify by virtue of being pregnant) who fail to cooperate with child support authorities are disqualified from receiving both MA and Food Stamps.

[b] Violation of a GA work requirement.

[c] Failure to submit required forms.

[d] Violation of a GA work requirement, altering a voucher, or lying.

[e] Comparable disqualification only occurs if the head of household has failed to cooperate after 4 months of benefit reduction sanctions.

Table of Contents

Table II-8. (cont.)
Requirements of Other Means-Tested Programs For Which Violation Results in Comparable Food Stamp Disqualification
(Among the 13 States Choosing This Option)

State	*TANF Requirements*							*Other Programs*
	Work Require-ment	*Child Immunization Requirement*	*School Attendance*	*Non-Work Related Classes*	*Requirements Specific to Minor Parents*	*Missed Appointments*	*Other (Specified Below)*	*General Assistance or Other Program Requirements (Specified Below)*
Mississippi	√[f]							
North Dakota	√		√		√			
Ohio	√	√					√[g]	
South Dakota	√[h]		√	√			√[i]	
Tennessee	√[j]							
Wyoming	√		√	√	√	√		
Total No. of States	11	1	4	3	5	2	3	3

[f] Mississippi is currently reconsidering this option.

[g] Violation of a provision of a required personal contract between caseworker and client.

[h] The only type of work requirement violation that results in a comparable food stamp disqualification is a voluntary quit.

[i] Comparable disqualifications other than those for voluntary quit are limited to 16-17 year olds who violate requirements specified in a personal contract (e.g. attendance at school or other non-work related classes).

[j] TANF/food stamp participants are subject to comparable disqualification for noncompliance with the TANF work requirement only if they are not exempt from food stamp work requirements. The comparable disqualification period is longer than the State's FSET sanction period. TANF/food stamp households that are exempt from food stamp work requirements have their benefits reduced for non-compliance with TANF work requirements.

Table of Contents

Table II-9.
Information by State on
Length of Minimum Food Stamp Disqualification for Violating Requirements of Other Mean-Tested Programs
(Among the 13 States Choosing This Option)[a]

	TANF Requirements							*Other Programs*
State	*Work Requirement*	*Child Immunization Requirement*	*School Attendance*	*Non-Work Related Classes*	*Requirements Specific to Minor Parents*	*Missed Appointments*	*Other (Specified in Table II-7)*	*General Assistance or Other Program Requirements (Specified in Table II-7)*
Arizona	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	None
California	Until compliance for 1st violation, 3 months for 2nd, and 6 for 3rd	--	--	--	--	--	--	Decisions about the GA program are left up to the counties
Idaho	Not available	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Illinois	--	--	--	--	--	None	None	--
Kansas	Until compliance for 1st violation, 2 months for subsequent	--	--	--	None	--	--	--

[a] Those TANF requirements for which violation does not result in comparable food stamp disqualification by the State, there is a notation of "--".

Table of Contents

Table II-9. (cont.)
Length of Minimum Food Stamp Disqualification for Violating Requirements of Other Mean-Tested Programs
(Among the 13 States Choosing This Option)

State	*TANF Requirements*							*Other Programs*
	Work Requirement	*Child Immunization Requirement*	*School Attendance*	*Non-Work Related Classes*	*Requirements Specific to Minor Parents*	*Missed Appointments*	*Other (Specified in Table II-7)*	*General Assistance or Other Program Requirements (Specified in Table II-7)*
Maine	None	--	--	None	None	--	--	None
Michigan	1 month[b]	--	1 month	--	1 month	--	--	--
Mississippi	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
North Dakota	1 month for 1st viol., 3 months for 2nd and 6 months for 3rd	--	None	--	None	--	--	--
Ohio	1 month for 1st viol., 3 months for 2nd, and 6 months for 3rd	1 month for 1st viol., 3 months for 2nd, and 6 months for 3rd	--	--	--	--	1 month for 1st viol., 3 months for 2nd, and 6 for 3rd	--
South Dakota	3 months	--	None	None	--	--	None	--
Tennessee	3 months	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wyoming	1 months	--	1 month	1 month	1 month	1 month	--	--

[b] Disqualification only occurs if the head of household has failed to cooperate after 4 months of benefit reduction.

Table of Contents

Table II-10.
Information by State on
TANF Requirements for Which Violation Result in a Food Stamp Benefit Reduction
(Among the Seven States Choosing This Sanction Option)

State	*TANF Requirements*						
	Work Requirement	*Child Immunization Requirement*	*School Attendance Requirement*	*Non-Work Related Classes*	*Requirements Specific to Minor Parents*	*Missed Appointments*	*Other (Specified Below)*
Connecticut	√						
Iowa	√[a]						√[b]
Kentucky		√	√		√		√[c]
Michigan	√[d]						
Mississippi	√	√	√[e]				
Montana	√	√		√	√	√	√[f]

[a] Iowa reduces benefits for violation of the client's "social contract" with the State. These contracts generally include provisions related to work requirements.

[b] Failure to comply with any condition in a client's personal contract. These conditions can differ by client.

[c] Failure to comply with child support and failure to apply for other benefits for which individual is eligible.

[d] If the head of household fails to cooperate after 4 months of benefit reduction the sanction is increased to a comparable disqualification.

[e] For minor parents only.

[f] Non-cooperation with child support

Table of Contents

Table II-10. (cont.)
Information by State on
TANF Requirements for Which Violation Result in a Food Stamp Benefit Reduction
(Among the Seven States Choosing This Sanction Option)

State	*TANF Requirements*						
	Work Requirement	*Child Immunization Requirement*	*School Attendance Requirement*	*Non-Work Related Classes*	*Requirements Specific to Minor Parents*	*Missed Appointments*	*Other (Specified Below)*
Tennessee	√[g]	√	√	√	√		√[h]
Total No. of States	6	4	3	2	3	1	4

[g] The reduction applies to TANF/food stamp households not subject to food stamp work requirements. Other TANF/Food Stamp households are subject to comparable disqualification from TANF and food stamps for violating TANF work requirements.

[h] Failure to comply with any requirement in their "work responsibility plan."

Table of Contents

Table II-11.
Characteristics of Food Stamp Benefit Reductions Imposed for Noncompliance with TANF Rules
(Among the Seven States Choosing This Option)

State	*When is Reduction Imposed?*		*Percentage Reduction in Food Stamp Benefits*
	Based on Income Before TANF Penalty is Imposed	*Based on Income After TANF Penalty is Imposed*	
Connecticut		√	20% reduction
Iowa	√		10% reduction
Kentucky		√	25% reduction
Michigan		√	25% reduction
Mississippi		√	25% reduction
Montana		√	25% reduction
Tennessee		√	20% reduction[a]

[a] The food stamp benefit reduction changed to 10% in December 1997.

Table of Contents

Table II-12.
Information by State on
Sanction Policy Choices for Parents Who Are in Arrears in Paying
Court-Ordered Child Support
(Among the Three States Choosing This Sanction Option)

State	*Does Sanction Apply Only to Food Stamp with TANF Cases?*	*Definition of "In Arrears"*
Ohio	Yes	Determined by child support agency
Oklahoma	No, also applies to food stamp only cases	Payments are one month late
Wisconsin	No, also applies to food stamp only cases	Payments are three months late

Table of Contents

Table II-13.
Information by State on
Sanction Policy Choices for Parents Failing to Cooperate with State Child Support Agency
(Among the Seven States Choosing This Sanction Option)

State	*Does Sanction Apply Only to Food Stamp with TANF Cases?*	*Does Sanction Apply to Non-Custodial Parents?*	*Minimum Length of Disqualification*	*Definition of Failure to Cooperate*	*Definition of Good Cause*
Idaho	No, also applies to food stamp only cases.	No	No	Client must provide name and identifying information for absent parent	If child conceived as a result of rape or incest or if there is fear of violence from absent parent
Kansas	Yes	No	Yes, varies by case	Defined by child support agency	Same as in old AFDC rules
Maine	No, also applies to food stamp only cases.	Yes	No minimum	Defined by child support agency	If child conceived as a result of rape or incest, if cooperation could result in physical or emotional harm, or if adoption pending or being contemplated
Michigan[a]	No, also applies to food stamp only cases.	No	No minimum	Defined by child support worker	Possibility of physical or emotional harm to the child or parent
Mississippi	No, also applies to food stamp only cases.	Yes	No minimum	Defined by child support agency	Defined by child support agency
Ohio	Yes	No	Yes, varies by case	Defined by child support agency	Defined by child support agency
Wisconsin	No, also applies to food stamp only cases.	Yes	No minimum	Defined by child support agency	If child conceived as the result of rape or incest. Child or parent at risk of physical or emotional harm

[a] If the parent does not cooperate within four months the disqualification becomes permanent.

Table of Contents

Table II-14.
Information by State on
Food Stamp Sanction Policy Choices for Adults Failing to Ensure that Minor Dependent Children are Attending School
(Among the Four States Choosing This Sanction Option)

State	*Does Sanction Apply Only to Food Stamp with TANF Cases?*	*Minimum Length of Disqualification*	*Extent of the Sanction*
Kentucky	Yes	--	Benefits reduced by 25%
Mississippi	Yes	--	Benefits reduced by 25%
New York	Yes	No minimum	Adults disqualified
Wyoming	Yes	One month	Adults disqualified

Table of Contents

Table II-15.
Information by State on Status of Intrastate Systems Used to Track Sanctioned Individuals and/or Households
(Among the 20 States Imposing at Least One of the Optional Food Stamp Sanctions)

State	*Tracking System Within States for Each Optional Food Stamp Sanction Provision*[a]											
	Comparable Disqualification for Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-Tested Programs			*Reduction in Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*			*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency or for Being In Arrears on Child Support*			*Disqualification or Reduction in Benefits for Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*		
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*	*Existing System*	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*	*Existing System*	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*	*Existing System*	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*
Arizona	√			Not applicable			Not applicable			Not applicable		
California	No information available			Not applicable			Not applicable			Not applicable		
Connecticut	Not applicable				√		Not applicable			Not applicable		
Idaho	No information available			Not applicable			√			Not applicable		
Illinois	√			Not applicable			Not applicable			Not applicable		
Iowa						√	Not applicable			Not applicable		
Kansas	√			Not applicable			√			Not applicable		
Kentucky	Not applicable			√						√		
Maine	√						√			Not applicable		
Michigan	√			√			√			Not applicable		
Mississippi	No information available			√			√			√		

[a] All States reported that they do not have and do not plan to have a formal interstate systems for tracking sanctioned individuals across States, though some would like such a system if it was provided federally.

Table of Contents

Table II-15. (cont.)
Information by State on Status of Intrastate Systems Used to Track Sanctioned Individuals and/or Households (Among the 20 States Imposing at Least One of the Optional Food Stamp Sanctions)

State	*Tracking System Within States for Each Optional Food Stamp Sanction Provision*											
	Comparable Disqualification for Failure to Perform Actions Required by Other Means-Tested Programs			*Reduction in Benefits for Non-compliance with TANF Rules*			*Disqualification for Failure to Cooperate with Child Support Agency or for Being In Arrears on Child Support*			*Disqualification or Reduction in Benefits for Failure to Ensure that Children Attend School*		
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*	*Existing System*	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*	*Existing System*	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*	*Existing System*	*Planned System*	*No plans to collect*
Montana	Not applicable					√	Not applicable			Not applicable		
New York	Not applicable			Not applicable			Not applicable			√		
North Dakota		√		Not applicable			Not applicable			Not applicable		
Ohio			√	Not applicable					√	Not applicable		
Oklahoma	Not applicable			Not applicable					√	Not applicable		
South Dakota	√			Not applicable			Not applicable			Not applicable		
Tennessee	No information available			√			Not applicable			Not applicable		
Wisconsin	Not applicable			Not applicable			√			Not applicable		
Wyoming			√	Not applicable			Not applicable			√		
Total No. of States	6[b]	1	2	4	1	2	6	0	2	4	0	0

[b] The number of State responses for this tracking question totals only nine, because interviewers did not obtain responses to this question from respondents in California, Idaho, Mississippi or Tennessee.

Table of Contents

III. State Choices Regarding Drug Felon and Fleeing Felon Provisions

Table of Contents

III.A. Drug Felons

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

III. Drug Felon and Fleeing Felon Provisions

III.A. Drug Felons

Table III-1.
Summary of State Choices on Food Stamp Program Drug Felon Provisions of PRWORA

Eligibility of Drug Felons for Food Stamps	*Number of States*
All Drug Felons are Permanently Ineligible	30
State Has Modified Drug Felon Disqualification, But Imposes Special Conditions on Drug Felons[a]	11
State Has Modified Drug Felon Disqualification and Imposes No Special Conditions on Drug Felons	10

[a] "Special conditions" include exemptions for only certain categories of convicted drug felons such as pregnant women or those in drug treatment programs. May also include a benefit reduction rather than a disqualification.

Table of Contents

State	All Drug Felons are Permanently Ineligible	State Has Opted Out of Drug Felon Disqualification, But Imposes Special Conditions on Drug Felons[a]	State Has Opted Out of Drug Felon Disqualification Entirely And Imposes No Special Conditions on Drug Felons
Alabama	√		
Alaska	√		
Arizona	√		
Arkansas	√		
California	√		
Colorado		√	
Connecticut		√	
Delaware	√		
District of Columbia	√		
Florida	√		
Georgia	√		
Hawaii		√	
Idaho	√		
Illinois			√
Indiana	√		
Iowa			√
Kansas	√		
Kentucky	√		
Louisiana		√	
Maine	√		

[a] "Special conditions" include exemptions for only certain categories of convicted drug felons such as pregnant women or those in drug treatment programs. May also include a benefit reduction rather than a disqualification.

Table of Contents

State	All Drug Felons are Permanently Ineligible	State Has Opted Out of Drug Felon Disqualification, But Imposes Special Conditions on Drug Felons[a]	State Has Opted Out of Drug Felon Disqualification Entirely And Imposes No Special Conditions on Drug Felons
Maryland	√		
Massachusetts	√		
Michigan			√
Minnesota		√	
Mississippi	√		
Missouri	√		
Montana	√		
Nebraska	√		
Nevada		√	
New Hampshire			√
New Jersey		√	
New Mexico	√		
New York			√
North Carolina		√	
North Dakota	√		
Ohio			√
Oklahoma			√
Oregon			√
Pennsylvania	√		
Rhode Island		√	
South Carolina	√		
South Dakota	√		
Tennessee	√		

Table of Contents

Table III-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
State Policy Choices Regarding Food Stamp Program Disqualification for Drug Felons

State	*All Drug Felons are Permanently Ineligible*	*State Has Opted Out of Drug Felon Disqualification, But Imposes Special Conditions on Drug Felons*[a]	*State Has Modified Drug Felon Disqualification And Imposes No Special Conditions on Drug Felons*
Texas	√		
Utah			√
Vermont			√
Virginia	√		
Washington		√	
West Virginia	√		
Wisconsin		√	
Wyoming	√		
Total No. of States	30	11	10

Table of Contents

Table III-3.
Information by State on
Food Stamp Sanctions for Drug Felons
(Among the 11 States That Have Opted Out of the Provision Making All Drug Felons Permanently Ineligible and Imposed Special Conditions on Drug Felons)

State	*Subgroups Exempted*	*Other Conditions Applied to Drug Felons*
Colorado	All drug felons are exempt from the disqualification sanction except those convicted of a drug felony involving trafficking in food stamps. The latter group is permanently disqualified.	None
Connecticut	Drug felons participating in substance abuse treatment programs or who have either completed their sentence or are complying with probation or court requirements are exempt from the disqualification sanction.	None
Hawaii	Drug felons participating in substance abuse treatment programs are exempt from the disqualification sanction.	None
Louisiana		Drug felons are disqualified for only one year, after which they may reapply.
Minnesota		Persons convicted of a drug felony after 7/1/97 are subject to random drug tests. If the person fails the test, his/her food stamp household's benefits are reduced by 10 percent. If a second or subsequent drug test is failed, benefits are reduced by 30 percent. Benefits are restored at the beginning of the month following a negative drug test result.
Nevada	Drug felons participating in substance abuse treatment programs are exempt from the disqualification sanction.	None
New Jersey	Drug felons participating in substance abuse treatment programs are exempt.	None

Table of Contents

Table III-3. (cont.)
Description of Modified Food Stamp Sanctions for Drug Felons
(Among the 11 States Who Have Opted out of the Provision Making All Drug Felons Permanently Ineligible)

State	*Subgroups Exempted*	*Other Conditions Applied to Drug Felons*
North Carolina		All drug felons are disqualified. However, persons convicted of class 'H' or 'I' drug felons (generally possession offenses) and who participate in approved court-ordered drug treatment programs may re-apply for food stamps after six months of disqualification.
Rhode Island		Rhode Island has opted out, but has yet to determine the exact nature and length of the sanction that will be imposed on some drug felons. The State respondent indicated that the State will not be choosing to maintain eligibility for all drug felons.
Washington	Drug felons participating in substance abuse treatment programs are exempt.	None
Wisconsin		Drug felons are required to take a drug test. Those with positive tests are disqualified and those with negative tests remain eligible.

Table of Contents

Table III-4.
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Drug Felons[a]

State	*Status of Intrastate Tracking Systems on Drug Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Determine Whether or Not an Individual is a Drug Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Sources Cited*
Alabama	√					√	
Alaska			√			√	Notification by Department of Law
Arizona	√					√	
Arkansas			√			√	
California			√			√	
Colorado	√				√		Drug felonies involving the sale of food stamps are already identified in in the food stamp information system.
Connecticut			√			√	
Delaware	√				√	√	Access to criminal history through the Delaware Justice Information System which will be fully automated in 1999
District of Columbia	√					√	
Florida	√			√		√	State receives manual report from the Department of Corrections
Georgia			√			√	

[a] No State reported having or planning any formal interstate systems to track drug felons across States.

Table of Contents

Table III-4. (cont.)
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Drug Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate Tracking Systems on Drug Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Determine Whether or Not an Individual is a Drug Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Sources Cited*
Hawaii		√		√	√	√	An anonymous hotline
Idaho	√					√	
Illinois	No drug felon disqualification						
Indiana	√					√	
Iowa	No drug felon disqualification						
Kansas	√					√	
Kentucky	√					√	
Louisiana	√					√	Individual parishes may use local media sources
Maine	√					√	If there is information suggesting a client is a drug felon they contact the State Police's Bureau of Identification
Maryland	√					√	
Massachusetts			√			√	
Michigan	No drug felon disqualification						
Minnesota	√					√	

Table of Contents

Table III-4. (cont.)
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Drug Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate Tracking Systems on Drug Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Determine Whether or Not an Individual is a Drug Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Sources Cited*
Mississippi		√				√	Cross-match to make sure prisoners are not on food stamps; have non-automated local sources of information
Missouri	√						If notified by local law enforcement or newspaper. Planning to add questions to application process.
Montana	√					√	Act on any information received
Nebraska		√				√	
Nevada	√					√	
New Hampshire	No drug felon disqualification						
New Jersey		√				√	
New Mexico	√			√		√	
New York	No drug felon disqualification						
North Carolina		√				√	
North Dakota	√					√	
Ohio	No drug felon disqualification						

Table of Contents

Table III-4. (cont.)
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Drug Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate Tracking Systems for Drug Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Determine Whether or Not an Individual is a Drug Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Sources Cited*
Oklahoma	No drug felon disqualification						
Oregon	No drug felon disqualification						
Pennsylvania		√				√	
Rhode Island			√				Caseworkers rely on client's self-declaration but do not directly ask
South Carolina	√					√	Newspapers
South Dakota	√			√		√	Self-declaration
Tennessee	√					√	
Texas	√					√	
Utah	No drug felon disqualification						
Vermont	No drug felon disqualification						
Virginia	√					√	
Washington			√			√	
West Virginia	√					√	
Wisconsin	√					√	If made aware by other means (e.g., law enforcement unit or newspaper)

Table of Contents

Table III-4. (cont.)
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Drug Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate Tracking Systems for Drug Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Determine Whether or Not an Individual is a Drug Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Sources Cited*
Wyoming			√			√	Community notification, local media
Total No. of States[b]	26	6	9	4	3	38	

[b] Ten States do not have a drug felon disqualification.

Table of Contents

III.B. Fleeing Felons

Table of Contents

Table III-5.
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Fleeing Felons[a]

State	*Status of Intrastate System to Track Fleeing Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Identify an Individual as a Fleeing Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Source*
Alabama	√					√	
Alaska	√					√	
Arizona	√					√	
Arkansas			√			√	
California	√					√	Match against State Department of Justice fleeing felon file
Colorado	√				√	√	
Connecticut		√				√	
Delaware	√				√	√	Access to criminal history through the Delaware Justice Information System
District of Columbia			√			√	
Florida	√			√		√	State receives manual report from the Department of Corrections
Georgia			√			√	

[a] No State reported having or planning any formal interstate systems to track drug felons across States.

Table of Contents

Table III-5. (cont.)
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Fleeing Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate Systems to Track Fleeing Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Identify an Individual as a Fleeing Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Source*
Hawaii		√		√	√	√	An anonymous hotline for reporting cases of fraud.
Idaho	√					√	
Illinois	√				√	√	Cross-match with state police
Indiana	√					√	Accepts information provided by law enforcement but does not solicit the information
Iowa			√			√	
Kansas	√					√	
Kentucky	√					√	Special FBI manual
Louisiana			√			√	Individual parishes may use local media sources
Maine	√						Act on any information given to the office
Maryland			√			√	
Massachusetts			√			√	
Michigan	√						If information provided by local law enforcement

Table of Contents

Table III-5. (cont.)
Information by State on
Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Fleeing Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate Systems to Track Fleeing Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Identify an Individual as a Fleeing Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Source*
Minnesota	√					√	
Mississippi	√					√	
Missouri	√					√	Have access to State's highway patrol database to verify client information
Montana	√					√	Act on any information received
Nebraska		√				√	
Nevada	√					√	NCIC law enforcement database that shows individual's status, local law enforcement officials and interfacing with parole and probation system
New Hampshire	√					√	
New Jersey			√			√	
New Mexico	√			√		√	Interface with law enforcement agencies and inspector general's report being sent out to counties
New York		√		√	√	√	State Division of Criminal Justice Services, law enforcement, probation and legal systems all feed into one database to which food stamp offices have access

Table of Contents

Table III-5. (cont.)
Information by State on Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Fleeing Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate System to Track Fleeing Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Identify an Individual as a Fleeing Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Source*
North Carolina		√				√	Some county offices have relationship with local law enforcement agencies
North Dakota	√					√	
Ohio			√			√	
Oklahoma			√			√	If some suspicion local offices may contact local corrections agency
Oregon			√				If police officer raises the issue or client mentions it
Pennsylvania		√				√	
Rhode Island			√				Relies on client's self-declaration but does not directly ask
South Carolina	√				√	√	
South Dakota	√					√	Depending on their workload investigators run matches on a case-by-case basis
Tennessee			√			√	
Texas	√			√		√	

Table of Contents

Table III-5. (cont.)
Information by State on Status and Description of Intrastate Systems to Track and Identify Fleeing Felons

State	*Status of Intrastate System to Track Fleeing Felons*			*Sources of Information Used During the Application or Recertification Process to Identify an Individual as a Fleeing Felon*			
	Existing System	*Planned System*	*No Plans to Track*	*Match Against Court Records*	*Track Arrest Warrants*	*Ask Client*	*Other Source*
Utah	√					√	One county office matches against jail records
Vermont	√					√	
Virginia	√					√	
Washington			√			√	
West Virginia	√					√	
Wisconsin	√					√	If informed by law enforcement unit or newspaper
Wyoming			√			√	
Total No. of States	30	6	15	5	6	47	

Table of Contents

IV. Databases Used by States to Verify Food Stamp Client Information

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

IV. Databases Used by States to Verify Food Stamp Client Information

State	State Wage Information Collection Agency Database (SWICA)	IRS's Unearned Income Database	Unemployment Insurance (UI) Database	Beneficiary Data Exchange Database (BENDEX)	State Data Exchange Database (SDX)	Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reporting System (BEERS)	Systematic Alien Verification Entitlements System (SAVE)
Alabama	Continuing	Discontinued	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Discontinued	Continuing
Alaska	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Arizona	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Arkansas	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Continuing
California	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Colorado	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Connecticut	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Delaware	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Continuing
District of Columbia	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Florida	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Georgia	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing

[a] States classified as "continuing" reported that the State used the system before and after welfare reform. States classified as "discontinued" reported that the State used the system previously, but stopped after welfare reform. States classified as "never used" reported that the State did not use the system either before or after welfare reform.

Table of Contents

State	State Wage Information Collection Agency Database (SWICA)	IRS's Unearned Income Database	Unemployment Insurance (UI) Database	Beneficiary Data Exchange Database (BENDEX)	State Data Exchange Database (SDX)	Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reporting System (BEERS)	Systematic Alien Verification Entitlements System (SAVE)
Hawaii	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Idaho	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Discontinued	Continuing
Illinois	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Indiana	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Iowa	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Kansas	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Kentucky	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Louisiana	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Maine	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used
Maryland	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Massachusetts	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Continuing
Michigan	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Never used
Minnesota	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Mississippi	Continuing	Discontinued	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Missouri	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Discontinued	Continuing
Montana	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing

Table of Contents

State	State Wage Information Collection Agency Database (SWICA)	IRS's Unearned Income Database	Unemployment Insurance (UI) Database	Beneficiary Data Exchange Database (BENDEX)	State Data Exchange Database (SDX)	Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reporting System (BEERS)	Systematic Alien Verification Entitlements System (SAVE)
Nebraska	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Nevada	Continuing	Discontinued	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
New Hampshire	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
New Jersey	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Never used	Continuing	Continuing
New Mexico	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
New York	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Never used
North Carolina	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
North Dakota	Continuing	Never used	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Ohio	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Oklahoma	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Oregon	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used	Continuing
Pennsylvania	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Rhode Island	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
South Carolina	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
South Dakota	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Tennessee	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing

Table of Contents

State	State Wage Information Collection Agency Database (SWICA)	IRS's Unearned Income Database	Unemployment Insurance (UI) Database	Beneficiary Data Exchange Database (BENDEX)	State Data Exchange Database (SDX)	Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reporting System (BEERS)	Systematic Alien Verification Entitlements System (SAVE)
Texas	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Utah	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Vermont	Discontinued	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Discontinued	Discontinued
Virginia	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Discontinued	Discontinued	Continuing	Continuing
Washington	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Never used
West Virginia	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Wisconsin	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
Wyoming	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing

Table of Contents

Table IV-2.
Information by State on
Use of Other Databases[a] to Verify Food Stamp Household Circumstances—Before and After Welfare Reform[b]

State	*State Prison Records*	*State Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Database*	*State Child Support Records*	*Other Databases Currently Used to Verify Food Stamp Household Information*
Alabama	Never used	Never used	Continuing	New hires
Alaska	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	Immigrant quarters data
Arizona	Never used	Never used	Continuing	WTPY (quarters of employment for eligibility of legal immigrants)
Arkansas	Never used	Never used	Discontinued	
California	Continuing	Never used	Never used	1) Duplicate receipt with Arizona, Nevada, and Oregon; 2) New hires; 3) Match social security number and other social security information with SSA; 4) California Youth Authority inmates file; 5) Nationwide disqualification data; 6) Intercept file for those who owe the State from previous food stamp spells
Colorado	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	
Connecticut	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	
Delaware	Began using	Continuing	Continuing	
District of Columbia	Never used	Continuing	Began using	
Florida	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	State Department of Labor employment database

[a] Other than databases in IEVS or SAVE

[b] States classified as "continuing" reported that the State used the system before and after welfare reform. States classified as "discontinued" reported that the State used the system previously, but stopped after welfare reform. States classified as "never used" reported that the State did not use the system either before or after welfare reform.

Table of Contents

State	State Prison Records	State DMV Database	State Child Support Records	Other Databases Currently Used to Verify Food Stamp Household Information
Georgia	Never used	Never used	Continuing	Department of Labor database
Hawaii	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
Idaho	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
Illinois	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	1) Check rolls to see if participant is enrolled elsewhere in the State; 2) New hires (begun 10/1/97)
Indiana	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	1) New hires; 2) Credit Bureau data match
Iowa	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	PadX for information on wages from about 7 States for child support purposes
Kansas	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	1) Birth records; 2) New hires; 3) Access to State of Missouri public assistance/welfare files online; 4) Tape-to-tape match with Colorado, Nebraska, and Oklahoma
Kentucky	Never used	Never used	Never used	
Louisiana	Never used	Never used	Continuing	
Maine	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
Maryland	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	State Verification Exchange System (SVES)
Massachusetts	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	1) New hires; 2) Department of Social Services (for kids in foster care); 3) Department of Youth Services
Michigan	Never used	Continuing	Never used	
Minnesota	Never used	Never used	Never used	

Table of Contents

Table IV-2. (cont.)
Information by State on
Use of Other Databases to Verify Food Stamp Household Circumstances—Before and After Welfare Reform

State	*State Prison Records*	*State DMV Database*	*State Child Support Records*	*Other Databases Currently Used to Verify Food Stamp Household Information*
Mississippi	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	
Missouri	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	Social Security match for verification of social security numbers.
Montana	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	State workers compensation
Nebraska	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
Nevada	Began using	Discontinued	Continuing	Wired Third Party Information Transfer (WTPY)
New Hampshire	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
New Jersey	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
New Mexico	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
New York	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	New hires
North Carolina	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	State Verification and Exchange System (SVES) to verify social security benefits and detailed information; 2) Interface between food stamp and child support tracking system for payment information; 3) Enumeration verification system to verify social security numbers; 4) Automated link between TANF and food stamp database to check for any demographic changes; 5) Match with Veteran's Administration; 5) Interstate match on recipiency.
North Dakota	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	New hires
Ohio	Began using	Continuing	Never used	
Oklahoma	Never used	Never used	Continuing	New hires

Table of Contents

State	State Prison Records	State DMV Database	State Child Support Records	Other Databases Currently Used to Verify Food Stamp Household Information
Oregon	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	
Pennsylvania	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	Vital statistics
Rhode Island	Continuing	Never used	Continuing	New hires
South Carolina	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	1) Governor's office — the Low Income Home and Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP); 2) New hires; 3) Special benefits (JTPA, youth programs, Unemployment (ESC); 4) State employee retirement system
South Dakota	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	Child care services
Tennessee	Never used	Continuing	Never used	New hires
Texas	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing	WTDY (SSA) quarters of employment match
Utah	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	New hires
Vermont	Never used	Never used	Continuing	
Virginia	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	1) State Verification Eligibility System; 2) New hires
Washington	Never used	Never used	Never used	
West Virginia	Continuing	Continuing	Began using	Database on worker's compensation benefits
Wisconsin	Never used	Continuing	Continuing	1) Disqualified Recipient System (DRS) to identify those with a history of fraud; 2) DILHB Employer wage reports (quarterly earnings reports)
Wyoming	Never used	Began using	Continuing	

Table of Contents

V. State-Funded Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

V. State-Funded Food Assistance Programs for Legal Immigrants

Table V-1.
Information by State on
State-Funded Food Assistance Programs For Legal Immigrants Who Have Become Ineligible Under PRWORA
(Among the 11 States Initiating These Programs as of 11/97)[a]

State	*Name of Program*	*Groups Eligible*	*Income Eligibility Criteria*	*Average Number of Participants In a Typical Month*	*Average Benefit Level Per Household*	*Form of Assistance*	*Agency that Administers at Direct Service Level*
California	California Food Assistance Program	Must be either under 18 or over 65.	Same as for FSP	40,000	Same calculation as FSP	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices
Colorado	Emergency Immigrant Assistance Program	Must be eligible for FSP on all criteria except alien status	Same as for FSP	10 households[b]	$442	Cash	Colorado Works Program
Florida	Temporary Income Bridge Program	Must be over age 65	Same as for FSP	13,752	$70 per individual	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices
Maryland	State-funded Food Stamp Program for Immigrant Children	Children under age 18 or in TANF	Same as for FSP	971	$120.82	EBT	Food Stamp Offices

a The respondent from Texas indicated that the State would be starting a program in February 1998 that would provide a $53 per individual benefit to elderly and disabled immigrants who had lost Food Stamp benefits under PRWORA. These benefits would be provided through the State's EBT system and would be available to a maximum of 28,000 residents.

b Respondent noted that small number of participants and high benefit levels were the result of counties not publicizing the program. Benefit levels are apparently tied to the number of participants.

Table V-1. (cont.)
Information by State on
Food Assistance Programs For Legal Immigrants Who Have Become Ineligible Under PRWORA
(Among the 11 States Initiating These Programs as of 11/97)

State	*Name of Program*	*Groups Eligible*	*Income Eligibility Criteria*	*Average Number of Participants In a Typical Month*	*Average Benefit Level Per Household*	*Form of Assistance*	*Agency that Administers at Direct Service Level*
Massachusetts	State Food Stamp Program	Must be eligible for FSP on all criteria except alien status	Same as for FSP	Did not know	38 percent of what would have been food stamp benefits[c]	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices
Minnesota	Minnesota Grown Food Supplemental Programs	Must be on GA or SSI	GA or SSI criteria	2,900	$32 per individual	Vouchers mailed to residence[d]	State Department of Human Services
	Minnesota Family Supplement Food Program	Eligible for TANF or GA	TANF or GA criteria	4,788	$63 per individual	Checks mailed to residence	State Department of Human Services
Nebraska	State Options Food Stamp Program	Must be eligible for FSP on all criteria except alien status	Same as for FSP	700	$71	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices

[c] The State planned to increase the benefit level in Winter 1998 to 100 percent of the Federal food stamp benefit.

[d] These vouchers enable the recipient to obtain food products grown or produced in Minnesota.

Table of Contents

Table V-1. (cont.)
Description of State Food Assistance Programs For Legal Immigrants Who Have Become Ineligible Under PRWORA
(Among the 11 States Initiating These Programs as of 11/97)

State	*Name of Program*	*Groups Eligible*	*Income Eligibility Criteria*	*Average Number of Participants In a Typical Month*	*Average Benefit Level Per Household*	*Form of Assistance*	*Agency that Administers at Direct Service Level*
New Jersey	New Jersey Food Stamp Program	Elderly, disabled, children under 18, GA recipients	Same as for FSP	3,258	$88.59	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices
New York[e]	Food Assistance Program	Under 18, elderly, disabled	Same as for FSP	71,400 (about 70,000 who are in New York City)	Don't know	Stamps	Social Services
Rhode Island	Food Stamp Program	Recipient must have been residing in Rhode Island prior to July 22, 1996	Same as for FSP	4,600	$64 per individual	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices
Washington	Food Assistance Program for Legal Immigrants	Must be eligible for FSP on all criteria except alien status	Same as for FSP	17,647	$62 per individual	Stamps	Food Stamp Offices

[e] All States except New York indicated that the programs were currently operating statewide.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

VI. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

VI. Coordination of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process

[illegible]	
State	***Description of State Policies Indicating Changes in Coordination or Co-Location of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process***
District of Columbia	There is no single application form for TANF and food stamps.
Idaho	There is no State requirement for a single TANF and food stamp application interview, but the respondent indicated that most often a single interview is conducted at the local offices.
Oregon	There is no State requirement for a single interview for TANF and food stamps, but the respondent indicated that all local offices conduct joint interviews for both programs.
South Dakota	In several local areas, the TANF application process now originates outside of the welfare office in a Job Services office, while the food stamp application process originates in the local Social Services office. Households are offered the opportunity to begin the food stamp application process at the Job Services office, but this is not necessarily routinely coordinated. In counties without the new Job Services offices, persons can apply for TANF and food stamps at the same time.
Texas	In several local offices, there is now an initial group interview where information about multiple benefit programs is provided. Individual interviews are conducted as necessary to follow-up and complete the application process.
Utah	Utah accepts public benefit applications at new employment centers rather than the traditional welfare office. Co-location of the TANF and food stamp application processes continue, however the State respondent noted that the application process has changed considerably for all clients, with employment services provided simultaneously as the application is being processed.

[illegible]	[illegible] (Cont.) [illegible] Food Stamp and TANF Application Process Changes in the Last [illegible]
State	***Description of State Policies Indicating Changes in Coordination or Co-Location of Food Stamp and TANF Application Process***
Wisconsin	Delivery of TANF services has been privatized in a small number of counties in Wisconsin (including Milwaukee County). In those counties private agencies process TANF applications, but the food stamp application is done by public employees. The workers taking applications for both programs are required by State law to be located in the same building, but at the time of the interview there were offices where they had not yet been able to locate both TANF and food stamp workers on the same premises.

Table of Contents

Appendix B : Telephone Survey Questionnaire For State Food Stamp Officials

Table of Contents

OMB No. 058

Table of Contents

HSR

Health Systems Research, Inc.
1200 18th Street NW Suite 700
Washington DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 828.5100
Fax: (202) 728.9469
Internet: www.hsrnet.com

TRACKING STATE FOOD STAMP CHOICES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES UNDER WELFARE REFORM

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STATE FOOD STAMP OFFICIALS

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
Office of Analysis and Evaluation

Prepared by:

Health Systems Research, Inc.
Washington, DC

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Introduction iii

Unit I. Able-bodied Adults Without Dependents 1

Unit I.1 ABAWD Exemption for Adults Medically Certified as Physically or Mentally Unfit for Employment 1
Unit I.2 ABAWD Exemption for Adults with Dependents 5
Unit I.3 ABAWD Waivers 6
Unit I.4 State's Data Collection Efforts on ABAWDs 6
Unit I.5 Workfare Programs for ABAWDs 10
Unit I.6 ABAWD Tracking Systems 11
Unit I.7 Services for Individuals Disqualified from Food Stamps Due to the ABAWD Time Limits 13
Unit I.8 Balanced Budget Act ABAWD Exemptions 13

Unit II. Sanctions 16

Unit II.1 Employment and Training Sanctions 16
Unit II.2 Disqualification for Noncompliance with Another Means-Tested Program 18
Unit II.3 Reduction of Food Stamps when Cash Benefits Reduced for Noncompliance with TANF Rules 29
Unit II.4 Child Support Sanctions 31
Unit II.5 Sanctions for Failure to Ensure Minors Attend School 34
Unit II.6 Sanctions for Drug Felons 36
Unit II.7 Fleeing Felons 39

Unit III. Verification Systems 40

Unit IV. State and Local Food Assistance Initiatives 44

Unit IV.1 Food Assistance for Immigrants 44
Unit IV.2 Food Assistance for Disqualified ABAWDs 47

Unit V. Food Stamp Application Process 50

Table of Contents

STATE _____

NAME AND TITLE OF INTERVIEWEE _____

DATE OF INTERVIEW _____

Introduction

Hello (NAME OF RESPONDENT). My name is (INTERVIEWER'S NAME) from Health Systems Research in Washington, D.C. A letter was sent to you on (DATE), signed by the Project Manager Vivian Gabor describing the purpose and content of the interviews that we are conducting for the Food and Consumer Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. This interview with you today is part of the Food Stamp Tracking Study, for which we are examining State food stamp choices under the new options and waivers available under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, more commonly known as the "new Federal welfare reform law."

You should know that you are taking part in a 50-State survey of food stamp officials. You were selected by USDA as a key official in your State with knowledge about State food stamp policies and procedures. The information we will be compiling from this telephone interview today will be presented to USDA as part of a catalog of States' initial food stamp choices under the new Federal welfare reform law. Your answers will not be judged or used by USDA for any quality control purposes.

For any of the questions I ask you, please feel free to respond that you don't know the answer. If I need to speak to someone else in your office to get answers to any specific questions, please let me know at the appropriate question, and I will get that name from you at the end of the interview. This survey will take about one hour.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Table of Contents

Unit I. Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents

The first series of questions are about how (STATE) has implemented the new time limits and work requirements for unemployed adults without dependents. Under this provision, receipt of food stamp benefits is limited to 3 months in a 3-year period for able-bodied adults, ages 18 to 50, without dependents, who are not employed at least an average of 20 hours per week, not participating in a public work program for 20 hours or more each week, or not in a workfare program. In the following series of questions, when I refer to this new provision I will use the term "ABAWD." When I refer to persons that (STATE) defines as potentially subject to the requirement, I will use the term "ABAWDs."

AB1 During which month were food stamp recipients first subject to program disqualification because they did not meet the ABAWD requirements?

_____(MONTH)

The next series of questions ask about (STATE)'s documentation requirements and definitions for the exemptions under the ABAWD provision of the new Federal welfare reform law.

Unit I.1 ABAWD Exemption for Adults Medically Certified as Physically or Mentally Unfit for Employment

AB2 Does (STATE) have a Statewide policy or any guidance to local food stamp offices regarding how to document a client as "medically certified as physically or mentally unfit for employment or do you leave it up to local discretion

YES, WE HAVE A POLICY/GUIDANCE 01
NO, WE LEAVE IT UP TO LOCAL DISCRETION . . 02

AB3 Are the criteria and procedures used in (STATE) to determine this exemption for ABAWDs more stringent, the same as, or less stringent than those used in (STATE) to determine the work registration exemption for persons physically or mentally unfit for employment?

MORE STRINGENT 01
THE SAME 02
LESS STRINGENT 03

Table of Contents

AB4 Does your State allow food stamp offices to accept a written statement from a health professional as documentation that a client is "medically certified as physically or mentally unfit for employment"?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB7

AB5 Does (STATE) require a health professional to complete a specific form created by the State Agency, or do you allow any written statement signed by a health professional to serve as acceptable documentation?

SPECIFIC FORM 01
ANY WRITTEN STATEMENT 02

AB5a Please describe the written statements you allow or require a health professional to use as written documentation for this exemption.

_____

_____

AB6 Of the following health professionals and health service settings, which does (STATE) authorize to provide certification that a food stamp client is physically or mentally unfit for employment?

AB6a Any health professional at all?

YES . . . . . 01 ---GO TO AB7
NO 02

AB6b An M.D.?

YES 01
NO 02

AB6c A Ph.D. psychologist?

YES 01
NO 02

AB6d A licensed therapist?

YES 01
NO 02

Table of Contents

AB6e A Nurse?

YES 01
NO 02

AB6f A health professional in a drug or alcohol treatment center?

YES 01
NO 02

AB6g Any other health professionals?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 --GO TO AB7

AB6h Which other health professionals?

_____

AB7 Does (STATE) allow food stamp offices to use receipt of certain disability benefits to document that a client is "medically certified as physically or mentally unfit for employment?"

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB8

AB7a Can food stamp offices use receipt of SSI benefits to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO 02

AB7b Can food stamp offices use receipt of Veterans disability benefits to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO 02

AB7c Can food stamp offices use receipt of SSDI benefits to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO 02

Table of Contents

AB7d Can food stamp offices use receipt of State disability benefits to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB7f

AB7e How stringent are the disability determinations for the State Disability program compared to the determinations for the SSI and VA disability benefit programs? Are they more stringent, about the same, or less stringent?

MORE STRINGENT 01
ABOUT THE SAME 02
LESS STRINGENT 03

AB7f Can food stamp offices use receipt of private disability benefits to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB8

AB7g How stringent are the disability determinations for private disability benefits in your State compared to determinations for the SSI and VA disability benefit programs? Are they more stringent, about the same, or less stringent?

MORE STRINGENT 01
ABOUT THE SAME 02
LESS STRINGENT 03

AB8 Does your State policy allow food stamp offices to use receipt of workers compensation benefits to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO 02

AB9 Does your State policy allow food stamp office staff to document this exemption based on the staff's direct observation of a client's obvious disability?

YES 01
NO 02

Table of Contents

AB10 Does your State policy allow self-reports to be used as documentation that an individual meets the ABAWD definition of physically or mentally unfit for employment?

YES 01
NO 02

AB11 Does your State policy allow food stamp offices to use another procedure to document this exemption?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB13

AB12 What other procedures do they use?

_____

_____

The next two questions are about the length of the disability in your definition of the able-bodied exemption.

AB13 Does the State policy exempt persons from ABAWD only for permanent disability or for either a permanent or temporary disability?

PERMANENT DISABILITY ONLY . . . . . 01 ---GO TO UNIT I.2
PERMANENT OR TEMPORARY DISABILITY 02

AB14 Does the State have a minimum duration of disability for its definition of "temporary" disabilities?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT I.2

AB14a What minimum duration defines a temporary disability for this exemption?

_____

Unit I.2 ABAWD Exemption for Adults with Dependents

The following two questions are about your State's definition of dependents for the purpose of exempting individuals from ABAWD requirements.

Table of Contents

AB15 The law exempts adult parents and caretakers from the work requirements and time limits of ABAWD if they have a dependent child. How does (STATE) define a child for this exemption?

_____

AB16 In a household with one or more dependent child, please tell me which one of the following best describes how many able-bodied adults could be exempt from the ABAWD requirements?

All parents in the household are exempt, ... 01
Only one parent can be exempt, ... 02
All adults in the household are exempt, or 03
All adult relatives in the household are exempt 04

Unit I.3 ABAWD Waivers

INTERVIEWER—CHECK THE STATE CONTACT INFORMATION SHEET TO DETERMINE IF THIS STATE HAS ANY APPROVED ABAWD WAIVERS AND, IF SO, FOR WHICH LOCAL JURISDICTIONS. IF THE STATE HAS WAIVERS ASK QUESTIONS AB17 and AB18. IF NOT, SKIP TO AB19.

AB17 I understand that the State has received FCS approval for waivers from the ABAWD requirements for certain areas in the State. Are there any areas for which you have received an approved waiver but are not using it?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT I.4

AB18 For which areas of the State do you have an approved ABAWD waiver but are not using the waiver?

_____

_____

Unit I.4 State's Data Collection Efforts on ABAWDs

The next series of questions are about data you may be collecting regarding ABAWDs in your State. I am interested in the data your State may be collecting on the following categories of programmatic information: 1) the number of food stamp participants waived from the ABAWD requirements; 2) the number of ABAWD food stamp participants subject to the new work requirements in a typical month; 3) the number of food stamp participants disqualified because of the ABAWD requirements since (STATE) implemented this provision; 4) the number of

Table of Contents

ABAWDs who are working at least 20 hours per week; 5) the number of ABAWDs enrolled in employment and training programs; and 6) the number of ABAWDs in workfare programs. I will ask you a series of questions about each of these categories of information.

INTERVIEWER—FOR EACH CATEGORY OF INFORMATION IN THE LEFT HAND COLUMN OF TABLE A BELOW, ASK THE FOLLOWING SET OF QUESTIONS. BELOW IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW TO PROCEED.

AB19a. "Does the State collect data on the number of ***food stamp participants waived from the ABAWD requirements***?

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02; not relevant =03)

If the response to AB19a=01, then go to AB19b.
If the response to AB19a=02 or 03, then go to AB20.

b. "What is the estimated number of ***food stamp participants waived from the ABAWD requirements?"***

(Number of individuals)

c. "What is the source of this estimate?"

(Response choices and codes: automated data system=01; manual review of case records=02; and other=03)

If the response to AB19c=01 or 02, then go to AB20.
If the response to AB19c=03, then go to AB19d.

d. "What other data source(s) are used to determine this estimate?"

(Response choice is open-ended)

REPEAT THIS PROCEDURE FOR QUESTIONS AB19 - AB24.

Table of Contents

Table AB: State Data Collection Efforts

No.	Categories of Programmatic Data on ABAWDs	a. Does the State collect data on the number of ...?	b. Currently, in a typical month, what is the estimated number of individuals...?	c. What is the source of this estimate?	d. What other data source(s) are used to determine this estimate?
		Yes=01 No=02 Not relevant=03	(Number of individuals)	automated data system = 01 manual review of case records = 02 other = 03	
AB19	**food stamp participants waived from the ABAWD requirements**	If 01 ➜ If 02 or 03, go to AB20		If 01 or 02, go to AB20 If 03 ➜	
AB20	**ABAWD food stamp participants subject to the new work requirements**	If 01 ➜ If 02 or 03, go to AB21		If 01 or 02, go to AB21 If 03 ➜	

Table of Contents

Table AB: State Data Collection Efforts (cont.)

No.	Categories of Programmatic Data on ABAWDs	a. Does the State collect data on the number of ...?	b. What is the estimated number of individuals...?	c. What is the source of this estimate?	d. What other data source(s) are used to determine this estimate?
		Yes=01 No=02 Not relevant =03	(Number of individuals)	automated data system = 01 manual review of case records = 02 other = 03	
AB21	**food stamp participants disqualified because of the ABAWD requirements since (STATE) implemented this provision**	If 01 ➜ If 02 or 03, go to AB22		If 01 or 02, go to AB22 If 03 ➜	
AB22	**ABAWDS who are working at least 20 hours/week**	If 01 ➜ If 02 or 03, go to AB23		If 01 or 02, go to AB23 If 03 ➜	
AB23	**ABAWDS in employment and training programs**	If 01 ➜ If 02 or 03 , go to AB24		If 01 or 02, go to AB24 If 03 ➜	
AB24	**ABAWDS in workfare programs**	If 01 ➜ If 02 or 03, go to Unit I.5		If 01 or 02, go to Unit I.5 If 03 ➜	

Table of Contents

Unit I.5 Workfare Programs for ABAWDs

The next set of questions are about your State's workfare programs for ABAWDs.

AB25. Are there any workfare programs now operating in (STATE) for ABAWDs?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT I.6

AB26 How long have workfare programs for food stamp recipients been in place in your State?

_____Years and/or

_____Months

AB27 In (STATE) is workfare program participation currently mandatory for all ABAWDs optional for all ABAWDS, or mandatory for some and optional for others?

WORKFARE MANDATORY FOR ALL 01
WORKFARE PARTICIPATION IS OPTIONAL 02
MANDATORY FOR SOME & OPTIONAL FOR
OTHERS 03

AB28 What is the largest category of employers for your ABAWD workfare positions? Is it public organizations or private sector nonprofit organizations?

PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS 01
PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS 02
NO LARGEST CATEGORY, THE SAME # OF BOTH 03

AB29 Does your State allow ABAWDs to participate in a self-initiated workfare program and count this toward his/her "workfare" hours for the ABAWD work requirement?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB32

AB30 Does the State document these self-initiated workfare hours?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB32

Table of Contents

AB31 How are these hours documented?

_____

_____

AB32 Is there a limit to the number of months during a year that ABAWDs can be enrolled in any kind of workfare program in your State?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT I.6

AB33 How long is this limit?

_____ (# OF MONTHS)

Unit I.6 ABAWD Tracking Systems

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about systems that (STATE) has or is planning to have for tracking ABAWD on the program and those that have been disqualified.

AB34 First, please tell me how long the typical food stamp certification period is for ABAWD households?

Less than three months 01
Three months, or 02
Longer than three months 03

The following are a list of questions about your system for tracking ABAWD participants to ensure they do not exceed the time limit if they are not meeting work requirements.

AB35 Do you track these individuals in an automated information system, a manual system or some combination of both?

AUTOMATED SYSTEM 01
MANUAL SYSTEM 02
COMBINATION OF AUTOMATED AND MANUAL . 03

AB36 Where are central files of this information kept?

At the state level . . . . . 01 ---GO TO AB38
At the county level, or . . . . . 02 ---GO TO AB38
Another filing system 03

Table of Contents

AB37 What other filing system does (STATE) have for this information?

_____

AB38 Who in the State is most knowledgeable about ABAWD tracking?

_____

AB39 Does (STATE) have or plan to have a tracking system within the State to identify ABAWDs who are disqualified because of time limits to ensure that they do not get food stamp benefits elsewhere until they meet the ABAWD work requirements?

YES, WE HAVE A SYSTEM 01
YES, WE ARE PLANNING A SYSTEM 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO HAVE A SYSTEM 03

AB40 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to identify these disqualified individuals to ensure that they do not get food stamp benefits until they meet the ABAWD work requirements?

YES, WE HAVE A SYSTEM 01
YES, WE ARE PLANNING A SYSTEM 02
NO, WE ARE NOT PLANNING TO HAVE A SYSTEM 03

AB41 Does (STATE) have or plan to collect any kind of information on ABAWDs disqualified due to the time limits, for the purpose of documenting and evaluating what happens to these individual after disqualification?

YES, ARE COLLECTING THIS INFO 01
YES, WE PLAN TO COLLECT THIS INFO 02
NO, WE ARE NOT PLANNING TO COLLECT THIS INFORMATION . . . . . 03 ---GO TO UNIT I.7

AB42 What mechanism are you using to or do you plan to use to collect this information?

_____

AB43 How often do you plan on collecting this information?

_____

Table of Contents

AB44 What kinds of information are you collecting to evaluate what happens to disqualified ABAWDs?

_____

_____

_____

Unit I.7 Services for Individuals Disqualified from Food Stamps Due to the ABAWD Time Limits

AB45 Does (STATE) provide any new services, other than food assistance, specifically for the group of food stamp participants who are disqualified from food stamps due to the ABAWD time limits?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT I.8

AB46 What types of services are provided for these disqualified individuals?

_____

_____

Unit I.8 Balanced Budget Act ABAWD Exemptions

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 permits States to grant their own exemptions from the food stamp time limits for ABAWDs, in addition to those exemptions that previously existed under federal law. States may grant exemptions for up to 15 percent of the number of people who would be denied food stamps under the time limits. States have the flexibility to use their own criteria to award these exemptions.

AB47 Is the State currently implementing or planning to implement any new exemptions for ABAWDs who would otherwise be subject to the time limit?

YES, STATE NOW IMPLEMENTING 01
STATE PLANNING TO IMPLEMENT 02
NO, STATE NOT PLANNING TO IMPLEMENT . . . . . 03 --GO TO UNIT II
STATE NOT YET DECIDED WHETHER TO IMPLEMENT . . . .04 --GO TO UNIT II

Table of Contents

AB48 Is or will the State indefinitely exempt certain individuals or exempt individuals for a defined time period?

INDEFINITE EXEMPTION. . . . . 01--GO TO AB49
EXEMPTION FOR A DEFINED TIME PERIOD. 02
WE HAVE NOT DECIDED YET . . . . . 03--GO TO AB49

IF RESPONSE TO AB48 IS 01 OR 03 THEN GO TO AB49

AB48a. For how many months are these individuals exempt from the time limit?

_____MONTHS

AB49 Has the State decided what criteria it will use statewide to determine which individuals will be exempt from the time limits?

YES WE HAVE DECIDED. 01
NO WE HAVE NOT DECIDED YET. . . . . 02 --GO TO UNIT II
WE WILL NOT HAVE STATEWIDE CRITERIA. . . 03 --GO TO AB51

AB50 Which of the following criteria will the State be using to determine which individuals will be exempt from the time limits?

AB50a. Will exemptions be granted based on participants' age?

YES. 01
NO. . . . . 02 --GO TO AB50c

AB50b. Please describe this exemption.

EXEMPTIONS WILL BE PROVIDED TO PERSONS OVER AGE_____
OTHER AGE-RELATED EXEMPTION _____

AB50c. Will exemptions be granted only to people living in certain parts of the State?

YES. 01
NO. . . . . 02 --GO TO AB50e

AB50d. In which specific areas of the State?

_____

Table of Contents

AB50e. Will exemptions be granted to persons who comply with specific requirements?

YES. 01
NO. . . . . .02--GO TO AB50g

AB50f. What are these requirements?

_____

AB50g. Will exemptions be granted to any other group or groups of people?

YES. 01
NO. . . . . .02 --GO TO AB51

AB50h. Which other group or groups of people?

_____

AB51 Does or will the State allow local agencies to establish their own standards in implementing these exemptions?

YES 01
NO 02

AB52 Will individual food stamp caseworkers be allowed to exercise their own discretion in implementing these exemptions?

YES. 01
NO. 02

AB53 How is the State allocating its exemptions among local areas?

AB53a. Will exemptions be distributed among local areas in proportion to their caseload as a percent of the total State caseload?

YES. . . . . .01--GO TO UNIT II
NO. 02

AB53b. How else will the State allocate exemptions among local areas?

_____

Table of Contents

Unit II. Sanctions

We have completed the ABAWD section of this survey. The next series of questions are about your State's choices regarding new options in Food Stamp Program sanctions.

Unit II.1 Employment and Training Sanctions

I will begin with questions about the new State options for employment and training program sanctions. From here on, I will refer to "employment and training" as "E & T."

ET1 The new Federal welfare law allows a State to choose whether to disqualify either the head of household or the whole household, if the head of household fails to comply with a State's food stamp E & T requirements. In your State, what choice have you made under this option?

Do you disqualify the entire household, ... 01 ---GO TO ET8
Just the individual head of household, or 02
In some cases the household and in other cases
the individual 03

ET2 The new Federal welfare reform law also provides States some flexibility in deciding the duration of this sanction. I would like to ask you about your choices under this new flexibility. For the first E & T violation, for how many months do you disqualify an individual head of household?

_____# MONTHS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THE DURATION VARIES, GET AN ESTIMATE OF THE TYPICAL # MONTHS.

ET3 For the second E & T violation?

_____# MONTHS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THE DURATION VARIES, GET AN ESTIMATE OF THE TYPICAL # MONTHS.

ET4 For the third E & T violation?

_____# MONTHS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THE DURATION VARIES, GET AN ESTIMATE OF THE TYPICAL # MONTHS.

ET5 In a typical month, how many individuals do you estimate are newly disqualified in (STATE) for failing to comply with food stamp E & T program requirements?

Table of Contents

_____# INDIVIDUALS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY CANNOT PROVIDE AN EXACT #, GET AN ESTIMATE.

ET6 Of the individuals disqualified for violating a work requirement, can you distinguish first-time violators from repeat violators?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO ET14

ET7 Of these individuals, what is your estimate of the number of first-time violators?

_____# INDIVIDUALS

IF RESPONSE TO ET1=02, THEN GO TO ET14

ET8 The new Federal welfare reform law also provides States some flexibility in deciding the duration of this sanction. I would like to ask you about your choices under this new flexibility. For the first E & T violation, for how many months do you disqualify an entire household?

_____# MONTHS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THE DURATION VARIES, GET AN ESTIMATE OF THE TYPICAL # MONTHS.

ET9 For the second E & T violation?

_____# MONTHS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THE DURATION VARIES, GET AN ESTIMATE OF THE TYPICAL # MONTHS.

ET10 For the third E & T violation?

_____# MONTHS
INTERVIEWER PROBE: IF RESPONDENT SAYS THE DURATION VARIES, GET AN ESTIMATE OF THE TYPICAL # MONTHS.

ET11 In a typical month, how many entire food stamp households do you estimate are newly disqualified in (STATE) for failing to comply with food stamp E & T program requirements?

_____# HOUSEHOLDS

Table of Contents

ET12 Of the households disqualified for violating a work requirement, can you distinguish first time violators from repeat violators?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO ET14

ET13 For how many of these households do you estimate this is their first disqualification for a program violation?

_____# HOUSEHOLDS

ET14 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, a tracking system within the State to identify individuals or households that have been disqualified because of failure to comply with food stamp E & T program requirements for the purposes of ensuring that they don't receive benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO
TRACK THIS INFORMATION 03

ET15 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to share information with other States on persons disqualified for noncompliance with E & T program rules, for the purposes of ensuring that these persons do not receive benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO
TRACK THIS INFORMATION 03

Unit II.2 Disqualification for Noncompliance with Another Means-Tested Program

The next set of questions concerns new rules under the Federal welfare reform law that give States the choice to disqualify a food stamp participant if he/she is disqualified from another means-tested program, for failure to perform actions required by that program.

M1 Can food stamp participants in your State be disqualified from the Food Stamp Program if they fail to perform actions required by another means-tested program?

YES. 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO Unit II.3

The next series of questions will focus on the programs that fall into the category of "other means-tested programs," for this sanction.

Table of Contents

M2 Does (STATE) include TANF in the category of "other means-tested programs" for this sanction?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO M11

I am going to read to you a list of provisions that may be required of TANF participants. For each requirement, I will ask you whether this is a TANF requirement for which a violation results in a TANF disqualification in your State. If this is the case, I will ask you if the individual or entire household are disqualified. Then I will ask you if violation of this TANF requirement will also result in food stamp disqualification. If the answer is yes, I will then ask you a few follow-up questions about the food stamp sanction.

FOR EACH PROVISION LISTED IN THE GRID, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. BELOW IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW TO PROCEED.

Table of Contents

M3	a	Does (STATE) disqualify recipients from TANF for violation of a ***work requirement?*** *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M3a =01, go to M3b. If response to M3a=02, go to M4.
	b	"Does (STATE) disqualify the individual or the whole household for violation of a TANF ***work requirement?*** *(Response choices and codes: individual only= 01; household only=02; sometimes individuals and sometimes households = 03)*
	c	"Does this TANF disqualification also result in disqualification from food stamps?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M3c=01, go to M3d. If response to M3c=02 , go to M4.
	d	"Is this disqualification period permanent?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M3d=01, go to M4. If response to M3d=02, go to M3e.
	e	"Can the disqualified participants regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualification?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)*
	f	"Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period under this sanction?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M3f=01, go to M3g. If response to M3f=02, go to M4.
	g	"What is the length of this minimum disqualification period?" *(Response choices= # of months)*

REPEAT THIS PROCEDURE FOR QUESTIONS M3 - M10.

Table of Contents

Table M3: TANF-Related Disqualification

No.	a. Does (STATE) disqualify recipients from TANF for violation of a TANF .....?	b. Does (STATE) disqualify the individual or the whole HH for violation of a TANF.....?	c. Does this TANF disqual. also result in disqual. from food stamps?	d. Is this disqual. period permanent?	e. Can the disqualified participant regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualification?	f. Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period for this sanction?	g. What is the length of this minimum disqualification period?
	Yes=01 No=02	Individ.=01 Whole HH=02 Sometimes individual, sometimes whole HH=03	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Number of months
M3	**Work requirement?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M4		If yes ➜ If no, go to M4	If yes, go to M4 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M4	
M4	**Child immunization requirement?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M5		If yes ➜ If no, go to M5	If yes, go to M5 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M5	
M5	**School attendance requirement for participants' children?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M6		If yes ➜ If no, go to M6	If yes, go to M6 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M6	

Table of Contents

Table M3: TANF-Related Disqualification (cont.)

No.	a. Does (STATE) disqualify recipients from TANF for violation of a TANF .....?	b. Does (STATE) disqualify the individual or the whole HH for violation of a TANF.....?	c. Does this TANF disqual. also result in disqual. from food stamps?	d. Is this disqual. period permanent?	e. Can the disqualified participant regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualification?	f. Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period for this sanction?
	Yes=01 No=02	Individ.=01 Whole HH=02 Sometimes individual, sometimes whole HH=03	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02
M6	**Requirement for participant attendance at non-work related classes, such as parenting or nutrition education?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M7	If yes ➜ If no, go to M7	If yes, go to M7 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M7	
M7	**Any Requirements specifically for minor parents?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M8	If yes ➜ If no, go to M8	If yes, go to M8 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M8	

Table of Contents

Table M3: TANF-Related Disqualification (cont.)

No.	a. Does (STATE) disqualify recipients from TANF for violation of a TANF .....?	b. Does (STATE) disqualify the individual or the whole HH for violation of a TANF.....?	c. Does this TANF disqual. also result in disqual. from food stamps?	d. Is this disqual. period permanent?	e. Can the disqualified participant regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualification?	f. Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period for this sanction?
	Yes=01 No=02	Individ.=01 Whole HH=02 Sometimes individual, sometimes whole HH=03	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02
M8	**Missed appointment with a TANF eligibility case worker, btwn cert. periods?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M9	If yes ➜ If no, go to M9	If yes, go to M9 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M9	
M9	**Another requirement?** If yes, ask "Which requirement?"_____ _____ _____, then ➜ If no, go to M10	If yes ➜ If no, go to M10	If yes, go to M10 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M10	

Table of Contents

M10 Does (STATE) include State or local General Assistance in the category of "other means-tested programs" for this sanction?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 --GO TO M12

INTERVIEWER ---TYPE IN THE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW IN TABLE M11, WHICH FOLLOWS. THEN ASK IF THERE ARE ANY ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR WHICH VIOLATION WOULD RESULT IN FOOD STAMP DISQUALIFICATION. IF SO, ASK THIS SAME SERIES OF QUESTIONS (a-e) FOR THE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT(S).

Table of Contents

M11Aa	"Does (STATE) disqualify participants from General Assistance if they do not comply with a GA ***work requirement***?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M11Ab=01, go to M11Ac If response to M11Ab=02, go to M11B.
b	"Does this violation of the GA ***work requirement*** also result in disqualification from food stamps?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M11Ab=01, go to M11Ac If response to M11Ab=02, go to M11B.
c	"Is this disqualification period permanent?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M11Ac=01, go to M11B. If response to M11Ac=02, go to M11Ad.
d	"Can the disqualified participant regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualification?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)*
e	"Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period under this sanction? *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to M11Ae=01, go to M11Af. If response to M11Ae=02, go to M11B.
f	"What is the length of this minimum disqualification period?" *(Response choices and codes: # of months; varies=98; permanent=99)*

REPEAT THIS PROCEDURE FOR M11A - M11C.

Table of Contents

Table M11: General Assistance-Related Disqualification

No.	a. Does (STATE) disqualify recipients from GA for violation of a GA ....?	b. Does this violation of the GA .... also result in disqualification from food stamps?"	c. Is the disqualification permanent?	d. Can the disqualified participant regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualification?	e. Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period for this sanction?	f. What is the length of this minimum disqualification period?
	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Number of Months
M11A	**A Work requirement?** If yes ➜ If no, go to M11B	If yes ➜ If no, go to M11B	If yes, go to M11B If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M11B	
M11B	**Another requirement?** If yes, ask "which requirement?" _____ If no, go to M12	If yes ➜ If no, go to M11C	If yes, go to M11C If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M11C	
M11C	**Another requirement?** If yes, ask "which requirement?" _____ If no, go to M12	If yes ➜ If no, go to M12	If yes, go to M12 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M12	

Table of Contents

M12 Does (STATE) include any other State or local program in the category of "other means-tested programs" for this sanction?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO M14

M12a Please name this program(s). _____

INTERVIEWER ---TYPE IN THE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW IN TABLE M13, WHICH FOLLOWS. THEN ASK IF THERE ARE ANY ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE "OTHER PROGRAM" FOR WHICH VIOLATION WOULD RESULT IN FOOD STAMP DISQUALIFICATION. IF SO, ASK THIS SAME SERIES OF QUESTIONS (a-e) FOR THE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT(S).

M13A a "If violation of the ***work requirement*** results in disqualification of the individual from the (Other Program), does it also result in food stamp disqualification?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02; violation does not result in disqualification from other program=03)

If response to M13Aa=01, go to M13Ab
If response to M13=02 or 03, go to M13B.

b "Is this disqualification period permanent?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)

If response to M13Ab=01, go to M13B.
If response to M13Ab=02, go to M13Ac.

c "Is the disqualified participant required to correct his or her behavior pattern in order for eligibility to be reinstated?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)

d "Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period for this sanction?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)

If response to M13Ad=01, go to M13Ae.
If response to M13Ad=02, go to M13B.

e "What is the length of this minimum disqualification period?"

(Response choices = # of months)

REPEAT THIS PROCEDURE FOR M13A - M13C.

Table of Contents

Table M13: Other Program Disqualification

No.	Does (STATE) disqualify recipients of (Other Program) for violation of a ....?	a. Does this violation of the (Other Program) ... also result in disqualification from food stamps?	b. Is the disqualification permanent?	c. Can the disqualified participant regain eligibility if he or she corrects the behavior pattern that caused the disqualified?	d. Is there a minimum food stamp disqualification period for this sanction?	e. What is the length of this minimum disqualification period?
	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02 Violation does not result in disqualification from other program=03	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Yes=01 No=02	Number of Months
M13A	**Work requirement** If yes ➜ If no, go to M13B	If yes ➜ If 02 or 03, go to M13B	If yes, go to M13B If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M13B	
M13B	**Other requirement:** _____ If yes ➜ If no, go to M13C or M14	If yes ➜ If 02 or 03, go to M13C	If yes, go to M13C If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M13C	
M13C	**Other requirement:** _____ If yes ➜	If yes ➜ If 02 or 03, go to M14	If yes, go to M14 If no ➜		If yes ➜ If no, go to M14	

Table of Contents

M14 Please estimate, if you can, how many food stamp participants are newly disqualified in a typical month in (STATE) because of failure to comply with the requirements of another means-tested program?

_____# PERSONS

M15 Does (STATE) have or plan to have a tracking system within the State to identify individuals or households that have failed to comply with required actions under another means-tested program, for the purpose of ensuring that they don't receive food stamp benefits during the disqualification period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

M16 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to share information with other States on persons disqualified for noncompliance with actions required under another means-tested program, for the purposes of ensuring that these persons do not recieve food stamp benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

Unit II.3 Reduction of Food Stamps when Cash Benefits Reduced for Noncompliance with TANF Rules

Prior to welfare reform, a State could not increase food stamp benefits for a household that had its TANF benefits reduced due to violation of a TANF program requirement. Current law maintains this requirement; however, it also gives States the option to reduce a household's food stamp benefits in such circumstances.

R1 Has (STATE) taken this option?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT II.4

R2 Are food stamp benefit reductions calculated using a standardized flat percentage reduction?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO R4

Table of Contents

R3 What is the standardized flat percentage reduction?

_____%

GO TO R5

R4 Based on what factors does the rate of the food stamp benefit reduction vary under this sanction?

_____

R5 Is the food stamp allotment from which the deduction is taken calculated based on the household's income before the TANF noncompliance penalty has been imposed, or afterwards?

BEFORE 01
AFTER 02

R6 Does the penalized household have the opportunity to take corrective action to have the food stamp penalty lifted?

YES 01
NO 02

R7 Please estimate, if you can, how many food stamp participants in (STATE) have their benefits reduced in a typical month because of their failure to comply with the requirements of a means tested program.

_____# PARTICIPANTS

R8 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, a tracking system within the State to identify households that have failed to comply with actions required under another means-tested program, for the purposes of ensuring that they receive reduced food stamp benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

Table of Contents

R9 Do you have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to share information with other States on households sanctioned for noncompliance with actions required under another means-tested program, for the purposes of ensuring that these households receive reduced food stamp benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION 03

Unit II.4 Child Support Sanctions

I would also like to talk with you about two new options under the Federal welfare reform law which permit States to disqualify parents from the Food Stamp Program. One option allows States to disqualify parents for being in arrears in their child support payments. Another allows States, more broadly, to disqualify parents for failure to cooperate with the State child support agency, unless they have good cause for their actions.

C1 First, I would like to know, has (STATE) opted to disqualify parents who are in arrears in paying court-ordered child support?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO C7

C2 How does the State define when a participant is "in arrears" in paying court-ordered child support for this sanction?

SPECIFIC # OF MONTHS IN ARREARS (specify) . . . 01 (specify #)____
PROPORTION OF PAYMENT NOT MADE 02
CURRENTLY LATE IN PAYING CHILD SUPPORT WITH HISTORY OF NONPAYMENT OR LATE PAYMENT 03
OTHER DEFINITION . . . . . 04 GO TO C2a IF THIS CHOICE SELECTED, OTHERWISE GO TO C3)

C2a. What is this other definition?

_____

C3 To which of the following two categories of recipients does the new rule apply?

All participants receiving food stamps, or 01
Only participants receiving food stamps and TANF benefits 02

Table of Contents

C4 In a typical month, how many adult food stamp participants in your State do you estimate are noncustodial parents subject to child support provisions?

_____# PERSONS

C5 Please estimate, if you can, how many of these participants are newly disqualified in a typical month because they are "in arrears" in paying court-ordered child support?

_____# PERSONS

C6 How can those affected by this sanction have their eligibility restored?

_____

_____

C7 Has (STATE) opted to disqualify parents for failure to cooperate with the state child support agency in establishing paternity or obtaining support for the child?

YES 01
NO ..... 02 ---GO TO UNIT II.5

C8 Do the new rules apply to custodial parents?

YES 01
NO ..... 02 ---GO TO C11

C9 Is there a minimum length of time for which custodial food stamp recipients are disqualified under this provision?

YES 01
NO ..... 02 ---GO TO C11

C10 What is the minimum duration of the disqualification?

_____(#months) OR
_____(# years)

Table of Contents

C11 Do the new rules apply to noncustodial parents?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO C14

C12 Is there a minimum length of time for which noncustodial food stamp recipients are disqualified under this provision?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO C14

C13 What is the minimum duration of the disqualification?

_____(#months) OR
_____(# years)

C14 What definition of "failure to cooperate" does the (STATE) Food Stamp Program use?

_____

_____

C15 What is (STATE'S) definition of "good cause" for failure to cooperate?

_____

_____

C16 To which of the following categories of recipients does the new rule apply?

All participants receiving food stamps, or 01
Only participants receiving food stamps and
TANF benefits 02

C17 Please estimate, if you can, how many of the food stamp particiants in (STATE) are newly disqualified in a typical month because they fail to cooperate with the child support agency, not including any parents you may have counted above as disqualified because they are in arrears in paying court-ordered child support.

_____# PERSONS

Table of Contents

C18 How can those affected by this sanction have their eligibility restored?

_____

_____

C19 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, a tracking system within the State to identify individuals that have failed to comply with child support requirements or are in arrears in paying court-ordered child support, for the purposes of ensuring that they don't receive benefits during the disqualification period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

C20 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to share information with other States on individuals who have failed to comply with child support requirements or are in arrears in paying court-ordered child support, for the purposes of ensuring that these persons do not receive benefits during the disqualification period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

Unit II.5 Sanctions for Failure to Ensure Minors Attend School

I'd now like to ask some questions about the new option under Federal welfare reform which permits States to sanction a food stamp household if the adult in the family fails to ensure that his or her minor dependent children attend school.

MS1 Has (STATE) taken this option?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO UNIT II.6

MS2 To what categories of food stamp households does this sanction apply?

To all food stamp households, or 01
To only food stamp/ TANF households? 02

Table of Contents

MS3 What is the sanction you apply to these households?

Do you disqualify the entire household, ... 01
Disqualify only the adults in the household, or 02
Reduce the households' food stamp benefits? . . . . . 03 ---GO TO MS10

MS4 Please estimate, if you can, in a typical month how many households in (STATE) have someone newly disqualified as a result of this new sanction policy?

_____# HOUSEHOLDS

MS5 How can disqualified households have their eligibility restored?

_____

_____

MS6 Is there a minimum length of the disqualification?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO MS8

MS7 What is the minimum length of this disqualification period?

_____# MONTHS

MS8 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, a tracking system within the State to ensure that parents who have been disqualified from food stamps for failure to ensure that their children attend school do not receive food stamp benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

MS9 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to ensure that parents who have been disqualified from food stamp benefits for failure to ensure that their children attend school do not receive food stamp benefits during the sanction period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

GO TO UNIT II.6

Table of Contents

MS10 On average, by what percentage are food stamp benefits reduced for households who are subject to this sanction in (STATE)?

_____%

MS11 Please estimate, if you can, how many households in your State have their benefits newly reduced as a result of this new sanction policy, in a typical month?

_____#HOUSEHOLDS

MS12 How can those whose benefits have been reduced by this sanction regain their previous benefit level?

_____

Unit II.6 Sanctions for Drug Felons

Next, I would like to ask you about a new provision of the Federal welfare reform law that affects the eligibility of individuals convicted of a felony drug violation. The law makes individuals ineligible for food stamps if convicted of Federal or State felonies for possession, use or distribution of illegal drugs after the date of enactment of Federal welfare reform. However, the law also permits States to opt out of the provision if they enact laws exempting individuals or limiting the disqualification period.

D1 Has (STATE) opted out of any aspect of the new rule that makes food stamp recipients permanently ineligible for food stamps if they are convicted of a felony drug violation?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO D5

D2 Has (STATE) passed a law to opt out of the new rule for all categories of recipients or just some categories of recipients?

ALL . . . . . 01 ---GO TO D4a
SOME 02

D3 For which categories of recipients has the State opted out of the disqualification rule?

D3a For pregnant women?

YES 01
NO 02

Table of Contents

D3b For persons participating in substance abuse treatment programs?

YES 01
NO 02

D3c Any others?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO D4

D3d Please name these other groups.

_____

D4 For those categories of convicted drug felons for which the State has opted out of the new rule, how has the STATE modified the disqualification rule?

D4a Has the State opted to maintain food stamp eligibility for these drug felons?

YES . . . . . 01 ---GO TO UNIT II.7
NO 02

D4b Has the State opted to disqualify drug felons, but not on a permanent basis?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO D4f

D4c Does the State define a specific length for the disqualification period for drug felons?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO D4e

D4d What is the length of the disqualification period?

MONTHS_____OR,
YEARS_____, OR
DISQUALIFICATION PERIOD VARIES FOR DIFFERENT INDIVIDUALS (OBTAIN SPECIFIC INFORMATION)

_____

Table of Contents

D4e Does the require drug felons to take any actions to have their food stamp benefits restored?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO 4g

D4f What is this requirement?

_____

D4g Has (STATE) opted to reduce benefits rather than disqualify food stamp recipients convicted of a felony drug violation?

YES 01
NO 02

D5 Please estimate, if you can, how many food stamp participants are newly sanctioned under this provision in a typical month.

_____# PARTICIPANTS

I will now read to you a list of sources of information that (STATE) may use during the time of food stamp application or recertification to determine whether an individual is a drug felon. As I mention each source, please tell me whether or not (STATE) uses it for this purpose.

D6a Do you match against court records?

YES 01
NO 02

D6b Do you track arrest warrants?

YES 01
NO 02

D6c Do you ask the client?

YES 01
NO 02

D6d Does (STATE) use any other sources of information to identify a drug felon?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO D7

Table of Contents

D6e Please name the other sources of information that (STATE) uses for this purpose:

_____

_____

D7 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, a tracking system within the State to ensure that individuals disqualified because they are convicted of a drug felony do not receive food stamp benefits elsewhere during the disqualification period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION 03

D8 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to share information with other States about individuals convicted of a drug felony for the purposes of ensuring that these persons do not receive benefits during the disqualification period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . . 02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION 03

Unit II.7 Fleeing Felons

I will now read to you a list of sources of information that (STATE) may use during the time of food stamp application or recertification to determine whether an individual is a fleeing felon. As I mention each source, please tell me whether or not (STATE) uses it for this purpose.

FF1a Do you match against court records?

YES 01
NO 02

FF1b Do you track arrest warrants?

YES 01
NO 02

FF1c Do you ask the client?

YES 01
NO 02

Table of Contents

FF1d Does (STATE) use any other sources of information to identify a fleeing felon?

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 ---GO TO FF2

FF1e Please name the other sources of information that (STATE) uses for this purpose:

_____

FF2 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, a tracking system within the State to ensure that fleeing felons do not receive benefits elsewhere once they are disqualified?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . .02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

FF3 Does (STATE) have, or plan to have, an interstate tracking system to share information with other States on fleeing felons for the purposes of ensuring that these persons do not receive benefits during the disqualification period?

YES, WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION 01
YES, WE PLAN TO TRACK THIS INFORMATION . .02
NO, WE DO NOT PLAN TO TRACK THIS
INFORMATION 03

UNIT III. Verification Systems

The Federal welfare reform law gives States greater flexibility in the methods used to verify information provided by food stamp applicants and recipients. We are interested in knowing if States have chosen to continue matching against the same sources for household certification purposes, or if they have changed matching procedures under the new law.

I am going to read to you a list of databases that may have been used for information verification prior to welfare reform, or which you may use now. For each database, please tell me whether or not you matched against this source before welfare reform, and whether or not you currently match against this source. If this source is currently being used for verification, I will ask you several follow-up questions.

Table of Contents

FOR EACH DATABASE IN THE LEFT HAND COLUMN OF TABLE VS BELOW, ASK THE FOLLOWING SET OF QUESTIONS. BELOW IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW TO PROCEED.

VS1 a. "Did you use ***the State Wage Information Collection Agency Database*** for verifying food stamp client information before welfare reform was enacted?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)

b. "Do you currently use ***the State Wage Information Collection Agency Database*** for verifying food stamp client information?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)

If the response to VS1b=01, then go to VS1c.
If the response to VS1b=02, then go to VS2.

c. "Is ***the State Wage Information Collection Agency Database*-matching** done only at the time of application and recertification?"

(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)

If the response to VS1c=01, then go to VS2.
If the response to VS1c=02, then go to VS1d.

d. "How frequently do you perform these matches within a certification period?

(Response= _____*(Frequency))*

Go to VS2.

REPEAT THIS PROCEDURE FOR QUESTIONS VS1 - VS11.

Table of Contents

Table VS: Verification Procedures Utilized

No.	Type of Database	a. Did you use...for verifying food stamp client information before welfare reform was enacted?	b. Do you currently use...for verifying food stamp client information?	c. Is...matching done only at the time of application and recertification?	d. How frequently do you perform these matches within a certification period?
		(YES=01;NO=02)	(YES=01; NO=02)	(YES=01; NO=02)	(Frequency)
VS1	**the State Wage Information Collection Agency Database (SWICA)**		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS2	If yes, go to VS2 If no ➜	
VS2	**IRS's Unearned Income Database**		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS3	If yes, go to VS3 If no ➜	
VS3	**the Unemployment Insurance (UI) Database**		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS4	If yes, go to VS4 If no ➜	
VS4	**the Beneficiary Data Exchange Database** (BENDEX)		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS5	If yes, go to VS5 If no ➜	
VS5	**the State Data Exchange Database (SDX)**		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS6	If yes, go to VS6 If no ➜	

Table of Contents

Table VS: Verification Procedures Utilized (cont.)

No.	Type of Database	a. Did you use...for verifying food stamp client information before welfare reform was enacted?	b. Do you currently use...for verifying food stamp client information?	c. Is...matching done only at the time of application and recertification?	d. How frequently do you perform these matches within a certification period?
		(YES=01; NO=02)	(YES=01; NO=02)	(YES=01; NO=02)	(Frequency)
VS6	the Beneficiary Earnings Exchange Reporting System (BEERS)		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS7	If yes, go to VS7 If no ➜	
VS7	the Systematic Alien Verification Entitlements System (SAVE)		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS8	If yes, go to VS8 If no ➜	
VS8	State Prison Records		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS9	If yes, go to VS9 If no ➜	
VS9	the State Dept. of Motor Vehicles Database		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS10	If yes, go to VS10 If no ➜	
VS10	State Child Support Records		If yes ➜ If no, go to VS11	If yes, go to VS11 If no ➜	
VS11	Any Other Database (specify)		If yes ➜ If no, go to Unit IV	If yes, go to Unit IV If no ➜	

Table of Contents

Unit IV.1 *Food Assistance for Immigrants*

Under the new Federal welfare reform law, States can use State or local funds to provide food assistance to legal immigrants who have become ineligible for the Food Stamp Program.

X1 I would like to know if (STATE) initiated any new non-federal food assistance programs or expanded any existing State- or locally-funded food assistance programs specifically to serve legal immigrants who have become ineligible for the federal food stamp program?

YES 01
NO. . . . . .02---GO TO UNIT V.2

Please name the program(s): X2._____

X3._____

X4._____

PLACE THE NAMES OF EACH PROGRAM IN THE LEFT HAND COLUMN OF TABLE X BELOW. FOR EACH PROGRAM, ASK THE FOLLOWING SET OF QUESTIONS. BELOW IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW TO PROCEED.

Table of Contents

X2	a.	"Is ***(X2)*** currently operating statewide?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)*
	b.	"How many legal immigrants participate in this program in a typical month?" *(Response: _____#participants)*
	c.	"In what form is the assistance provided? *(Response choices and codes: cash=01; vouchers=02; and food=03)*
	d.	"Is there a categorical eligibility criterion for legal immigrants in this program? *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)*
	e.	"Is there an income eligibility criterion for legal immigrants in this program?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to X2e=01, then go to X2f If response to X2e=02, then go to X2g
	f.	"What is the income eligibility ceiling for this program?" (*Response: % of federal poverty level*_____%, or *other measure*_____)
	g.	"Who administers this program at the direct service level?" *(Response choices and codes: local food stamp program office=01; other public agency=02; private, non-profit agency=03)*
	h.	"What is the average dollar value of the monthly food assistance benefit provided to each household?" *(Response: _____$)*

REPEAT THE SAME SET OF QUESTIONS FOR ANY ADDITIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS THE STATE HAS NAMED.

Table of Contents

Table X: Food Assistance for Immigrants

No.	Name of Food Assistance Program for Legal Immigrants	a. Is... currently operating statewide?	b. How many legal immigrants participate in this program in a typical month?	c. In what form is the assistance provided?	d. Is there a categorical eligibility criterion?	e. Is there an income eligibility criterion?	f. What is the income ceiling for this program based on the federal poverty level or another measure?	g. Who administers this program at the direct service level?	h. What is the average dollar value of the monthly food assistance benefit provided to each household?
		Yes=01 No =02	_____# of participants	Cash=01 Voucher=02 Food=03	Yes=01 No=02	Yes= 01 No=02	% of FPL _____%, or other measure _____	Food Stamp Offices=01 Other Public Agency=02 Private, Non-profit =03	(_____$)
X2	_____ _____					If yes ➜ If no, go to X2g			
X3	_____ _____					If yes, ➜ If no, go to X3g			
X4	_____ _____					If yes ➜ If no, go to X4g			

Table of Contents

Unit IV.2 Food Assistance for Disqualified ABAWDs

States can also use State or local funds to provide food assistance to able-bodied adults without dependents who have become ineligible for the Food Stamp Program

Y1 I would like to know if (STATE) initiated any new non-federal food assistance programs or expanded any existing State- or locally-funded food assistance programs specifically to serve able-bodied adults without dependents who have become ineligible for the federal Food Stamp Program.

YES 01
NO . . . . . 02 --GO TO UNIT VI

Please name the programs: Y2_____

Y3_____

Y4_____

PLACE THE NAMES OF EACH PROGRAM IN THE LEFT HAND COLUMN OF TABLE Y BELOW. FOR EACH PROGRAM, ASK THE FOLLOWING SET OF QUESTIONS. BELOW IS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW TO PROCEED.

Table of Contents

Y2	a.	"Is ***(Y2)*** currently operating statewide?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)*
	b.	"How many ABAWDs participate in this program in a typical month?" *(Response: _____#participants)*
	c.	"In what form is the assistance provided? *(Response choices and codes: cash=01; vouchers=02; and food=03)*
	d.	"Is there an income eligibility criterion for ABAWDs in this program?" *(Response choices and codes: yes=01; no=02)* If response to Y2d=01, then go to Y2e If response to Y2d=02, then go to Y2f.
	e.	"What is the income ceiling for eligibility for this program, based on the federal poverty level or another measure?" (*Response: % of federal poverty level*_____%, or *other measure*_____)
	f.	"Who administers this program at the direct service level?" *(Response choices and codes: local food stamp program office=01; other public agency=02; private, non-profit agency=03)*
	g.	"What is the average dollar value of the monthly food assistance benefit provided to each household?" *(Response: _____$)*

REPEAT THE SAME SET OF QUESTIONS FOR ANY ADDITIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS THE STATE HAS NAMED.

Table of Contents

Table Y: Food Assistance for Disqualified ABAWDs

No.	Name of Food Assistance Program for Disqualified ABAWDs	a. Is... currently operating statewide?	b. How many ABAWDs participate in this program in a typical month?	c. In what form is the assistance provided?	d. Is there an income eligibility criterion for ABAWDs in this program?	e. What is the income ceiling for this program based on the federal poverty level or another measure?	f. Who administers this program at the direct service level?	g. What is the average dollar value of the monthly food assistance benefit provided to each household?
		Yes=01 No=02	(_____# of participants	Cash=01 Voucher=02 Food=03	Yes=01 No=02	(% of FPL _____%, or other measure _____)	Food Stamp Offices=01 Other Public Agency=02 Private, Non-profit =03	(_____$)
Y2	_____ _____				If yes ➜ If no, go to Y2f			
Y3	_____ _____				If yes ➜ If no, go to Y3f			
Y4	_____ _____				If yes ➜ If no, go to Y4f			

Table of Contents

UNIT V. Food Stamp Application Process

The new Federal welfare reform law removes some of the national standards for local Food Stamp Program operations. Under the previous national standards, States were required to have a single application for food stamps and AFDC, and States were required to offer households a joint application process for these two programs. We are interested to know how you have changed the application process since this mandatory national standard has been removed, and the new TANF program has been implemented.

AP1 First, does your State still have a single application form for food stamps and TANF households?

YES 01
NO 02

AP2 Next, under the new flexibility provided by the Federal welfare reform law, does (STATE) require that local offices still give households the opportunity to apply for TANF and Food Stamp Program benefits through a single interview?

YES 01
NO 02

AP3 Since implementation of the new Federal welfare reform law, can households usually apply for the Food Stamp Program and TANF benefits at the same location?

YES . . . . . 01 ---GO TO CLOSING
NO 02

AP4 Are TANF applicants referred to the local food stamp office at the time of the TANF interview?

YES 01
NO 02

Closing

That is all the questions I have. Thank you for taking part in this interview.....

INTERVIEWER—IF YOU NEED TO GET THE NAMES OF OTHER FOOD STAMP OFFICIALS TO CONTACT IN THIS STATE TO COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE GET THEIR NAMES AND CONTACT NUMBERS NOW.