Intergovernmental

May 31, 1994

The Honorable James J. Lack
The Honorable Art Hamilton
National Conference of
State Legislatures
Suite 515
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear James and Art:

Thank you for your letter regarding my Administration's welfare reform efforts. I'm glad to know we share a deep concern for the personal health and economic security of all of our people.

I am committed to building a welfare system in this nation that rewards work and makes it easier for families to stay together. As you know, my Administration's Working Group on Welfare Reform has recently presented a number of options to help meet this goal, and I am currently reviewing their recommendations. As we complete our discussions in developing a plan to end welfare as we know it, I'll certainly keep your thoughts in mind.

I appreciate your insight on this important issue, and I welcome your continued participation in the process.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON

BC/DNP/MM/ps (Corres. #1563623)
(5.welfareref)

cc: Jeremy Benami, ODP, w/incoming

MM

CK

PL - Welfare Reform/ Imm. Grants/Refugees

064330

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W. SUITE 515 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
202-624-5400 FAX: 202-737-1069

DJ

May 6, 1994

The Honorable William J. Clinton
The President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) is concerned about the financing mechanisms being considered by your Administration's Task Force on Welfare Reform. Of particular concern is the proposal to reduce welfare eligibility for legal immigrants, refugees, and other non-citizens by extending the deeming provisions for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and creating deeming provisions for other programs such as Medicaid. Eliminating federal assistance will not eliminate legal immigrants' needs, and state and local budgets and taxpayers will bear the burden. We believe that this financing mechanism would shift significant costs to state and local governments. Furthermore, NCSL maintains that welfare reform legislation is not the appropriate place to debate immigration policy.

NCSL strongly believes that it is the responsibility of the federal government to fund its policy decisions. Because the federal government has sole jurisdiction over immigration policy, it must bear the responsibility to serve the immigrants that it allows to enter states and localities.

The proposal to reduce or eliminate non-citizen benefits under consideration by the Task Force on Welfare Reform will be a direct cost-shift to state and local budgets and our joint tax payers will still bear the burden. As legal immigrants lose their eligibility to participate in federal programs such as AFDC, SSI, Food Stamps, and Medicaid, in many cases they will access state and local General Assistance and other state and local assistance programs to replace lost benefits. As a result of the 1971 Supreme Court decision *Graham v. Richardson*, states and localities may not exclude persons from participating in their welfare programs on the basis of lawful alienage. Although the federal government has the option to drop legal immigrants from its welfare roles, states and localities may not.

Unfortunately, state and local officials have already faced the results of curtailed federal spending for legal immigrants. Last year, your Administration and the Congress funded the Unemployment Insurance extension by increasing the wait before legal immigrants can access the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program. Many states with high immigrant populations, such as California, New York, New Jersey and Illinois, have comprehensive General Assistance programs which are now serving increased caseloads of legal immigrants who would have been eligible for SSI.

State and local governments cannot and should not be the safety net for federal policy decisions. NCSL will oppose federal reductions in benefits to legal immigrants, whether the proposal cuts $20 billion, $8 billion, or $4 billion worth of program eligibility. Eliminating federal funds for legal immigrants does not change the states' legal responsibility to make its services available to all legal

Denver Office: 1560 BROADWAY SUITE 700 DENVER, COLORADO 80202 303-830-2200 FAX: 303-863-8003

immigrants, in fact it increases it substantially. With the steady decline in federal assistance, states and localities are faced with cutting back on programs and with meeting the needs of the native-born as well as the newcomers, raising issues of equity and community tensions. In short, this proposal will force states to bear the cost of federal immigration policy without the benefit of federal assistance.

We do not believe that welfare reform legislation is the appropriate place for the immigration debate. Program eligibility for legal immigrants should be debated in the context of immigration reform and nowhere else. We urge you to reject policies that divide us and cause states to bear the cost of yet another unfunded federal mandate. Please contact Sheri Steisel in NCSL's Washington, D.C. office, (202) 624-5400, to further discuss these concerns.

Sincerely,

James J. Lack
Majority Steering Committee Chairman
New York Senate
Vice President, NCSL

Art Hamilton
Art Hamilton
Minority Leader, Arizona House
Immediate Past President, NCSL

THE WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF DOMESTIC POLICY

CAROL H. RASCO
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

To: Kathi

Draft response for POTUS
and forward to CHR by:

Draft response for CHR by:

Please reply directly to the writer
(copy to CHR) by:

Please advise by:

Let's discuss:

For your information: ✓

Reply using form code:

File:

Send copy to (original to CHR):

Schedule ? : ☐ Accept ☐ Pending ☐ Regret

Designee to attend:

Remarks:

OCT 3 1994

STATE OF KANSAS

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

JOAN FINNEY, *Governor*
State Capitol, 2nd Floor
Topeka, KS 66612-1590

913-296-3232
1-800-432-2487
TDD# 1-800-992-0152
FAX# (913) 296-7973

September 26, 1994

Carol H. Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Ms. Rasco:

Kansas has carefully reviewed the Administration's "Work and Responsibility Act of 1994". Some of our comments are included in accompanying material and the rest are included in this letter. The attached documents provide Kansas some needed information as well as being used for this response.

The staff reviewing the document, also reviewed information available through the Congressional Record, American Public Welfare Association, National Governors Association, and the Center on Law and Social Policy. They believe much has been addressed in the "Act" that thoroughly changes the way states do business. Kansas has some concerns about staffing and financial implications, which will need to be addressed as time goes along.

1. It is felt that the "Act" will be much more expensive to operate than the current AFDC/JOBS program without major funding enhancements. The State will still incur major financial obligations which concern Kansas as the need is great.

2. Many of the Administration's suggestions for simplification have been addressed in the Kansas Welfare Reform Waiver proposal, "ACTIVELY CREATING TOMORROW (A.C.T.) FOR FAMILIES" which was submitted to the United States Departments of Health and Human Services (Administration for Children and Families), (Health Care Financing Administration) and Agriculture (Food and Nutrition Service) on July 22, 1994. Also, in May of this year, I signed into law a number of Welfare Reform measures, out of which the Kansas waiver document was developed.

3. There are some ideas in the Administration's proposal that concern the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services:

   o The **Declaration of Citizenship and Alienage** should be eliminated or conform to match the requirement of the Food Stamp program.

- The $3,500 **vehicle allowance for AFDC families** should also match the Food Stamp program allowance, which is $4,500. It is felt that the best policy would be of the AFDC and Food Stamp programs to match Medicaid and exclude one vehicle.

- If is felt that the **Essential Persons Policy** is narrowly defined and does not acknowledge the extended and non-traditional families prevalent today and the impact these family members have on the well-being of the children.

- **Quality Control.** It is felt that outcome-based performance measures should be State specific and negotiated with each state.

- **National Clearinghouse.** This is a great idea, however, there is concern that the system would become backlogged in keeping information updated. There is also a question on how valuable this would be in tracking the two year time limit.

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments on the Welfare Reform proposal submitted by the Administration. If you have concerns or questions please feel free to contact my office or Donna Whiteman, Secretary of the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services at 913-296-3271.

Sincerely,

Joan Finney
Governor

JF:DLW:RLW:fms

Enclosures

cc: Donna L. Whiteman

WELFARE REFORM

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL - June 1994

S. 2224/H.R.4605

ISSUE	ANALYSIS	KANSAS LEGISLATION/APPROPRIATION NECESSARY
1. Education and Training Requirements	Personal Responsibility Agreement required at time of AFDC application; employability plan within 90 days of receiving benefits. Up-front job search required for those determined job ready. Employment Oriented Education. Substance Abuse Treatment may be necessary. JOBS is linked with education and training programs, Dept. of Labor programs, National Service, etc. Work Supplementation participants may be assigned to unfilled vacancies in the private sector, provided they do not violate current nondisplacement law. State Plan is required to include a description of how to include training for women in nontraditional employment. Microenterprise is an allowable activity. Individuals in self-initiated education and training receive child care benefits if activities are approved through JOBS. State option to develop training and employment programs for non-custodial parents. Time-limits are 24 months. Deferrals and Sanctions are possible within limits.	Current law allows only participants who are employable to receive services and only those who are substantially more employable to receive training. Current law limits participation in KanWork to not more than 30 months. KAR's have been written to establish the beginning of the 30 months at the time participation in the first component begins. Under the Adm. bill, the 24 month period would begin with the initial AFDC check or 1 check following redetermination for current recipients.
2. Work Program Provisions	Those who cannot find a job in 2 years are assigned to the WORK program for paid employment in the private or public sector. Minimum work standard is 20 hrs./week; state option to increase to 30 hrs/week. States must establish local work advisory boards. Governor designates who operates JOBS and WORK; but a single agency must administer both programs. IV-A agencies are still required to administer AFDC benefits under WORK. 24 month time limit for all recipients without reason for deferral, excepting those meeting the min. work standard. WORK assignments must be an average of 15 hrs./week up to a maximum of 40 hrs./week. After 2 WORK assignments participants could be reassigned to JOBS, continue in WORK or be terminated from AFDC for 6 months if employable but not making good faith efforts to find a job. Recipients who leave AFDC/JOBS qualify for a limited number of additional months of eligibility.	Legislation would be necessary to implement WORK program, time limits, and exceptions. NOTE: Finding enough WORK slots may be difficult. Also a significant increase in staff would be necessary to do necessary case management functions i.e. Teen Parents, JOBS participants and AFDC recipients. Appropriations would also be needed for system automation changes.
3. Phase In/ Participation Rates	Starts with custodial parents born after 1971; state option to define group more broadly. JOBS program targeting requirements are eliminated; state receive additional funding if participation rates exceed 55%; loss of IV-A funds if they serve under 45%. AFDC-UP participation rates remain as current. States must meet either 80% WORK participation standard or a number required to participate based on funding. Loss of IV-A funds if not met.	See above

ISSUE	ANALYSIS	KANSAS LEGISLATION/APPROPRIATION NECESSARY
4. Exemptions	Deferred if; parent of a child less than age 1 or if child is conceived while parent is on AFDC, deferred if child is up to 12 weeks old; if individual is ill or incapacitated; 60 or older; is needed to care for another household member, in the 3rd trimester of pregnancy; or lives in a remote area. Deferral cap set at 5% through FY 99 and 10% thereafter. Loss of IV-A funds if exceeded.	Change in state law pertaining to deferral of individuals with children under 3 yrs would need to be changed.
5. Penalties	JOBS: Non-compliance results in a loss of parents' AFDC benefits until compliance; second offense is a minimums of 3 months of parents' benefit loss; 3rd a minimum of 6 months. for parents. WORK: Refusal to take a job results in family's benefit loss for 6 months; quitting or being dismissed from WORK slot results in loss of 50% of family's grant for 1 month; second offense is 3 months for family's benefits; third offense entire grant is lost for 3 months for family; and 4th and subsequent offenses entire grant is lost for 6 months for family.	Current sanctions differ from the Adm. proposal and would require change in the law. NOTE: Incremental penalties are difficult to track and no proof of effectiveness. Flat time period for all penalties is better.
6. Matching Rates and Changes in Funding	For JOBS, federal cap is increased to $1.75 billion in FY 96; $1.9 billion for FY 99-04. Minimum federal match is 65% in FY 96 phased in to 70% in FY 2000. Spending for direct program costs, administrative costs, and other work-related support services are matched at this rate. Capped entitlement for WORK program is set at $200 million for FY 98; $1.7 Billion for FY 04. At-risk Child Care Program financing increased to $1 billion by FY 99. State match for all other IV-A Child Care programs changed to enhanced match for other IV-A services.	If federal legislation is passed before 10/01/1995, additional appropriations would be necessary for State Fiscal Year 1996. Additional staff would be needed and for changes needed in the automated systems.
7. Child Care and Transitional Child Care (TCC)	Child Care guaranteed during education, training, and work programs. States must supplement disregard of offer another child care arrangement. State option to extend hours and weeks of care under IV-A programs. State may not lower statewide limits in payment below those in effect 1/1/94. IV-A child care programs follow CCDBG requirements. States may place all federal child care programs into one agency.	
8. Minor Parent/Teen Provisions	Effective FY 96, minor mothers live at home. Time-limit applied at age 18. States are required to provide case management to all custodial minor parents under age 20. All eligible teens must remain enrolled in school or GED equivalent. Separate authority under Title XX is established for programs related to teen pregnancy prevention. A designated number of community sites chosen by the HHS Secretary and others are entitled to demonstration grants to educate and support school-age youth, with an emphasis on pregnancy prevention.	Legislation would be required to add exceptions to the requirement for minors to live at home.
9. Mandatory Teen Parent Education	State option to provide bonuses or impose sanctions on attendance.	At this time, the KanLearn legislation appears to be sufficient.
10. Paternity Establishment as a Condition of Eligibility	States are required to establish paternity within one year after the mother has named the father, or risk losing a portion of their federal match. Mothers who do not cooperate by naming all possible fathers, additional relevant information, agreeing to genetic testing, and appearing at required interviews will be denied benefits.	State law change contingent upon how federal regulations are written.
11. Family Cap	State option to deny or limit benefits for additional children	At this time, current legislation appears to be sufficient.

ISSUE	ANALYSIS	KANSAS LEGISLATION/APPROPRIATION NECESSARY
12. Stepparent Deeming Treatment	State option to increase amount of stepparent disregards	See above.
13.Mandatory Substance Abuse	State option to require treatment for substance abuse.	See above.
14. Income and Resources	Raises AFDC resource limit to $2,000 (or $3,000 for a household with a member age 60 or over) Recipients may establish IDAs not to exceed $10,000 which will be matched by federal government dollars on a demonstration basis.	Legislation would be necessary to change resource limits.
15. AFDC-UP	State option to eliminate 100 hour rule, 30 day unemployment requirement and the unemployment test.	At this time, current legislation appears to be sufficient.
16. Earned Income Deduction	States are required to disregard a minimum of $120/month; state may establish higher earnings disregard amounts to encourage work.	State law change contingent upon how federal regulations are written.
17. Block Grant	States may convert all federal payments for AFDC to a block grant equal to 103% of the total amount the state received in FY 92 to establish an alternative program for providing cash assistance for needy children.	This looks possible but cost shifting could occur.
18. Social Security Matches to Prevent Fraud	Implements MIS infrastructure to use location and receipt of AFDC with names and Social Security numbers to detect and prevent fraud and abuse.	At this time, current legislation appears to be sufficient.
19. Changes in Waiver Process	HHS Secretary may authorize no more than 5 demos. with time limits other than 24 months. States may not waive WORK programs, but may seek waiver to operate CWEP.	If or when this proposal passes, HHS has indicated that they will individually review states' waivers.
20. Earned Income Tax Credit	Under demonstrations, states can make advance payments of EITC to eligible residents. Noncitizens are ineligible for EITC. WORK wages are not eligible for EITC or the TJTC.	At this time, legislation might be necessary.
21. Evaluations Outcome Measures	HHS Secretary enacts an outcome-based performance standard system measuring programs' efficiency in improving clients' self-sufficiency and other provisions. Sec. develops specific outcomes on performance measures and publishes them in the Federal Register by 10/1/96. By 4/1/98, Sec. presents recommendations based on gathered info. for finalization into legislation.	Concept is positive however it should be negotiated with each state
22. Program Simplification and Coordination	State option to use prospective or retrospective budgeting with or without monthly reporting. Excludes non-recurring lump sum payments from income for AFDC disregards reimbursement and EITC as resources for AFDC and Food Stamp programs. States may implement federal income tax intercept programs to collect outstanding AFDC overpayments.	Legislation would be required to exempt lump sum payments and EITC payments as a resource

ISSUE	ANALYSIS	KANSAS LEGISLATION/APPROPRIATION NECESSARY
23. Restriction of Benefits for Noncitizens	Under SSI, five year sponsor-to-alien provision is made permanent. After 6 years in the U.S. and without citizenship, no sponsored immigrant is eligible for AFDC, SSI, and Food Stamps if sponsor's income is above median line.	Legislative change would be required.
24. Cuts in Welfare Spending	Cap on Emergency Assistance set in FY 95 and increased by CPI each year.	This could cause cost shifting for states.
25. Child Support Enforcement	Greater use of administrative rather than judicial processes to establish and enforce child support and establish paternity; centralized payment center for state and then would also be required to link with national registry of support orders; new hire information taken from W-4's would be compiled at national level and made available to states. Changes in federal funding and federal distribution mandates and how arrearages would be handled. Several demos for Child Support Assurance program will also be made.	State legislation would be necessary for: Administrative process; centralized payment center; arrearage methodology and budget increases for update in automation; concept of national clearinghouse is good but it must be kept up-to-date and timely.
26. Other	AFDC vehicle exclusion to $3,500 and redefining essential person. Declaration of Citizenship and Alienage -	Legislation would be necessary unless a waiver could be obtained. SRS feels that this should be eliminated or match Food Stamp program. This should match Food Stamp program

FMS: wp51\ADMWRPRO.SPD 7/94

PROPOSED
WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1994
compared with
THE KANSAS KANWORK PROGRAM

The Welfare Reform Bill
Proposed by the Clinton Administration
as compared to the Kansas JOBS Program
as the latter would appear if current
waiver requests are approved

POPULATION TO BE SERVED:

KANWORK	WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT	COMMENT
Participation will be limited to those AFDC recipients determined through assessment to be currently employable or who have the potential to be employable within 30 months with assistance from JOBS program services.	Participation will be required for AFDC recipients who fall under the Act's definition of the "Phased-in Group" > This group includes all applicants who are custodial parents (including minors) born after 1971. Current recipients born after 1971 would be covered as of their first redetermination following the effective date of the Act. > States would be permitted to serve a broader range of participants as long as the "phased-in group" is covered. > "Phased-in Group" members could be deferred for good cause such as substantial barriers to employment as long as the total number of deferrals does not exceed 5% of the total number of persons in the phased-in group. A higher percentage may be requested from the Secretary. > Deferrals could also be granted for parents with a child under the age of 1 who was not conceived while the parent was on assistance (limit: 1 parent per AFUP family); documented serious illness; need to remain home to care for family member; 3rd trimester of pregnancy; lives in a remote area. These deferrals would not be counted in the 5%.	Limited resources should be concentrated on those individuals who can make the most efficient use of program services and who have the greatest probability for avoiding chronic dependency on public assistance. This would be those individuals who are either employable at the outset or who are assessed as having the potential to become employable within the time limits established by law. The deferral of individuals possessing such substantial barriers as to render them unemployable is a good idea and could help avoid investing resources in those not likely to have a successful outcome. However, the use of this provision should be determined on a case-by-case basis. An arbitrary cap on the number of such determinations as a percentage of the total number in the phased-in group bears no relationship to the actual number of those who may or may not be employable.

INTAKE, ORIENTATION, ASSESSMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY PLAN:		
KANWORK:	**WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:**	**COMMENT:**
Intake occurs prior to referral according to IM procedures. Orientation & Assessment are conducted by EPS at the earliest possible date. However, waiting lists may be utilized at the local level when the number of referrals exceed available resources. Self Sufficiency Planning is recommended within 30 days of the initial assessment interview.	> A Personal Responsibility Agreement between the applicant and the agency would be part of the application process for AFDC. This is not the same as the employability plan. This is a general agreement emphasizing the goal of self sufficiency and describing the responsibilities of the applicant and the agency. Current recipients would be required to sign the Agreement as part of the redetermination process. > The State would also be required to obtain written confirmation from each applicant in the phased-in group that they had been informed of the 2 year time limit, participation requirements, and available services. > The assessment & employability plan will be required within 90 days from the date for which earliest payment was made for new applicants & within 90 days of the redetermination for current recipients	The requirement for assessment & employability planning within 90 days of the date of the first check or redetermination would impact Kansas' 75 case cap per JOBS case manager. This would either require increased staffing to do up front assessments which would increase costs or allow caseloads to increase, which could effect the quality of case management services.

DEFERRALS:		
KANWORK:	**WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:**	**COMMENT:**
An individual who is unable to participate in JOBS activities due to documented barriers may be placed in Resolution Status for up to 6 months in order to work on removing the barriers. Actions are specified on a Self Sufficiency Plan and Support Services are available.	> Adult recipients may be placed in deferral status for an indefinite period of time. The time spent in Deferred Status does not count against the 24 month time limit. > Those with potential for removing their barriers may be placed in activities which will prepare them for employment or participation in the JOBS program. Those who are not likely to participate may be assigned other goals, such as improving parenting or money management skills. > The use of JOBS funds for individuals in deferred status would be permitted but not required. There would be no child care guarantee for individuals in deferred status. > Recipients who are deferred due to substance abuse may be required to participate in a treatment program provided that the treatment is available at no cost to the recipient. Sanctions may be imposed for non-cooperation. In this case, States would be required to provide Support Services & Child Care if needed for the recipient to participate in the treatment program.	The option to require deferred substance abusers to participate in treatment will require an increase in resources for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services.

TIME LIMITS:

KANWORK:	WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:	COMMENT:
> The focus of the time limit is participation in the JOBS program. > Participation will be limited to a cumulative total of 30 months. The 30 months would begin with participation in the first component. Limited extensions are possible in well documented cases of undue hardship. > Participants working on GED will be limited to 9 months to obtain the GED. This will count as part of the total 30 months. Limited extensions are possible in well documented cases of undue hardship. > Following the 30 months, unemployed participants may continue to receive support services for an additional six months while seeking employment.	> The focus of the time limit is on receipt of AFDC cash assistance for those recipients who are in the "phased-in" group. > Participation will be limited to a cumulative total of 24 months for recipients over the age of 18. The 24 months will begin with the initial AFDC check or first check following redetermination for current recipients. > The State would be required to complete the assessment & employability plan within 90 days of the date first payment was made. > The State will be required to advise the recipient at least every six months as to the time remaining. A face-to-face meeting would be required at least 90 days prior to the expiration of the 24 months. > The time limit does not apply to recipients who are not in the "phased-in group."	Under the JOBS State Plan, case management services are provided for participants in KanWork and JOBS/Balance of State Counties by EPS Staff. Caseloads are limited to 75 per case manager in order to assure the quality and sufficiency of the services provided to the participant. This has required waiting lists in a number of localities where the number of referrals has exceeded staff available to provide the quality of case management necessary. If the method for initiating the time limit envisioned under the Work and Responsibility Act were to become law, this would require immediate availability of services for recipients. This would create a situation in which significant staffing increases could be required to maintain the quality of case management services currently made possible by the caseload cap.

AFDC -UP FAMILIES AND THE TIME LIMIT:

KANWORK;	WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:	COMMENT:
There will be no targeted groups. All participants will be subject to the employability and time limits.	> If either parent falls into the phased-in groups, both are counted as part of this groups, even if they should later separate. > Separate records are kept concerning each parent"s cumulative time and program status. One parent's participation does not generally have an effect on the other, except in cases where their combined hours meet the minimum work standard or where sanctions are applied against one parent for refusing to accept unsubsidized employment	

TEEN PARENTS:		
KANWORK:	**WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:**	**COMMENT:**
> A minor unmarried parent must reside with a parent, guardian, or other adult-supervised situation in order to receive cash assistance. Exceptions are made in the situation where the living parent or guardian's whereabouts are unknown, where the minor's health or safety would be jeopardized, or where the minor has lived independently for one year prior to applying for assistance. > Teens who are participating in the KDHE Teen Pregnancy Case Management Projects will not be subject to the KanWork participation time limits.	>Custodial parents under the age of 20 who have children 12 weeks old and older would be required to participate in the JOBS program if they have not completed high school or received a GED. Education activities would be given priority. States would be required to provide case management services. >A teen parent would not be subject to the 24 month rule until reaching the age of 18. Students eligible for services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act would receive automatic extensions up to age 22 if needed to complete high school. States could also defer individuals under the age of 20 who were unable to attend school due to a serious illness.	These provisions will require an increase in funding for: > Additional staff to provide case management services to the larger number of participants resulting from the inclusion of teen parents into the program. > Additional funding for child care. This would include an increase in provider rates to encourage providers to care for infants of parents who ar deferred for only twelve weeks after the birth of the child.

JOBS SERVICES:		
KANWORK:	**WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:**	**COMMENTS:**
> Participants who are determined to be employable during the initial assessment may be assigned to search for employment. The job search component is limited to a total of 8 weeks within any twelve month period. > Job development and placement services are primarily offered by referral to the Kansas Department of Human Resources or other contracting entity.	> All adult recipients in the phased-in group having either a high school diploma/GED or a non-negligible work history would be required to perform a job search from the date assistance began. This component would be limited to 4 months in any 12 month period as an exclusive activity, but could be required in conjunction with other activities.	The extended job search up front could be helpful in a number of ways: > Since job development and placement services are contracted out in Kansas, this requirement could reduce waiting lists without placing substantial additional demands on case managers. > The increased time requirement enhances the possibility that the recipient could obtain employment prior to the need for extensive case management. > For those who do not obtain employment during the 4 month period, the activities associated with an intensive job search would underscore the program emphasis on employment and provide experiences that would be helpful in subsequent self sufficiency planning The implementation of these provisions would require an increase in funding and renegotiation of our contracts with job development and placement service providers in consideration of the increased number of referrals that would result.

SANCTIONS/PENALTIES:		
KANWORK:	**WORK AND RESPONSIBILITY ACT:**	**COMMENT:**
Penalty for non-compliance without good cause is removal of the individual's needs from the AFDC/Food Stamp benefit for 3 months, compliance, or employment of at lease 30 hours per week at Federal minimum wage, whichever occurs first. At the end of 3 months, the benefits for the entire family would be terminated if the individual had not taken the requisite action to remove the penalty.	> For failure to comply with a JOBS program requirement: in the first instance, removal of the individual from the cash grant until the failure ceases; in the second instance, a minimum of three months and compliance; for all subsequent penalties, a minimum of six months plus compliance. > For refusing without good cause to accept an offer of unsubsidized employment, the entire family would lose the AFDC cash grant for up to six months unless the adult accepts a job offer.	Penalties with a fixed period of ineligibility as in the first instance above remove responsibility and control form the parent and give it to the agency. Placing control of the during of the disqualification period with the parents has been found to be an effective means of enforcing program compliance.

THE WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF DOMESTIC POLICY

CAROL H. RASCO
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

To: Ruday

Draft response for POTUS
and forward to CHR by:

Draft response for CHR by:

Please reply directly to the writer
(copy to CHR) by:

Please advise by:

Let's discuss:

For your information: ✓

Reply using form code:

File:

Send copy to (original to CHR):

Schedule ? : ☐ Accept ☐ Pending ☐ Regret

Designee to attend:

Remarks:

OCT 17 1994

STATE OF OHIO
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
COLUMBUS 43266-0601

GEORGE V. VOINOVICH
GOVERNOR

September 15, 1994

Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
The White House
2nd Floor, West Wing
Washington, DC 20500

Re: The Work and Responsibility Act of 1994

Dear Ms. Rasco:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on The Work and Responsibility Act of 1994. We are following the welfare reform issues with great interest and concern. We strongly recommend that there be no unfunded mandates resulting from these efforts. Ohio has taken the initiative to propose a number of federal waivers in order to begin our own programs as soon as possible, and it is very apparent that many of our issues coincide.

We feel the key to Welfare Reform is economic development, that strengthening an economic support system will promote family preservation through self sufficiency. With our Welfare Reform, JOBS, Ohio 2000, OhioCare Family and Children First, and Head Start initiatives, Ohio is making a strong commitment to stimulate private sector employment. We are providing incentives to employers to increase job slots as well as preparing and encouraging welfare recipients to take these jobs.

I. JOBS, TIME LIMITS AND WORK

JOBS AND TIME LIMITS

In reviewing the options offered, Ohio strongly favors those programs that could be implemented which would reduce the participant's dependency on social programs. The programs include: requiring deferred substance abusers to participate in treatment programs, requiring all new recipients to perform up-front job search, and subjecting volunteers to a specific time limit. These options encourage the participant to seek out employment opportunities and provide support to overcome employment barriers.

Ohio does not see a need to increase the minimum work hours beyond 20 hours; the importance of working a minimum standard is to get experience to move on to unsubsidized employment. At the present time Ohio has no plans to delay implementation of WORK. It is also too early to determine how we would opt to reallocate JOBS/WORK funding. As far as Transition to Work/WORK, Ohio will need to study this issue further before we can state an opinion.

ADMINISTRATION OF JOBS/WORK

We anticipate JOBS/WORK will be operated by Ohio's IV-A agency, the Department of Human Services. The Department will have the option of contracting with other entities to carry out all JOBS/WORKS functions.

WORK

In looking at WORK eligibility criteria, Ohio embraces the requirement that both ADC-U parents work, although we would retain the option of exemptions for caretakers of small children. We also want to encourage participants to find unsubsidized employment and are willing to advance this goal by providing supportive services to WORK participants who are engaged in concurrent training/education activities. In addition we would like the option of requiring WORK participants to engage in job search while in a work assignment and we may opt for allowing participants, after two consecutive work assignments, to engage in extensive job search or face six months of ineligibility. Ohio would also allocate Interim Activities/Job Search for participants awaiting WORK assignments if we could receive credit for the effort.

Our stand on Sanctions/Penalties is that they need to be simplified to eliminate some of the bureaucratic red tape that encumbers the program.

MAKE WORK PAY

Ohio strongly agrees with the make work pay concept to assist participants in becoming self-sufficient. It is important that IV-A child care funds continue to flow to the IV-A agency. Our goal is to have a child care program that can provide support services in a simplified manner so that the participants can find unsubsidized employment and become self-sufficient. In order to accomplish this task more funding will be needed to provide a program that will deliver services to the public in an efficient and consistent fashion. MAKE WORK PAY also needs to address transportation funding in order for the program to be successful.

Ohio applauds the option to establish disregards policy on earned income. We believe that we can design a policy that is understandable to clients and encourages employment. The current policy is neither understandable or encouraging. We also would support (EITC) but we would not be one of the four states that allow this option on an advance basis by this agency.

ENHANCING RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY FOR NON-CUSTODIAL PARENTS

Training and employment for non-custodial parents is an excellent concept that should be explored with IV-D child support funding rather than IV-F funds.

II. INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Ohio strongly feels that automated systems should be augmented to accommodate WORK, and that funding for this should be at an enhancement reimbursement rate due to its importance.

III. PREVENT TEEN PREGNANCY AND PROMOTE PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Ohio has a strong commitment to working with teen parents as a result of the LEAP program and Family and Children First initiative. We feel that now is the time to expand our efforts to reduce teen pregnancy. These proposals would assist our efforts.

We also believe that it is not in the best interest of the family to limit ADC benefits to families who have additional children while on ADC. However, it is absolutely essential to promote programs that prevent first pregnancies and reduce the incidence of second pregnancies.

IV. CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROPOSAL

Ohio agrees with establishing financial incentives for paternity establishment, simplifying paternity establishment, and the concept of paternity outreach. It is important to establish family cohesiveness as early as possible. We would also like to see more child support distributed to households by using the same or similar disregard formula as is used for earned income.

V. IMPROVING GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Ohio strongly agrees with the elimination of special eligibility requirements for two-parent families. As they are now framed, the requirements prohibit family formation and cause the members to choose between program-driven behavior impacting their income, or family solidarity.

Again, thank you for your inquiry and if you have any further questions regarding the JOBS program, please feel free to contact Joel A. Rabb Jr., Chief, Bureau of Welfare Reform and JOBS, Ohio Department of Human Services, at (614) 466-3196.

Sincerely yours,

George V. Voinovich

GVV:mm

cc: Arnold R. Tompkins, Director, Ohio Department of Human Services
Gayle Cozens, Assistant Director, Ohio Department of Human Services
Mary L. Harris, Deputy Director, Office of Family Support and Jobs, ODHS
Joel A. Rabb, Jr., Chief, Bureau of Welfare Reform and Jobs, ODHS

STATE OF OHIO

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

COLUMBUS 43266-0601

Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy
The White House
Second Floor, West Wing
Washington, DC 20500

printed on recycled paper

THE WHITE HOUSE
OFFICE OF DOMESTIC POLICY

CAROL H. RASCO
Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy

To: Kathi Way

Draft response for POTUS
and forward to CHR by:

Draft response for CHR by:

Please reply directly to the writer
(copy to CHR) by:

Please advise by:

Let's discuss:

For your information: ✓

Reply using form code:

File:

Send copy to (original to CHR):

Schedule ? : ☐ Accept ☐ Pending ☐ Regret

Designee to attend:

Remarks: One to read – Should we do anything further on this?

AUG 31 REC'D

State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

CN 700
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0700
(609) 292-3717

WILLIAM WALDMAN
Commissioner

August 18, 1994

Ms. Carol Rasco
Assistant to the President
for Domestic Policy
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Ms. Rasco:

Thank you for your letter of July 11, 1994, to Governor Whitman requesting our comments concerning the State options included in the Work and Responsibility Act of 1994. The Department strongly agrees with the concept that states should have greater flexibility to tailor programs to local need. We support most of the options included in the administration's proposal. We were particularly pleased that most of the waivers which HHS granted New Jersey would become options in the proposal. Nevertheless, it is important that the current waiver authority remain intact for states that are interested in pursuing other innovative changes in AFDC.

New Jersey has a specific interest in optional retrospective budgeting and in aligning the AFDC and Food Stamp Program requirements particularly in the area of reporting and budgeting requirements. However, if these requirements are aligned, we must be assured that the issue of correcting every AFDC overpayment and underpayment is not again inadvertently overlooked as was the case when monthly reporting was initially made optional. The AFDC rules must be amended to allow the State an administrative time frame in which to react to changes in a client's income and time to reflect that change in the recipient's grant. If we follow food stamp budgeting, reporting, and time frame requirements, our current prospective budgeting dilemma may be resolved.

We recommend that states also be given the option to apply only incentives rather than both incentives and sanctions, as an inducement for pregnant teens and teen custodial parents to attend an educational program. We also recommend that the number of state demonstrations for Child

Support Assurance be increased and that the legislation permit publicly administered advanced EITC payment systems.

Lastly, while we support the flexibility provided in the administration's bill, we strongly oppose the proposed cap on AFDC Emergency Assistance as a way to fund the proposal. New Jersey's allocation would be permanently set at our level in 1991 which would result in a reduction of about $6 million in the first year. We estimate that this could result in the denial of homeless services to about two thousand families a month. This method of raising revenue is inappropriate, conflicts with the goal of the administration's proposal to promote self-sufficiency, and sends a signal that the Federal Government will no longer be an equal partner with the states and localities to address this national problem.

Thank you again for requesting our comments. Please let us know if we can provide any additional assistance.

Sincerely,

William Waldman
Commissioner

WW:6

STATE OPTIONS IN THE WELFARE REFORM PROPOSAL

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROPOSAL

I. ESTABLISH AWARDS IN EVERY CASE
  - A. Financial Incentives for Paternity Establishment
  - B. Streamlining the Paternity Establishment Process
    - i. Paternity Outreach
  - C. Administrative Authority to Establish Orders Based on Guidelines

II. ENSURE FAIR AWARD LEVELS
  - A. Modifications of Child Support Orders
  - B. Distribution of Child Support Payments

III. COLLECT AWARDS THAT ARE OWED
  - A. State Role
    - i. Option for Integrated State Registry
    - ii. Centralized Collection and Disbursement Through a State Central Payment Center
  - B. Other Enforcement Measures
    - i. Verification of Social Security Numbers
  - C. Funding
    - i. Revolving Loan Fund

IV. GUARANTEEING SOME LEVEL OF SUPPORT - CHILD SUPPORT ASSURANCE DEMONSTRATIONS

V. ENHANCING RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY FOR NON-CUSTODIAL PARENTS
  - A. JOBS participation
  - B. WORK participation

PREVENT TEEN PREGNANCY AND PROMOTE PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

I. RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL-AGE PARENTS RECEIVING CASH ASSISTANCE
  - A. Limiting AFDC Benefits to Additional Children while on AFDC
  - B. Case Management for All Custodial Teen Parents

II. MAKE WORK PAY
  - A. Child Care
    - i. Program Simplification/Consistency Issues
    - ii. Continuity of Care
  - B. Permitting Publicly Administered Advanced EITC Payment System
  - C. Earned Income Disregards

III. INFORMATION SYSTEMS

A. Automated, Statewide, AFDC Case Management Information System

B. Automated, Statewide, Child Care Case Management Information System

C. Automated, JOBS/WORK, Case Management System

i. Improving Government Assistance

a. Filing Unit

b. Optional Retrospective Budgeting

c. Recovery of Overpayments Through Federal Tax Intercept

ii. Regulatory Revisions

a. Boarder Income

b. Verification

JOBS, TIME LIMITS AND WORK

I. EFFECTIVE DATE AND DEFINITION OF PHASED-IN GROUP

II. EMPLOYABILITY PLAN

III. PRE-JOBS

IV. SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND ASSIGNMENT TO PRE-JOBS

V. TEEN PARENTS

VI. JOBS SERVICES AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPANTS

A. Up-Front Job Search

VII. MINIMUM WORK STANDARD

A. JOBS Participation for the Not-Phased-In-Group

IX. JOBS FUNDING

X. TRANSITION TO WORK

A. Worker Support

XI. WORK FUNDING

XII. WORK ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND APPLICATION PROCESS

XIII. ALLOCATION OF WORK ASSIGNMENTS/INTERIM ACTIVITIES

XIV. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES/WORKER SUPPORT

Memorandum
May 24, 1994
TO: Kathi Way
FROM: Jessica Aldrich
RE: State Options in the Welfare Reform Proposal

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROPOSAL

I. ESTABLISH AWARDS IN EVERY CASE

Financial Incentives for Paternity Establishment

(3) **At State option, States may experiment with programs that provide financial incentives to parents to establish paternity.** Such programs, upon approval of the Secretary, will be eligible for FFP. The Secretary will additionally authorize up to three demonstration projects whereby financial incentives are provided to parents for establishing paternity.

Streamlining the Paternity Establishment Process

Paternity Outreach

(2) (Under the proposal) States will be required to implement outreach programs promoting voluntary acknowledgement of paternity through a variety of means including, but not limited to, the distribution of written materials at schools, hospitals, and other agencies. States are also encouraged to establish pre-natal programs for expectant couples, either married or unmarried, to educate parents on their joint rights and responsibilities in paternity. **At State option, such programs could be required of all expectant welfare recipients;**

Administrative Authority to Establish Orders Based on Guidelines

(1) States must have and use simple administrative procedures in IV-D cases to establish support orders so that the IV-D agency can impose an order for support (based upon State guidelines) in cases where:

(3) in cases of separation where a parent has applied for IV-D services and there is not a court proceeding pending for a legal separation or divorce. **At State option, States may extend such authority to all cases of separation and divorce, but they are not required to do so.**

II. ENSURE FAIR AWARD LEVELS

Modifications of Child Support Orders

(1) States shall have and use laws that require the review and adjustment of all child support orders included in the State Central Registry once every three years. The State shall provide that a change in the support amount resulting from the application of guidelines since the entry of the last order is sufficient reason for modification of a child support obligation without the necessity of showing any other change in circumstances. **(States may,**

at their option, establish a threshold amount not to exceed 5 percent since entry of the last order.)

(2) States may set a minimum timeframe that runs from the date of the last adjustment that bars a subsequent review before a certain period of time elapses, absent other changed circumstances. Individuals may request modifications more often than once every three years if either parent's income changes by more than twenty percent.

Distribution of Child Support Payments

Treatment of Child Support for AFDC Families - ***State Option***

With the exception of the $50 pass-through, states may not pay current child support directly to families who are AFDC recipients. Instead child support payments are paid to the State and are used to reimburse the State for AFDC benefit payments. Many States have found that both AFDC recipients and noncustodial parents misunderstand and resent child support being used for state debt collection. Under waiver authority, Georgia has undertaken a demonstration to pay child support directly to the AFDC family and a number of other States have expressed interest in this approach. **The proposal will allow states the option to pay child support directly to the AFDC family, thereby allowing States to choose the distribution policy that will work best in their state.** The AFDC benefit amount is reduced in accordance with state policy to account for the additional family income. This policy change makes child support part of a family's primary income and places AFDC income as a secondary source of support.

(1) At State option, States may provide all current child support payments made on behalf of any family receiving AFDC must be paid directly to the family (counting the child support payments as income).

III. COLLECT AWARDS THAT ARE OWED

STATE ROLE

Option for Integrated State Registry

(4) States may, at their option, maintain a unified, integrated registry by connecting local registries through computer linkage. (Local registries must be able to be integrated at a cost which does not exceed the cost of a new single registry.) Under this option, however, the State and State staff must still perform all of the activities described herein for central registries and must maintain a State Central Payment Center for collection and disbursement of payments.

Centralized Collection and Disbursement Through a State Central Payment Center

(5) States may form regional cooperative agreements to provide the collection and disbursement function for two or more States through one "drop box" location with computer linkage to the individual State registries.

OTHER ENFORCEMENT MEASURES

Verification of Social Security Numbers

In order to enforce orders of support more effectively, States must have and use laws that provide IV-D agency administrative authority to carry out the enforcement functions described below without the necessity of court approval..:

(1) automatically impose administrative liens on all nonexempt real and titled personal property if arreages equal two months' worth of support **(less than two months' worth at State option)**; the liens shall cover all current and future support arrearages and shall have priority over all other creditors' liens imposed after the child support liens' imposition; in appropriate cases the agency shall have the power to freeze, seize, sell and distribute encumbered or attached property.

In addition the State must have and use laws that:

(8) require the withholding or suspension of professional or occupational licenses from noncustodial parents who owe past-due child support or are the subject of outstanding failure to appear warrants, capiases, and bench warrants related to a parentage or child support proceeding;

(a) the State shall determine the procedures to be used in a particular State and determine the due process rights to be accorded to obligers.

(b) the State shall determine the threshold amount of child support due before withholding or suspension procedures are initiated.

(9) suspend the drivers licenses, including any commercial licenses, of noncustodial parents who owe past-due child support:

(a) the suspension shall be determined by the IV-D agency, which shall administratively suspend licenses. The State shall determine the due process rights to be accorded the obligor, including, but not limited to, the right to a hearing, stay of the order under appropriate circumstances, and the circumstances under which the suspension may be lifted;

(b) the State shall determine the threshold amount of child support due before withholding or suspension procedures are initiated.

FUNDING

Revolving Loan Fund

(1) The Federal government through OCSE shall provide a source of funds appropriated up to $100 million to be made available to States and their subdivision to be used solely for short-term, high-payoff operational improvements to the State child support system. Projects demonstrating a potential for increases in child support collections will be submitted to the Secretary on a competitive basis. Criteria for determining which projects to fund shall be specified by the Secretary based on whether adequate alternative funding already exists, and whether collections can be increased as a result. Within these guidelines, **States shall have maximum flexibility in deciding which projects to fund.**

(2) Funding will be limited to no more than $5 million per State or $1 million per project, except for limited circumstances under which a large State undertakes a statewide project, in which case the maximum for that State shall be $5 million for the project. **States**

may supplement Federal funds to increase the amount of funds available for the project and may require local jurisdictions to put up a local match.

IV. GUARANTEEING SOME LEVEL OF SUPPORT - CHILD SUPPORT ASSURANCE DEMONSTRATIONS

(1) Congress will authorize and appropriate funds for three CSA demonstration programs:

(d) As part of the demonstrations, some States will have the option of creating work programs so that noncustodial parents could work off the support if they have no income.

(2) The child support assurance criteria for the State demonstration programs will require that:

(a) the CSA program shall be administered by the state IV-D agency, or at state option, its department of revenue; in order to be eligible to participate in the CSA program, States must ensure that their automated systems that include child support cases are fully able to meet the CSA program's processing demands, timely distribute the CSA benefit, and interface with an in-house (or have on-line access to a) central statewide registry of CSA cases.

(b) States are provided flexibility in designing the benefit scales within the following parameters: benefit levels between $1,500 per year for one child and $3,000 per year for four or more children and benefit levels between $3,000 per year for one child and $4,500 per year for four or more children.

V. ENHANCING RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY FOR NON-CUSTODIAL PARENTS

JOBS Participation

(1) At State option, up to 10 percent of JOBS program funding could be used for training and work readiness programs for noncustodial parents.

(b) At State option, participation by non-custodial parents could be mandatory or voluntary but the non-custodial parents' children will have to be receiving AFDC or WORK services at the time of referral in order to participate. Paternity, if not already established, will have to be voluntarily acknowledged prior to participation in the program. Arrears do not have to be accrued in order for non-custodial parents to be eligible to participate. For those parents with no identifiable income, participation could commence as part of the establishment or enforcement process.

(d) States are not required to provide the same JOBS services to custodial and non-custodial parents, although they may choose to do so. The non-custodial parents' participation will not be linked to self-sufficiency requirements or JOBS/WORK participation by the custodial parent.

(e) At State option, the child support obligation could be suspended or reduced to the minimum while the noncustodial parent was participating in JOBS activities which did not provide a stipend or wages sufficient to pay the amount of the current order.

WORK Participation

(1) At State option, up to 10 percent of WORK program funding could be used for work programs and work opportunities for noncustodial parents.

(b) At State option, participation by non-custodial parents could be mandatory or voluntary but the non-custodial parents' children will have to be receiving AFDC/JOBS/WORK services at the time of referral or have arrearages owed to the State for periods when the children were participating in the AFDC/JOBS/WORK program. Paternity, if not already established, will have to be voluntarily acknowledged prior to participation in the program. Arrears do not have to have accrued in order for non-custodial parents to be eligible to participate. For those parents with no identifiable income, participation could commence as part of the establishment or enforcement process.

(d) States will not have to provide all WORK opportunities offered to custodial parents in their non-custodial parents WORK program, although they may choose to do so.

PREVENT TEEN PREGNANCY AND PROMOTE PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

B. RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL-AGE PARENTS RECEIVING CASH ASSISTANCE

2. Limiting AFDC Benefits to Additional Children Conceived While on AFDC

(a) Allow States the option of keeping AFDC benefits constant when a child is conceived while the parent is on welfare. This does not apply to a minor mother's child living in a grandparent's household. The family planning services under 402(a)(15) must be provided to all recipients.

(c) Provision will not be applied in the case of rape or in any other cases that the State agency finds would violate the standards of fairness and good conscience.

3. Case Management for All Custodial Teen Parents

(a) Provide States the option to use monetary incentives (which must be combined with sanctions) as inducement for pregnant teens and teen custodial parents who are receiving AFDC and who do not have a high school diploma or GED to enroll (or remain enrolled) in and regularly attend a school or education program leading to a high school diploma or GED, or a special skills training program if the State determines this is most appropriate for a recipient. States may also choose to provide incentives for participation in parenting education activities. This option will operate as part of the new JOBS program, and the rules pertaining to JOBS will apply unless it is specifically stated otherwise.

(b) Each State plan must clearly define the following--

*** Sanctions. Sanctions under the revised JOBS program would apply unless the State proposes alternative sanctions, to be approved by the Secretary, which the State believes better achieves their objectives.**

*** Eligibility. States must include custodial teen parents under 20 years of age and pregnant women under the age of 20. States may choose to include all pregnant teens**

and teen parents up to their 21st birthday. States may also choose to include all teens, beyond those who are pregnant or parents.

*** State-wideness. States can limit the geographic scope of this option.**

MAKE WORK PAY

A. CHILD CARE

2. Program simplification/consistency issues

(a) Have the IV-A child care funds flow directly to the IV-A agency and give the States the explicit option to contract to the CCDBG agency. States would retain the flexibility to have more than one agency involved.

(c) Added to the health and safety standards section are:

--a requirement that the state must have requirements that all children funded under these authorities are immunized at levels specified by PHS. **States will be given the flexibility to exclude particular immunizations if they submit an acceptable justification to the Secretary.**

3. Continuity of care

(a) The States will be given the option under the IV-A programs to extend hours and weeks of care for children and required participation of their parents in JOBS, WORK, and employment.

B. PERMITTING PUBLICLY ADMINISTERED ADVANCED EITC PAYMENT SYSTEMS

(a) A State would have the option to propose to the Secretary of the Treasury a demonstration project pursuant to which advance payments of the EITC would be made to eligible residents through a state agency. Such agencies may include public assistance offices (AFDC and/or Food Stamps), Employment Service Offices, State finance and revenue agencies, and so forth. A State may choose only one agency to provide the advance credit.

(c) Where appropriate, States may include in their proposals coordination of advance payments of the EITC and other federal benefits (such as food stamps) through electronic benefit technology.

(e) States would be allowed (but not required) to provide an advanced basis up to 75 percent of the maximum amount of the credit for which the taxpayer is eligible.

C. EARNED INCOME DISREGARDS

(b) States will have the option to establish their own disregard policies on income above this amount. Additionally, States will have complete flexibility in establishing fill-the-gap policies (i.e., States will have the flexibility to determine which types of income should be considered in developing a fill-the-gap policy, such as child support payments, stipends, etc., in addition to earned income).

(c) The AFDC $50 pass-through of child support payments will be indexed for inflation in rounded $10 increments. **States will have the flexibility to pass-through additional child support payments above this amount.**

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

C. AUTOMATED, STATEWIDE, AFDC CASE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

D. AUTOMATED, STATEWIDE, CHILD CARE CASE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

Add new section 402(a)(XX):
The State IV-A agency must have in operation, in accordance with an Advance Planning Document approved under Section 402(e), an economical, effective, and efficient automated case management information system, to:

(A) Allow the State to control, account for, and monitor all programs that provide child care administered under the State plan and, **at its option, to achieve seamless child care delivery, all child care programs of the State, including providing operational systems support necessary for administration of the child care program(s) and managing the non-service related CCDBG funds**, such that automated procedures and processes will allow the state to: (cont.)

E. AUTOMATED, JOBS/WORK, CASE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

1. FILING UNIT

(a) Allow states, at their option, to eliminate the special eligibility requirements for two-parent families (i.e. the 100-hour rule and the work history test). Remove the sunset provision that calls for the termination of AFDC-UP in 1998 and make it a permanent program.

3. OPTIONAL RETROSPECTIVE BUDGETING

(a) Amend the Social Security Act at section 402(a)(13) to delete the clause "but only with respect to any one or more categories of families required to report monthly to the State agency pursuant to paragraph (14),". **This technical amendment will make retrospective budgeting optional for States without regard to whether families are required to monthly report.**

9. RECOVERY OF OVERPAYMENTS THROUGH FEDERAL TAX INTERCEPT
B. REGULATORY REVISIONS

2. BOARDER INCOME

(a) **Modify AFDC and Food Stamp rules to permit States the option to allow a flat rate, a percentage, or either the maximum allotment for a household of the**

same size as the number of borders in the thrifty food plan or the actual documented cost, if it is higher than the allotment. The same procedure would be adopted for each program.

5. VERIFICATION

Regulatory Specifications

(a) Exercise current Secretarial waiver authority and amend regulations so that:

--States may choose the verification systems, methods and time-frames for action;

--States may choose the computer matching activities that are most effective provided that the alternative match or verification process is just as effective as those required IEVS and SAVE; and

--States may verify additional factors of eligibility.

--FNS will continue to have authority to verify additional factors that relate to the Food Stamp program only, such as actual medical costs.

JOBS, TIME LIMITS AND WORK

1. EFFECTIVE DATE AND DEFINITION OF PHASED-IN GROUP

(c) States would have the option to define the phased-in group more broadly (e.d., custodial parents born after 1969, born after 1971 and all first-time applicants), provided the phased-in group included at least the population described in (b) [The phased in group would be defined as custodial parents, including minor custodial parents, who were born after 1971 (in 1972 or later).

3. EMPLOYABILITY PLAN

(g) To resolve disputes (regarding the employability plan) not settled by the intervention in (f), a State may elect one or more of the following processes:

i. **Permit the agency to establish an internal review board to arbitrate disputes.** This board would have the final say. The Secretary would establish regulations for such boards.

ii. **Permit agencies to employ mediation using trained personnel, rather than arbitration, to resolve the dispute.** HHS would be responsible for providing technical assistance to States that wish to use mediation.

iii. Provide the recipient with a fair hearing contesting whether the State agency had followed the established process for developing the employability plan. A fair hearing could be the exclusive remedy or could be allowed in addition to the procedure in (i) or (ii). (only phased-in recipients required to participate in JOBS would be entitled to a fair hearing.

4. PRE-JOBS

(d) States could provide program services to individuals in the pre-JOBS phase, using JOBS funds, but would not be required to do so. Likewise, States could provide child care or other supportive services to persons in pre-JOBS status but would not be required to do so--there would be no child care guarantee for individuals in pre-jobs. Persons in pre-JOBS status would not be subject to sanction for failure to participate in pre-JOBS activities. In other words, in order to actually require an individual to participate in an activity, a State would have to classify the individual as JOBS-mandatory.

5. SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND ASSIGNMENT TO PRE-JOBS

Legislative Specifications

(a) States may require persons found not able to engage in employment or training due to substance abuse to participate in substance abuse treatment as a pre-JOBS activity.

(b) Sanctions, equivalent to JOBS sanctions, may be levied for non-participation in treatment, provided such treatment is available to the recipient.

9. TEEN PARENTS

Legislative Specifications

(a) States would be required to provide case management services to all custodial parents under 19 and to 19-year-old custodial parents who did not have a high school degree or the equivalent. **States would have the option to provide case management services to a broader population, for example, all custodial parents under 20.**

10. JOBS SERVICES AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPANTS

Up-Front Job Search

(b) States would have the option of requiring all job-ready new recipients, including those in the not-phased-in-group, to perform up-front job search. States would also be permitted to require job search from the date of application (as under current law, this requirement could not be used as a reason for a delay in making the eligibility determination or issuing the payment.

11. MINIMUM WORK STANDARD
Legislative Specifications

(a) Months in which an individual met the minimum work standard would not count against the time limit. In an AFDC-UP family, if one parent meets the minimum work standard, neither parent is subject to the time limit.

OPTION A: The minimum work standard would be 30 hours per week, with a State option to reduce the minimum to 20.

OPTION B: The minimum work standard would be 20 hours per week for parents of children under 6 and 30 hours for all others, with a State option to reduce the minimum to 20 hours across the board.

JOBS Participation for the Not-Phased-In Group

(g) States would be given substantial flexibility regarding JOBS services for persons not in the Federally-defined phased-in group (custodial parents born after 1971), as discussed below:

i. A State would be required to serve volunteers from the not-phased-in group to the extent that federal JOBS funding was available (i.e., the State had not drawn down its full JOBS allotment). **States would have the option of subjecting such JOBS volunteers to the time limit.**

ii. States could also require persons in the not-phased-in group to participate in JOBS, but could not apply the time limit to such JOBS-mandatory persons (as opposed to volunteers above). In other words, a State that defined the phased-in group as persons born after 1971 could require a person born in 1968 to participate in JOBS, and sanction such an individual for failure to comply, but that person would not be subject to the time limit. Individuals (not phased-in) who met one of the pre-JOBS criteria could not be required to participate in JOBS.

13. JOBS FUNDING

(d) **A State would be permitted to reallocate an amount up to 10% of its combined JOBS and WORK allotments (WORK allotment from the capped entitlement) from its JOBS program to its WORK program and vice versa.** The amount transferred could not exceed the allotment for the program from which the transfer was made.

(e) If the States were not able to claim all available Federal JOBS and WORK funding (WORK capped entitlement) for a fiscal year, **a State would be permitted to draw down Federal funds for JOBS spending in the excess of its allotment.**

15. TRANSITION TO WORK

(c) States would have the option of providing an additional month of AFDC benefits to individuals who found employment just as their eligibility for AFDC benefits/JOBS participation ended, if necessary to tide them over until the first paycheck.

Worker Support

(d) States would be permitted to use JOBS or WORK funds (from the capped WORK allocation; see below), to provide services designed to help persons who had left the JOBS or WORK programs for employment keep those jobs.

19. WORK FUNDING

(e) If, as described in JOBS FUNDING, the States were not able to claim all available Federal JOBS and WORK funding (WORK capped entitlement) for a fiscal year, a State would be permitted to draw down Federal funds for WORK spending for operational costs in excess of its allotment from the capped entitlement.

26. WORK ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND APPLICATION PROCESS

(d) Only one parent in an AFDC-UP family would be required to participate in the WORK program. **States would, however, have the option of requiring both parents to participate.**

27. ALLOCATION OF WORK ASSIGNMENTS/INTERIM ACTIVITIES

(b) **States would have the option of requiring persons who were awaiting WORK assignments to participate in other WORK program activities (e.g., individual or group job search, arranging for child care, self-initiated activities), and to establish mechanisms for monitoring participation in such activities. Persons in this waiting status could include both WORK participants who had completed an initial WORK assignment without finding unsubsidized employment, participants whose assignments ended prematurely for reasons other than the participant's misconduct, and individuals awaiting a hearing concerning misconduct.** Individuals who failed to comply with such participation requirements would be subject to sanction as described below (see SANCTIONS).

31. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES/WORKER SUPPORT

(b) **States would be permitted to make supportive services available to WORK participants who were engaged in approved education and training activities in addition to a WORK assignment or other WORK program activity.** In other words, a States could, but would not be required to, provide child care or other supportive services to enable a WORK participant to, for example, also take a vocational education course at a community college.

33. SANCTIONS/PENALTIES (JOBS AND WORK)

JOBS Sanctions

(a) A State's conciliation policy (to resolve disputes concerning JOBS participation only) could take one of the following two forms:

i. A conciliation process that meets standards established by the Secretary; or

ii. A process whereby recipients are notified, prior to the issuing of a sanction notice, that they are in apparent violation of a program requirement and that they have 10 days to contact the State agency to explain why they were not in compliance or to indicate their intent to comply. Upon contact from the recipient, the State agency would attempt to resolve the issue and would have the option of not imposing the sanction.

Ineligibility for a WORK Assignment

(g) The Secretary shall establish regulations defining good cause for each of the following:

iii. Dismissal from a WORK assignment. The regulations shall allow a State, subject to the approval of the Secretary, to apply in such instances the definition of misconduct utilized in its unemployment insurance program. (A IV-A agency might be allowed to contract with the State UI hearing system to adjudicate these cases.)

36. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT FOR NON-CUSTODIAL PARENTS

Legislative Specifications

(a) A State could spend up to 15 percent of its JOBS funding and WORK funding (allotment from the capped entitlement) for training, work readiness, and work opportunities for non-custodial parents. The State would have the complete flexibility as to which of these funding streams would be tapped.

ii. Additionally, States may submit an application to the Secretary to conduct a random assignment evaluation of its non-custodial program and, if approved, no State match will be required to operate the program. (If the non-custodial program is a multi-site or state-wide program, the State match would be waived in those areas covered by the random assignment evaluation.)

(d) States are not required to provide all the same JOBS or WORK services to custodial and non-custodial parents, although they may choose to do so. Participation in the JOBS program is not a prerequisite for participation in a non-custodial parent work program. The non-custodial parent's participation will not be linked to self-sufficiency requirements or to JOBS/WORK participation by the custodial parent. Non-custodial parents who participate in such programs will, for the purposes of calculating the JOBS participation rate, be included in the numerator but not the denominator.

(e) Payments of stipends for work will be required. Payment of training stipends is allowed. All stipends are eligible for FFP.

ii. At State option, the child support obligation can be suspended or reduced to the minimum while the non-custodial parent was participating in program activities which did not provide a stipend or wages sufficient to pay the amount of the current order.

WELFARE REFORM PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE SPECIFICATIONS

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROPOSAL

5. Expanded Mission for Quality Control System

(c) States would be required to conduct periodic, internal audits of their JOBS and WORK processes to ensure the accuracy of reported data and annual audits to establish payment accuracy rates. The Federal government would specify the minimum sample sizes to achieve 90 to 95 percent confidence at the lower limit a method generally used by OIG). **States would also be permitted to use current QC resources to conduct special studies to test and improve the system. (This is an option)**

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Enhanced State Systems

(paragraph 4)

States would have the option to develop their own systems, modify and/or adopt prototype systems developed by the Federal government, or use systems developed by groups of States. A higher match rate would be available to States which adopted a Federal prototype or a system developed by a group of States; otherwise regular administrative match would be available.

Legislative Specifications

3. Automated, Statewide, Child Care Case Management Information System

(a) Add new section 402(a)(XX): The State agency, at its option, shall have in operation, in accordance with an Advance Planning Document approved under section 402(e), an economical, effective, and efficient automated case management information system, to:

(A) Allow the State to control, account for, and monitor all programs that provide child care administered under the State plan, at its option, to achieve seamless child care delivery, all child care programs of the State, including providing operational systems support necessary for administration of the child care program(s) and managing the non-service related CCDBG funds, such that automated procedures and processes will allow the State to;

(i) identify families and children in need of child care, establish eligibility for child care, and determine funding source(s);

(ii) plan and monitor services, determine payments, and update and maintain the family and child care eligibility status for child care;

(iii) maintain and monitor necessary provider information;

(iv) process payments and meet other fiscal needs for the management of child care program(s); (cont.)

4. Automated, JOBS/WORK Case Management Information System

(a) Establish a new Subsection 482(j): The State IV-A Agency, at its option, shall have in operation, in accordance with an Advance Planning Document approved under subsection 402(e), an economical, effective, and efficient automated case management information system, to:

(1) Allow the State to control, account for, and monitor all factors of the JOBS and WORK programs..

(2) Support both management and administrative activities of the program..

ADMINISTRATION OF JOBS/WORK

1. Overall administration

(b) Unless the governor designates otherwise, the IV-A agency shall administer JOBS/WORK.

(d) If the IV-A agency retains administration of JOBS, it shall have the option of contracting with another entity to carry out any and all functions related to JOBS/WORK.

3. Other Areas of Responsibility

In States where an entity other than the IV-A agency is responsible for JOBS/WORK, we propose to give States the flexibility to determine how the following functions are carried out. The State plan would have to contain specific information detailing how the State intended to carry out these functions.

(a) Determining JOBS Prep status

(b) Granting extensions to the time limits

(c) Providing secondary reviews and hearings on issues specifically related to JOBS or WORK participation.

John—this is great. This is exactly what we need!

WORKPLAN FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL OUTREACH (JUNE 6 - JUNE 20)

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1994

General

Begin preparation of document describing all intergovernmental outreach activities by WRWG to date (Jim Ivery).

Governors

Call staff of Governors Bayh (John), Miller (Keith), Carper (Kathi), and Caperton (John) to obtain their reaction to the compromise proposal permitting a state option to time-limit the WORK program for certain individuals.

Call Liz Ryan to alert her to the timing of the welfare reform bill introduction and to review the agendas for Tuesday's DGA and NGA meetings (Kathi).

Call DGA staff to alert them to the timing of the introduction of welfare reform and to our possible interest in a DGA statement and/or a press event involving Democratic governors (Keith).

Call NGA staff to alert them to the timing of welfare reform and to review the agenda for Tuesday's meeting (Kathi).

State Legislators

[illegible]

Call Sheri Steisel to alert NCSL to the timing of our bill introduction and to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting (John).

I need to confirm—KNT

Call Rep. Dave Richardson to review the timing of welfare reform and to urge NBCSL to issue a balanced statement regarding welfare reform next week (John).

State Administrators

Call Elaine Ryan to alert APWA to the timing of welfare reform and to review the agenda for Thursday's meeting (John).

I need to confirm—KNT

County Officials

Call NACO to discuss the timing of the introduction of our welfare reform bill, to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting, and to identify any other issues they wish to discuss on Wednesday beyond their expressed concerns regarding program simplification and financing (Dave Garrison).

Call Kay Beard (Democratic leader of NACO's welfare reform task force) and Doris Ward (President of National Association of Democratic County Officials) to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to solicit their assistance in obtaining as positive a statement as possible from NACO next week, and to determine whether they will be available to make positive statements regarding our welfare reform bill next week (Dave Garrison).

Call Webster Guillory of NOBCO regarding timing of the introduction of our welfare reform bill, his expressed concerns (Haiti, meeting with the POTUS, longer time limit), and NOBCO's public statements next week (John).

City Officials

Call NLC to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting, and to identify any other issues they may wish to discuss on Wednesday beyond their expressed concerns regarding the role of local government in WORK and financing (Dave Garrison).

Call USCM to make suggestions regarding their proposed welfare reform resolution, to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting, and to identify any other issues they may wish to discuss on Wednesday beyond their expressed concerns regarding the role of mayors in WORK, eligibility of WORK recipients for the EITC, generous extensions for JOBS, noncooperation in paternity establishment, family caps, minor mothers' provisions, training, and financing (Dave Garrison).

[illegible] there [illegible] need to [illegible] a [illegible] make commitment before the meeting w/ [illegible]?

Call Mayor Cleaver to discuss USCM's concerns with our welfare reform plan, to make suggestions regarding their proposed welfare reform resolution, and to develop a strategy for handling mayors' comments at the upcoming USCM meeting in Portland (John).

Call Mayor Abrahamson's office regarding our responses to USCM's concerns and the upcoming USCM meeting in Portland (Dave Garrison).

Call Mayor White's office regarding our responses to USCM's concerns and NCDM's role in helping identify mayors to support our welfare reform plan at the upcoming USCM meeting in Portland (Dave Garrison).

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994

Governors

Meet with staff of Democratic governors serving on the NGA leadership team (see attached agenda), 10-11 a.m. in Room 211 OEOB (John, Kathi, and Keith).

Meet with NGA staff, Liz Ryan, and LeeAnn Redick (see attached agenda), 4-5 p.m. at the Hall of States (John, Kathi, and Keith).

Begin calls to all Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors' senior staff with the following objectives (John, Keith, Kathi, and Jeremy make calls per attached list):

o Alert the governors to introduction of the President's proposal during the week of 6/13.

o Review the final decisions on outstanding bottom-line issues for Democratic governors, i.e., family cap, time-limiting WORK, waivers, and financing.

o Request that each governor prepare a letter of support for the President's welfare reform plan and suggest that it focus upon how our plan ends welfare as we know it, provides substantial state flexibility (in particular, permitting state options in a number of crucial areas), enhances federal financial assistance to states for education, training and work programs, and resulted from substantial consulations with the nation's governors.

o Request that a copy of the letter of support be faxed to Keith Mason no later than close of business, Friday, June 10, 1994.

o Request that each Democratic governor be available to respond positively to national and regional press inquiries regarding the welfare reform plan during week of June 13.

o Ask that each Democratic governor identify aspect(s) of our welfare reform plan (e.g., child support enforcement, time limits, etc.) which he or she would like to emphasize in press calls by citing initiatives in his or her state.

State Legislators

Call Sen. Bill Purcell (D-Tenn.) to alert him to the timing of our introduction of welfare reform and to request that he put together a letter from several Democratic legislative leaders expressing support for elements of the President's plan (John).

Followup call to Jeff Wice of the Democratic Legislative Leaders' Association staff regarding the status of the DLLA letter (Margaret).

Call Jane Campbell (D-OH) and Tom Bates (D-CA) to alert them to next week's bill introduction and ask for their assistance in moving NCSL's welfare task force to issue supportive statements for our welfare reform plan next week (John).

County Officials

Begin followup calls to the staff of Los Angeles County Supervisors Mollina, Burke, and Edelman to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to review financing decisions, and to urge them to make positive statements regarding our welfare reform policy and consultation process during the week of 6/13 (Dave Garrison).

City Officials

Begin followup calls to the staff of Mayors Rice, Webb, Belton, Norquist, Archer, Harrenton, Campbell, Schmoke, Rendell, Riordan, and Daley to confirm that their offices have reviewed our welfare reform materials, to answer any remaining questions they may have, to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to request their assistance in making positive statements regarding our bill at the USCM meeting in Portland, and to ask them to issue positive statements regarding our bill next week (and to fax those statements to HHS by COB Friday) (Dave Garrison).

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1994

General

Circulate draft summary of intergovernmental outreach activities to Kathi, Keith, John, and Melissa (Jim Ivery).

Governors

Continue calls to Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors' staff (Kathi, John, Keith, and Jeremy).

State Legislators

Meet with NCSL staff (see attached agenda), 8-9 am, Kathi's office (Kathi, John, and Keith).

County Officials

Meet with NACO staff (see attached agenda), 11-12 am, OEOB 211 (Kathi, John, Keith, Dave Garrison).

City Officials

Meet with USCM staff (see attached agenda), 12-1 pm, OEOB 211, (Kathi, Keith, John, Dave Garrison).

Meet with NLC staff (see attached agenda), 1:30-2:30 pm, OEOB 211, (Kathi, Keith, John, Dave Garrison).

Continue calls to selected mayors' offices (Dave Garrison).

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1994

General

Deliver final version of intergovernmental outreach fact sheet to WRWG co-chairs, ASL, WH, Public Liaison (Jim Ivery).

Provide names of state and local elected officials who have committed to making positive statements regarding our welfare reform bill to Jim Ivery for compilation (John, Kathi, Keith, Dave, Jeremy).

Governors

Complete calls to senior staff of Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors (Kathi, Keith, John, and Jeremy).

State Legislators

State Administrators

Meet with APWA staff (see attached agenda), 8-9 am, OEOB 211, (Kathi, Keith, John).

County Officials

City Officials

Brief Secretary Shalala regarding her speech at USCM meeting in Portland (John, Dave).

Continue calls to selected mayors' offices (Dave Garrison).

FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1994

Governors

Complete any followup actions necessary for Democratic and Republican/Independent governors, including waiver conversations (Kathi, Keith, John, and Jeremy).

Conclude discussions with NGA regarding their public statements about the welfare reform bill (Kathi, Keith, and Jeremy).

Finalize plans with DGA for a welfare reform statement and/or press event during week of 6/13 (Keith).

State Legislators

Conclude discussions with NCSL regarding their public statement about our welfare reform bill during the week of 6/13 (John, Kathi).

County Officials

Conclude discussions with NACO regarding their public statement about our welfare reform bill during the week of 6/13 (John, Dave, and Kathi).

City Officials

Conclude discussions with NLC regarding their public statement about our welfare reform bill during the week of 6//13 (John, Dave, and Kathi).

SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1994

City Officials

USCM Human Services Committee considers welfare reform resolution (John, Dave).

SUNDAY, JUNE 12, 1994

City Officials

Secretary Shalala and David Ellwood speak at USCM meeting in Portland (John, Dave).

MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1994

General

Prepare final list of state and local elected officials who are willing to make positive statements regarding our welfare reform policy and their particular areas of interest (Jim Ivery).

Governors

Call all Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors' offices who have failed to transmit their statements of support for our welfare reform plan (John, Kathi, Keith, and Jeremy).

City Officials

USCM considers welfare reform resolution recommended by Human Services committee (Dave).

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1994

Governors, State Legislators, and State Administrators

Conduct a briefing at the Hall of States for NGA staff, Washington Representativces, NCSL, and APWA regarding the provisions in our bill (Kathi, John, and Co-Chair).

Conduct a briefing at HHS for all local government representatives in DC (Wendell, John, Jim Ivery to coordinate).

AGENDA FOR MEETINGS WITH STATE AND LOCAL GROUPS

I. Timing of bill introduction.

II. Review of consulation process by WRWG.

III. Updated cost estimates for state share of new program costs (Issue: Should we distribute paper showing that states will pick up less than 10% of total cost? that many states can keep their additional costs down to zero?)

IV. Review of state flexibility in President's welfare reform bill (Issue: Has WH DPC completed draft document showing all the state options permitted in the current plan? Should such a document be distributed at the meeting?)

V. Review of Our Resolution of Outstanding Issues of Concern to the Organization

DGA/NGA/NCSL/APWA: effective date of legislation, part-time work hours, WORK obligations for persons reaching the two-year limit who are working less than 20 hours per week, mandates for in-state child support and paternity establishment, obligation of the state to serve volunteers, performance standards, CWEP option in WORK, denial of FFP for states failing to meet paternity establishment standards, waivers, child care regulations, time-limiting WORK, family caps.

NACO: simplification and intra-state flexibility for welfare administration.

NLC: role of local government in job creation.

USCM: role of mayors in WORK, denial of EITC to WORK recipients, generous extensions, noncooperation, family caps, minor mothers' provision, training.

VI. Review of Financing Proposals

a. Superfund

b. Family day care

c. Emergency assistance (Issue: do we share paper?)

d. DAA

e. PRUCOL

f. Deeming (Issue: do we share paper?)

g. Extenders and other enforcement actions.

VII. Next Steps

a. Would like as positive a statement as possible at the time of introduction of the welfare reform bill; in particular, would like to see a statement include recognition of broad agreement on <u>policy</u> principles, increased state flexibility, favorable federal match rates. Please fax statement to us by COB Friday, June 10, 1994 for press purposes.

WORKPLAN FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL OUTREACH (JUNE 6 - JUNE 20)

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1994

General

Begin preparation of document describing all intergovernmental outreach activities by WRWG to date (Jim Ivery).

Governors

Call staff of Governors Bayh (John), Miller (Keith), Carper (Kathi), and Caperton (John) to obtain their reaction to the compromise proposal permitting a state option to time-limit the WORK program for certain individuals.

Call Liz Ryan to alert her to the timing of the welfare reform bill introduction and to review the agendas for Tuesday's DGA and NGA meetings (Kathi).

Call DGA staff to alert them to the timing of the introduction of welfare reform and to our possible interest in a DGA statement and/or a press event involving Democratic governors (Keith).

Call NGA staff to alert them to the timing of welfare reform and to review the agenda for Tuesday's meeting (Kathi).

State Legislators

Call Sheri Steisel to alert NCSL to the timing of our bill introduction and to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting (John).

Call Rep. Dave Richardson to review the timing of welfare reform and to urge NBCSL to issue a balanced statement regarding welfare reform next week (John).

State Administrators

Call Elaine Ryan to alert APWA to the timing of welfare reform and to review the agenda for Thursday's meeting (John).

County Officials

Call NACO to discuss the timing of the introduction of our welfare reform bill, to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting, and to identify any other issues they wish to discuss on Wednesday beyond their expressed concerns regarding program simplification and financing (Dave Garrison).

Call Kay Beard (Democratic leader of NACO's welfare reform task force) and Doris Ward (President of National Association of Democratic County Officials) to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to solicit their assistance in obtaining as positive a statement as possible from NACO next week, and to determine whether they will be available to make positive statements regarding our welfare reform bill next week (Dave Garrison).

Call Webster Guillory of NOBCO regarding timing of the introduction of our welfare reform bill, his expressed concerns (Haiti, meeting with the POTUS, longer time limit), and NOBCO's public statements next week (John).

<u>City Officials</u>

Call NLC to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting, and to identify any other issues they may wish to discuss on Wednesday beyond their expressed concerns regarding the role of local government in WORK and financing (Dave Garrison).

Call USCM to make suggestions regarding their proposed welfare reform resolution, to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to review the agenda for Wednesday's meeting, and to identify any other issues they may wish to discuss on Wednesday beyond their expressed concerns regarding the role of mayors in WORK, eligibility of WORK recipients for the EITC, generous extensions for JOBS, noncooperation in paternity establishment, family caps, minor mothers' provisions, training, and financing (Dave Garrison).

Call Mayor Cleaver to discuss USCM's concerns with our welfare reform plan, to make suggestions regarding their proposed welfare reform resolution, and to develop a strategy for handling mayors' comments at the upcoming USCM meeting in Portland (John).

Call Mayor Abrahamson's office regarding our responses to USCM's concerns and the upcoming USCM meeting in Portland (Dave Garrison).

Call Mayor White's office regarding our responses to USCM's concerns and NCDM's role in helping identify mayors to support our welfare reform plan at the upcoming USCM meeting in Portland (Dave Garrison).

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1994

<u>Governors</u>

Meet with staff of Democratic governors serving on the NGA leadership team (see attached agenda), 10-11 a.m. in Room 211 OEOB (John, Kathi, and Keith).

Meet with NGA staff, Liz Ryan, and LeeAnn Redick (see attached agenda), 4-5 p.m. at the Hall of States (John, Kathi, and Keith).

Begin calls to all Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors' senior staff with the following objectives (John, Keith, Kathi, and Jeremy make calls per attached list):

o Alert the governors to introduction of the President's proposal during the week of 6/13.

o Review the final decisions on outstanding bottom-line issues for Democratic governors, i.e., family cap, time-limiting WORK, waivers, and financing.

o Request that each governor prepare a letter of support for the President's welfare reform plan and suggest that it focus upon how our plan ends welfare as we know it, provides substantial state flexibility (in particular, permitting state options in a number of crucial areas), enhances federal financial assistance to states for education, training and work programs, and resulted from substantial consulations with the nation's governors.

o Request that a copy of the letter of support be faxed to Keith Mason no later than close of business, Friday, June 10, 1994.

o Request that each Democratic governor be available to respond positively to national and regional press inquiries regarding the welfare reform plan during week of June 13.

o Ask that each Democratic governor identify aspect(s) of our welfare reform plan (e.g., child support enforcement, time limits, etc.) which he or she would like to emphasize in press calls by citing initiatives in his or her state.

<u>State Legislators</u>

Call Sen. Bill Purcell (D-Tenn.) to alert him to the timing of our introduction of welfare reform and to request that he put together a letter from several Democratic legislative leaders expressing support for elements of the President's plan (John).

Followup call to Jeff Wice of the Democratic Legislative Leaders' Association staff regarding the status of the DLLA letter (Margaret).

Call Jane Campbell (D-OH) and Tom Bates (D-CA) to alert them to next week's bill introduction and ask for their assistance in moving NCSL's welfare task force to issue supportive statements for our welfare reform plan next week (John).

County Officials

Begin followup calls to the staff of Los Angeles County Supervisors Mollina, Burke, and Edelman to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to review financing decisions, and to urge them to make positive statements regarding our welfare reform policy and consultation process during the week of 6/13 (Dave Garrison).

City Officials

Begin followup calls to the staff of Mayors Rice, Webb, Belton, Norquist, Archer, Harrenton, Campbell, Schmoke, Rendell, Riordan, and Daley to confirm that their offices have reviewed our welfare reform materials, to answer any remaining questions they may have, to alert them to the timing of our bill introduction, to request their assistance in making positive statements regarding our bill at the USCM meeting in Portland, and to ask them to issue positive statements regarding our bill next week (and to fax those statements to HHS by COB Friday) (Dave Garrison).

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1994

General

Circulate draft summary of intergovernmental outreach activities to Kathi, Keith, John, and Melissa (Jim Ivery).

Governors

Continue calls to Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors' staff (Kathi, John, Keith, and Jeremy).

State Legislators

Meet with NCSL staff (see attached agenda), 8-9 am, Kathi's office (Kathi, John, and Keith).

County Officials

Meet with NACO staff (see attached agenda), 11-12 am, OEOB 211 (Kathi, John, Keith, Dave Garrison).

City Officials

Meet with USCM staff (see attached agenda), 12-1 pm, OEOB 211, (Kathi, Keith, John, Dave Garrison).

Meet with NLC staff (see attached agenda), 1:30-2:30 pm, OEOB 211, (Kathi, Keith, John, Dave Garrison).

Continue calls to selected mayors' offices (Dave Garrison).

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 1994

General

Deliver final version of intergovernmental outreach fact sheet to WRWG co-chairs, ASL, WH, Public Liaison (Jim Ivery).

Provide names of state and local elected officials who have committed to making positive statements regarding our welfare reform bill to Jim Ivery for compilation (John, Kathi, Keith, Dave, Jeremy).

Governors

Complete calls to senior staff of Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors (Kathi, Keith, John, and Jeremy).

State Legislators

State Administrators

Meet with APWA staff (see attached agenda), 8-9 am, OEOB 211, (Kathi, Keith, John).

County Officials

City Officials

Brief Secretary Shalala regarding her speech at USCM meeting in Portland (John, Dave).

Continue calls to selected mayors' offices (Dave Garrison).

FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1994

Governors

Complete any followup actions necessary for Democratic and Republican/Independent governors, including waiver conversations (Kathi, Keith, John, and Jeremy).

Conclude discussions with NGA regarding their public statements about the welfare reform bill (Kathi, Keith, and Jeremy).

Finalize plans with DGA for a welfare reform statement and/or press event during week of 6/13 (Keith).

State Legislators

Conclude discussions with NCSL regarding their public statement about our welfare reform bill during the week of 6/13 (John, Kathi).

County Officials

Conclude discussions with NACO regarding their public statement about our welfare reform bill during the week of 6/13 (John, Dave, and Kathi).

City Officials

Conclude discussions with NLC regarding their public statement about our welfare reform bill during the week of 6//13 (John, Dave, and Kathi).

SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1994

City Officials

USCM Human Services Committee considers welfare reform resolution (John, Dave).

SUNDAY, JUNE 12, 1994

City Officials

Secretary Shalala and David Ellwood speak at USCM meeting in Portland (John, Dave).

MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1994

General

Prepare final list of state and local elected officials who are willing to make positive statements regarding our welfare reform policy and their particular areas of interest (Jim Ivery).

Governors

Call all Democratic and targeted Republican/Independent governors' offices who have failed to transmit their statements of support for our welfare reform plan (John, Kathi, Keith, and Jeremy).

City Officials

USCM considers welfare reform resolution recommended by Human Services committee (Dave).

TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 1994

Governors, State Legislators, and State Administrators

Conduct a briefing at the Hall of States for NGA staff, Washington Representativces, NCSL, and APWA regarding the provisions in our bill (Kathi, John, and Co-Chair).

Conduct a briefing at HHS for all local government representatives in DC (Wendell, John, Jim Ivery to coordinate).

AGENDA FOR MEETINGS WITH STATE AND LOCAL GROUPS

I. Timing of bill introduction.

II. Review of consulation process by WRWG.

III. Updated cost estimates for state share of new program costs (Issue: Should we distribute paper showing that states will pick up less than 10% of total cost? that many states can keep their additional costs down to zero?)

IV. Review of state flexibility in President's welfare reform bill (Issue: Has WH DPC completed draft document showing all the state options permitted in the current plan? Should such a document be distributed at the meeting?)

V. Review of Our Resolution of Outstanding Issues of Concern to the Organization

DGA/NGA/NCSL/APWA: effective date of legislation, part-time work hours, WORK obligations for persons reaching the two-year limit who are working less than 20 hours per week, mandates for in-state child support and paternity establishment, obligation of the state to serve volunteers, performance standards, CWEP option in WORK, denial of FFP for states failing to meet paternity establishment standards, waivers, child care regulations, time-limiting WORK, family caps.

NACO: simplification and intra-state flexibility for welfare administration.

NLC: role of local government in job creation.

USCM: role of mayors in WORK, denial of EITC to WORK recipients, generous extensions, noncooperation, family caps, minor mothers' provision, training.

VI. Review of Financing Proposals

a. Superfund

b. Family day care

c. Emergency assistance (Issue: do we share paper?)

d. DAA

e. PRUCOL

f. Deeming (Issue: do we share paper?)

g. Extenders and other enforcement actions.

VII. Next Steps

a. Would like as positive a statement as possible at the time of introduction of the welfare reform bill; in particular, would like to see a statement include recognition of broad agreement on policy principles, increased state flexibility, favorable federal match rates. Please fax statement to us by COB Friday, June 10, 1994 for press purposes.

GOVERNORS

DEMOCRATS

Folsom (AL) - Keith

Tucker (AR) - Kathi

Romer (CO)* - Keith

Carper (DE) - Keith, Kathi, and John

Chiles (FL) - John

Miller (GA) - Keith

Waihee (HI) - Keith

Andrus (ID) - Keith

Bayh (IN)* - Keith

Finney (KS) - Jeremy

Jones (KY)* - John

Edwards (LA) - Keith

Schaefer (MD) - Kathi

Carnahan (MO)* - Kathi

Nelson (NE) - John

Miller (NV) - Kathi

King (NM) - John

Cuomo (NY) - Jeremy

Hunt (NC)* - John

Walters (OK) - Kathi

Roberts (OR)* - John

Casey (PA) - Kathi

Sundlun (RI) - Jeremy

McWherter (TN) - John

Richards (TX) - Kathi

Dean (VT)* - Kathi

Lowry (WA) - Keith

Caperton (WV)* - John

Sullivan (WY) - Kathi

<u>REPUBLICANS</u>

Engler (MI) - Kathi

Weicker (CT) - John

Schaefer (ND) - John

Miller (SD) - Keith

McKernan (ME) - Kathi

Branstad (IA) - Kathi

Campbell (SC) - Kathi

GOVERNORS

DEMOCRATS

Folsom (AL) - Keith

Tucker (AR) - Kathi - 501-682-2345

Romer (CO)* - Keith

Carper (DE) - Keith, Kathi, and John LIZ RYAN 202-624-7724

Chiles (FL) - John

Miller (GA) - Keith

Waihee (HI) - Keith

Andrus (ID) - Keith

Bayh (IN)* - Keith

Finney (KS) - Jeremy

Jones (KY)* - John

Edwards (LA) - Keith

Schaefer (MD) - Kathi Ken Mannella 202-638-2215

Carnahan (MO)* - Kathi Jill Friedman 202-624-7720

Nelson (NE) - John

Miller (NV) - Kathi R. Leo Penne 202-624-5405

King (NM) - John

Cuomo (NY) - Jeremy

Hunt (NC)* - John

Walters (OK) - Kathi Larry Joplin 202-508-3820

Roberts (OR)* - John

Casey (PA) - Kathi Philip F. Jehle 202-624-7828

Sundlun (RI) - Jeremy

McWherter (TN) - John

Richards (TX) - Kathi Jane Hickie 202-638-3927

Dean (VT)* - Kathi 802-828-3333

Lowry (WA) - Keith

Caperton (WV)* - John

Sullivan (WY) - Kathi 307-777-7434

REPUBLICANS

Engler (MI) - Kathi LeAnne Redick 202-624-5840

Weicker (CT) - John

Schaefer (ND) - John

Miller (SD) - Keith

McKernan (ME) - Kathi 207-287-3531

Branstad (IA) - Kathi Phil Smith 202-624-5442

Campbell (SC) - Kathi Nikki McNamee 202-624-7784

Intergovernmental