

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT AUGUST 2 - 4, 1993

NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE REPORT

JULY 12, 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 Changes	5
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	5
2.4.4 Claims Collection	6
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	6
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	7
3.1 System Functionality	7
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	10
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	10
3.4 Current Automation Issues	11
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	11
4.1 Overview of the Previous System	11
4.2 Justification for the New System	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.3 Development and Implementation Activities	12
4.4 Conversion Approach	13
4.5 Project Management	13
4.6 FSP Participation	14
4.7 MIS Participation	14
4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation	14
5.0 TRANSFERABILITY	14
6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS	14
6.1 System Profile	15
6.2 Description of Operating Environment	15
6.2.1 Operating Environment	15
6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance	16
6.2.3 Telecommunications	17
6.2.4 System Performance	17
6.2.5 System Response	17
6.2.6 System Downtime	17
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	18
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	18
7.1 New Hampshire FAMIS Planning Costs and Federal Funding	18
7.1.1 New Hampshire FAMIS System Components	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 New Hampshire FAMIS Planning Cost Components	19
7.2 EMS Operational Costs	19
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	20
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	21
7.3 New Hampshire Cost Allocation Methodologies	22
7.3.1 Historical Overview of FAMIS Development Cost Allocation Methodology	22
7.3.2 FSP Operations Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	23

APPENDICES

A State of New Hampshire 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	6
7.1 SF-269 ADP Operating Costs	20
7.2 Food Stamp Program Honeywell Charges Third Quarter, FFY 1993	20
7.3 Honeywell System Operating Costs Allocation Basis	21

APPENDIX A - State of New Hampshire Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>	
A-2.1 Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1 State of Utah Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1 New Hampshire Cost Pools	A-5

NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE REPORT

Site Visit August 2-5, 1993

STATE PROFILE

Current/Planned

System Name: Eligibility Management System (EMS)/Undecided

Start Date: 1975/1991

Completion Date: 1978/1997

Contractor: Delphi Associates/Not yet selected

Transfer From: State developed/Not yet selected

Cost:

Actual: \$700,000/Not yet determined

Projected: N/A/ \$25,000,000

FSP Share: N/A/Not yet determined

FSP %: N/A/25.5%

Number of Users: 874/Not yet determined

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: Honeywell Bull DPS90/Not yet determined

Workstations: Variety of Honeywell terminals and IBM compatible used as terminals

Telecommunications

Network: State Police microwave network; Bull HDLC protocol for 16 9.6 or 19.2 Kb circuits

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, Child Care, Adult State Supplement, JOBS, Employment and Training Support (ETS), Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The New Hampshire Food Stamp Program (FSP) is administered through the Department of Health and Human Services by the Division of Human Services (DHS). The Office of Economic Services (OES) is within the Division of Human Services and is responsible for the functions of systems support, internal quality assurance, field operations, and support staff. Systems support does not include coding or operations.

The Systems Support Unit interacts with the Bureau of Management Systems which has the systems analysts and programmers. The Bureau of Management Systems is under the authority of the Commissioner's Office of Administration and Finance. The department's computer center is part of the Bureau of Management Systems. This includes mainframe support in the areas of production control, customer service, and technical support. The computer operators serve both Honeywell and IBM equipment and are under the authority of another agency, the Department of Administrative Services.

The Program Operations Unit contains the program management, policy, internal operations, and employment support services/JOBS functions.

The current automated system, EMS, is supported by the System Support Unit within the Office of Economic Services. This office interfaces with the State computer center which is under the authority of the Assistant Commissioner for Administration and Finance. The computer hardware (Honeywell/Bull) is owned by the Department but operated by the State data center. EMS supports the FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid eligibility functions.

New Hampshire is partially rural with no unique geographical features that would impact the operations of the Food Stamp Program. Its population as of the 1990 census was 1,113,915; approximately five percent of the population received food stamps in 1992. The State has 13 local offices located in 10 counties. No office has a caseload of less than 125.

New Hampshire noted that regulatory changes, changes in requirements at the State level, and increased unemployment have been major factors impacting food stamp operations over the past five years. In addition, State staff layoffs and hiring freezes have had an adverse impact on the State's ability to effectively administer the program. For the past few years, New Hampshire has had the highest rate of increase in the country in food stamp caseloads.

The level of unemployment in New Hampshire has risen steadily since 1986, reaching a ten year high of 7.2 percent in 1991. Between 1986 and 1991 the unemployment rate almost doubled.

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

- New Hampshire's nominal expenditure growth for fiscal year (FY) 1993 was between 5 and 9 percent, more than the national average of 2.4 percent.

- The regional outlook is not promising as this region has been the hardest hit by the recession. Unemployment rates in the New England area are among the highest of any region; its population growth among the lowest.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The New Hampshire Food Stamp Program is State-administered; all food stamp workers are employees of the State. Field operations are carried out through a branch office and 12 district

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has increased dramatically from 5.2:1 in 1988 to 17.2:1 in 1991.

New Hampshire's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased since 1988.¹

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$153.80	\$142.36	\$124.34	\$98.89	\$90.73

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

New Hampshire's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.² Total cost shows a general upward trend over the period while average cost per household has decreased steadily since 1988.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$2,638,396	\$2,633,567	\$2,034,470	\$2,009,609	\$1,833,938
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$8.92	\$10.90	\$12.36	\$16.45	\$17.37

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

² The number of households and FSP Federal Administrative Costs are data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

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

The information presented below was provided directly by the State or extracted from data reported to the FNS by the States. Anecdotal information that provides some indication of system impacts on program performance is presented when provided.

2.4.1 Staffing

The New Hampshire OES currently employs 133 full-time and 5 part-time eligibility workers (EW). Authorized strength is 141.5 full-time workers. There are also 32 eligibility worker supervisors involved in the Food Stamp Program. While this number represents an increase over the employment levels of five years ago, the average monthly caseload per worker has also increased over this time period. Case backlog has not, however, increased during this period.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

New Hampshire failed to implement in a timely manner many of the federal regulatory changes imposed over the past few years. Specifically, New Hampshire did not implement 7 of the 14 regulatory changes shown in Exhibit A-2.1 of Appendix A.

In addition, a waiver is in effect regarding implementation of issuance regulation 274.6(b)(2) and regulations 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F) and 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F) were not applicable to New Hampshire.

New Hampshire FSP personnel believe that the regulations were not really applicable to New Hampshire's population and thus accorded them a low priority. No sanctions are currently in effect.

No one regulation was identified as being most problematic to implement and it does not appear as if the current automated system played any role in the decision to implement or not implement any specific regulation.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

New Hampshire official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has been on an upward trend since 1988. The error rate increased in 1989 and 1990, decreased slightly in 1991, and increased again in 1992.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	12.05	10.53	10.78	8.37	7.77

2.4.4 Claims Collection

The amount of claims collected as a percentage of claims established in New Hampshire increased steadily from 1988 to 1992 and ended by more than doubling in this period.

The percentage of claims collected is affected by the total number of claims established, whether the individual is still receiving benefits, the amount of available assets, and other factors.

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of collections and the percentage of claims established that were collected. During the period from 1988 to 1992, the dollar value of claim collections increased each year.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$465,871	\$264,250	\$265,414	\$250,088	\$212,532
Total Claims Collected	\$217,068	\$202,910	\$166,869	\$149,925	\$146,660
As a % of Total Claims Established	46.6%	76.7%	62.8%	59.9%	69.0%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

New Hampshire's current system is not FAMIS certified. According to State staff, New Hampshire is one of only two States in the country that has not undertaken the approved planning or development of a FAMIS system. FNS review status of the EMS system was unavailable.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides a brief overview of the functionality supported by New Hampshire's current system (EMS). EMS supports FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid program areas, as well as Child Care, ETS, and JOBS.

3.1 System Functionality

Major features of EMS functionality are described in this section. Areas addressed include:

- **Registration.** Applicants complete a combined application form at a district or branch office and indicate for which public assistance programs they are applying. The application form is used for food stamps, Child Care, AFDC, Financial and Medical Assistance, and other programs. The need for expedited service is determined at the front desk and a same day interview is arranged, if necessary; the receptionist or other clerical staff screens the applicant using a name search routine of the EMS name index (alpha index). This screening process searches against current and previous participants in public assistance programs and the State-level DRIPS file. All household members are searched for in this manner, case and individual numbers are assigned accordingly, and a potential duplicate report is produced daily. Clerical personnel are responsible for reviewing potential matches in the participation file and for determining whether the record is to be included in the case file. The potential duplicate report is researched and reconciled at the Office of Data Management. Social Security number search/match routines are unavailable.
- **Eligibility Determination.** After completing the application form (Form 800), the client is interviewed by an EW who verifies information entered by the client. After the interview, the EW fills out an Eligibility Determination Worksheet (Form 811) from information on the original application and from data collected during the interview process.

A Data Entry Code Sheet (Form 801) can then be completed. It is used in entering data into EMS by the EW. Some on-line edits are available during this data entry process. A budget sheet for food stamps is available and is used extensively. Data entry screens must be individually requested by the worker. These screens follow the format of the coding sheet.

Eligibility determination is performed by EMS using an overnight batch process during which the main body of edits are executed. The EMS system does not automatically assign cases to EWs and cannot schedule appointments. The EW is responsible for determining non-financial eligibility.

Workers have the ability to "pend" cases and set future dates by which missing verification materials should be received. The system provides on-line outstanding

verifications reports/status fields which are used to confirm receipt of required documentation. It also provides a batch verification report. This function is used for pending cases only. The system does not automatically enforce verification requirements.

- **Benefit Calculation.** No caseworker review and authorization of calculated benefit levels is required. Caseworkers do not verify the benefit level nor is it necessary for supervisory level staff to authorize benefits for new or re-applying cases. Benefit levels are clear from work performed by the caseworker on the Eligibility Determination Worksheet. Because the edits and calculation processing are performed in an overnight batch mode, however, the potential for error rejection and a resultant delay in benefit calculation/eligibility determination increases.
- **Benefit Issuance.** New Hampshire mails out all coupons from the central State office, manually preparing and stuffing envelopes from reports produced by the EMS system. This task is performed by a clerical support unit which draws upon additional clerical personnel as needed during the issuance cycle. Approximately 20 percent of all mailings are certified and an unknown percentage are mailed to district/branch offices for client pick-up. Some Authorization to Participate (ATP) documents are manually issued. An Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) project is under study in conjunction with Maine and Vermont, but formal approval has not yet been requested. No itinerant site issuance was noted.

If coupons are returned to the central office, the local office where the case is assigned is notified by State staff. The district office uses E-mail to send a new address to the central office, and the coupons are remailed.

If the coupons were stolen, or if re-issuance is necessary, the local office must complete a paper form and forward it to the central office. No information regarding stolen or undelivered/returned coupons is entered on-line by the local office.

EMS links document numbers of original and replacement issuances, and provides a report of the entire issuance history upon request. EMS produces all the federally mandated issuance reports and checks and/or adds missing zip code information. Issuance is almost completely manual and records are maintained by EMS.

Issuance files are created monthly for all on-going cases and daily for new approvals and other special issuances. Expedited issuance is possible within one day of the overnight batch process.

- **Notices.** EMS generates notices for all major case events. These include:
 - Key events related to household participation

- Key events related to household eligibility
- Denial because of failure to keep appointments
- Eligibility determination results
- Benefit reductions
- Benefit increases
- Application approval
- Denial based on eligibility determination
- Closure based on recertification information

The system generates both automatic and worker-initiated notices. EWs do not have input into the wording of the notices after they are developed. EMS selects the notice message for financial eligibility unless the EW overrides it. The EW selects the non-financial notice messages. These messages are included in the notices automatically from codes entered in the system by EWs, or defaulted to in the case of mass changes.

- **Claims System.** The New Hampshire claims system is a separate system that is not linked with EMS. Data about allotment reduction cases is exchanged between the two systems on a monthly basis. New Hampshire maintains a collection unit at State headquarters which establishes and collects claims. Data regarding overpayment is entered onto a paper claim form by the EW who forwards it to the centralized claim unit.

EMS calculates the monthly recoupment amount from codes entered by the collection unit and subtracts that amount from monthly benefit issuance. Claims are tracked by the collection unit using a manual/micro-based system independent of EMS. No automated transfer of data between the two systems is performed. EMS maintains a record of the outstanding claim, but the amount and status of that claim is not updated over time.

- **Computer Matching.** Computer matching is performed in a monthly batch process. Department of Employment Security files are searched for wage and unemployment benefit information on a daily basis. No private industry data is accessed nor is any data from adjoining States. On-line checks for duplicate participation are performed at application and when a new household member is added, but only for that particular household member.

New Hampshire utilizes thresholds to determine which "hits" will be reported to EWs. The extent of this targeting scheme was unavailable.

All "hits" exceeding these thresholds are reported to EWs via paper reports. The discrepancies are not prioritized nor are those that have the greatest cost impact noted. No on-line tracking of discrepancies is performed. Tracking, if any, is performed manually by EWs. No tracking of related costs/benefits is performed at this time.

- **Alerts.** EMS does not support on-line alerts except for a screen which shows all pending cases assigned to a worker. Redeterminations are also noted for the workers' benefit and are automatically removed when the redetermination is processed. An alert due to a pending case may only be removed from the system when the case is opened or denied. It is then automatically removed because it is no longer in a pending status.
- **Monthly Reporting.** New Hampshire is not a monthly reporting State.
- **Reports Generation.** New Hampshire staff were clear in their concern regarding the accuracy of EMS produced management and operational level reports. No on-line reports are provided and the paper-oriented reports produced by the system lack both accuracy and timeliness. The system produces "a multitude of paper reports of questionable accuracy." Management reports "have raw data and are not combined to produce a useful tool for evaluation and monitoring. This must be done manually."
- **Program Management and Administration** The New Hampshire EMS network provides a limited E-Mail capacity, reaching only to the district office level. Help screens are available, though limited due to the code-driven nature of the system itself. On-line policy manuals were developed and implemented, but later discontinued because they were difficult to access.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

EMS is primarily a data entry and inquiry system that supports the AFDC, Food Stamp, and Medicaid Programs as well as various State-level public assistance programs by providing financial eligibility determinations for financial assistance. It is the primary system support for all Public Assistance programs in the State of New Hampshire. It lacks a well-developed claims module, on-line alerts, and various other features common in more modern, FAMIS-type systems. Its age (15 years) indicates its level of design features. A major enhancement in 1987 gave EWs the ability to enter data directly, an improvement over the previous centralized data entry design.

Integration of the system functions into the normal office procedures and operational workflows is minimal. Redundant entry of data onto multiple paper forms and records as well as into the system itself is commonplace within the field offices. Most system produced data is accurate and are supplemented by ad hoc reports run on Magna 8.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

The EMS system has over 300 workstations in the 13 field offices and central headquarters. Workstation ratio is one to one for OES personnel.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

New Hampshire is currently in the early planning stage for a new FAMIS-certified system which would replace the existing system. An EBT project is also under study in conjunction with the States of Maine and Vermont. A replacement for the current Medicaid Management Information System is now under development and a Child Support Enforcement System was recently installed. No major enhancements to the EMS system are currently planned in anticipation of the new FAMIS system development.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section of the report considers EMS as the previous system and notes development and implementation activities for the proposed new FAMIS system as applicable. Because New Hampshire is in the early stages of this system development effort, little information is available for some areas of this section, and some planned activities may change as the project progresses.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

The EMS system was designed in 1976 and fully implemented in 1978. The system resides on a Honeywell/Bull DPS 90 mainframe at the State data center and supports approximately 300 terminals through Honeywell/Bull DPS 6 mini-computers located in each district/branch office.

The system operates through an analog microwave network with line drops of various speeds serving the local offices. The microwave network operates at 56 Kb and supports the mini-computers, numerous dumb terminals, and some micro-computers that use terminal emulation software.

EMS supports financial eligibility determinations for all noted public assistance systems in operation within the State. It is primarily an on-line data entry and inquiry system with some transaction processing capabilities and overnight batch processing of major program determinations and calculations. It is batch oriented and is written in COBOL 68. Numerous code changes have been made to the system over the past 15 years. System application documentation is described as poor and out-of-date but the operational documentation is current and accurate.

4.2 Justification for the New System

New Hampshire stated in a July 1993 Preliminary Advanced Planning Document (PAPD) that it believes a new FAMIS system will:

- Incorporate advances in technology that will allow workers to perform their jobs more efficiently and accurately;
- Free EWs from the complexities of public assistance program policies;

- Be easier to use and maintain and flexible enough to handle the major changes in public assistance programs expected to occur in the next 10 to 15 years;
- Reduce the time required to process cases and help eliminate errors caused by complicated policies;
- Standardize procedures and ensure consistent application of policy;
- Promote more efficient use of staff resources by simplifying the eligibility determination process, adding automated tools for tracking, and providing on-line policy and training;
- Reduce paper intensive procedures by using automated data and provide imaging capability;
- Implement an interactive interview process;
- Expand the eligibility determination process to provide for non-financial criteria and add on-screen edits and automatic updating of crossmatch and interface information;
- Automate time-consuming manual processes;
- Improve the client notice function; and
- Enhance supervisory monitoring by means of comprehensive on-line management reports.

In addition, FSP personnel emphasized the difficulty of maintaining EMS. The age of the current system, outdated documentation, and the many changes made to the programming code over the years make changing EMS difficult and time-consuming.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

New Hampshire submitted a PAPD in December 1992. This document was returned to the State as unsatisfactory and was modified and resubmitted in August 1993. It was still pending as of the on-site interviews. The latest PAPD requested about \$1.17 million for planning activities, including hiring a planning contractor.

A project structure has been devised that includes a steering committee, oversight committee, and user groups. A project manager has been selected and a separate organizational reporting structure put in place to support the project.

The original PAPD was rejected due to lack of detail in the alternative analysis, cost allocation, and project management sections. In addition, the State was requested to justify the cost allocation methodology and to change the original approach in both the

alternative analysis and Request for Proposal (RFP) sections. An increase in State-level project staffing was also requested.

One major shortcoming of the original PAPD was the stated intention to identify a specific system for transfer and implementation purposes. This did not comply with the current Federal requirement of a statement of functional requirements rather than the identification of a single system to be transferred.

4.4 Conversion Approach

No conversion approach has been identified for the proposed new FAMIS-certified system.

4.5 Project Management

The proposed project staffing scheme calls for two oversight committees to be established, one for the Department of Health and Human Services and one for the Division of Human Services. The oversight committees will receive a monthly status report from the project director.

A steering committee was also established. This committee consists of the following officials:

- Assistant Commissioner of Administration and Finance
- Assistant Commissioner for Policy and Programs
- Deputy Director of Administration and Finance
- Director of Human Services
- Administrator of the Office of Economic Services
- DHS Administrator of Fiscal Services
- FAMIS Project Director

The project director reports directly to the Administrator of Economic Services and supervises an administrative group consisting of nine individuals.

Various specialist groups will also be directed by the Project Director as needed during the course of the project.

A total of 28 full-time State employees will be assigned to the FAMIS project.

The project director was chosen from the public assistance area. She has a great deal of public assistance program experience, significant MIS experience, and some background in Project Management, although not in projects of this size and scope.

During the early, internal planning stages, the project manager has been assigned other organizational duties not related to the FAMIS project. Approximately 50 percent of her

time has been dedicated to these other duties. She will become completely dedicated to the project if it is approved.

4.6 FSP Participation

Food Stamp Program administrative staff have been involved in the preliminary planning for the new FAMIS system from the beginning of the project. It would be more accurate to describe both field and administrative staff as being public assistance staff as opposed to food stamp only employees. At any rate, Food Stamp Program knowledge and expertise has been present during the early phases of the project.

Survey team observations indicated that the majority of project input and decisions have been made at the administrative level to date although field staff involvement has been continuous and significant. Field staff involvement will continue and should increase as the project matures.

4.7 MIS Participation

The Department of Management Information Systems (MIS) section has been heavily involved during the preliminary stages of the project and this involvement is expected to remain very high. Representatives from the State-level MIS organization play a major role in the Steering Committee.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

The New Hampshire FAMIS project is not expected to reach the development and implementation stages for at least a year. Problems encountered during the early planning stage have been limited to the rejection of the first PAPD. It is unknown whether the second submission will meet with Federal approval.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

The current Federal guidelines concerning identification of potential transfer candidates prevent New Hampshire from designating a specific system as a transfer candidate for its new system design.

The current EMS system is not a viable transfer candidate due to its age and outmoded design. The proposed new FAMIS-certified system is still in the early planning stage and no evaluation of its transfer potential can be made at this time.

6.0 SYSTEMS OPERATIONS

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

6.1 System Profile

- **Mainframe:** Bull HN DPS 90
GCOS8, DMIV TP-TSM, TSM, FMS
- **Disk:** IBM 3380 A/B
Bull HN MSU501
- **Tape:** Bull HN MTU4600
- **Printers:** Impact - Bull HN PRU1200
Laser - Nipson 6090
PPS III (ASDC)
- **Front Ends:** DSU8010, DSU8030
- **Workstations:** Variety of HOW terminals and IBM compatible ow
running in PC7800 emulation

teleprocessing control, TMS for tape management, and software security is managed by GCOS8. New Hampshire is still using COBOL 68, but they also have begun moving to COBOL 74.

Peripheral equipment consists of 14 - Honeywell MTU820 3420-type reel tape drives supporting a 8,000 volume tape library. They are using both IBM 3390 and Honeywell MSU501 disk drives connected directly to the DPS 90. Two printers, one impact and one laser, support the output from the DPS 90. Two Bull Datanet 8 Model 8010 Front End Processors support the DHHS telecommunications network with all communications lines coming directly from the district office minicomputers into the data center.

There are 13 Honeywell DPS 6 minicomputers located in district offices throughout the State. The units serve two purposes: 1) as a communications controller for the DHHS terminals; and 2) as a local processor supporting office automation functions (i.e., electronic mail, word processing, etc.) for the district office. Since neither the direction nor the hardware platform of the new system has been set, the future use of these minicomputers has not been established.

An uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is installed providing both battery and generator backup for the data center.

There is no disaster recovery plan in place to support the DHHS applications at the present time. The new data center manager stated that one of his priorities was to establish a general disaster recovery plan for approval by senior management, but that it would entail a great deal of time and resource commitment to construct a workable plan for the State.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

The operations and support staff consists of the following personnel: project manager (1), programmers and analysts (12), technical support (3), Production control and mainframe support (8), and network support (4). The help desk is in OES and has four staff.

The on-line portion of EMS runs from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.. There are no regions on the DPS 90 so the mainframe allocates its resources based on job priority and demand. The batch window runs from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. the next morning. The State did not identify any problems in meeting expected on-line up times as the result of batch overruns.

Hardware and software maintenance are usually planned for Sundays when production is not normally scheduled. Full disk backups are performed every weekend and stored off-site. Incremental backups are performed nightly by individual applications.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

New Hampshire uses the State Police network to support its DHS users. The network is 99 percent microwave with the only ground loops being from the microwave base unit to the district office. The network provides an extremely inexpensive vehicle (\$2,000 per month) to connect all sites to the Concord data center and is providing reasonable performance.

The thirteen district offices each have a DPS 6 installed as a terminal and telecommunications controller. The minicomputers are connected to the Datanet 8 Front End Processors via a 9.6 or a 19.2 Kb circuit using Bull HDLC protocol based on transaction volumes to be supported.

There have been no plans made to determine the impact of the new public assistance system on the current network. When sufficient information has been determined to pinpoint the hardware platform to be used and the volume of transactions to be processed, the telecommunications needs of the project will be identified.

6.2.4 System Performance

The Honeywell DPS 90 has been installed for three years. The system averages approximately 33 percent utilization with peaks of 40 to 50 percent. EMS uses approximately 20 percent of the total DPS 90 resources. There appears to be more than enough capacity to support all system applications over the two- to three-year period needed to develop the successor to EMS.

No information was gathered on the IBM 3081 since it does not provide any support for EMS.

6.2.5 System Response

No timings are maintained for terminal response time (time needed to get a response after the "enter" key is hit). DHHS indicated that response times are normally in the three- to five-second range and that there were few complaints from the field concerning consistently or regularly occurring periods of degraded response time. During the system demonstration, however, it appeared that for some transactions, the response time could be in the 15-20 second range. Since there were no records of historical response time performance, we were unable to identify any specific areas of concern.

6.2.6 System Downtime

No detailed records are kept on system availability or unscheduled outages. In discussions with the data center director and DHHS systems staff, the percentage of time the system was scheduled to be operational and was, in fact, ready and able to process was 99+ percent. There were no indications from either DHHS programming or systems staff that reliability of the system was a problem.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Although a PAPD for the EMS replacement has been initiated, there are a number of EMS operational problems, a large backlog, problems making modifications, etc., that Management Systems is committed to addressing.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the estimated planning and development costs of the New Hampshire FAMIS, the current operating costs charged to FNS via the SF-269 for Food Stamp Program support, and the methodology proposed for allocating New Hampshire FAMIS planning costs and the methodology currently used to allocate current Food Stamp Program operating costs to FNS.

7.1 NEW HAMPSHIRE FAMIS PLANNING COSTS AND FEDERAL FUNDING

The initial PAPD for the New Hampshire FAMIS-certified system was submitted to the Federal approval agencies in late 1992. The estimated planning costs totalled \$1.74 million. The FNS share of the planning costs, \$533,498, was allocated at 30.7 percent; reimbursement by FNS was set at 63 percent Federal financial participation (FFP), or \$366,104. The length of the planning period was estimated to be six months. The development phase would occur over an 18-month period following the end of the planning phase. FNS granted contingent approval of the initial PAPD in February 1993. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) disapproved the initial PAPD in March 1993. Among the reasons cited for disapproval were:

- The role of the planning services contractor was not within the boundaries set forth in 45 CFR Part 95.605(1), especially in the areas of database design and strategic planning.
- The cost allocation plan did not explain how New Hampshire arrived at the percentages for allocating planning costs to Federal programs.
- Plans for quarterly status reporting were not addressed.

A revised PAPD was submitted to the Federal approval agencies on July 30, 1993. The total estimated planning costs in the revised PAPD decreased to \$1.17 million from \$1.74 million. The FNS share of the estimated planning costs declined to 25.5 percent, or \$298,780, from 30.7 percent, to be reimbursed at 63 percent, or \$188,231.

Federal approval of the PAPD is expected within 60 to 90 days of submission. The planning phase is slated to continue through December 1994.³ Near-term planning

³ PAPD, July 1993, FAMIS Planning Budget, p. 34.

activities include the preparation of a RFP for the independent planning services consultant. The planning services consultant contract is scheduled to be let by December 1993. This will be followed by the preparation of the Implementation Advanced Planning Document (IAPD) and an RFP to acquire the services of an implementation contractor. Current plans are to submit the IAPD and RFP for Federal approval by December 1994. The anticipated completion date of the total project is February 1997.⁴

The estimated project cost is \$25 million. This estimate is based on the costs incurred by other States of comparable size.⁵ The total costs incurred to date for New Hampshire FAMIS planning activities have not been separately identified and accumulated. However, an estimated cost-to-date based on the number of staff assigned to the effort to date is approximately \$50,000.

7.1.1 New Hampshire FAMIS System Components

EMS, which currently supports the Food Stamp Program, was designed and developed in 1976; statewide implementation occurred in 1978. Current State efforts are focused on expanding and upgrading the functionality of EMS with a more technologically advanced system that will support AFDC and other financial assistance programs, as well as Medicaid, FSP, Child Care, Medicare, JOBS, and other employment support services.

7.1.2 New Hampshire FAMIS Planning Cost Components

The estimated \$1.17 million planning costs include:

- Services of independent consultants to provide technical assistance and oversight to planning activities (\$540,000)
- Salaries and benefits of State personnel participating in the planning activities (\$487,786)
- Equipment costs (\$83,900)
- Travel costs (\$60,000)

Component costs for the development effort have not been identified at this time.

7.2 EMS OPERATIONAL COSTS

Table 7.1, SF-269 ADP Operating Costs, presents the costs of supporting the Food Stamp Program reported to FNS since Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1990. The component costs of the annual total, the column entitled "ADP OPERATING COSTS," includes costs

⁴ Letter, 7/30/93.

⁵ PAPD, July 1993, p. 22.

associated with EMS operations on the Honeywell system, as well as costs of processing applications that benefit the Food Stamp Program or personnel assigned to that program.⁶

Table 7.1 SF-269 ADP Operating Costs

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	ADP OPERATING COSTS
1990	360,300
1991	616,084
1992	646,130
1993 (3 quarters)	632,481

Table 7.2, Food Stamp Program Honeywell Charges, shows five specific operating costs accumulated for the Honeywell system for one three-month period. It shows that the FSP was allocated slightly more than one-fifth of the total costs associated with central processing unit (CPU) capacity specifically, and Honeywell system operations in general.

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on 1992 FSP operating costs of \$646,130, monthly operating costs averaged \$53,844 in 1992. The average monthly number of FSP cases was 26,069 households. The cost per case -- the monthly operational costs divided by the number of monthly cases -- was \$2.06.

**Table 7.2 Food Stamp Program Honeywell Charges
Third Quarter, FFY 1993**

HONEYWELL COMPONENT	QUARTER TOTAL	FOOD STAMP ALLOCATION \$	FOOD STAMP ALLOCATION %
CPU	\$325,770	\$69,578	21.36%
DASD	\$32,987	\$5,192	15.74%
Printer	\$8,870	\$2,000	22.55%
Tape	\$29,929	\$6,276	20.97%
Transactions	\$28,333	\$7,040	24.85%
TOTAL	\$425,889	\$90,086	21.15%

⁶ The Leave and Attendance System is an example of a non-FSP application that benefits personnel assigned FSP responsibilities.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

When the State owned and operated the Honeywell system, the Department of Health and Human Services was billed for services provided to support operations of EMS and other systems supporting Department-administered programs. However, following the transfer of ownership of the Honeywell system from the State to the Department, the Department had to allocate the costs of operating the system to the programs supported rather than allocate a monthly bill received from a third party. Also, since the Honeywell supports non-Department programs, the Department had to maintain a billing structure that could be used to charge other State agencies for services provided. Currently, 70 percent of the Honeywell system capacity is used by the Department; the remaining 30 percent is used to support other State agencies.

The billing system was changed to allow it to both allocate and bill by grouping costs associated with using the Honeywell system into six cost pools: CPU, direct access storage device (DASD), printer, tape, transactions, and administrative.⁷ The majority of the costs associated with the system include maintenance and service support provided by Honeywell; other costs include supplies and services required to support the application systems.

The costs accumulated into each cost pool are then allocated based on usage by *units*. The definition of a unit as applied to the allocation of each of the six cost pools is defined in Table 7.3, Honeywell System Operating Costs Allocation Basis.

Table 7.3 Honeywell System Operating Costs Allocation Basis

OPERATIONS COST POOLS	ALLOCATION UNIT
Honeywell CPU	Milliseconds * memory size in 1024-work blocks for each interval for which memory size remains constant
Honeywell DASD	100 little links per day of ownership
Honeywell Printer	Number of lines printed
Honeywell Tape	Channel time measured in seconds
Honeywell Transactions	10,000 CPU cycles
Administrative	Jobs run

The job accounting system resident on the Honeywell system collects the units, identified by job number, used for each processing application. The units used by

⁷ Salaries and other administrative costs associated with the operations of the Honeywell System.

all projects associated with Food Stamp applications are totalled. The total number of units used by the Food Stamp Program is then used to determine the Food Stamp Program share of each associated cost pool. The allocation of each of these cost pools to the Food Stamp Program is made using the following algorithm:

$$\text{FOOD STAMP PROGRAM ALLOCATION}_{\text{PERIOD}} = \text{TOTAL COST POOL}_{\text{PERIOD}} \times$$

$$(\text{UNITS USED BY FOOD STAMP APPLICATIONS}_{\text{PERIOD}} \div \text{TOTAL UNITS USED BY ALL APPLICATIONS}_{\text{PERIOD}}).$$

7.3 NEW HAMPSHIRE COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES

This section describes two cost allocation methodologies:

- The methodology proposed by the Department for distributing the \$1.17 million in FAMIS planning costs to the Federal funding agencies
- The methodology currently used by the Department to allocate the costs to the Food Stamp Program.

The methodology for allocating FAMIS development costs has not been established.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of FAMIS Planning Cost Allocation Methodology

The methodology for allocating planning costs to the Federal funding agencies is based on the random moment time study (RMS) of EWs completed in October 1992. This study used transactions that occurred in the months of December 1992, and January and February 1993. All of the transactions and RMS observations are collected on a hierarchical basis of Financial Assistance, Medical Assistance, Child Care, and Food Stamp Program. Adjustments to the allocation percentages calculated using RMS findings include the following:

- Any case receiving both financial and medical assistance is adjusted for both programs.
- Because all recipients of the Adult Cash Assistance Program, a State supplement program, also receive Medical Assistance, and all but five of the eligibility requirements for the supplement program are common to those for Medical Assistance, New Hampshire is claiming a 50 percent match for 90 percent of the State supplement group.
- A portion of all Medicaid cases that do not receive financial assistance is being claimed at the 90 percent match rate since all but six eligibility requirements are identical to those for AFDC.

Using the adjusted RMS findings, planning costs will be allocated in the following percentages:⁸

- AFDC - 38.91%
- Food Stamp Program - 25.5%
- Medicaid - 25.45%
- Adult State Supplement - 8.99%
- At Risk Child Care - 0.2937%
- AFDC Child Day Care - 0.4141%
- Transitional Child Care - 0.0865%
- Title IV-E Foster Care - 0.16%

Although this methodology has been Federally approved for use in the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services Cost Allocation Plan, it has not yet been approved for use in allocating FAMIS planning costs.

7.3.2 FSP Operations Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

The allocation of costs to Federal programs is a semi-automatic process in New Hampshire. All costs are collected into the New Hampshire Integrated Financial System (NHIFS), the State accounting system. Each cost is assigned a job number that associates that cost to a particular cost pool and allocation basis. Staff hours are entered into the payroll system with an assigned job number. Salary costs are accumulated into the State accounting system by this same job number. Computer support activities are assigned a job number that is recognized in the job accounting system resident on the Honeywell system.

The data from NHIFS is keyed into a Lotus spreadsheet along with raw data from time studies. The percentage allocations are calculated by Lotus using the data entered from the accounting system and the statistical data associated with the actual allocation process. Table A-7.1 in Appendix A, New Hampshire Cost Pools, lists the major pools used to accumulate costs that are routinely allocated to the Food Stamp Program, and the basis for that allocation. Table 7.3 lists the cost pools associated with the Honeywell system and the allocation basis of each.

⁸ Revised PAPD, July 1993, p. 22.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92*	N	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	N	N	Y
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	N	Y
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	Y	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)?
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	N	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89*	N	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	N	Y	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	WAIVER	N/A	N/A
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-7.1
New Hampshire Cost Pools**

COST POOL	TYPE OF COSTS ACCUMULATED IN COST POOL	ALLOCATION BASIS
Economic Services	DHS staff costs at the district office level whose duties are administration and direct client activities related to public assistance programs.	RMS every 12 months of the case technicians to develop unit times to be applied against monthly EMS transactions.
OES Staff	DHS staff costs at the State Office level whose assigned duties are providing administrative support to and technical assistance for public assistance programs.	
Administrator for Economic Services	DHS staff costs at the State Office level whose duties include the administration of the Food Stamp Program and other public assistance programs.	Salaries of program personnel in the OES at the State Office level as a percentage of the total OES salaries at State office.
Benefits	Employer's share of FICA, Retirement, Health, Dental, Life Insurance, Workman's Compensation, and any other benefits for eligible DHS employees.	Salaries of program personnel in DHS as a percentage of the total DHS salaries at State office.
Data Management Staff	The costs of the staff at the Commissioner's Office of Administration and Finance (COAF) who operate, maintain and develop all automated management systems including EMS.	Time study completed each day by each member of this cost center.
Management Systems Staff - Honeywell operations	The costs of COAF staff at the State office level assigned to operate the Honeywell System.	Number of jobs run by project number each month as a percentage of total jobs.
Information Center	The costs of COAF staff at the State Office level whose assigned responsibilities to service various users to do data processing functions on their own using various COTS products, including word processing. This group is responsible for maintaining all data processing hardware and software within DHS.	Number of staff in DHHS supporting a program as a percentage of all staff.
Chief, Bureau of Management Systems	The costs of COAF staff at the State Office level assigned the direct administration and support of the Divisions Management Information Systems	Total salaries charged to a program by Management Systems staff as a percentage of total salaries charged by Management Systems staff.
Human Resources	The costs of staff at the State Office level whose assigned responsibilities include processing and monitoring all postings, hirings, evaluations, leave and disciplinary actions for all divisions.	Number of staff assigned to the Food Stamp Program as a percentage of the total staff.
Bureau of Data Management	The costs of staff at the State Office level whose assigned duties are the administration and supervision of all data processing.	Time study completed by each member of the Office of Data Management.
Current Expense - DHS	State office current expense charges that benefit DHS but that cannot be directly allocated to a public assistance program.	Total salaries within the department supporting food stamps as a percentage of total salaries within the department.
Food Stamps-Other	Contracted staff costs and all other direct costs associated with the enhancement and operation of the Food Stamp System. Operational costs for DP support are a direct billing from the Division of Information Services. Food Stamp Issuance costs are a direct charge to the Food Stamp Program.	Direct based on specific assignment to Food Stamp Program

APPENDIX B

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

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 are the perceptions of eligibility workers in New Hampshire. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in New Hampshire. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

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

Number of EWs in New Hampshire	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
140	63	45.3%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	21	33.3%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in New Hampshire. The response rate of 33 percent is low. The low response rate produces a sample whose responses may not be representative of eligibility workers in New Hampshire.

Summary of Findings

Most of the eligibility workers are somewhat satisfied with the computer system in New Hampshire. There is, however, widespread disagreement with these views, with significant percentages reporting problems accomplishing specific tasks or difficulty using the system. Most respondents think the computer system helps them do their jobs and makes them more efficient, but 81 percent feel the system adds stress to their jobs and a majority feel that is more of a problem than a help.

Since the current New Hampshire system has been operational since 1987, 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	8	38.1
Good	12	57.1
Excellent	1	4.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	13	61.9
Good	8	38.1

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	4.8
Sometimes	11	52.4
Often	9	42.9

A majority of the eligibility workers who responded agree that the system's response time is usually good or excellent, although 38 percent think it is poor.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	4	19.0
Often	17	81.0

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	23.8
Sometimes	12	57.1
Often	4	19.0

A majority (81 percent) of the eligibility workers who responded think the system is generally available although a smaller majority (76 percent) agree that it is sometimes or often down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	5	23.8
Good	15	71.4
Excellent	1	4.8

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	65.0
Sometimes	7	35.0

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	61.9
Sometimes	7	33.3
Often	1	4.8

How often is the systems data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	71.4
Sometimes	3	14.3
Often	3	14.3

The eligibility workers who responded generally feel that the operations of the system are accurate although about one third indicate problems with the system such as out-of-date data and incorrect eligibility determination. Most who responded think the information in the system is either good or excellent (76 percent).

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	61.9
Sometimes	6	28.6
Often	2	9.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	14	70.0
Sometimes	6	30.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	84.2
Sometimes	2	10.5
Often	1	5.3

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	63.2
Sometimes	7	36.8

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	87.5
Often	1	12.5

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	60.0
Sometimes	7	35.0
Often	1	5.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	45.0
Sometimes	9	45.0
Often	2	10.0

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	68.8
Sometimes	4	25.0
Often	1	6.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	80.0
Sometimes	4	20.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	57.9
Sometimes	6	31.6
Often	2	10.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	4	57.1
Often	3	42.9

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	6	46.2
Sometimes	4	30.8
Often	3	23.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	16	76.2
Sometimes	4	19.0
Often	1	4.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	68.4
Sometimes	6	31.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	43.8
Sometimes	4	25.0
Often	5	31.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	46.7
Sometimes	3	20.0
Often	5	33.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	38.5
Sometimes	3	23.1
Often	5	38.5

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	72.2
Sometimes	5	27.8

Usually a majority of the eligibility workers responding do not have difficulty performing any of the system-specific tasks such as assigning new case numbers or generating adverse action notices but there are several instances where significant percentages do experience some difficulty performing these tasks. There are also several tasks, such as tracking outstanding verifications or identifying recipients already known to the State, where a majority of the workers report sometimes or often having difficulty.

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	6	28.6
Often	15	71.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	4	19.0
Sometimes	11	52.4
Often	6	28.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	8	38.1
Sometimes	11	52.4
Often	2	9.5

Most of the eligibility workers who responded think that the current system is a help to them in their work although 81 percent report that it adds stress to their jobs and a majority feel that it is sometimes or often more of a problem than a help.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

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

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	7	36.8
Sometimes	11	57.9
Often	1	5.3

Most of the eligibility workers who responded agree that expedited service is sometimes difficult to provide.

Client Service

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

APPENDIX C

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

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 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 supervisors in New Hampshire. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in New Hampshire. 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 Supervisors in New Hampshire	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
32	30	96.1
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	13	43.3%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in New Hampshire. The total number of respondents, however, is low. The low response rate produces a sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

The supervisors generally think the system is good and helps them in their jobs, although the percentage with positive responses is relatively small, often close to 50 percent. A significant percentage, usually one third, reports having difficulty performing certain tasks while 77 percent had problems obtaining information from the system.

Since New Hampshire's current system has been operational since 1987, 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	5	38.5
Good	8	61.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	8	61.5
Good	5	38.5

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	7.7
Sometimes	8	61.5
Often	4	30.8

A slight majority of the supervisors who responded agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although 92 percent also feel that the system response time is sometimes or often too slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	2	15.4
Often	11	84.6

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	12	92.3
Often	1	7.7

Most of the supervisors who responded think the system is generally available but all feel that the system is down sometimes or often.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	7.7
Good	12	92.3

Almost all of the supervisors who responded think the information in the system is good.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	23.1
Sometimes	8	61.5
Often	2	15.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	61.5
Sometimes	5	38.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	4	33.3

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	4	33.3

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	37.5
Sometimes	3	37.5
Often	2	25.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	72.7
Sometimes	2	18.2
Often	1	9.1

A large percentage, 77 percent report difficulty obtaining information from the system. Those who responded generally (usually about two thirds) do not have difficulty performing such specific tasks as generating adverse action notices or restoring benefits although more than half report difficulty generating warning notices.

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	8	61.5
Often	5	38.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	15.4
Sometimes	8	61.5
Often	3	23.1

A small majority of the supervisors who responded (62 percent) think that the current system is a great help to them in their work but a large majority (85 percent) feel that it contributes added stress.

Management Needs

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	33.3
Good	8	66.7

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	6	46.2
Good	7	53.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	28.6
Sometimes	4	57.1
Often	1	14.3

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	33.3
Sometimes	1	33.3
Often	1	33.3

The supervisors responding generally think the system helps them in their management tasks, although 71 percent reported difficulty in making mass changes. Two thirds think the reports produced by the system are good but barely half agree that the quality of the support provided by the technical staff is good.

Client Service

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