

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: APRIL 7 - 9, 1993

UTAH STATE REPORT

AUGUST 2, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

**Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302**

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Administrative Costs	3
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	4
2.4.1 Staffing	5
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes	5
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	6
2.4.4 Claims Collection	6
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	7
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	7
3.1 System Functionality	7
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	9
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	9
3.4 Current Automation Issues	10
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	10
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	10
4.2 Justification for the New System	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	11
4.4 Conversion Approach	12
4.5 Project Management	13
4.6 FSP Participation	13
4.7 MIS Participation	14
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	14
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	15
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	16
6.1 System Profile	16
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	16
6.2.1 Operating Environment	16
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	17
6.2.3 Telecommunications	19
6.2.4 System Performance	19
6.2.5 System Response	19
6.2.6 System Downtime	19
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	19
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	20
7.1 PACMIS Development Costs and Federal Funding	21
7.1.1 PACMIS System Components	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major PACMIS Development Cost Components	23
7.2 PACMIS Operational Costs	24
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	25
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	26
7.3 Utah Cost Allocation Methodologies	26
7.3.1 Historical Overview of PACMIS Development Cost Allocation Methodology	26
7.3.2 PACMIS Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	27

APPENDICES

A State of Utah Exhibits	A-1
B Analysis of Managerial User Satisfaction	B-1
C Analysis of Operator User Satisfaction	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	3
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	4
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	6
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	7
7.1	PACMIS System Development Costs 1987 - 1989	22
7.2	Major Phase I PACMIS Expenses	23
7.3	Major Phase II PACMIS Expenses	24
7.4	PACMIS Annual Operating Costs 1989 - 1992	25
7.5	PACMIS Food Stamp Operational Cost Per Case	25
7.6	PACMIS Projected Funding Allocations	27
7.7	Management Services Cost Centers/Activities	28
7.8	PACMIS Office of Financial Services Food Stamp Allocation	28

APPENDIX A - State of Utah Exhibits

Exhibit No.

A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Utah Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-6.2	State of Utah Software Inventory	A-5

UTAH STATE REPORT
Site Visit: April 7 - 9, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Public Assistance Case Management Information System (PACMIS)

Start Date: 1985

Completion Date: 1989

Contractor: Systemhouse, Inc.

Transfer From: Arizona AZTECS

Cost:

Actual: \$10,513,519

Projected: \$1,247,511

FNS Share: \$2,480,160

FNS %: 20.9%

Number of Users: 1,200

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: IBM 3090-600J and IBM 3090-200J

Workstations: 3270-type terminals

Telecommunications Network: SNA, T1 backbone

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, General Assistance

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Office of Family Support (OFS) within the Utah Department of Human Services (DHS) administers the Food Stamp Program in Utah. It is also responsible for administering the Aid to Families with Dependent Children and General Assistance (GA) Programs. Medicaid Program policy is the responsibility of the Health Care Finance Division of the Department of Health, which also oversees the Special Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and community-based health programs.

System support for the FSP and other assistance programs is provided by two offices within the Department of Human Services -- the Office of Management Services and Electronic Data Processing (EDP). The integrated PACMIS supports the AFDC, Food Stamp, and Medicaid Programs. PACMIS operates on State mainframes and telecommunications networks that are the responsibility of the Department of Administration, Electronic Data Processing and Systems Bureau.

Recent changes in State administration have affected staffing in the Department of Human Services. Organizational changes will continue to occur over the next six months. Although the State has experienced budget cuts, these have not affected the Departments of Human Services and Health. The two departments have been able to increase client grants by three percent and increase staffing to handle the caseload increases.

Much of Utah is rural and recipients travel considerable distances to local welfare offices. The Navajo reservation in southeastern Utah is very remote with many unimproved roads. For this reason, the Department has some small outreach offices and utilizes mail issuance for coupons.

Total Utah population was estimated at 1,727,784 as of 1990. Approximately 5.9 percent were FSP recipients.

The unemployment rate in Utah had been declining during the late 1980s, but increased to 4.9 percent in 1991. Before this increase, the unemployment rate decreased from 6.4 percent in 1987 to 4.3 percent in 1990.

The October 1992 report, *The Fiscal Survey of States*, provides the following information compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Utah's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was in the 5.0 to 9.9 percent range; the national average was 2.4 percent.
- Utah did not reduce the 1992 State budget after it was approved.
- Utah enacted sales tax changes to increase revenues for FY 1993 by \$11.6 million.
- The regional outlook indicated the nation's strongest economic performance occurred in the Rocky Mountain region. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 6.3 percent

was lower than the national average of 7.8 percent. The per capita personal income increase for the region (4.7 percent) was nearly double the national average of 2.4 percent. Utah experienced the second strongest job growth in the United States between June 1991 and June 1992.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The State of Utah has 34 local welfare offices. Five of these offices have caseloads of less than 125 people. The local welfare offices report to one of four Regional Directors, who report to the Director of the Office of Family Support. The Regional Directors evaluate and determine staffing requirements and direction. The Regional Directors are a part of the State Executive Staff. The director of the FSP takes issues concerning regional and local office staffing to the Regional Directors. Until 1979, caseworkers were specialized. Utah then began moving to a generic caseworker approach. Local offices have the discretion to try different approaches to providing service. If an approach is effective, other offices can choose to follow suit. Local offices select and order ADP equipment from State-approved vendors.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

As of January 1992, Utah's unduplicated caseload for the AFDC, Foster Care, General Assistance, Food Stamp, and Medicaid Programs was approximately 193,000 cases and 232,000 individuals. Individual program caseloads increased between 1988 and 1992 as shown in Table 2.1. During this period, the number of FSP households increased by 25,213, a 120 percent increase. AFDC cases increased by only 18 percent, while the number of Medicaid recipients increased by 60 percent between 1988 and 1992.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC - cases	17,605	16,110	15,417	14,839	14,954
AFDC - individuals	50,984	46,762	44,625	N/A	N/A
FSP - households	46,232	40,814	37,006	34,682	21,019
FSP - individuals	126,078	111,770	102,238	N/A	N/A
Medicaid - individuals	102,669	93,886	72,052	65,823	64,118
GA - cases	2,535	2,558	2,468	2,596	2,528
Foster Care - children	1,232	1,165	1,133	N/A	N/A

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 8.9:1 in 1988 to 9.6:1 in 1992.

Utah's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as shown in Table 2.2, has increased.¹

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$179.36	\$174.30	\$165.03	\$150.39	\$145.92

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Utah's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are presented in Table 2.3.² Total administrative costs have increased each year except 1990 and the average cost per household has reflected the same trend.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$9,905,323	\$7,690,063	\$6,594,743	\$6,938,270	\$6,180,927
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household/ Month	\$18.60	\$16.15	\$15.32	\$17.04	\$16.40

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Food stamp systems typically have an impact in several program performance areas. This section examines the system impact in the areas of staffing, responsiveness to regulatory change, error rates, and claims collection.

¹ The number of households and benefit amounts use data reported the FNS State Activity Report each year.

² The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported the FNS State Activity Reports each year.

2.4.1 Staffing

As a result of caseload increases, Utah increased its eligibility worker (EW) and issuance worker staffing levels. Currently there are 515 EWs and 54 EW supervisors. There are ten issuance center workers, four regional directors, nine associate directors, and four assistant directors. Utah does not separate the functions of registration, intake, and on-going casework. All of these functions are performed by EWs.

Staffing requirements are determined based on caseload. When PACMIS was implemented, caseworkers handled about 125 cases per worker. In 1993, the average caseload increased to nearly 200 financial assistance (e.g. AFDC, FSP) cases per worker. Although Utah generally has adopted a generic caseworker approach, there still are some specialized workers who handle Medicaid cases. Each specialized worker now handles between 300 and 350 adult medical cases, up from 240 to 250 cases. Regardless of the number of programs per case, the current average workload is 187 cases per worker. Since PACMIS was implemented, caseloads have increased, Medicaid has become three to five times more complicated, and other assistance programs also have become more complex. State staff believe that the number of caseworkers would have decreased as a result of PACMIS, if everything else had remained constant.

Before PACMIS, there was a data entry unit that entered data from application forms and turnaround documents used to change data already in the system. Once PACMIS was implemented, caseworkers were required to input case information. Some caseworkers could not adjust to this change and resigned. Since the 1990 to 1991 period, Utah has added thirty percent more staff to accommodate caseload increases.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes

Utah has been able to implement regulatory changes in a timely fashion in most instances, as indicated in Exhibit A-2.1 in Appendix A. Exceptions have occurred in implementing the following regulatory changes:

- Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act (273.9(d)(5)(i)), which requires the State agency to use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. Utah was approximately six months late in implementing the regulation while awaiting computer support.
- Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act (273.8(e)(5)), related to an extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. The State was two months late in implementing the regulation while awaiting computer support.
- Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act (273.9(c)(14)), which involved an exclusion of advanced earned income tax credit payments. This regulation was implemented one year late because Utah was in the process of converting to PACMIS during 1988.

Advance notices of regulatory changes are not perceived by the State as reliable for anything beyond a cursory analysis. The final legislative impact is not known until the approved regulations are published. At this point, the State begins to implement the change. For example, the Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act (273.8(e)(17)) excluded as a resource for food stamp purposes, household resources exempt by public assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed households. The State implemented this regulation before the rules were final. The interpretation of the legislation changed after outstanding questions were resolved in the final regulation. Because Utah had implemented changes before the regulation had been finalized, State policy had to be revised after the final regulations were published.

There are other factors that make it difficult to implement regulatory changes in a timely manner. When new data elements need to be added, the regulatory change is more difficult to implement. Utah currently utilizes most of the State's programming resources on PACMIS changes for the Medicaid spend-down process. This effort has caused delays in changes that other programs would like to see in PACMIS. Systems staff indicated that some of the effort associated with the Medicaid changes is caused by the high degree of integration between Medicaid eligibility and the other assistance programs. Systems personnel indicated that they wished they had not integrated Medicaid so closely with other programs.

Mass changes are rarely a problem to implement because of the table structure of the system. Management Information services (MIS) needs three- to seven-days of advance notice. Then, mass changes are implemented over the weekend. It takes up to two days to perform a mass change. Mass changes that involve functions other than table changes may take considerable time and require acceptance testing before implementation.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Utah's official combined error rate, which is provided in Table 2.4, fluctuated between 1988 and 1992. After an increase in 1988, it decreased in 1989 and 1990. The 1991 error rate increased to 7.25 percent and decreased in 1992 to 7.12.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	7.12	7.25	6.56	7.60	8.22

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Total claims collected and claims collected as a percentage of claims established fluctuated during the past five years as shown in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$1,136,740	\$976,268	\$810,197	\$525,366	\$507,319
Total Claims Collected	\$669,493	\$669,493	\$527,598	\$562,473	\$619,815
As a % of Total Claims Established	68.5%	68.1%	65.1%	107.0%	122.1%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

PACMIS was Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified in 1989, and the Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) post-implementation review also was completed that year.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

PACMIS reduced the amount of paper that caseworkers handle by eliminating the data entry and turnaround documents. Monthly reporting was also eliminated.

3.1 System Functionality

Workers utilize terminals that are linked to the mainframe through the Local Area Network (LAN). Each case is assigned a number. An individual identification number, a Social Security Number (SSN) is used for all Departmental programs and systems (PACMIS, Office of recovery System (ORS), and Unified Social Services Delivery System (USSDS)). This number never changes regardless of the case within which the individual appears. This is, in effect, a high-level client index that is never archived or purged.

- **Registration.** Cases that have been closed for less than 60 days can be reopened if the household composition is unchanged. The case number remains unchanged and information is updated as needed. For new applicants, an inquiry is made to determine whether the applicant is known to any of the public assistance systems. This includes PACMIS, USSDS, the ORS, and the system that preceded PACMIS. For closed cases, a history of participation is shown. The inquiry is conducted on

each household member, based on the last name and SSN. If the client is not known, the case is established on the system and a case number is assigned by the system. If the case was active within the last 12 months, information on all of the household members will still be in PACMIS. Historical records can be copied into the current record. During registration, the program types for which the client is applying are entered. The need for expedited benefits is determined by the EW and entered into PACMIS.

- ***Applicant Interview.*** Either the caseworker or clerical staff member schedules the interview. PACMIS screens can be used during the interview to enter applicant household, resource, and expense information, or the information can be entered into PACMIS after the interview. The caseworker can move through the PACMIS screens at will, bypassing unnecessary screens. The screens emulate the hard copy application form and provide on-line edits.
- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Eligibility is determined one month at a time. PACMIS offers both prospective and retrospective budgeting screens, separately or together. Once all household, expense, resource, and income information has been entered and verified as required, PACMIS displays a resource determination summary for each program. This screen lets the worker know whether the case has passed or failed the resource test for each program. The worker then can return to any of the resource entry screens to review or correct information in the case.
- ***Benefit Calculation.*** The system determines the client's eligibility and calculates benefits. The worker authorizes the benefits. Supervisors review benefit authorization for all new workers and those who are on probation.
- ***Issuance.*** Benefit issuance is provided over the counter and by mail. The system prints labels for mailing the food coupons. Replacement benefits can be requested by the EW on-line. Utah has a food stamp cash-out program for SSI recipients and the elderly.
- ***Notices.*** The system generates both automatic and worker-initiated notices to households. After the worker has finished with a case, PACMIS will display a list of possible notice situations resulting from actions taken on the case. After the worker reviews the list and decides what notices should be mailed, the worker can delete the notice situations. All notice details are maintained in a client history file.
- ***Claims System.*** Claims are handled through the Office of Recovery System. If the claim was due to fraud, the Office of Recovery System processes the claim. For claims resulting from worker errors, the recovery is the responsibility of the district office. The recoupment amount is calculated by ORS and is then passed to PACMIS. PACMIS maintains a record of overpayments and is updated monthly through an automated interface with ORS.

- **Alerts.** Discrepancies in income information between the PACMIS database and the external databases, such as Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), State Data Exchange (SDX), and Internal Revenue Service (IRS), are reflected in EW alerts. Each alert requires that the EW access on average at least three additional screens for data input and alert clearance. MIS staff indicated that caseworkers can query against Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and job service files on-line.
- **Computer Matching.** Utah performs matching against SDX, IRS, and other external sources using tapes. PACMIS can query against DMV and job service to determine eligibility; however, this is not an on-line computer interface.

When an applicant is registered on the system, PACMIS uses the SSN to determine whether the applicant is known to ORS, USSDS, or PACMIS.

- **Reporting and Innovative Features.** PACMIS generates parts of the reports Utah is required to submit to the Federal government. Utah is adopting an on-line reporting module within six months to try to eliminate paper within the system. Reports are now printed in DHS or at the Data Center and mailed.

Utah plans to increase the number of LANs being used. They are also looking into the use of wide area networks (WAN). Utah does not plan to use Federal funds for these improvements. PACMIS provides electronic mail for communicating messages and memoranda. Utah also is adding the capability of writing free-form text to client notices and maintaining the text as a part of the case record.

- **Monthly Reporting.** Utah has moved from monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting to prospective budgeting. This effort involved all programs. The State established a committee with programs, Management Services, and local offices. This improvement project was discontinued in the spring of 1992 because of massive changes in Medicaid regarding spend-down.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

PACMIS is on the upper end of the integration scale. MIS staff indicated that they would prefer that the assistance programs not be as closely integrated as they are. The underlying reason for desiring less integration is that every time requirements are changed for one program, there is the potential that other programs will be affected. Integration of the Assistance Programs at the application-software level adds to the degree of complexity of the system.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Each worker has a terminal that accesses the centralized mainframe through a LAN. Supervisors and administrators have microcomputers that also are on the LAN. Utah's goal is to shift all workers to microcomputers.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

Program staff feel it takes too long to make changes in the system, primarily because of many competing priorities. An on-line case-action log is being developed that will help caseworkers, enabling them to type in their notes. There are some concerns that this capability may degrade system response time. Program staff would also like additional improvements in the system, such as combining the generation of a notice and a form (for example, the Landlord Form for Shelter Cost) so that the two documents can be folded and mailed together.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

PACMIS has been operational since 1989. The FNS Mountain Plains Regional Office closed the Advanced Planning Document (APD) in 1989. Many of the original project participants are no longer available. The same is true of APDs and project cost information from 1982 through 1989. Information about the system development process was obtained from several individuals who were on the periphery of the project, the former project manager, and the available system documentation.

During 1981 to 1985, Utah began developing a new system, but the State did not proceed beyond the stage of determining the functional requirements. At the recommendation of the Federal government, Utah examined existing systems that were FAMIS certified and decided to transfer an existing system. The State referred to the transfer process as Stage II. By the time the system was fully implemented, every one of the few million lines of transferred code had been modified. The State originally projected that it would take approximately 18 months to complete the project; instead it required three years. Approximately 50 percent of the AFDC code was transferred. Utah added General Assistance, Medicaid eligibility, a claims collection module, and additional functionality. Utah also increased system security. For the purpose of this review, PACMIS development and implementation began with the 1985 APD and ended in 1989.

4.1 Overview of Previous System

PACMIS was intended to replace two systems, the USSDS and the Assistance Payments Administration Case Information System (APA/CIS). USSDS was developed in 1981 to support Family Services, Handicapped Services, Mental Health Services, Alcohol and Drug Services, Adult Services, Management Services, and Protective Payments. APA/CIS was a table drive file-oriented system that accommodated AFDC, Medicaid, General Assistance, and Food Stamp Programs. APA/CIS required data entry and turnaround documents, overnight batch processing, and heavy reliance on paper print outs and the U.S. Postal Service. The system was initially transferred from the State of Maine, modified to meet Utah's needs, and fully implemented in August 1972. Because Utah operates unified client services between assistance payments and social services, the two systems collected and maintained common case information.

4.2 Justification for the New System

Utah hoped to achieve the following objectives and benefits from a new system.

- Reduction in error payments/issuance for AFDC, food stamps and Medicaid
- Increased recoupments through increased error detection
- Increased worker job satisfaction and efficiency through the elimination of paper turnaround and input documents
- Consistency in the application of policies and computation of income and resource entries
- Improved client service across program boundaries
- Exchange of client information across program boundaries
- Reduced fraud and abuse.

Program staff felt that PACMIS had the capability to reduce client fraud, although they had no documentation to this effect. The ability of the system to provide a total case history is very helpful in analyzing potential fraud.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Initial planning began for a new system in 1981 and continued through 1985. During this period, Utah obtained Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and FNS funding, at the 50 percent rate, for development of a database management system. Some important activities during this period included:

- In 1982, Utah received approval from DHHS and FNS for in-house development of a FAMIS-type system.
- In October 1984, the State submitted an updated APD to fund additional development costs.
- In March 1985, the State received partial approval from DHHS for the 1984 APD.
- In October 1985, Utah submitted an amended APD for \$7.7 million to transfer an existing system.

In 1986, Utah made revisions to its APD and received Federal approval. In January of that year, Utah revised the October 1985 APD and submitted a Request for Proposals (RFP) for PACMIS. Around this time, FNS; the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), and the Agency for Children and Families (ACF) proposed cost allocation plans

to the State. In April 1986, FNS approved Utah's APD and RFP and established the FNS Federal financial participation (FFP) at \$1.5 million for FY 1985 through EY 1988. In

allotted because workers could not spare the time away from their local offices. According to program staff, the training was inadequate, especially for those workers who could not type. Workers had difficulty knowing what screens to go to next. This problem was solved with the development of a handbook to guide workers through screen sequences.

- ***On-going Training.*** New employees receive one week of PACMIS training and four days of program training from regional office training staff. This "hands-on" training uses PACMIS terminals.

For periodic changes to PACMIS, local staff are trained by interactive television. OFS Program personnel go to the University of Utah to utilize EDNET, an interactive television center that is operated by the educational system. Public agencies may schedule training times using EDNET. Although interactive training eliminates the need for travel, both local office staff and the trainers prefer in-person training. Staff are uncomfortable asking questions to a camera, and trainers find it difficult to gauge trainee response.

4.5 Project Management

The project was led by a senior level manager who was transferred from the State System Planning Board to the Office of Family Support to manage this project. The project manager was politically knowledgeable and was able to convince high-level management within the State to approve funding. Although the project manager had little public assistance or systems background, he was instrumental in establishing widespread communications among the multiple project participants. The project manager reported directly to the director of the Department of Human Services. He also reported to three user groups comprised of representatives from each of the affected programs and agencies, including those outside of DHS. Staff and budget resources were made available to the project team to demonstrate the State's commitment to implementing a new system quickly.

Communication within the project management structure was excellent. Groups in opposition to the project were invited to participate in the solution of project problems. The project manager also was responsible for managing the contractors and reviewing their deliverables.

4.6 FSP Participation

There was a high degree of user involvement during the planning, development, and implementation of PACMIS. Each district office sent three people to participate on the User Committee. Staff from the regional offices as well as supervisors were involved. Line staff, supervisors, and policy personnel were involved.

During planning and development, three committees played a major role:

- User Committee
- Technical Committee
- Executive Committee

Utah used program staff, supervisors, and line workers as analysts on the development project. Similar types of staff are used as help desk staff today.

4.7 MIS Participation

During development, there were two to three programmers dedicated to PACMIS provided by the EDP group and eight to 10 programmer analysts from the user group. The user group personnel became information analysts, and four of them now staff the help desk.

Utah had a contractor who was familiar with the technical and logistical aspects of the system, SystemHouse, Inc. This greatly facilitated the development and transfer of the system.

FNS Mountain Plains Regional Office (MPRO) Information Resources Management (IRM) staff visited Utah three to four times a year during PACMIS development. The State found this to be its best source of information.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

The following problems were encountered:

- ***Planning.*** Initially, DHS underestimated the time and resources required to develop a new system. When the State decided to transfer, it had to rely on the contractor's experience regarding conversion time.
- ***Regulatory Changes.*** During system implementation, a number of regulatory changes occurred. To finish the implementation of PACMIS, Utah had to put a hold on implementing these changes.
- ***Cost Allocation Approach.*** Utah wanted to use a time sheet approach for the staff time associated with adding Medicaid eligibility determination to PACMIS so that other programs would not be charged for this time. Obtaining the approvals for this approach was time consuming.
- ***Changes to the Fixed Price Contract.*** Utah would have preferred to use a contract vehicle that did not require constant modifications to the fixed-price contract. Utah overestimated the cost of completion by nearly a half million dollars. This amount was returned to the Federal government at completion of the project.

- **APD Process.** Utah encountered a lack of coordination between FNS and DHHS that affected the preparation of APDs. The State suggested several areas for improvement:
 - DHHS and FNS should coordinate their communications and APD reviews better. The multiple Federal agencies involved should determine who will control the process. A single point of contact would be helpful.
 - The Federal agencies should provide more technical assistance.
 - A system impact statement should be prepared before requiring regulatory changes impacting the system.
 - The APD process should be streamlined.
 - A single APD should be acceptable for common technical issues.
 - DHHS should move the APD decision process to the regional level because centralizing decision making in Washington is detrimental to communications during the development process.
 - Definitions for "development project" and "enhancement" should be formulated and provided to states.

Utah reported that communications with the FNS regional office systems personnel were excellent and indicated that MPRO systems staff were flexible, understanding, and helpful. Whenever adequate funds were available for travel, MPRO staff would conduct site visits. The State felt these visits were very fruitful.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Utah evaluated three state systems -- Arizona's AZTECS, North Dakota's Technical Eligibility Computer System (TECS), and the Vermont system. Utah selected the Arizona system and began the transfer while AZTECS was still in the design phase.

Of 77 system functions transferred, Utah modified or completely re-developed all but two. The unchanged functions were the case number assignment and client scheduling, which is a manual function. Sixteen new programs were added, including Medicaid eligibility. The functions that were developed included: categorical eligibility determination, recoupment, mass change, claims collection, Social Security Number enumeration, management reporting for the State and the Federal government, maintenance of a three-year history on-line, and caseload and participation statistics maintenance. About five percent of AZTECS functions that were transferred were never used, including a hearings function and an archiving function.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATION

The following section provides a description of the PACMIS system. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the system operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting the current food stamp system in Utah are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090 - 200J
IBM 3090 - 600J
OS/MVS/XA, JES2, ADABAS
- **Disk:** IBM 3380/3390
- **Tape:** IBM 3480
STK 3420
- **Printers:** IBM 3203 Line
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** IBM 3270
- **Telecommunications:** SNA, T1 backbone

Exhibit A-6.1 illustrates the number and type of equipment installed in Utah for PACMIS.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

This section contains a description of the current operating system environment, including maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. There also is a discussion of the plans for the future of the system.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

PACMIS operates seven days a week. On-line capability is available from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. daily. The batch cycle extends from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. except on the Friday after monthly processing. On this day the batch cycle may run until noon. The monthly Medicaid eligibility batch run requires 14 hours, mainly because 74 percent to 85 percent of the processing is performed in ADABAS. State Management Services personnel believe the batch time can be reduced if the ADABAS percentage is reduced. Backups, either incremental or full, are done daily. Maintenance and mass changes are run on weekends. Medicaid eligibility is passed to the Health system daily from PACMIS. Benefit issuance for Medicaid then is merged with issuance for PACMIS programs.

PACMIS runs on an IBM 3090-600J that is shared with at least three other State agencies. Utah also has an IBM 3090-200J that PACMIS uses as backup and for running batch jobs. The central equipment is housed in a State central data processing center operated by the Department of Administrative Services. All telecommunications lines are monitored from this central site. All direct access storage device (DASD) is administered by a central database administrator. Utah uses both nine-track and cartridge tapes.

PACMIS operates under the latest release of IBM's OS/MVS/XA with JES2 release 4.1.0. Software AG's ADABAS database manager controls the disk database. On-line code is written in COBOL II and many of the batch programs are written in NATURAL. Utah uses a unique product called NET-PASS that allows the user to "hot-key" to other State systems and databases for participation searches. This function provides the EWs with immediate access to several other State databases through menu options. Exhibit A-6.2 provides a detailed listing of Utah's software.

Management Services utilizes a software release approach whereby software changes are implemented only twice a year, with some exceptions. This has greatly facilitated software testing, implementation, user training, and documentation. A steering committee comprised of program and MIS representatives determines what changes go into each release. Members of this group also participate in acceptance testing.

All report requests are handled through MIS. There is no remote report capability. MIS keeps a library of standard routines and reports that serve to facilitate request turnaround.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

Operational support for PACMIS is provided by both DHS Management Services staff and contractors. Program staff and the PACMIS Steering Committee provide input regarding prioritizing system changes.

- ***Staffing for Systems Support.*** Utah has hired five more programmers and another information analyst. Help Desk personnel have decreased from four or five people to two. State pay scales are not competitive with private sector salaries for technical personnel. PACMIS has been serving as a training ground for ADABAS and NATURAL. There is a six-month learning curve for the system.

Currently DHS is supplementing its systems staff with contractor employees for on-going system enhancements. The current contract expires in June 1993. The contractor personnel were tasked with finding new ways to make PACMIS operate more efficiently and reduce response time, which is a continual problem. Contractor personnel have concentrated on cache, files, and system management to improve response time.

Utah has been following the California District Court case related to Medicaid countable income which will affect the entire database structure of PACMIS, in

terms of individuals within a household and how income is counted. Should Utah be required to comply with this court case, the State may require additional contractor assistance.

- **Archiving.** No records have been purged from PACMIS yet. Medicaid cases are archived after five years, Child Support Enforcement (CSE) cases are archived after seven years, and food stamp cases are archived after three years. According to the Office of Overpayment and Recovery Systems Information (ORSI), Utah must be able to retrieve all data related to claims for seven years. DHS Management Services staff archive records on DASD so they can retrieve the records through their on-line system, thereby making software maintenance easier. Whenever Utah makes a change in its current system, it modifies the archived system as well so that it can always go back into the inactive cases and bring them into the active records.
- **On-going Changes.** Program staff determine first whether the problem appears to be a staff issue, a training issue, or a system problem. If it is determined to be a system issue, a request is made to Management Services. The PACMIS Steering Committee meets twice a month to set the priorities for system changes. This steering committee is comprised of representatives from the Office of Family Services (AFDC, FSP, GA), EDP, and Management Services.

Priorities are assigned depending on a number of factors -- complexity, who can be assigned to perform the task, and what other activities are taking place at the time. In some instances, a change can be added to another change that is already underway. For some changes in the system, the State solicits the views of field staff.

Management Services groups software changes together into software "releases." Program staff see both advantages and disadvantages to this approach. Testing the changes is scheduled well in advance and the testing continues until all problems have been resolved. Training can also be scheduled well in advance. Scheduling new releases about every six months, gives caseworkers time to learn the system before they have to make changes. The disadvantage to the release approach is that program staff sometimes feel that computer support is not as responsive as it should be. This situation is compounded by the scope of the services offered by Management Services, which also provides maintenance and programming support to other offices within DHS and offices within the Department of Health. Given the choice, program staff in OFS would like Management Services to report to OFS instead of both offices reporting to the same director.

Although staff indicated that it is more difficult to implement changes in the highly-integrated PACMIS system than in separate systems, staff felt that integration greatly improved the caseworker workload and the level of client service, prompting consistency across-programs and uniform application of policy to all recipients.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Utah has an extensive systems network architecture (SNA) in Salt Lake among all State mainframes. Utah utilizes T1 lines, microwave, and local copper wire throughout the State. Telecommunication speeds range from the T1 lines to 56KB trunk lines to 9600 and 4800 baud local lines. Digital is used where available. Some fiber optic is beginning to be implemented in the network.

Over 1,200 terminals are associated with the PACMIS system in local offices. The objective is for every worker to have a terminal. Utah is beginning to explore the possibility of a local expert system capability supported by microcomputers for the redesign of PACMIS. This is anticipated to begin between 1995 and 1997.

6.2.4 System Performance

Utah has CPU capacity of 130 MIPS. PACMIS uses 30 to 75 percent of that capacity. Utah has 307 gigabytes of DASD, of which PACMIS uses 10 percent. There are 22 tape drives available, but no system is allowed to utilize over five at a time. The batch window in Utah is 12 hours long, but PACMIS exceeds the batch window during month-end processing. Month-end processing requires up to 20 hours. The longest runs are for mass changes. In March, an emergency mass change for every program was performed that required 27.5 CPU hours.

6.2.5 System Response

System response time is expected to be less than four seconds 90 percent of the time and, in most cases, the system exceeds this standard. Response time for inquiry, edit, and participation searches generally ranges from less than one second to two seconds. Eligibility determination response times are two to three seconds. Periodically, system response time is slower because of a lack of memory availability.

Approximately 254,000 transactions daily translate to over eight million database calls. Over 10,000 transactions occur before 8 a.m.

6.2.6 System Downtime

System downtime is not an issue in Utah because it occurs so rarely, and then it is usually scheduled, e.g. the last Friday morning of the month. Occasionally, however, the system will go down unexpectedly for 15- to 20-minute periods.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Current PACMIS activities and plans are to improve operational efficiencies through system and application enhancements, improve user satisfaction through application enhancements, be responsive to regulatory changes, and plan for future program requirements.

Utah is moving to the use of personal computers (PC) and LANs in the local offices. This is being done in anticipation of additional changes that will continue to build the system and also facilitate the move Utah believes it wants to make toward a graphical user interface and expert system.

The State employs four contractor staff to identify and correct system inefficiencies. The savings associated with eliminating such inefficiencies covers the cost of the contractors. The contractors implement changes that reduce DASD use, CPU run time, ADABAS utilization, and CICS usage to improve user response time or increase operational efficiencies that have a direct impact on operational costs.

Utah is planning to install microcomputers and local area networks in local offices to increase productivity and to be ready for the future. State staff believe that an expert system will be used in the future. Utah would like to implement new technologies that would result in cost savings in the long run, but is concerned that the present PACMIS architecture and the Federal government's requirement that States transfer existing systems would prevent them from doing so.³

The State also has submitted an APD for an Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) system. Although Utah understood initially that an APD was not required and that a letter notifying FNS of its EBT planning effort was sufficient, FNS required that Utah prepare a Planning APD. FNS MPRO staff visited Utah to help them prepare the Planning APD. Utah has had frequent conversations with FNS IRM staff regarding EBT and have found FNS helpful in identifying contacts in other States that could help with technical problems. The State also found the FNS EBT training in St. Paul to be very helpful.

Of greatest concern to the State, however, is the lack of a new systems concept for eligibility determination and benefit calculation. Current systems utilize technologies developed in the 1970s. Utah personnel would like to see a different concept and a different approach for handling these systems.

Utah would like the Federal government to relax the transfer requirement because it believes that this requirement has limited the development of more efficient systems. Utah staff suggested that the Federal agencies and states work together to develop a new design for these systems.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses PACMIS planning and development costs; current Utah Food Stamp system operational costs; and the cost allocation methodologies applied to PACMIS planning, development, and operational costs.

³ Utah's perception is that the Federal government "requires" States to transfer existing systems, even though the FNS APD Handbook 901 indicates that States are required to "investigate" existing systems.

The Utah Department of Human Services does not have all Advance Planning Document Update documents and maintains limited amounts of information on PACMIS development costs.

7.1 PACMIS Development Costs and Federal Funding

PACMIS was conceived in 1981 and became operational in 1989. The 1981 Advanced Planning Document estimated PACMIS development costs to be \$1,247,511.⁴ The Food and Nutrition Service approved the APD amount in October 1981. The APD was approved by all Federal sources by January 1982. The initial PACMIS project was delayed from 1982 to 1985 due to Federal policy changes, difficulties in transforming external design specifications, public resistance, and a variety of other internal coordination issues. The project resumed in 1985.

The initial 1981 APD was updated in 1985, 1987, and 1988 with APDUs. The 1985 APDU estimated total development costs for PACMIS to be \$7,732,100.⁵ This represented a 520 percent increase over the 1981 APD estimated PACMIS development costs. According to the APDU, this increase was due to an expanding functionality and increased hardware costs. Although the 1987 and 1988 APDUs were developed, submitted, and approved by FNS, no detailed information on these APDUs is currently maintained by the State.

The 1987 APDU total amount was approximately \$9.6 million, and the 1988 APDU total cost was \$12.3 million for the development of the PACMIS system. The actual PACMIS funding allocations, the total development cost of the system, the FNS share, and other major Federal funding shares are shown in Table 7.1.⁶

⁴ 1981 APD.

⁵ 1986 APD.

⁶ PACMIS Project cost tracking spreadsheets 1987 to 1989.

Table 7.1 PACMIS System Development Costs 1987 - 1989

Cost	1987⁷	1988	1989	Total
All	\$1,912,953	\$5,960,558	\$2,640,008	\$10,513,519
FNS	\$412,696	\$1,284,418	\$513,460	\$2,210,574
FNS Percent	21.6%	21.5%	19.4%	21.0%
AFDC	\$747,372	\$2,335,109	\$895,983	\$3,978,464
Medicaid	\$404,443	\$1,254,923	\$486,483	\$2,145,849
Total Federal Funding	\$1,564,511	\$4,874,450	\$1,895,926	\$8,334,887

When PACMIS became fully operational in February 1989, the FNS FFP for development costs was reduced from 75 to 50 percent for operations. The total cost for the PACMIS system including planning and development totaled \$11,853,644.⁸ Planning costs for the system were \$1,340,125 and development costs were \$10,513,519.

7.1.1 PACMIS System Components

The PACMIS project consisted of two stages. The planning stage, Stage I, of the PACMIS project was broken out into the following four task areas:

- Project planning and preparation
- Project initiation
- Implementation preparation
- External design

Stage II, the development stage of the PACMIS project, consisted of the following six task areas:

- Implementation preparation
- Design
- Development
- Acceptance testing
- Implementation
- Post-implementation review

⁷ PACMIS project cost tracking spreadsheet 1987 to 1989. Includes all development costs prior to 1987, but does not include Stage I planning costs.

⁸ PACMIS Project cost tracking spreadsheets 1987 to 1989.

The following section details the cost of Stages I and II by major cost category and the portions funded by FNS.

7.1.2 Major PACMIS Development Cost Components

This section provides the costs of developing the PACMIS system. The cost information was extracted and summarized from PACMIS project cost tracking spreadsheets. Stage I tasks were completed prior to April 1987. Total major Stage I, or planning costs, are shown in Table 7.2, Major Stage I PACMIS Expenses.

Table 7.2 Major Phase I PACMIS Expenses⁹

Expense	Total Stage I	FNS Share	Percentage Share
Contractor	\$280,748	\$56,536	23%
Hardware	\$62,639	\$12,614	20%
EDP Charges	\$241,507	\$48,633	20%
Personnel	\$615,922	\$124,031	20%
Other	\$139,309	\$27,772	20%
TOTAL	\$1,340,125	\$269,586	20%

The total cost of PACMIS Stage I was \$1,340,125. The total Federal funding amount was \$1,097,663.¹⁰ Of the total Stage I planning costs, the FNS share was \$269,586 or 20 percent.¹¹ The FNS FFP for Stage I of PACMIS was 75 percent enhanced funding. The State share of Stage I costs was \$242,242.¹²

The development of the PACMIS project was awarded to Systemhouse, Inc. Total development costs are shown in Table 7.3, Major Stage II PACMIS Development Costs.

⁹ Source: PACMIS project cost tracking spreadsheets 1987 to 1989.

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² *ibid.*

Table 7.3 Major Stage II PACMIS Expenses¹³

Expense	Total Stage II	FNS Share	Percentage Share
Contractor	\$2,756,000	\$592,950	21%
Hardware	\$986,663	\$198,893	20%
EDP Charges	\$3,389,986	\$727,232	21%
Personnel	\$1,764,908	\$359,255	20%
Other	\$1,615,962	\$332,244	21%
TOTAL	\$10,513,519	\$2,210,574	21%

A new mainframe was purchased by the Department of Administration to facilitate the PACMIS project. Additionally, 45 terminals were purchased to support PACMIS central and field office activities. The total cost of Stage II was \$10,513,318 of which FNS funded \$2,210,574 or 21 percent.¹⁴ The FNS FFP for Stage II was 75 percent from its start in March 1987 until PACMIS became operational in February 1989. From March 1989 until June 1989 when PACMIS development was completed, the FNS FFP was 50 percent. The State share for Stage II was \$2,188,630.¹⁵

7.2 PACMIS Operational Costs

The PACMIS system supports Food Stamp, AFDC, and Medicaid Programs. The estimated operating costs in the 1981 APD were \$35,000 monthly or \$420,000 annually. Current operating costs for PACMIS consist of ADP operations, maintenance and enhancements (including contractor costs), and Management Services (personnel). Recent PACMIS operating costs are provided in Table 7.4, PACMIS Annual Operating Costs 1989 - 1992.

¹³ Source: PACMIS project cost tracking spreadsheet 1987 to 1989.

¹⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵ *ibid.*

Table 7.4 PACMIS Annual Operating Costs 1989 - 1992¹⁶

Federal Fiscal Year	Total Annual PACMIS Operating Costs	Percentage Change from Previous	Food Stamp FFP at 50%	Food Stamp Percent of Total
1989	\$4,152,561	N/A	\$651,746	15.7%
1990	\$5,054,306	21.7%	\$780,395	15.4%
1991	\$4,757,450	(5.9%)	\$959,005	20.1%

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The State of Utah owns and operates the equipment which was used to develop PACMIS and on which PACMIS currently operates. The computer and telecommunications equipment is operated by the Department of Administration. ADP cost includes various machine operating times (in microseconds), storage space, printers, and programmer time. ADP machine costs are tracked through internal machine monitoring devices which collect processing time and track the time to a specific cost pool which is identified by a unique job number. ADP-programmer time is tracked through the Microman application which accrues time incurred for specific jobs/activities. PACMIS ADP operational costs are accumulated and billed through Utah's Financial Information Resources Management System (FIRMS).

7.3 Utah Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the cost allocation methodology used by Utah to allocate PACMIS cost. This includes the PACMIS development costs methodology and the PACMIS operational costs methodology.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of PACMIS Development Cost Allocation Methodology

Utah no longer maintains detailed cost allocation documentation figures for the PACMIS development effort, which was completed in June 1989. However, the cost allocation between major Federal Programs is discussed in the 1981 APD and the 1985 APDU.

According to Utah Department of Human Services sources, the cost allocation for development of the PACMIS system was based upon an analysis of benefits to be achieved from the development of the PACMIS system and current Department of Human Services workloads. The 1981 APD specified the following Federal funding breakdown for development costs:

- AFDC: 75 percent
- Medicaid: 15 percent
- FSP: 10 percent

The cost allocation methodology was modified in the 1985 APDU so that the allocation of development costs among AFDC, Medicaid, and FSP are based upon a "federally agreed upon ratio" and "distribution of overhead costs which cannot be directly charged will be treated as common costs under the same cost allocation."¹⁹ After the modification was implemented, development costs across the Federal programs were as follows:

- AFDC: 59 percent

¹⁹ Source: 1985 APDU.

- Medicaid: 15 percent
- FSP: 26 percent

Based on the project expense tracking worksheets, the projected cost allocation percentages for planning and development of the PACMIS system are shown in Table 7.6, Actual PACMIS Project Funding Allocations.

Table 7.6 PACMIS Projected Funding Allocations²⁰

Participant	Stage I - Planning %	Stage II - Development %
FNS	26.85	28.77
AFDC	52.21	43.42
Medicaid	19.58	23.62
State Only	1.36	4.19
Total	100%	100%

According to Utah Department of Human Services staff who participated in the PACMIS planning and development effort, these funding allocations were based on an agreement between Utah and all Federal funding sources involved in the project. Timesheets were used to track development costs associated with State and contract personnel.

7.3.2 PACMIS Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

The costs associated with PACMIS operations fall under the Management Services and State Systems Center services. Management Services provides the coordination, planning, maintenance, and operations of systems which support the mission of the Department of Human Services. The State Systems Center provides all computer services, including communication, which support the PACMIS system. PACMIS operating costs can be grouped into the following categories:

- Management Services costs
- PACMIS ADP Operational costs
- Department of Human Services contractor costs
- Indirect costs

Management Services cost centers are identified by organization codes. Each organization code has several activities associated with it. Three activities are associated with Management Services. Management Services PACMIS costs are charged to cost center activity codes, as shown in Table 7.7, Management Services Cost Centers/Activities.

²⁰ PACMIS project cost tracking spreadsheet 1987 to 1989.

Table 7.7 Management Services Cost Centers/Activities

Cost Center / Organization	Activity Code	Activity Name	Description
2057	S1550	Management Services	Administrative costs for Human Service Systems.
	S1580	PACMIS Operations	Data processing related services.
	S1585	Department of Social Services (DSS) Contractor Costs	DSS Operation support, maintenance, and enhancement of the programs (software) which run PACMIS.

Each activity code is related to a specific activity within DHS. Management Services divides its time between the Office of Financial Services, which operated PACMIS and Office of Social Services (OSS). Expenditure allocation between OFS and OSS is determined by Random Moment Sample (RMS) allocations. These allocations are based on the ratio of OFS and OSS RMS strikes to the total RMS strikes. In 1992, the OFS RMS allocation was 34 percent and OSS RMS allocation was 66 percent.²¹ Within OFS, costs are further allocated to funding sources based on the proportion of RMS strikes.²² The RMS allocations for the Office of PACMIS food stamp costs from 1990 through 1992 are shown in Table 7.8, PACMIS Food Stamp Allocation.²³

Table 7.8 PACMIS Office of Financial Services Food Stamp Allocation

State Fiscal Year	RMS PACMIS Food Stamp Allocation Percentage
1990	28.18%
1991	30.10%
1992	34.26%

Data processing costs and DHS contractor costs are allocated on the basis of the Random Moment Sampling Plan. This allocation is based upon time and strikes associated with OFS services in support of PACMIS versus time and strikes associated with services provided to support other DHS systems. These data processing costs then are allocated

²¹ Source: Random Moment Sample Summary 1992.

²² Source: July 1, 1992 Utah Department of Human Services Cost Allocation Plan.

²³ Source: Random Moment Sampling Annual Summaries 1990, 1991, and 1992.

to the appropriate programs based on RMS samples properly identified by the ratio of RMS strikes applicable to each program's total.²⁴

ADP costs are billed directly to each program supported by PACMIS. Each PACMIS job run through the central computer operating facility is uniquely identified by a job number. Job numbers are associated with specific detailed and identifiable program functions.

A portion of DHS-approved salaries and wages are charged as indirect costs of the PACMIS system to cover overhead and administrative fees. Indirect cost allocations are determined by the proportion of approved Executive Director Office salaries to expenses. PACMIS makes up 6.4 percent of total DHS indirect costs. In 1992, the food stamp RMS portion of indirect cost was 34 percent of the 6.4 percent, or 0.22 percent of total DHS indirect costs.

²⁴ July 1992 Utah DHS Cost Allocation Plan.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF UTAH

EXHIBITS

**Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	Y	Y	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92*	N (Imp. date: 6/1/93)	Y	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	N (Imp. date: 9/1/89)	Y	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal timeframes. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	Y	Y	Y
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service timeframes. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	Y	Y	Y

**Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	N
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	N (Imp. date: 1/1/89)	Y	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y (Imp. date: 10/1/88)	N	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	Y	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

* These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

**Exhibit A-6.1
State of Utah
Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090-600J	IBM	Purchase	512 MB main storage 1536 MB extended storage
3090-200J	IBM	Purchase	256 MB main storage 1,024 MB extended storage
DISK			
3380/3390	IBM	Purchase	3390 - Mod 3 307 gigabytes
TAPE			
Tape Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (32)
Tape Drives	STK	Purchase	3420 (12)
PRINTERS			
Line	IBM	Purchase	3203 (1)
FRONT ENDS			
3745	IBM	Purchase	
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
3270 Type	IBM	Purchase	1,200

Exhibit A-6.2
State of Utah Software Inventory

<u>Software</u>	<u>Release</u>	
ABEND-AID	6.0.3	Inhouse 6.1.3
ACF-NCP	5.4	
ACF-SSP	3.6.0	Inhouse 3.7
ACF-VTAM	3.3	Inhouse 3.4.1
ACF-2	5.2	Inhouse Maint
ADABAS	5.1.9	Inhouse 5.2.3, 5.2.4
ADABAS ONLINE SERVICE 2.2.4	2.1.3	Inhouse 2.2.1, 2.2.3,
ADABAS SQL	1.4.2	
ADAPREP	2.3	
AF/OPERATOR	225	Inhouse Maint 9205
AF/OPERATOR APPLICATION LIBRARY	110	
AF/PERFORMER	105	
APAS/INSIGHT	3.0.2	Inhouse 3.01.03, 3.01.05
ASSEMBLER-H	2.1.0	
ASSIST/GT	3.1.1	
AUTOLOADER	1.2.0	
BMDP	1990	
BESTNET/MSNF	5.5	
CA-1	4.9	Inhouse 5.0, Maint PTF
CA-7	2.9	Inhouse 3.0, Maint
CA-90	1.0	Inhouse Maint
CICS	3.1.1	

Exhibit A-6.2 (cont'd)
State of Utah Software Inventory

CICS/FDS	1.6	
COBOL VS COMP/LIB	2.4	
COBOL II	3.1	Inhouse 3.2
COBOL REPORT WRITER	3.0	
CODE-1 PLUS	1.0	Inhouse 1.1
COM-LETE	4.4.4	Inhouse 4.5.2, 4.5.3, 4.5.4
CRYSTAL/DB2	6.6	
CRYSTAL/MVS	6.6	
CRYSTAL-SUBSYSTEM	2.0	
CRYSTAL CICS SUPPORT	6.6	
CRYSTAL PERFORM EVALUATOR	6.6	
DB2	2.3.0	
DB2 ANALYZER (MICS)	PSP9010	
DASD CONSULTANT	1.1	Inhouse 1.3
DATACENTER	1.1	Inhouse 2.0
DEVICE SUPPORT FAC (DSF)	12	Inhouse 13, 14
DFDSS	2.5	
DFHSM	2.5	
DFP	3.2.0	
DISPLAYWRITE	2.1.0	
DISSOSS/370	3.4.0	
DISSOSS LIBRARY SERVICES	2.1.1	Inhouse Maint
DMS/OS	8.1	
DFSORT	11.0	Inhouse 12.0
EMULATION PROGRAM (EP)	9.0	
ENTERPRISE PRINT MANAGER		Inhouse 1.0

Exhibit A-6.2 (cont'd)
State of Utah Software Inventory

EPIC	4.1	
EPILOG	500	Inhouse 1000
EREP	3.4.2	
ESA	4.1	Inhouse 4.2
ESRA CICS	500	
EZTRIEVE-PLUS	6.00.C	
FAVER	3.00.00	
FORTRAN	2.3.0	Inhouse 2.5.0, Maint
FSE-PLUS	3.3.C	
GDDM	2.2.0	
GDDM-PGF	2.1.0	
HFDL	2.1.D	
HOST COMMAND FACILITY	2.1	
INSIGHT FOR DB2	3.1.6	
INTERTEST	4.2.1	Inhouse 5.10
IPCP/MVS	4.01A	Inhouse 4.1A
ISPF DIALOG	3.2	
ISPF PDF	3.2	
JES2	4.1.0	
KOMAND/DB2	3.4.0	
KOMAND	3.4.2	
MAILSTREAM PLUS		Inhouse 2.1
MICS	PSP9204	Inhouse 9210

Exhibit A-6.2 (cont'd)
State of Utah Software Inventory

NATURAL2	2.2.3	Inhouse 2.2.4
NATURAL-CONNECTION	2.2.2	Inhouse 2.2.4
NATURAL CONNECTION OS/2 (PC)	2.1.1	
NATURAL CONSTRUCT	3.1.2	Inhouse 3.2.1, 3.2.2
NAT-OPTIMIZER	2.1.1	Inhouse 2.1.2, 2.2.4
NATURAL2 SECURITY	2.2.2	Inhouse 2.2.4
NATURAL VSAM	2.2.2	Inhouse 2.2.4
NET-PASS	2.2.1	
NETSPY	4.2	Inhouse Maint QN92060
NETVIEW	1.3	Inhouse 2.2
NETWORK VTAM	5.2.1	Inhouse 5.2.2
OFFICE VISION	2.0	
OMEGAMON CICS	550	
OMEGAMON DEXAN	710	
OMEGAMON STATUS MONITOR	231	
OS NETWORK SNA	2.1.2	
OV/ASSIST	1.1.0	
PAN TSO	14.01.B	
PANVALET	14.01.B	
PANVALET ISPF	14.01.B	
PL1 OPTIM	1.5.1	Inhouse 2.3.0
PREDICT	3.1.4	
PREDICT APPLICATION CONTROL	1.2.1	Inhouse 1.2.2
PRINT SERVICES FACILITY	2.1.0	
PROSECURE	2.3.7	
QUERY MGMT FACILITY	3.1	Inhouse 3.1.1

Exhibit A-6.2 (cont'd)
State of Utah Software Inventory

RC/MIGRATOR, RC/QUERY	2.4	
RMF	4.2.0	
ROUTING TABLE GENERATOR	1.1.1	Inhouse PTF
RTA CICS	500	
SAS PC	6.04	
SAS/ACCESS INTERFACE TO ADABAS	1.1.0	Inhouse 6.06
SAS/SASGRAPH	6.07	
SAS/BASE	6.07	
SDF II	2.0	Inhouse 3.0
SDSF	1.3.1	
SERVICE CONNECTION	1.1.2	
SMART TEST	2.2	Inhouse Maint, 3.0 Maint
SMP-E	1.6	
SNA HOST TAPE	40040	
STROBE	8.6	Inhouse 9.0, 9.1
SUPERBMS	3.2	
SUPEREDIT	3.2	
TSO EXTENSIONS	2.1.0	
TSO-MON-ONLINE	5.2.1	Inhouse 5.3.0, 5.3.1
TSO-MON-BASE	5.3.1	
TSO SUPERSET	4.3D	
VSAM-EASY	3.6	
VSUM	1.3.3	
VTAM PRINTER SUPPORT	6.0.066	
XEROX LASER PRINTING	2.5	

Exhibit A-6.2 (cont'd)
State of Utah Software Inventory

UNIX

ADABAS	1.2.0.5 (Beta)	Inhouse 1.2.1
NATURAL	1.2.0.5 (Beta)	Inhouse 1.1.4
NETWORK	1.1.4.1 (Beta)	
NETWORK INTERLINK	5.2.1 (Beta)	

APPENDIX B

STATE OF UTAH

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Utah. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Utah. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Utah	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
491	63	12.8%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	35	55.6%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Utah. The number of responses, however, is low and produces a small sample that may not be representative of the randomly selected group.

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are satisfied with the computer system in Utah. EWs generally find the system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use to be acceptable. Workers also think the system contributes to job satisfaction; more than 94 percent of EWs feel that the system often is a great help to them.

Compared to the previous system, over 92 percent of eligibility workers prefer the current system. A large majority finds the current system easier to use for specific functions. Most of the respondents believe the current system makes them more efficient and productive and increases their job satisfaction. Compared to the previous system, EWs generally think that the current system has a positive impact or little effect in two areas: client service and fraud and errors.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Good	23	65.7
Excellent	12	34.3

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	7	20.0
Good	26	74.3
Excellent	2	5.7

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	28.6
Sometimes	25	71.4

Respondents are quite satisfied with system response time. All of the eligibility workers think that overall system response time is excellent or good, and 80 percent believe that response time is good or excellent during peak processing periods.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Often	35	100.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	62.9
Sometimes	13	37.1

EWs in Utah are satisfied with system availability. All of the EWs think that the system is available when they need to use it, and the majority feels that the system is rarely down. For the minority that believes the system sometimes is down, the downtime apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system is generally available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Good	22	62.9
Excellent	13	37.1

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	97.1
Sometimes	1	2.9

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	97.1
Sometimes	1	2.9

How often is the system's data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	91.2
Sometimes	3	8.8

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	1	7.7
Easier	12	92.3

The responding eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are very accurate and timely. All workers feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or excellent. Almost all EWs feel that problems with incorrect eligibility determination, cases terminated in error, and obsolete data in the system are rare. Compared to the previous system, more than 92 percent of eligibility workers think that the current system facilitates accurate benefit calculation.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	82.9
Sometimes	5	14.3
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	62.9
Sometimes	12	34.3
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	80.6
Sometimes	5	16.1
Often	1	3.2

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	88.6
Sometimes	4	11.4

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	88.2
Sometimes	3	8.8
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	1	2.9
Rarely	33	94.3
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	88.6
Sometimes	3	8.6
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	88.2
Sometimes	4	11.8

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	88.6
Sometimes	3	8.6
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	85.3
Sometimes	4	11.8
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	68.4
Sometimes	3	15.8
Often	3	15.8

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	63.6
Sometimes	10	30.3
Often	2	6.1

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	76.5
Sometimes	4	11.8
Often	4	11.8

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	80.0
Sometimes	5	14.3
Often	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	60.6
Sometimes	12	36.4
Often	1	3.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	65.6
Sometimes	9	28.1
Often	2	6.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	56.3
Sometimes	12	37.5
Often	2	6.3

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	88.6
Sometimes	4	11.4

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	5	38.5
Easier	8	61.5

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	2	15.4
Easier	11	84.6

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	2	15.4
Easier	11	84.6

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system is easy to use. For every function, majorities report rarely having difficulty performing the task. The areas in which the largest minorities encounter some difficulty include: learning to use the system, identifying cases making payments through recoupment, and identifying suspected fraud cases.

In comparison to the previous system, most workers feel that the current system is easier to use. For each specific function, between 62 and 85 percent of the EWs feel that it is easier to perform the task with the current system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	2	5.7
Often	33	94.3

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	67.6
Sometimes	11	32.4

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	2	15.4
More	11	84.6

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	3	23.1
More	10	76.9

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Less	2	15.4
About the same	9	69.2
More	2	15.4

Under the new (current) system, how much are you able to get done?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	2	15.4
More	11	84.6

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	2	15.4
More	11	84.6

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	1	7.7
Better	12	92.3

Responding eligibility workers feel that the system contributes to job satisfaction. All workers believe that the system is more helpful than problematic, and large majorities feel that it often is a great help and rarely is an added stress in their jobs.

Compared to the previous system, over 92 percent of responding EWs prefer the current system overall. Large majorities find their work more satisfying and pleasant with the current system, but most think their jobs are equally stressful with current and previous systems. Most EWs also believe that they are more efficient and more productive in their work with the current system.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	33	94.3
Sometimes	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	94.1
Sometimes	1	2.9
Often	1	2.9

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	10	76.9
Easier	3	23.1

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the number of trips the client has to make to obtain benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	8	61.5
Fewer	5	38.5

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of time a client has to wait in the office?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	6	46.2
Less	7	53.8

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of paperwork demanded of the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	3	23.1
About the same	6	46.2
Less	4	30.8

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has a positive impact or no effect on client service. Most workers feel that expedited service is relatively easy to achieve. A narrow majority believes that clients are required to spend less time waiting in the office with the current system. In other areas (e.g., ability to interview clients in a timely manner), workers generally think that there is little difference between the current and previous systems.

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	4	44.4
Easier	5	55.6

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	1	8.3
About the same	2	16.7
Fewer	9	75.0

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	2	20.0
About the same	5	50.0
Fewer	3	30.0

Eligibility workers generally feel that the system has a positive impact or little effect on fraud and errors. The majority thinks that the number of errors made now is lower than with the previous system, and a slim majority believes that it is easier to collect overpayments with the current system. Workers have divergent perceptions, however, regarding the amount of fraud that goes undetected; half feel it is the same with the previous and current systems.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF UTAH

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Utah. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in the State. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EW Supervisors in Utah	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
59	30	50.8%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	23	76.7%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Utah. The response rate of 76.7 percent is acceptable and produces a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals.

Summary of Findings

Most of the EW supervisors believe that the system often helps them in their jobs. The majority of EW supervisors reports that system response time, availability, and accuracy are acceptable. EW supervisors also feel that the system is quite easy to use. Respondents agree that the system contributes to improved job satisfaction and supports most management needs.

In comparison to the previous system, all responding EW supervisors think the current system is better overall. Most EW supervisors believe that the current system is easier to use and offers improvements in many areas including job satisfaction, management support, and client service. Supervisors also think the system has a positive impact or little effect on fraud and errors.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	17.4
Good	15	65.2
Excellent	4	17.4

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	6	26.1
Good	15	65.2
Excellent	2	8.7

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	34.8
Sometimes	14	60.9
Often	1	4.3

Most EW supervisors in Utah generally are satisfied with system response time. More than 82 percent of the respondents think that overall response time is good or excellent, and nearly 74 percent of the supervisors feel response time remains good or excellent during peak processing periods.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Often	23	100.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	39.1
Sometimes	14	60.9

EW supervisors think that system availability generally is good. All of the respondents believe that the system often is available when needed. Although more than 60 percent think that the system is sometimes down, this downtime apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	4.3
Good	13	56.5
Excellent	9	39.1

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	15.4
Easier	11	84.6

EW supervisors perceive the quality of the system's data and the accuracy of its calculations to be very good. More than 95 percent of the supervisors feel that the information in the system is good or excellent. In comparison to the previous system, approximately 85 percent of the EW supervisors think that it is easier to calculate benefit levels accurately with the current system.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	16	69.6
Sometimes	7	30.4

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	68.2
Sometimes	7	31.8

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	19	86.4
Sometimes	3	13.6

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	87.0
Sometimes	3	13.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	20	95.2
Sometimes	1	4.8

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	21	91.3
Sometimes	2	8.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Easier	13	100.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.7
Easier	12	92.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	3	23.1
Easier	10	76.9

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	15.4
Easier	11	84.6

EW supervisors feel that the system is easy to use. For each of the functions addressed, a large majority of the responding EW supervisors reports rarely having difficulty with the function. The areas in which the largest number of respondents sometimes have

difficulty are: learning to use the system (32 percent) and obtaining information from the system (30 percent). Compared to the previous system, more than three quarters of the EW supervisors believe that it is easier to perform each of the specific functions addressed using the current system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	4.3
Sometimes	1	4.3
Often	21	91.3

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	60.9
Sometimes	9	39.1

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	15.4
More	11	84.6

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	4	30.8
More	9	69.2

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	8	61.5
About the same	5	38.5

Under the new (current) system, how much work are you able to get done?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	15.4
More	11	84.6

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.7
More	12	92.3

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Better	13	100.0

EW supervisors feel that the system improves job satisfaction. More than 91 percent of EW supervisors think the system often is a great help. The majority also believes that the system rarely causes additional stress.

All of the supervisors feel that the current system is better overall than the previous system. Most EW supervisors find their work to be more satisfying, more pleasant, and less stressful with the current system. Large majorities also believe that they are more productive and more efficient with the current system.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	17.4
Good	18	78.3
Excellent	1	4.3

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	4.3
Good	16	69.6
Excellent	6	26.1

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	46.7
Sometimes	7	46.7
Often	1	6.7

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	72.7
Sometimes	3	27.3

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are the people you supervise?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	8.3
More	11	91.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to make mass changes?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	5	55.6
Easier	4	44.4

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to evaluate local office efficiency?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	4	33.3
Easier	8	66.7

For the most part, EW supervisors feel that the system supports management needs. Large majorities feel that the quality of both technical support and reports produced by the system is good or excellent. Most supervisors also rarely have problems meeting Federal reporting requirements. Nevertheless, more than half of the supervisors report sometimes or often having difficulty making mass changes to the system.

In comparison to the previous system, supervisors view the current system as meeting their management needs better. Most think that the current system makes it easier to evaluate local office efficiency, and almost 92 percent of the supervisors feel that the personnel they supervise are more efficient with the current system. But, the majority thinks the same level of difficulty is involved in making mass changes in the current and previous systems.

Client Service

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	7.7
About the same	10	76.9
Easier	2	15.4

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the services received by the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.7
Better	12	92.3

Under the new (current) system, how do you think the average client is being served?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	1	7.7
Better	12	92.3

A large majority of EW supervisors believes that client service is improved with the current system; however, most EW supervisors also feel their ability to interview clients in a timely manner is the same with the current and previous systems.

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	20.0
About the same	1	10.0
Easier	7	70.0

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	6	46.2
Less	7	53.8

Under the new (current) system, how many false claims are caught?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fewer	1	8.3
About the same	8	66.7
More	3	25.0

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	1	8.3
About the same	9	75.0
Fewer	2	16.7

EW supervisors feel that compared to the previous system, the current system has a positive or neutral impact with respect to fraud and errors. Seventy percent of respondents think that it is easier to collect overpayments with the current system, and the majority believes that less errors are made with the current system. But, two thirds of the supervisors think that the same number of false claims are caught, and three quarters believe that the same level of fraud cases get by undetected with the current system.