

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: NOVEMBER 10 - 12, 1993

WASHINGTON STATE REPORT

SEPTEMBER 7, 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 Costs	4
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	5
2.4.1 Staffing	5
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change	6
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	6
2.4.4 Claims Collection	7
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	7
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	8
3.1 System Functionality	8
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	14
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	15
3.4 Current Automation Issues	15
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	16
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	16
4.2 Justification for the New System	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	16
4.4 Conversion Approach	18
4.5 Project Management	18
4.6 FSP Participation	18
4.7 MIS Participation	19
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	19
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	19
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	20
6.1 System Profile	20
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	21
6.2.1 Operating Environment	21
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	21
6.2.3 Telecommunications	22
6.2.4 System Performance	22
6.2.5 System Response	22
6.2.6 System Downtime	23
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	23
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	23
7.1 ACES Development Costs and Federal Funding	23
7.1.1 ACES System Components	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components	24
7.1.2.1 Contractor Costs	27
7.1.2.2 State Personnel Costs	27
7.1.2.3 Hardware Costs	27
7.2 ADP Operational Costs	27
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	28
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	28
7.3 Cost Allocation Methodologies	29
7.3.1 ACES Development Cost Allocation Methodology	29
7.3.2 ADP Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	29
7.3.2.1 Cost Allocation Methodologies and Administrative Costs	31
7.3.2.2 Cost Allocation Methodology for ISSD Charges	31

APPENDICES

A State of Washington 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	FNS Estimated Participation by FFY	24
7.2	ACES Development Cost History	25
7.3	ACES Projected Development Expenditures	27
7.4	ITIS Operational Cost	28
7.5	Administrative Cost Allocation Methodologies	30

APPENDIX A - State of Washington Exhibits

Exhibit No.

A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Washington Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	Allocated Cost Pools	A-5

WASHINGTON STATE REPORT
Site Visit November 10 - 12, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Interactive Terminal Input System (ITIS)

Start Date: 1977

Completion Date: 1981

Contractor: Not applicable

Transfer From: Not applicable

Cost:

Actual: Not completed

Projected: \$41,849,231 (ACES)

FNS Share: \$16,371,419 (ACES)

FNS %: 39.12% (ACES)

Number of Users: 2,315

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: Unisys 2200/611; 2200/622ES

Workstations: UTS 400 terminals, various PCs

Telecommunications Network: SNA/SDLC over T1 and 56KB lines

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp Program

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) is the designated State agency for the administration of the Food Stamp Program (FSP). There are six assistant secretaries who oversee the following areas:

- Medical Assistance Services (Medicaid)
- Health and Rehabilitative Services
- Economic Services
- Aging and Adult Services
- Children, Young, and Family Services
- Management Services

The existing mainframe application that supports FSP is maintained by the Information System Services Division (ISSD) within Management Services. Maintenance and support of the microcomputer systems are decentralized and provided by computer support personnel within each of the divisions that employ personal computers (PC) in their work. The PC systems that support field operations are supported by the Economic and Medical Field Services (EMFS) within Economic Services.

Data center support for the mainframe operations is provided by the Department of Information Systems (DIS).

There are 66 field offices that come under the direction of the EMFS. All offices are staffed with State employees. All offices are integrated.

The level of unemployment in Washington has generally declined since 1982. Between 1983 (11.2 percent) and 1990 (4.9 percent), the unemployment level decreased by over 50 percent. The 1991 unemployment rate was 6.3 percent.

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

- Washington's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was in the 0 to 4.9 percent range; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.
- Washington reduced the 1992 State budget by \$48 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Washington decreased by 0.64 percent. This change was similar to the national average decrease of 0.60 percent.
- Washington reduced revenues by \$177.8 million for FY 1993.
- The regional outlook indicated that Washington's per capita personal income growth was above the national average and that it had below average unemployment rates.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The Food Stamp Program is located within the Division of Income Assistance which is within Economic Services. The assistant secretary of Economic Services and the director of Income Assistance are political appointees. Within Income Assistance there are three major groups: Programs, Employment and Training and JOBS, and Quality Control. The Programs area contains:

- Food Stamp, Outreach, and Nutrition Programs
- Adult and Emergency Services, which includes Supplemental Security Income (SSI), General Assistance (GA), system maintenance, and miscellaneous State programs
- Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Refugee Assistance

Each program is staffed with a chief and seven program managers. Resolution of conflicts among the various programs occurs at the program level. FSP is supported by the Interactive terminal Input System (ITIS), developed in 1977. The data below reflects the existing system. This system is scheduled to be replaced by the Automated Client Eligibility System (ACES), which is being transferred from Connecticut.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

The food stamp caseload has increased from 127,253 households to 175,800 households, and from 313,751 individuals to 440,696 individuals from 1988 to 1992. Similar increases have occurred in AFDC and very large increases have occurred with Medicaid (MA) eligibles.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	97,492	90,650	82,543	79,128	75,831
Individuals	276,321	256,178	231,583	222,672	212,572
Foster Care	7,398	7,005	7,105	6,987	1,477
GA					
Cases	19,435	18,844	17,396	18,761	14,143
Individuals	19,642	19,021	17,567	18,935	14,256
FSP					
Households	175,800	163,211	141,351	132,954	127,253
Individuals	440,696	398,618	348,015	327,182	313,751
Medicaid	516,619	445,474	394,859	369,093	352,629

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 8.7:1 in 1988 to 11.6:1 in 1992.

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

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$161.10	\$146.94	\$128.34	\$118.60	\$117.75

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Washington's FSP administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.² The data indicates that total administrative costs increased each year from 1988 to 1992. It also shows that the average cost per household increased steadily until 1991, then fell to \$13.89 in 1992.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$29,632,452	\$26,830,799	\$21,874,036	\$19,638,301	\$20,099,045
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$13.89	\$14.18	\$16.27	\$13.82	\$13.45

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

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

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

FSP is supported by the following existing systems:

- ITIS is the major system for case management. Since the worker determines eligibility, the State prefers not to refer to this system as an eligibility determination system, but it does support the worker in making the determination. This is a mainframe system.
- The Disqualified Recipient System (DRS) and Income Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) are mainframe systems that provide cross matching.
- The Claims Recovery System (CRS) is a PC-based system used for claims recovery.
- The Financial Super System (FSS) is a PC-based system developed and supported by EMFS that calculates the benefit amounts that are entered onto an input document that is input to ITIS. The FSS also produces information necessary to issue Food Coupon Authorization (FCA) cards and food stamp identification (ID) cards at the local office through a file which is passed to an automated forms printing program.
- The Reception/Barcode System is a statewide application that supports reception, application intake scheduling, and application tracking in all offices. The barcode portion provides a CSO masterfile of all clients and tracks the location of the physical case record file while it is in the office as well as when it is transferred to either another office or to the Records Retention Center for archiving.
- The Food Stamp Accounting and Sales System (FSAS) supports CSO cashing of FCAs using barcode technology. It also tracks the food coupon inventory and provides monthly food stamp reports.

ITIS has been in place for over 20 years and will be replaced by a new system (ACES) that is under development. Any positive effect the system may have had on program operations when the system was implemented are no longer noticeable. Error rates have been high for the last five years; benefits have consistently been issued; expedited issuances has been a periodic problem (the State has been sued); and claims recovery has been slow.

2.4.1 Staffing

The current staffing levels are: food stamp issuance workers - 39; regional office staff -- 25; eligibility workers (EW) - 1,291; clerical staff - 823; and supervisors - 137.

There are a variety of EW models. Most are generic, performing both intake and on-going functions, but there are some workers who are Medicaid long-term workers only. The number of field staff has remained stable while the caseloads have increased.

Staffing within the field offices is based on workload staffing, but workloads have been out of date for the last five years and do not take into account automation and changes in program requirements. A weighted caseload is used, with public assistance (PA) cases requiring twice as much time as food stamp cases for certification.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

Washington did not implement 3 of the 14 of the major legislative changes shown in Appendix A on time. These included:

- Standard Estimate of Shelter Expenses for Household with Homeless Members (CFR 273.9(d)(5)(i)). Implementation of this regulation was delayed until the State received clarification on the regulation from Food and Nutrition Services (FNS).
- Combined Initial Allotment (normal and expedited) (CFR 274.1(b)(2) and CFR 274.2(b)(3)). These regulations were implemented late due to policy issues and difficulty in making the changes in the system.

Two regulations did not apply to the State. The State does not have a clothing allowance and does not make migrant vendor payments. Many of the changes did not require system changes since the worker determines eligibility before the case is input to ITIS.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Washington's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has increased somewhat between 1988 and 1992.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	11.73	11.22	10.08	9.55	10.27

Error rates increased from 9.55 percent in 1989 to 11.73 percent in 1992. According to the State, the 1993 State findings for error rates shows a significant reduction to about 8 percent.

Error rates increased at about the same time caseloads increased (up 13 to 15 percent as opposed to an expected increase of 4 to 5 percent), that is, when participation rates

increased and staff remained the same. When the staff attempted to keep up with the workload, they generally did not take the extra step to verify the data provided by the client. At the time, the Family Independence Program was also underway (cancelled in June 1993). The philosophy of this program was to be less punitive and accept the client information without double checking everything. This move to a "prudent person" concept, along with the increased caseloads, may have contributed to the error rates.

Under ACES (the system under development), a number of errors should disappear, such as errors in Social Security numbers (SSN), and arithmetic calculation of wages, salaries, and other income.

2.4.4 Claims Collections

DSHS has nearly tripled the value of claims established over the last five years, from \$2.65 million in 1988 to \$6.9 million in 1992, but the rate of claims collected has increased at a somewhat lower rate, from \$1.3 million to \$2.5 million, reflecting a decline in the percentage of total claims collected from 51.5 percent to 36.4 percent. The Office of Financial Recovery is responsible for establishing the claims and for initiating the recoupment process. This office initiates garnishment of wages and has increased the tools and staff used to collect. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax refunds as well as unemployment compensation benefits can be redirected. The development of FSS to support field offices has caused a decline in errors due to miscalculations by workers. DSHS staff indicated that they liked their existing claims collection process and do not plan to replace it, even though the Connecticut system being transferred has a functioning claims collection system.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$6,911,859	\$4,586,585	\$5,280,523	\$3,732,318	\$2,657,630
Total Claims Collected	\$2,513,966	\$2,207,658	\$1,716,376	\$1,485,830	\$1,370,983
As a % of Total Claims Established	36.4%	48.1%	32.5%	39.8%	51.5%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

The existing systems are not Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified and do not meet Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or FSP requirements. Because the existing mainframe is 20 years old, its capabilities and functions have been supplemented with State-developed PC applications that are used in

the field offices. These applications provide local offices with a degree of flexibility and responsiveness that the mainframe system could not provide. Furthermore, some of the PC applications are innovative and efficient. DSHS expects that with the transfer of the Eligibility Management System (EMS) from Connecticut that it will eventually meet Federal requirements for certification. However, without Federal enhanced funding, the incentive for the creation of a Federally-certified system has been greatly diminished.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

Automation in Washington is very fragmented and includes the following systems:

- DRS - This subsystem tracks disqualified recipients.
- IEVS - This system performs the computer matching required by Federal government.
- FSS - A PC-based system that calculates benefits which are input through ITIS or a PC application connecting to mainframe. It also sends a local issuance file to an automated forms printing system which barcodes the FCAs.
- Reception/Barcode System - A statewide, PC-based system that supports reception, application intake scheduling, and application tracking in all offices. It uses bar codes to track case files.
- ITIS - This mainframe-based system is the major system for case management.
- Accounts Receivable Monitoring System (ARMS) - is PC-based.
- FSAS - The Food Stamp Accounting System is PC-based and uses bar code technology to read FCA cards offered for cashing and to provide the appropriate coupon mix to clients. It also issues food coupons and prepares coupon issuance reconciliation reports for field offices.

The PCs in local offices are also utilized for office automation activities such as word processing and spreadsheets and are used for other application systems such as:

- Record retention automatic transfer system
- Supplies ordering system
- Training and scheduling system
- Inventory system
- Forms ordering system
- Accounting, finance, and travel voucher system

3.1 System Functionality

FSP is primarily supported by an automation system which was implemented over 20 years ago and was initially designed as a Medical Eligibility System. ITIS was added as a significant enhancement in 1977. Over the years, subsidiary systems have been developed to enable the PA programs to provide assistance in accordance with most Federal and State requirements. Washington will continue to enhance the existing systems to the degree feasible to improve field service efficiency and program performance and will do so until a new system has been implemented. The system functionality described

below, therefore, is not limited solely to ITIS, but encompasses other subsidiary systems used in support of FSP.

- **Registration.** A single application form is used by all applicants for PA.

When a person applies for PA, clerical staff utilize the Reception/Barcode System. Clerical staff make an inquiry against the master file to determine whether the individual has received assistance from the local office in which they are applying for assistance. Clerical staff also inquire into the ITIS mainframe system to see if the household members have previously participated or are currently participating in assistance programs within the State. This is an on-line inquiry to the mainframe system. This system also contains information on applications that have been previously submitted but were denied or withdrawn within the last three years. The clerical staff enter the names, SSNs, addresses, and dates of birth of all household members. This information becomes a part of the CSO master file.

Using the Reception/Barcode System, the clerical staff schedule appointments for interviews with clerical workers. The system maintains a schedule of all workers' interviews and the types of interviews that are to be performed. The system finds the first available appointment for a worker according to the type of interview required. If the time is suitable to the client, the clerk prints an appointment notice in either English or Spanish (or another language, if appropriate) and gives it to the client. If the client is not present at the time of scheduling, a notice is printed, placed in a window envelope, and mailed to the client.

After the inquiry is completed and the individual is not found in either the local office master file or ITIS, a case number is assigned to the application. Each office is given a block of case numbers to assign to new cases. If the case already exists in ITIS, the clerk requests a transfer of the case record to the local office so that the record is on hand when the interview takes place. The case number is then changed to reflect the new local office case number. Once the case number has been assigned, a bar-coded file folder label is created that provides the case number, case name, and date of application. This bar code is placed on the folder

so the workers do not have to re-enter the names of the household members and the demographic information. Information from the application form is entered into the Authorization Document, a worksheet prepared by EWs, also called the M-Form. Financial information is entered into FSS, from which eligibility is determined. FSS prints the award notice at this time. The non-photo FSP identification (ID) card is created at this time. The application record created in FSS is maintained in FSS at the local site.

Clerical staff enter the data from the M-Form into the PC-ITIS system. This is a PC application that mirrors the UTS-400 terminal. The PCs can be operated in a on-line mode to the central mainframe or, if response time is slow, the worker can choose to enter all of the application data, holding the data in a queue on the PC's hard drive to be sent in a batch mode to the mainframe when completed or when the mainframe is available. Income information is maintained in ITIS by case, not by individual. It is possible to enter up to 15 people in one case. The M-Form is an exact match to the PC-ITIS screens. If there are insufficient PCs available to enter the M-Form data, the worker can use the UTS-400. PC-ITIS provides field edits on the data entered. The mainframe ITIS system performs relationship checks and field edits overnight.

ITIS provides an error report on all data processed the previous night. The information is loaded onto the hard drive of the PC in the local office and can be printed by the worker at any time.

- **Benefit Calculation.** EWs use a stand-alone PC-based application (FSS) to calculate benefits. Financial information is entered into the FSS, from which the benefit amount is calculated. The results of the calculation are entered into the Authorization Document which is then given to clerical staff for entry into the ITIS mainframe system. The system calculates benefits based on financial information that is entered by the worker.
- **Benefit Issuance.** A variety of issuance mechanisms are employed in Washington. Coupons may be mailed to households living in non-high mail loss areas. FCAs are mailed to households living in high mail loss areas, except for elderly and disabled households which may receive coupons. All other clients are issued FCA cards. FCAs can be redeemed at 64 of the 66 local offices, at a U.S. Post Office (in the future, this option will no longer be possible), and in about 40 check-cashing venues.

FCAs may be issued by either local offices (via the FSS system) or the central office (via the ITIS mainframe system). The local office decides whether FCAs will be issued locally or centrally, depending on the amount of time available. If the application is taken at the end of the month, the local office will issue the FCA. The FCA has a bar code printed on it that reflects the amount of the benefit, the case number, issuance date, and mix of coupons. The system also prints the FSP ID card at the same time. Once the case has been established on

the mainframe system, FCAs are printed (with bar codes) and mailed to the client on the monthly run. This assures that the client receives his or her initial benefits in a timely manner, although some high-volume offices may run into problems with timeliness of expedited issuance during certain times of the year (for instance, during the summer months when there is a high volume of migrant workers). Clerical staff handle the FCA printing and issuance in the local offices.

Food coupons that are issued out of the local offices are handled in the following manner, using FSAS. When the FCA is presented, the worker scans the FCA and then scans the optical character reader (OCR) control number printed on the food coupon book front cover. This is used by the local office to control and reconcile the food coupons within the local office. FCAs that are redeemed by post offices and check cashers are keyed in at the central office as there are no bar-code readers at these locations.

The automated Registration and Control of Negotiables (RCN) System is used to collect and display information about client or vendor negotiables which have been received at the local office, record the disposition authorization information, to record disposition action, print RCN logs, and prepare transmittals for cancelled negotiables. This system helps the local office to manage and control the those negotiables redirected to the local office.

- **Notices.** Notices are prepared and sent from a number of locations and systems.
 - The Reception/Barcode System (the PC system used to prepare the case folder and track all individuals) sends denial letters to clients who do not appear for their interviews and approvals FSS. It also prints the interview notice. This is a batch letter-printing system.
 - FSS (PC-based system at the local office used to determine eligibility and calculate benefits) prints food stamp notices and generates the file of data needed to print Medicaid ID cards, FSP ID cards, and FCAs. The worker selects the required notice from a menu of notices. The system alerts workers by flashing the notice that needs to be sent. If the required notice is not sent, the worker is unable to finalize work on the case that day. The notice will be pre-filled with data that is present in FSS. If there are any changes, the worker can enter these onto the notice.
 - ITIS prints notices of mass changes, recertifications, and FCA cards. When ITIS sends out FCAs, coupons, and warrants, it includes a change of circumstances form for clients who do not report monthly.
 - FSAS prints affidavits (for lost coupons), exchanges, and returns and prints notices of coupon overissuance.

- **Claims System.** Washington does not have a single claims system per se, although it has mechanisms in place for tracking recoupments and payments made against outstanding claims. In the local office, FSS is used for overpayments. When an overpayment has occurred, the worker goes into FSS and enters the financial information that should have been reported for the months that were in error. A claim determination form is prepared and an overpayment notice is sent by certified mail to the client indicating the overpayment amount as calculated by FSS. The overpayment package is then sent to the Office of Financial Recovery which sets up the obligation. The M-Form is updated, keyed into ITIS, and the percentage of the overpayment to be recovered monthly is entered. This amount is deducted from the monthly benefit. Each month, ITIS provides a tape of the cases where recovery is occurring to ARMS, operated by the Office of Financial Recovery, which reduces the amount of the obligation. When the amount due is nearly paid off, the worker is notified and the amount to be recouped by ITIS is deleted (via the M-Form input document) from ITIS so that the reduction requirements will be deleted from ITIS.

For cases that have been closed, CRS is used at the local office to determine the status of the outstanding balance. This system was developed by the Office of Financial Recovery and is a part of ARMS. If a client wants to repay an overpayment, a restitution form is prepared in the local office and sent to the Office of Financial Recovery for input to CRS.

The collection method is determined by the case circumstances and through discussions between the worker and the client. If the case is active, the client can opt to pay a lump sum or to have the overpayment recouped each month.

- **Computer Matching.** The central office (via ITIS) conducts matching on all individuals within a case and provides a printout for the local worker when there is a discrepancy in income reports within a certain dollar range. Matches are performed on name, SSN, date of birth, and other identification fields. Tolerances are set by the Division of Income Assistance to limit the matches as much as possible. All required IEVS matching is performed: Benefit Earnings Exchanges system (BEERS), State Data Exchange (SDX), Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), IRS, and State Employment Security for wages and unemployment insurance benefits. Matching on IRS, DRS, and State-reported income is performed. Matches are also performed with vital statistics through the Department of Health to obtain information on births. Some systems also allow bank accounts, Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) data, and workers compensation to be checked.
- **Verifications.** DSHS performs the mandatory verifications for the issuance of FSP benefits. The systems do not require verifications. The worker completes a form that lists the required verifications to keep track of those received. If the required verifications are not present, a letter is sent to the client requesting the missing verifications. The Reception/Barcode System, as well as FSS, can produce this

letter and track pending applications. After 10 days a denial will occur if the verifications have not been received. FSS produces the denial letter.

DSHS has developed a PC-based system, the Verification Overpayment Controls System (VOCS), that tracks complaints on overpayments made by the public. It is an official means for the public to complain about apparent inequities or abuses of public assistance. VOCS workers verify the accuracy of the complaints.

Special investigators hired as Fraud Early Detection (FRED) staff, can assist workers in verifying resources and bank accounts of applicants.

- **Recertifications.** FSP-only and Medicaid cases that are input to ITIS are automatically closed according to the closing date on the file in ITIS. No more benefits are issued after that date. ITIS sends a notice six to seven weeks before the end of the last month of certification, enclosing an eligibility review or application form that the client is to complete and return to the local office before the expiration date. The worker conducts the interview and determines eligibility and makes sure that benefits are continued without cutoff before the certification period is over. If ITIS closes the case, a new application form must be prepared with a new cycle of benefits, but the case can still be retrieved in ITIS so that all of the household information that has remained unchanged will not have to be reentered.
- **Alerts.** FSS provides alerts to the workers regarding notices that must be sent. The worker must send the required notice to be able to proceed with the case.
- **Monthly Reporting.** Monthly reporting is required for all clients who have earned income or clients who have had earned income in the last three months. These clients are identified on the M-Form input to ITIS which sends out the monthly reporting form. EWs direct clerical staff to update the ITIS database. EWs input the information into FSS which produces a short form that is given to the clerical staff to update the payment status code. If there is a change in the circumstances, EWs prepare an M-Form that is input to ITIS by clerical staff. Cases are not terminated based on non-receipt of the monthly reporting form due to a court case brought against the State in 1982 when monthly reporting was implemented. The worker can look at the inquiry screen of ITIS to see what the payment status code is, indicating whether the monthly reporting form has been received.
- **Reports Generation.** ITIS provides a number of reports: listings of monthly and daily benefits, management reports, accounting reports, and month-end reports reflecting potential duplicate issuance and payments. Each of the PC systems provides output records. FSAS is notable in that it provides local offices with the capability to prepare inventory control reports and reconciliation reports automatically that can be rolled up into the FNS-250 and -471 reports.

Although ITIS produces accurate and timely reports as required, the ITIS database architecture limits ad hoc reporting. Program staff must submit a service request for an ad hoc report. There are no more fields to collect additional information and program staff are unable to describe the character of the population.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** EMFS oversees all operations in field offices and provides the PC-based systems that have been discussed above. Field offices have considerable discretion in the utilization of many of these systems, sometimes employing their own PC-based systems. The ideas for most of the PC systems developed at the central office for the field offices were originated by a field office. When a system, or new version, has been developed, its availability is announced on an automated bulletin board to the field offices. Field offices may have computer programming staff to develop other systems or to help them in installing central office developed systems. The regional offices also provide computer information consultants to help field offices implement new PC applications.

There is an electronic mail (E-mail) system which is installed in field offices at the discretion of the regional offices and field offices. Through the mainframe ITIS system, terminal alerts and messages can be sent from the central office to any office in the State.

On-line help screens are available for some PC applications. Some offer help at the data element level; others offer it at the screen level. Some applications offer help to the extent that the need for any printed user manuals is completely obviated.

While the level of automation for the functions that are required for eligibility determination and benefit calculation appears relatively high, the primary system, ITIS, provides little of this automation. Of the 78 functions identified in the survey, only 11 of these are fully automated and another 8 are partially automated. All of the remaining functions are considered manual functions for ITIS. Field offices have supplemented ITIS out of necessity with PC applications, as discussed above, to assist the workers in the field.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

Organizationally, the level of program integration is high. There is one department (DSHS) that is responsible for all health and assistance programs and for the development and maintenance of the systems that support them, although a second agency provides data center support services. Within DSHS, although two divisions are responsible for managing the health and assistance programs, one division is designated the lead agency for managing ITIS. Any changes to ITIS must go through the Income Assistance Division which prepares the change request and submits the request to ISSD. All mainframe support is provided by ISSD. Development and support of numerous office

automation (PC) systems are decentralized throughout DSHS, with EMFS handling FSS and bar-coding efforts and the Division of Revenue handling CRS.

All programs are integrated at the generic-caseworker and local field-office level where a client can apply for assistance with a single application form.

Because there are multiple PC and mainframe systems, there is little integration and communication between the systems. There is a transfer of some already keyed information between the PC systems in the local offices, but completely redundant data entry (by the clerical staff) is required to put the case into the mainframe ITIS system.

Organizationally and programmatically, there is a high degree of integration of assistance programs at the central and field office that is reflected in the systems that have been developed to support them. However, there are many separate applications residing on PCs in the field offices and the mainframe in the central office that are not integrated at all.

Because ITIS has very limited functionality, the level of complexity is quite low. This will also change considerably under ACES, resulting in the disappearance of many PC applications that now exist in field offices.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

All data entry staff input data to ITIS via UTS 400 terminals or PCs (that have a PC-ITIS data entry application) that connect directly to the mainframe. There are many PCs located in the field, but not every worker has access to a PC.

There are approximately 800 PCs in field offices that are considered acceptable for the future ACES, now under development. About 2,500 new PCs (model 486 was contracted for) will be added to the field offices, bring the total up to 3,300 PCs. There may be additional PCs in field offices that do not meet ACES standards. All caseworkers will not have PCs on their desks, but all will have access to PCs, which are needed for completion of their work.

There are 1,291 EWs, 823 clerical staff, 25 regional office staff, and 39 issuance staff. These figures represent full-time staff; since issuance is conducted in 64 of the 66 offices, there are actually more staff members who perform issuance functions, but not on a full-time basis.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

With the low level of automation provided by ITIS, field offices and the central field office operations have developed a variety of PC systems to supplement ITIS. Many of these PC systems offer a high degree of automation for certain functions, such as field office issuance of FCAs and coupons, as well as fast turnaround and response for eligibility determination and benefit calculation functions. The eventual transition to the

central mainframe-based ACES now under development can be expected to be somewhat problematic if ACES does not perform as responsibly, quickly, and flexibly as the existing PC applications. For instance, when a worker has a problem with a PC application, the worker can call the developer of the application directly, to obtain further instructions or to make modifications to the PC applications. The PC applications are constantly undergoing upgrades and revisions with new versions of the modifications made available within a relatively short period. It can be expected that the separate PC applications will continue to be developed either at the individual field office level or from the central field operations for enhancing field operations if the mainframe ACES system does not provide the functionality upon which workers have come to rely.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Washington has an approved Advanced Planning Document (APD) and has contracted with Integrated Systems Solutions Corporation (ISSC) for the transfer of Connecticut's EMS system. This project is a second attempt to implement an integrated system to replace the State's existing systems. The project team is in place and ACES is in the early stages of system development. The team has recently completed the program specifications for the system.

4.1 Overview of Current System

Washington has a combination mainframe and local area network (LAN)-based system. The automated mainframe system was developed in 1970 and enhanced with an interactive terminal input capability (referred to as ITIS) in 1977. Mainframe functions are executed on the Unisys 2200. Remote video display terminals are Sperry UTS 400 terminals located in 66 field locations. Workers utilize PCs during the eligibility determination process, then prepare input documents for entry via PCs or UTS 400 terminals. It is a batch-processing system with an on-line inquiry capability. The system provides limited functionality, and is very labor intensive for the worker. For instance, workers must review the printouts resulting from the computer matches and prepare a turnaround document for changes that need to be made in the case file.

PC-ITIS is a data entry system for ITIS. It can interact with the mainframe but usually sends transactions in a batch mode. Elementary edits, such as numbers and dates, are performed at the PC level; relational edits, such as program specific codes, are performed at the mainframe level. The results of outside database searches are returned to the worker the day after batch transaction. ITIS is a case-based system that retains eligibility information for both cases (household) and individuals but does not contain income or resource information at the individual level.

4.2 Justification for New System

The existing system was originally scheduled for replacement in the 1980s, but the system development effort that would have replaced it was eventually cancelled. Over the years, however, the dumb terminals were replaced with personal computers on the LANs. To

supplement a number of system deficiencies, EMFS developed a number of PC-based systems, some of which have been implemented statewide. The PC systems have enabled the State to continue to provide benefits. Although the multiple systems have created a fragmented network of automation, the PC systems have offered a great deal of flexibility and responsiveness for the field users.

The new system is intended to replace the mainframe system (ITIS) as well as some of the PC-based systems. The objectives of the new system are to:

- Meet State and local program requirements,
- Eliminate data inconsistency and redundancy
- Meet Federal requirements
- Reduce errors
- Improve client service
- Increase worker productivity through increased automation and functionality
- Increase accountability
- Improve automated interfaces

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

ACES began in 1989 with the planning phase, was completed in July 1993. User committees developed and program management approved the functional requirements. In January 1992, a Union Management Committee was formed to join with the administrative group in each region to insure readiness and resolve union issues. This group has had a major impact on clerical, eligibility worker, and social worker roles in the new system.

In November 1993, Washington was in the process of reviewing EMS from Connecticut and preparing a set of ACES-detailed modification documents. These documents included decision tables, an acceptance test plan (scripts), screens, etc. The software specifications are to be developed from January through March of 1994.

In late 1994, the system is due to enter acceptance testing. This testing will include case scenarios and user-training modules. The contractor will also train 130 field staff as county-level experts to provide local support.

Two local offices are scheduled to take part in a pilot project from February 1995 to April 1995 to test conversion and training. Training will proceed for four months from May 1995 through August 1995; thereafter field staff will convert their cases with county-level experts providing support. If the pilot is successful, the system will be implemented statewide. Conversion itself will take a maximum of 10 months.

ISSC is the prime integration contractor, with IBM responsible for the computer center, telecommunications and hardware; Mid America Systems for training; and Cutler Williams for the conversion plan.

ISSC maintains a computer center in Boulder, Colorado. This center is used to review the system and generate change documents. In month 15 of the project, this small mainframe will move to Olympia, Washington; in month 22 it will be upgraded with its own 3745 and connected to the other State agencies through the DIS 3745.

4.4 Conversion Approach

There was no conversion required for ITIS since there was no system prior to ITIS. There has not been any conversion necessary for any of the PC-based systems. Each system evolved its own database.

ACES will convert the limited demographic information, plus SSN and case income information, from the Unisys ITIS database to the ACES IBM database after the pilot. The ACES skeleton case information will sit in a pending file until the workers are trained. After training workers will enter all new cases into ACES. Cases in process will continue to be entered into ITIS until they come up for recertification or redetermination.

It will take 6 to 10 months to convert all cases to ACES. Historical information for closed cases will be available to the workers through an ITIS interface.

4.5 Project Management

Project management for ACES is the responsibility of the program staff. The project manager reports to the secretary of DHHS and is part of the Program and Policy Steering Committee, along with all directors of program areas and field services. The ACES Project has field staff assigned to the project in six-month intervals, after which they will rotate back to the field. These staff perform a liaison role.

4.6 FSP Participation

Users from the field and policy and management are drawn into the planning and development process as needed to review the ACES Project Team deliverables and user screens and provide input. Meetings occur on an ongoing basis with these groups in a formal process, with the user representation dependent on the subject matter of the meeting. FSP staff were not involved in the review of transfer candidate systems, which was handled by the ACES Project Team. FSP user involvement with other groups during planning and development has been minimal, occurring during informational meetings held by the ACES Project Team. FSP users are not responsible for assuring ACES compliance with FSP regulations.

ACES project management staff feel that one of the problems with COSMOS (the failed system) was that program staff were made a permanent part of the COSMOS project team and, over the course of the COSMOS project the program staff began to lose program expertise. DSHS believes that ACES is a better model. Program staff and supervisors are consulted on final decisions recommended by the ACES Project Team.

4.7 MIS Participation

DSHS Management Information Systems (MIS) staff are part of ISSD and report to a division director within DSHS. There are 17 staff dedicated to the ITIS system. They interact with the ACES team for conversion consultation and specifications and current-system interface specifications. They will program the interfaces between ACES and the existing mainframe ancillary systems. MIS staff are not included on the key project team, nor are any members part of the core ACES development.

The State may hire a contractor to be an information systems technical advisor part-time for the project. The State data center DIS staff are not central to the development effort, much like the DSHS ISSD staff. There is a LAN specialist from DIS who will be part of the ACES core team.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development

The costs for the ACES project increased twice after the 1990 planning APD. In 1991, the State DIS recommended a different project structure based on an analysis of the ACES project and the failed COSMOS project. This reconfiguration included more staff, greater participation by ISSD, and a technical advisor. This additional planning effort increased the planning phase costs from \$1.0 million to \$1.9 million.

In 1992, additional funds were required because the effort to procure a responsive implementation bid was extended. After the bids in response to the first Request for Proposals (RFP) came back very high, almost three times what the State had projected, Washington met with the potential contractors to try and explicate the discrepancy. A second RFP was issued and an implementation contractor was selected, but this extra effort increased the cost of the planning and bid process by approximately \$0.8 million.

The elimination of enhanced funding in April 1994 will be very costly to the State in regards to the ACES project.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Washington used Agency for Children and Families (ACF) transfer conferences, American Public Welfare Associates (APWA) conferences, vendor demonstrations, and system documentation to assess the currently available automation systems. The State visited Ohio, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and California (NAPAS) to view those transfer candidates deemed most appropriate for Washington. Connecticut's system had most of the functions required by Washington State, was certified, and the worker-interaction approach was acceptable.

A few of the areas where changes in Connecticut's EMS were needed include:

- Retrospective Budgeting: Washington requires two-month retrospective budgeting. EMS has one-month retrospective budgeting. Washington has considered using prospective

budgeting -- it is easier with food stamps, but Washington advocacy groups are opposed to prospective budgeting. The decision on the approach to be taken has not yet been made.

- Standard Utility Allowance - Washington prorates by individuals, Connecticut prorates by household.
- Size - Since Washington has twice the caseload of Connecticut, system changes will be required to accommodate the increased caseload.
- Overpayments - EMS does not track client overpayments so Washington may keep (and try to incorporate) its current PC-based ARMS that tracks overpayments.

No transfers have occurred from Washington to other States.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the Washington automated system, ITIS. The

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

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

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The current Unisys system operates 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. The system will be available on-line from 7:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. daily, six days a week. System maintenance is performed Sunday from 3:00 p.m. until Monday at 7:00 a.m. It uses the Unisys DMS 1100 database manager. There are less than 400 non-report programs in the system and about 100 scheduled reports from the mainframe. Only one program exceeds 10,000 lines of code, most of the rest are less than 2,000 lines.

Operations uses AM/PM from Empact Software to distribute software to the community service office LANs. Developers use IMS Programmers Workbench from Anderson Consulting to increase productivity on their PCs for mainframe development. There are also a number of tools from Compuware in use, including FILE-AID/MVS, FILE-AID/IMS, and ABEND-AID. JEM from Diversified Software is used to control JCL standards. Omegamon/MVS and CICS from Candle Computing is used to assist in the system monitoring process. An automated distribution software system from Archtype facilitates report distribution, bursting, and report collation. Users and system staff use DYL-280 from Sterling Software for IMS ad hoc queries. The user can also look at reports on-line instead of having them printed. On-line documentation is stored using Assist/GT from GT Software.

ACES will also operate 7 days a week, 24 hours a day and will be available as described above. The IBM ES9000 has 90 million operations per second (MIPS). It operates with the MVS/ESA operating system, using JES2 for batch control, OPC/ESA for job scheduling, ZEBB from Altai for job recovery, and RACF for security. There will be 180 gigabytes of direct access storage device (DASD) on the system.

There is a disaster recovery plan in place that is in the process of being tested one component at a time. The plan is completed, though not yet thoroughly tested.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

There are 17 DSHS ISSD staff dedicated to ITIS maintenance on Unisys. ITIS is written primarily in COBOL, with Assembler subroutines for input/output (I/O). The Unisys hardware is in a central data processing facility run by the State DIS. ISSD is a software and operations group within DSHS that runs and supports ITIS.

Washington has a problem retaining good staff because of the Unisys environment, the age of the system, the lack of money for training, and the lack of opportunity for

advancement. Staff are also uncertain of their future since they have no daily interaction with the ACES project and it is on IBM.

ISSD receives approximately 25 service requests per month and there are approximately 180 information system requests currently in backlog. Although documentation was redone last year for ITIS, there are some programs for which there is no documentation and no source code.

ISSD uses MAPPER to extract reports from the monthly issuance file. This allows programs personnel to access this file for reports and lessens the request load on ISSD; however, timeliness is a problem.

The field systems are written in Clipper on the LAN by EMFS personnel. They are responsible for the barcoding system and FSS. All scheduling, preliminary calculations, and demographic information is performed by these systems.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Washington monitors the automated system through IBM's NETVIEW. There are approximately 5,000 transactions on-line daily; only 200 of these are attributable to FSP. The maximum number of transactions per case change for any one day is one. There are currently over 3,300 PCs on Token Ring LANs attached to the network.

The network is set up to use T1 lines from DIS to a regional office and 56KB lines to a LAN gateway server attached to the Token Ring. If the current pilot proves feasible, the ACES network will be a SCAN or PSTN network (Ethernet based) from the Token Ring at headquarters to the Token Ring in the county services offices. Some circuits are DIS and some are U.S. WEST.

6.2.4 System Performance

Capacity is not an issue because of the batch environment and the shared resources of the Unisys machines. The monthly batch and on-line can run at the same time if necessary; transactions go into a queue until the monthly batch run is completed. A case is purged from the database after three years of inactivity. There are approximately two million records on the current database.

6.2.5 System Response

Most of the staffs on CSOs have, since PCs and networks became common, access to ITIS for inquiry. Response time is an issue, although historically staff have learned to live with lengthy responses time from the mainframe. Over time, response time has improved a great deal.

6.2.6 System Downtime

ITIS is up over 99.9 percent of the time. Since data entry is via batch from the counties, ITIS availability is not an issue. Even if the system is down, the transactions are merely queued until it comes up. The workers do not work in a real-time response environment.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Washington's future plans revolve around ACES and follow-on contingencies. There are plans to redesign the ITIS database, develop eligibility determination and on-line clearance, increase access to information on-line, and provide case load management and lists of pertinent items for the caseworker. These enhancements would be developed either as part of ITIS or as part of the LAN environment. These contingencies are based on the success and timeliness of ACES.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses ACES development costs and level of Federal funding, ADP operational costs, cost control systems and methods, and cost allocation (CA) methodologies for development and operational costs.

7.1 ACES Development Costs and Federal Funding

ACES is currently in the development stage. The March 1993 implementation APD (IAPD) projected total development costs of \$41.8 million. The detailed cost components of this total are provided in section 7.1.2. Table 7.1 provides the estimated FNS share and the amount of FNS participation from Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1993 through the pilot phase ending in March 1995. The FNS total share at 39.12 percent through FFY 1996 is \$16,371,419. The history of the ACES planning APD (PAPD) and IAPD process and the cost impact of these activities are presented in Table 7.2.

Total actual ACES development costs to date are \$1,813,806. Of this amount, \$301,054 has been allocated to FNS using the cost allocation percentage of 39.12 percent multiplied by relevant expenditures. FNS has matched these development expenditures at 63 and 50 percent Federal funding participation (FFP) rates.

Table 7.1 FNS Estimated Participation by FFY³

FFY	FNS SHARE	ENHANCED FFP (63%)	REGULAR FFP (50%)
1993	\$ 875,193	\$ 548,002	\$ 2,674
1994	6,427,574	4,035,895	10,696
1995	3,412,898	2,143,387	5,348
TOTAL	\$10,715,665	\$ 6,727,284	\$ 18,718

7.1.1 ACES System Components

After the development effort is completed, ACES will be an on-line, integrated eligibility system which will support AFDC, FSP, MA, and other State programs. The system will consist of 16 major functions:

- Intake processing
- Application/case change (includes eligibility determination and benefit calculation)
- Notices
- Federal reporting
- Tracking
- Inquiry
- Issuance
- Reconciliation
- Recoupment/recovery
- Interfaces and verifications
- Mass change
- Quality assurance
- Support functions
- Management reporting
- Purging procedures
- Security

7.1.2 Major Development Cost Components

The following sections discuss the individual projected-cost components for the ACES project as documented in the March 1993 IAPD. Table 7.3 summarizes all development cost-component expenditures.

³ Approval letter received 7/8/93 by ACES project team.

Table 7.2 ACES Development Cost History

FY	EVENT	COST IMPACT
8/8/91	DSHS submitted initial draft ACES IAPD.	None.
9/25/91	ACF and Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) approved the Preliminary Advanced Planning Document Update (PAPDU) and implementation RFPs with contingencies.	Approved revised PAPD cost of \$1,873,052. Title IV-A share was 66.56% or \$1,246,703 and matched at 90% for FFP of \$1,122,033. Title XIX share was 14.88% or \$278,710 and was matched at 50% or \$139,355
9/27/91	FNS approved RFP for ACES implementation phase but still had concerns over RFP and IAPD.	None.
10/07/91	FNS approved the ACES PAPDU.	Approved revised PAPD cost of \$1,873,052. FNS share was \$347,638 (18.56%). Of this amount, \$190,352 was funded at 75% for match not to exceed \$142,764 and the \$152,287 was funded at 63% for a match not to exceed \$99,091.
11/5/91	FNS approved the DSHS ADP/CIS Model Plan.	None.
11/4/91	ACF and HCFA contingently approved the ACES IAPD.	None. ACF wanted DSHS to make certain changes or address concerns such as timeframe of project and more equitable cost allocation.
1/29/92	DSHS submitted modifications for the ACES IAPD and requested FNS approval of these changes.	None.
2/4/92	DSHS informed Federal agencies that bids received in response to the original RFP were rejected. WA planned to make alternate plans to reissue the RFP.	Reissuance would necessitate revisions to the IAPD but no amounts were cited as of this time.
3/6/92	DSHS submitted PAPDU.	Requested an additional \$876,700 for the planning phase. Therefore total amount requested became \$2,749,752.
3/13/92	DSHS provided FNS with spreadsheet which distributed the \$876,000 increase across months 11 through 24 of the project in the 91-93 biennium.	Actual expenditures as of 2/1/92 were \$1,533,214.
3/17/93	FNS approved PAPDU dated 3/6/92.	Total approved was \$2,749,752 for planning phase. However, FNS would fund the increase at 63% FFP. FFP at 75% was \$142,764 and FFP at 63% was \$201,602, for total FFP of \$344,366.
5/1/92	DSHS submitted new RFP for ACES implementation phase.	None.
6/30/92	FNS approved new RFP.	None.

Table 7.2 ACES Development Cost History

FY	EVENT	COST IMPACT
7/1/92	DSHS released RFP to bidders.	None.
7/24/92	DSHS submitted a revised draft of the ACES IAPD.	Costs were updated to reflect current estimates.
10/13/92	FNS reviewed the IAPD but did not yet approve it due to several concerns.	FNS wanted explanation for the DSHS decision to use duplicated case counts as the CA methodology because FNS historically prefers that States use unduplicated case counts.
10/20/92	DSHS responded to FNS concerns.	WA stated that the CA methodology based on duplicated case counts was one of the changes requested by FNS and DHHS in a joint meeting dated 9/12/91.
10/26/92	FNS accepted the draft IAPD and stated that funding approval would be made after final IAPD had been submitted.	None.
12/4/92	DSHS stated that it understood that agreement had been made between all Federal agencies regarding the CA methodology for ACES development.	None.
12/31/92	FNS confirmed agreement on CA methodology.	WA stated that allocation percentages were to remain in effect throughout transfer modification and implementation process.
4/2/93	DSHS submitted a revised IAPD to make it consistent with the ACES implementation approach proposed by ISSC. The ISSC contract was also submitted for review. DSHS also stated that the planned start date for the ACES implementation phase was 7/1/93.	None.
6/2/93	DSHS stated that the Washington State legislature had approved the State budget for the 1991-1993 biennium.	The Washington State legislature committed \$8.953 million for the ACES project and it was expected that the remaining funding would be provided in the subsequent biennium.
7/08/93	FNS approved funding for the revised ACES IAPD dated 4/2/93. Funding was approved through the pilot phase ending 3/30/95.	Total funding approved was \$41,849,230. The FNS share, based on the approved CA methodology, was \$16,371,419 (39.12%) through FFY 1996. Total FFP matched at 63% was \$6,907,377 and matched at 50% was \$2,703,655.

7.1.2.1 Contractor Costs

The system transfer agent cost is the most significant cost component of the ACES development effort. ISSC is the prime contractor, but several subcontractors are also involved in the project, including Eligibility Management Systems, IBM, and Mid America System. The total cost to cover all contractors is \$24,241,510. In addition to the development contract, there are two one-year options, priced at \$1,643,220, for administration, application, and maintenance that are exercisable at the discretion of DSHS.

7.1.2.2 State Personnel Costs

The second most significant cost component is direct personnel costs which cover a 36-month period. This cost category consists of four subcategories: project management (\$2,711,736), quality assurance (\$807,518), technical personnel (\$1,086,662), and training (\$1,896,700).

7.1.2.3 Hardware Costs

The third most significant cost category is the purchase/lease of hardware. Hardware costs include estimated CPU charges of \$4,417,280 and local office hardware leases of \$9,018,862, both of which will be amortized over 60 months. Local office hardware purchases include over 2,500 terminals and 700 printers and related peripherals.

Table 7.3 ACES Projected Development Expenditures

COST COMPONENT	PROJECTED COST
Direct Personnel	\$6,502,616
Miscellaneous Costs	3,168,862
Transfer Agent Costs	24,241,510
Purchase/Lease Hardware	6,364,418
Purchase/Lease Software	1,571,825
TOTAL	\$41,849,231

7.2 ADP Operational Costs

DSHS currently supports and monitors AFDC, FSP, and MA transactions through a manual process for eligibility determination and a number of automated, yet non-integrated, systems for issuing benefits, producing reports, and maintaining historical information. The major automated system, ITIS, provides distributed data entry capabilities and limited on-line inquiry functions to local offices.

The mainframe functions for the automated systems are performed on a Unisys 2200 and monitored at the DIS data center. The majority of the CPU charges for the mainframe are allocated charges which are itemized on a monthly ISSD chargeback report.

Currently, because of the number of automated systems, as well as the method in which the DSHS expenditures must be tracked in the State's accounting system, ADP operational costs cannot be accurately isolated. Instead, ADP operational costs are mixed with other administrative costs, such as certification and issuance, and then allocated to the Federal agencies based on a random moment sampling (RMS) basis.

Although total ADP operational cost has not been separately tracked, the actual ITIS operational cost was estimated as part of the cost benefit analysis in the March 1993 IAPD and is presented in Table 7.4.

Table 7.4 ITIS Operational Cost

FY	TOTAL ITIS OPERATIONAL COST
990	\$2,750,955
1991	2,915,474
1992	2,967,953
1993	3,021,376

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on 1992 FSP operating costs of \$2,967,953, monthly operating costs averaged \$247,329 in 1992. The average number of FSP cases monthly was 175,800 households. The cost per case -- the monthly operational costs divided by the average number of monthly cases -- was \$1.41.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

Prior to 1991, DSHS used an internal accounting system called PF1 which could track all allocated expenditures by object code. This system enabled the agency to separately identify ADP operational costs from other costs.

In 1991, DSHS converted to a new internal accounting system, the Financial Reporting System (FRS), and a new account code structure to comply with requirements for data entry into the State's accounting system, Accounting and Financial Reporting System (AFRS).

Currently, all DSHS allotment and expenditure transactions are entered into AFRS and then flow into FRS via interface. DSHS has access to this detailed data in FRS by object code. A cost allocation subsystem, which is part of FRS, computes State and Federal share on intermediate cost pools after the cost allocation percentages have been entered into a table on a monthly basis. In this subsystem, cost data is tracked by cost objective (synonymous with cost center) and program/sub-program/CA code. However, it is currently not possible to see detailed cost data by both object code and program/sub-program/CA code.

The *Cost Allocation Summary Report* shows, by cost objective, total share and Federal share, after FFP, for each cost objective. Cost objectives applicable to the FSP include:

- E61A3 - FSP Administration, 50 percent FFP, FFY 1993
- E61C3 - FSP Fraud, 50 percent FFP, FFY 1993
- E61R3 - FSP Administration, ACES, 63 percent FFP, FFY 1993
- E61V3 - FSP Administration, ACES, 50 percent FFP, FFY 1993

Under these cost objectives are many program/sub-program/CA code combinations which show the detailed amounts which comprise the total. The last character in each cost objective indicates the FFY.

7.3 Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section describes the methodologies used by the Accounting Services Office in the Comptroller's Division under DSHS to allocate ADP development and operational costs.

7.3.1 ACES Development Cost Allocation Methodology

ACES development costs are currently being allocated using percentages calculated from weighted duplicated caseload counts. Current percentages used for actual ACES development costs are: ACF IV-A - 48.65 percent, ACF IV-F - 1.11 percent, HCFA - 8.38 percent, FNS - 39.12 percent, and State - 2.74 percent.

Examples of program/sub-program codes used to track development costs in the cost allocation subsystem include: 120-8811 - ACES project management, 120-8812 - contractor services, 120-8813 - hardware and software, 120-8814 - quality assurance, and 120-8815 - project chargebacks.

7.3.2 ADP Operational Cost Allocation Methodologies and Mechanics

The following sections discuss the cost allocation methodologies used for administrative costs and one component of ADP operational cost.

Table 7.5 Administrative Cost Allocation Methodologies

COST	METHODOLOGY	DESCRIPTION
FINANCIAL SERVICES		
Eligibility Determination	Staff Effort	Allocation based on results from Random Moment Time Samples.
DIA Special Mailings	Pieces Mailed	Costs are allocated based on the type and number of pieces of mail distributed monthly.
Mandatory Monthly Reporting	Pieces Mailed	See above.
SSPS Postage	FTEs Disbursed	Costs in the area are allocated based on proportion of FTEs disbursed.
Warrant Roll Postage	Pieces Mailed	See above.
DIVISION OF INCOME ASSISTANCE		
Director's Office	FTEs Disbursed	See above.
Research Projects	Case Counts	Costs are allocated based on the population served (cases/claims/clients/participants/average resident population).
State Exchange Program	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
Office of Self-Sufficiency	FTEs Disbursed	See above.
FSP Employment & Training	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
Office of Assistance Programs	FTEs Disbursed	See above.
FSP Services FSP Fraud Prosecution	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
SAVE	Staff Effort	See above.
Office of Evaluation and Program Review	FTEs Disbursed	See above.
Quality Control	Case Counts	See above.
QC Management Evaluation	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
ISSD Chargebacks	Case Counts	See above.
FSP E&T contract	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
West WA University Training Contract	Staff Effort	See above.
DCD FSP Outreach	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
WA State University FSP Nutrition Education Program	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.
County Prosecuting Attorney Contracts	Direct Charge	Self explanatory.

Table 7.5 Administrative Cost Allocation Methodologies

COST	METHODOLOGY	DESCRIPTION
REFUGEE ASSISTANCE		
Headquarters Administration	Case Counts	See above.
COMMUNITY SERVICES HEADQUARTERS		
Community Services Management	FTEs Disbursed	See above.
Office of Financial & Administrative Services		
SPECIAL PROJECTS		
Income Assistance-ORDA-Cost of Living Study	Case Counts	See above.
ACES Project	Fixed Percentages	Costs are allocated based on rates or percentages agreed upon between DSHS and the Federal funding sources.
PROGRAM SUPPORT		
Regional Offices, Community Services Offices	FTEs Disbursed	See above.

7.3.2.1 Cost Allocation Methodologies for Administrative Costs

As mentioned in section 7.2, DSHS does not currently segregate total ADP operational costs from other administrative costs. Table 7.5 summarizes the methodologies used to allocate FSP administrative costs.

7.3.2.2 Cost Allocation Methodology for ISSD Charges

ISSD charges consist of costs for ongoing maintenance, modifications, and report requirements for automated systems. ISSD staff track hours spent on these tasks using system codes in their own time-reporting system. For example, time spent on an FSP task may be charged to code "PFS.". With information from the time-reporting system, the ISSD Chargeback System transfers costs for these tasks into AFRS via an automated journal voucher. Those costs that cannot be directly charged to a Federal or State program are allocated in the cost allocation subsystem based on unduplicated case count percentages.

Once all costs have been allocated in the cost allocation subsystem, the detail by program/sub-program/CA code is fed into an SF-269 worksheet so that the amounts can be combined in the appropriate column. The monthly totals for each column are then combined to determine the quarterly amount.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF WASHINGTON

EXHIBITS

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

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required 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	Y	N	Y
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	N	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	N	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	Y	N	N
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y

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

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	Y	Y
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	N/A	N/A	N/A
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*	Y	N	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	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	N	N
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	N
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 Washington
Hardware Inventory**

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
2200/611	Unisys	Purchase	8 megabytes
2200/622ES	Unisys	Purchase	16 megabytes
DISK			
8490	Unisys	Purchase	27.2 gigabyte
9740	Unisys	Purchase	10.0 gigabyte
9735J	Amperif	Purchase	8.3 gigabyte
9200k	Amperif	Purchase	41.0 gigabyte
TAPE			
436N Tape Drives	Unisys	Purchase	9 track (16)
U47 Tape Drives	Unisys	Purchase	36 track (28)
PRINTERS			
Line	IBM	Purchase	6262 (2)
Page	IBM	Purchase	3825 (1)
Laser	IBM	Purchase	4029 (7)
FRONT ENDS			
FEPs	IBM	Purchase	3745 (1)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
PS2	IBM	Purchase	

APPENDIX B

STATE OF WASHINGTON

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 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 Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Washington. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Washington. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about 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 Washington	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
1,291	63	4.9%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Washington. 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

Respondents generally are satisfied with the computer system in Washington. EWs think that the system provides acceptable response time, availability, and accuracy. Most eligibility workers consider the system to be easy to use for many, but not all, functions, and workers' responses indicate some problems with particular features of the system. A large majority thinks that the system improves job satisfaction and is a great help.

Since Washington's current system has been operational since 1977, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Good	22	75.9
Excellent	7	24.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	2	6.9
Good	20	69.0
Excellent	7	24.1

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	46.4
Sometimes	12	42.9
Often	3	10.7

EWs in Washington are satisfied with system response time. All responding eligibility workers think that overall system response time is good or excellent, and over 93 percent of the EWs believe that response time also is acceptable during peak processing periods.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	2	7.1
Often	26	92.9

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	60.7
Sometimes	10	35.7
Often	1	3.6

Nearly 93 percent of eligibility workers believe that the system often is available when they need to use it, but a significant minority also thinks that the system is sometimes or often down. The system downtime, however, does not seem to be intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	5	17.2
Good	16	55.2
Excellent	8	27.6

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	85.7
Sometimes	4	14.3

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	78.6
Sometimes	6	21.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	82.1
Sometimes	5	17.9

Most of the eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are quite accurate. Nearly 83 percent of the workers feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or excellent. Large majorities also believe that problems related to cases terminated in error, incorrect eligibility determination, and obsolete data are rare.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	67.9
Sometimes	8	28.6
Often	1	3.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	86.2
Sometimes	4	13.8

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	61.9
Sometimes	3	14.3
Often	5	23.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	69.6
Sometimes	5	21.7
Often	2	8.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	81.5
Sometimes	4	14.8
Often	1	3.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	84.6
Sometimes	4	15.4

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	80.8
Sometimes	5	19.2

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	85.2
Sometimes	4	14.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	53.6
Sometimes	11	39.3
Often	2	7.1

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	72.7
Sometimes	5	22.7
Often	1	4.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	84.0
Sometimes	4	16.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	81.0
Sometimes	2	9.5
Often	2	9.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	41.7
Sometimes	3	25.0
Often	4	33.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	8	50.0
Sometimes	7	43.8
Often	1	6.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	77.3
Sometimes	4	18.2
Often	1	4.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	17	77.3
Sometimes	4	18.2
Often	1	4.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	60.0
Sometimes	5	25.0
Often	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	38.9
Sometimes	5	27.8
Often	6	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	6	31.6
Sometimes	7	36.8
Often	6	31.6

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	63.2
Sometimes	5	26.3
Often	2	10.5

Eligibility workers' responses to these questions express the belief that the system is easy to use for many, but not all, functions for the majority of workers. Most EWs sometimes or often have difficulty identifying error prone and suspected fraud cases and monitoring the status of hearings. Half of the EWs report sometimes or often having difficulty tracking outstanding verifications. Significant minorities also report some difficulty with the following functions: tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms, identifying recipients already known to the State, identifying cases making payments through recoupment, and assigning new case numbers.

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	4	14.3
Often	24	85.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	67.9
Sometimes	8	28.6
Often	1	3.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	96.4
Sometimes	1	3.6

Most EWs think that the system positively influences job satisfaction. Almost 86 percent of eligibility workers believe that the system often helps them in their jobs. Although nearly one third of the workers feel that the system contributes to job-related stress, more than 96 percent of EWs usually perceive the system as being more helpful than problematic.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	78.6
Sometimes	3	10.7
Often	3	10.7

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	74.1
Sometimes	5	18.5
Often	2	7.4

A significant majority of EWs feel that there are few problems associated with providing expedited service to clients.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Washington system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Washington's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF WASHINGTON

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 Washington. 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 Washington	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
137	30	21.9%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	6	20.0%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Washington. The total number of respondents, however, is very low. The low response rate produces a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection. Responses reflect individuals' perceptions that should not be generalized to the EW supervisor population.

Summary of Findings

Responding EW supervisors in Washington regard the system positively and believe that it helps them in their jobs. Most of the EW supervisors report that response time, system availability, accuracy, and ease of use are good. There are a couple of areas, however, in which significant proportions of EW supervisors believe there are problems. For the most part, EW supervisors feel the system has a positive effect on job satisfaction. Supervisors have mixed feelings about the system's ability to support management needs.

Since Washington's current system has been operational since 1977, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of

limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	16.7
Good	3	50.0
Excellent	2	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	33.3
Good	3	50.0
Excellent	1	16.7

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	1	16.7
Often	1	16.7

EW supervisors in Washington are satisfied with system response time. Over 83 percent of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, and two thirds believe that

response time rarely is too slow and 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
Sometimes	1	16.7
Often	5	83.3

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	2	33.3

With a single exception, all responding EW supervisors report that the system often is available when they need to use it, and two thirds of the supervisors feel there rarely are instances of downtime.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	16.7
Good	5	83.3

Five of six responding EW supervisors generally think that the quality of the system's data is good.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	20.0
Sometimes	3	60.0
Often	1	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	1	16.7
Often	1	16.7

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	20.0
Sometimes	3	60.0
Often	1	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	83.3
Sometimes	1	16.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	2	33.3

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	2	33.3

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	83.3
Sometimes	1	16.7

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	100.0

EW supervisors generally feel that the system is easy to use. For most functions, four or five of the six respondents report rarely having difficulties in these areas. There are two areas; however, in which four supervisors report sometimes or often having problems: obtaining information from the system and tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms.

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
Sometimes	1	16.7
Often	5	83.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	1	16.7
Often	1	16.7

EW supervisors feel that the system contributes to job satisfaction. More than 83 percent of respondents feel that the system often is a great help, and two thirds of the EW supervisors think it rarely creates added stress in their jobs.

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	50.0
Good	2	50.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	33.3
Good	2	33.3
Excellent	2	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	50.0
Sometimes	1	25.0
Often	1	25.0

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	20.0
Sometimes	4	80.0

EW supervisors have somewhat ambivalent feelings regarding the system's ability to support management needs. For example, half think that the quality of the reports produced by the system is good, but the other two supervisors think the report quality is poor. Two thirds feel that technical staff support is good or excellent.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Washington's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Washington system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Washington's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.