

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: JULY 28 - 30, 1993

MAINE STATE REPORT

AUGUST 3, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

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

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATE PROFILE	1
1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	2
2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Administrative Costs	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	6
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	6
2.4.4 Claims Collection	6
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	7
3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM	7
3.1 System Functionality	7
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	11
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	11
3.4 Current Automation Issues	11
4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION	12

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	18
6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans	18
7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION	18
7.1 FAMIS Development Costs and Federal Funding	18
7.1.1 FAMIS System Components	20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
7.1.2 Major FAMIS Development Cost Components	20
7.1.2.1 FAMIS Planning Cost Components	20
7.1.2.2 Estimated FAMIS Transfer, Modification, and Implementation Cost Components	21
7.2 Operational Costs	23
7.2.1 Cost Per Case	24
7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices	24
7.3 Maine Cost Allocation Methodologies	24
7.3.1 Historical Overview of FAMIS Development Cost Allocation Methodology	25
7.3.1.1 Planning Cost Allocation Methodology	25
7.3.1.2 TMI and Warranty Cost Allocation Methodology	25
7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics	25

APPENDICES

A State of Maine 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	4
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	5
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	6
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	7
7.1	SF-269 ADP Operating Costs	23
7.2	Operational Charges	24
7.3	Planning Cost Allocation	25

APPENDIX A - State of Maine Exhibits

<u>Exhibit No.</u>		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Maine Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	IAPD Budget	A-5

MAINE STATE REPORT
Site Visit July 28 - 30, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name: Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS)

Start Date: 1991

Completion Date: 1996

Contractor: Not yet selected

Transfer From: Not yet selected

Cost:

Actual: Not yet determined

Projected: \$22,218,969

FSP Share: \$ 8,883,144 (est.)

FSP %: 39.98% (est.)

Number of Users: 900 (est.)

Basic Architecture:

Mainframe: Not yet determined

Workstations: Variety of PC and non-intelligent devices utilized as 3270 type terminals

Telecommunications Network:

195 SNA/SDLC circuits ranging from 9.6 to 56 kilobytes (KB)

System Profile:

Programs: Food Stamp Program (FSP), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid, Transitional Services

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Department of Human Services (DHS) is the State agency responsible for administering public assistance in Maine. The organizational structure in the State consists of six bureaus that report to the DHS deputy commissioner of Program Operations. These are the Bureaus of:

- Income Maintenance
- Health
- Medical Services
- Rehabilitation
- Child and Family Services
- Elder and Adult Services

The DHS also has a deputy commissioner of Management and Budget who reports directly to the DHS commissioner. Several administrative divisions report to the deputy commissioner of Management and Budget including the Division of Data Processing.

The Bureau of Income Maintenance consists of four units:

- Division of Programs and Policy
- Division of Support Enforcement and Recovery
- Office of the Deputy Director
- Division of Management and Information Systems

The Division of Programs and Policy is responsible for developing and monitoring policy for the Food Stamp Program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, Child Care, Medicaid, Maine Health Programs, ASPIRE/JOBS/JET/Family Services, General Assistance (GA) and Telephone Subsidy programs.

State staff characterize Maine's environment as partially rural and partially urban, and the State's 1990 population was 1,233,223. Approximately 8.5 percent of the population received Food Stamp Program benefits.

Unemployment rates in Maine decreased each year from 1983 to 1988 and increased each year between 1989 and 1991. The State's unemployment rate decreased from 9.0 percent in 1983 to 3.8 percent in 1989. By 1991, the unemployment rate had increased to 7.5 percent. The increase in the unemployment rate and DHS fiscal measures required by State officials -- including hiring freezes, reduced work hours, and reduction in force -- were cited by State staff as factors that had an adverse effect upon the operations of FSP in recent years.

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

- Maine's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was between 0 to 4.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.

- Maine reduced its 1992 State budget by \$28.4 million after it was approved.
- State government employment levels in Maine increased by 2.87 percent between FY 1992 and FY 1993. This change differed in direction from the national average 0.60 percent decrease in state government employment during the same period.
- Maine implemented changes to increase revenues by \$10.5 million for FY 1993. These changes included increases in sales taxes and personal income taxes.
- The regional outlook indicated that economic performance in New England was weaker than national economic performance in recent years. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 8.1 percent was higher than the national average of 7.8 percent, and the per capita regional personal income increase of 2.2 percent was less than the national average of 2.4 percent.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The Food Stamp Program is operated under the Bureau of Income Maintenance through five regional offices which supervise 15 local offices located throughout the State. Regional operations are managed by the Office of the Deputy Director. Workers at the local offices have access to the Maine Integrated Client System (MICS), which supports the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, and Child Welfare Programs.

The Management and Information Systems Division also has responsibilities related to FSP. The Division's Quality Assurance unit is responsible for Food Stamp Program review and Food Stamp Program management evaluation functions. Application support for MICS, which operates on the State's central computer system, is provided by Division of Management and Information Systems (MIS) staff.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Between 1988 and 1992, the number of FSP participants has increased significantly. The number of participating households increased by nearly 23,900. This represented a 62.2 percent increase. The number of participating individuals exhibited similar growth, increasing by over 53,500 persons, a 59.4 percent increase. The largest one-year change in participation levels occurred between 1990 and 1991 when FSP participation increased by approximately 23 percent.

Changes in participation levels for the FSP and other public assistance programs for the last five years are provided in Table 2.1. While participation increases are evident for each program area in which data are available, the magnitude of the increases varies among programs. For the five-year period, AFDC participation increased by approximately 30 percent. The number of individuals participating in the Medicaid Program increased by 42.5 percent between 1989 and 1992.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	22,925	22,218	19,624	17,810	17,655
Individuals	65,843	58,295	55,376	50,486	50,607
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
FSP					
Households	62,377	55,260	44,942	39,879	38,447
Individuals	143,704	129,026	104,887	92,112	90,176
Medicaid	152,310	142,528	118,586	106,882	N/A

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 10.2:1 in 1988 to 18.5:1 in 1992.

Maine'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	\$156.82	\$139.84	\$126.52	\$107.60	\$106.13

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Maine's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.² Average cost per household remained relatively stable through 1990, and decreased in 1991 and 1992. Total costs over the period increased each year except in 1988.

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.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$5,869,522	\$5,666,587	\$5,274,845	\$4,650,315	\$4,648,733
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$8.46	\$9.35	\$10.66	\$10.42	\$10.42

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Areas of Food Stamp Program performance that could potentially be affected by the automated systems that support the Program include:

- Staffing
- Responsiveness to Regulatory Change
- Combined Official Payment Error Rates
- Claims Collection
- Certification/Reviews

The information presented below was provided directly by the State or gathered from data reported to the Food and Nutrition Service by Maine. Anecdotal information that provides some indication of system impacts on program performance is presented when available.

2.4.1 Staffing

Maine currently employs approximately 50 clerical employees, 33 eligibility worker (EW) supervisors, and 210 eligibility workers to operate its public assistance programs throughout the State. Six additional employees are assigned to the issuance function at State headquarters.

Total staffing in these positions has decreased during the past five years; however, State staff do not attribute this decrease to the operation of the automated system. Maine's cost reductions policies -- including hiring freezes, force reductions, and decreased work hours -- were cited as the major cause for recent staff reductions. During this five-year period, the average monthly caseload per worker increased, as did the backlog of on-going cases. Furthermore, given the age of the current system, any staffing impacts directly attributable to the system probably would have occurred many years ago.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

State staff indicated that all applicable Food Stamp Program regulations, except regulation 273.9(d)(5)(i), to use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members, and regulation 273.10(a)(1)(ii), to eliminate migrant initial month proration, have been implemented in a timely manner. State officials indicated that regulation 273.9(d)(5)(i) was not received in time to make the necessary policy and system changes before the Federally-required implementation date. The regulation eliminating migrant initial month proration affected a very small number of recipients, and its implementation was overlooked by State staff.

State staff indicated that the most difficult regulations to implement were those dealing with combined initial allotments (274.6(b)(2) and (3)) because these regulations required complex computer system programming changes. The age of the current system and the lack of accurate documentation further complicated making changes that involved the system's processing logic.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Maine's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has fluctuated between 1988 and 1992. The error rate increased in 1989, decreased in 1990 and 1991, and increased in 1992.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	8.43	7.18	8.35	8.39	7.42

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of collections and the percentage of claims established that were collected. During the 1987 to 1991 period, the dollar value of claims established and claims collected fluctuated.

Maine's claims collected as a percentage of claims established increased in 1989, decreased in 1990 and 1991, and increased again in 1992. 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 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$815,135	\$827,321	\$614,916	\$554,269	\$838,458
Total Claims Collected	\$422,810	\$374,648	\$350,165	\$355,127	\$401,118
As a % of Total Claims Established	51.8%	45.3%	56.9%	64.1%	47.8%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

While both the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) have extensive knowledge of the features, capabilities, and limitations of the current Maine system, available information indicates that neither agency has conducted a complete, formal review of the system. The system has not been Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified by DHHS. FNS did not conduct a post implementation review, but in 1988, the Agency conducted a review that focused on general adherence to the Model Plan requirements. Results of this review were not available.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides a brief overview of the functionality, complexity and level of integration of Maine's current system. The MICS system is approximately 20 years old and was developed internally by State staff. A new FAMIS system is being planned and will replace the existing system within the next three years.

3.1 System Functionality

Under the current system, data collected during recipient interviews are transferred from paper application forms to data entry code sheets before being entered into the system by a clerk. Eligibility workers and receptionists have access to the system for clearance and inquiry purposes. The system has extensive batch "back-end" functions including linkages to a Department-wide Master Client Index. Major features of MICS functionality are described in this section. Areas addressed include:

- **Registration.** When an applicant enters a local office, the initial point of contact is the receptionist. The receptionist finds out which type(s) of assistance the applicant is seeking and collects identifying information including name and Social Security Number (SSN) for the applicant or the head of the household. The receptionist also provides the applicant with an eight-page AFDC/FSP combined application form to complete. A worker is assigned to the applicant's case, and the receptionist notifies the worker.

The eligibility worker is responsible for performing an inquiry using the applicant's SSN. This search is performed against the Master Client Index, which contains identifying information about all individuals who have received services from the Department of Human Services. If the client was previously known to the system, the system will provide: the assigned Client-ID, other identifying information, and the case number(s) of the specific case(s) he or she is or has been a member of for each program area. Searches also may be made against the Department of Motor Vehicles' files.

The assigned EW then conducts an interview with the applicant. After the interview has been completed, the worker transfers data from the application form to a data entry coding sheet and forwards that document to the data entry clerk for entry into the system.

If the case has been active within the past 36 months, the system has the ability to copy the historical files into the new case record. This allows the client to maintain his or her previous or existing case number. The data entry operator enters new or changed information to the existing computerized files for that client.

Interviews are held the same day that the applicant receives the application form. Pre-screening is not performed before the application is completed. The need for expedited service is determined by the assigned worker from information provided on the application form. The worker is responsible for determining the composition of assistance units when a single household is eligible for assistance in multiple programs.

- **Eligibility Determination.** The system determines eligibility in real-time mode using data entered into the system by the data entry clerk. The system does not support background eligibility processing. Eligibility is determined only for those cases with the proper case status. Missing verifications result in the system assigning a case the "pending" status which prevents eligibility determination until changes are made by the EW.

Changes may be made to income, assets, and other data until the end of the working day on which eligibility was determined. After this time, changes to data in the system require a corrective action to be taken.

- **Benefit Calculation.** MICS automatically calculates benefit levels, but the system does not notify the worker of the eligibility status or the benefit levels determined. Supervisory approval is not required for eligibility determination or benefit calculations. Some local office sites require data entry operators to hand copy data from system screens and forward it to the assigned worker for verification, but generally the worker is unaware of the outcome of the application.

The system provides test budget screens that allow workers to enter budget data and see the expected results. This data does not update system records; however, its only function is to assist workers.

- **Benefit Issuance.** Until 1975, Maine issued food stamp benefits through an Authorization to Participate (ATP) system. The State then switched to direct coupon mailout as the FSP issuance method.

Approximately 73 percent of all coupons are mailed via regular mail directly to the client, 26 percent require certified mail status, and 1 percent are mailed to local offices for pickup by clients. Clients also may request coupon pickup at the local office. There are no electronic benefit transfer (EBT) systems currently in demonstration, pilot, or operational status; however, Maine is considering a tri-State EBT project with New Hampshire and Vermont.

After the central office notifies the local office about returned mailings, through electronic mail, the EW assigned to the case is responsible for taking necessary actions. The worker enters information about returned or stolen coupons into the system. If coupons were returned because of an incorrect address, the worker may mail the coupons to a corrected address without interfacing with the system except to correct the client's address. Lost or stolen coupons may be re-issued upon worker request after a mandatory waiting period. Replacement benefits are re-issued in the next daily issuance process.

The system has several capabilities related to issuance. It maintains a 36-month period issuance history on-line. Additional history is available upon request from archived records. The system can print a bar coded form for use in controlling stuffing machines. The system does not check zip code information, and it does not automatically prepare Federally required issuance reports.

- **Notices.** Notices may be automatically generated by the system for activities such as mass changes, and workers may initiate numerous other notices including those for the following activities:
 - 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 also provides workers with the ability to generate free-form letters to clients. The subjects may include interview scheduling, a function which is performed manually by the workers.

Approximately 60,000 to 70,000 notices are generated monthly for all program areas. Maine combines AFDC and Food Stamp Program notices.

- **Claims System** The claims system is integrated into MICS. Workers enter information into the system on-line. For active cases, the system automatically calculates the corrected benefit allotment amount. The MICS system tracks the claim status and automatically creates a collection record. The State's central Special Investigations and Recovery Unit has responsibility for collecting all claims where allotment reduction is not being done.
- **Computer Matching.** MICS supports the Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) requirements. Matching also is performed against absent parent support files. Most computer matching is done monthly in batch mode for applicants and annually for active cases. Thresholds are used to limit the situations where follow-up actions are required.

Workers are provided with a monthly report showing all discrepancies. One section of this report specifies discrepancies that may impact client eligibility. Individual print outs are provided for IEVS matches only. Discrepancies continue to appear on monthly reports as long as they exist. The system does not provide an on-line listing of unresolved discrepancies, and it does not require workers to respond to each discrepancy. Eligibility workers are responsible for manually tracking match resolutions. The State does not require workers to report time, cost, or benefit figures through the system. A 10 percent sampling survey of IEVS matches and related costs and benefits is currently being conducted in Maine.

- **Alerts.** MICS does not support on-line alerts. Paper reports, in the form of a monthly report to eligibility workers and supervisors, is the main vehicle for tracking due and overdue activities. The types of activities reported are fairly limited but include:
 - Discrepancies from IEVS
 - Notices that collection plans have not been established for clients
 - Notices that redetermination is due
 - Cases pending over 30 days

- **Monthly Reporting.** Monthly reporting is not performed in Maine.
- **Reports.** MICS provides limited reporting ability. Operational-level reports to workers and supervisors are printed monthly reports, as described above. Statistical and ad-hoc reports also have been developed over the past several years. Most reports are written in COBOL 74 by technical staff, occasionally with a COBOL 68 report generator.
- **Program Management and Administration.** MICS supports electronic mail capacity, but its use is limited to EW supervisors and higher level personnel. E-mail is used to disseminate internal correspondence, notices of policy interpretations, and similar documents.

The system does not support on-line policy manuals, organizational charts, workload allocation monitoring, case narratives, or problem reporting.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

MICS supports the AFDC and Food Stamp Programs in an integrated fashion. While Medicaid and Child Welfare are included as programs supported by MICS, these program areas are not truly integrated into the application code of the other major program areas. Medicaid's use of separate screens and processing and the division of duties among workers at the local office sites is consistent with Medicaid being associated, but not fully integrated, with the AFDC/FSP aspects of the system.

The system itself has been enhanced numerous times since its initial design, and linkages and processes have been added, changed, and deleted. Major processes are batch-oriented, and limited attention is paid to user interface issues. The system's batch-oriented, centralized data entry design has been modernized over time to allow on-line inquiry by workers and administrative staff. The Master Client Index, which is maintained by the State, receives data from many individual systems and is not an integrated part of MICS itself. MICS lacks comprehensive help functions and is really not implemented at the eligibility worker level.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Each eligibility worker has access to a terminal with which to access MICS. Data entry is centralized at all local office sites. Additional terminals are available for use by supervisory and administrative personnel and users from other program areas, such as Child Support Enforcement, with access to the system or specific MICS data. Approximately 300 terminals are installed statewide.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

Maine currently is planning a new FAMIS. This system, which is expected to be operational in 1996, will replace the existing system with a modern design capable of

supporting the integration of all major public assistance programs. Because of the new system development effort, further enhancements to MICS have been curtailed to only those that have significant impact.

The State's decision to implement a new FAMIS was predicated on the availability of enhanced Federal funding. If this funding is not available, the State, due to the current economic conditions, may be unable to proceed as planned. The current system cannot be expanded further. The only alternative immediately available would be to duplicate (clone) the current system and divide the agency-wide functions now supported. This would be a last resort.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section describes development and implementation activities for the proposed new FAMIS system. Because Maine is in the early stages of the system development effort, detailed plans have not been formulated for all areas, and some plans may change as the project progresses. Throughout this section, the MICS system is considered to be the previous system.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

A detailed description of the MICS system is provided in section 3.0 of this report. The system combines AFDC and Food Stamp Program eligibility and issuance activities. The system has supported FSP for almost 20 years, and major modifications were made 10 years ago to add AFDC and more on-line functions to the system. The current system utilizes centralized data entry in each office, and eligibility workers' use of the system is limited mainly to inquiry functions.

4.2 Justification for the New System

State staff believe that the existing system is obsolete and extremely difficult to modify because many changes have been made to the code that have not been documented. The inability to add new functionality, or to make even minor corrections without extensive testing and manpower resources, is viewed by the State as the primary justification for developing a new system.

The primary justification for the development of a new eligibility system is that the existing system is antiquated and difficult to modify and maintain. Inability to add new programs without major revisions as well as hardware and software obsolescence further support the need for a new system.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Formal planning for the new FAMIS system began in 1991. In February 1991, Maine submitted a Planning Advanced Planning Document (PAPD) for a new FAMIS system to support the AFDC and Food Stamp Programs. FNS and DHHS approved the PAPD

in March 1991. In May 1992, additional Federal funding was requested to add JOBS and Educational Training and Transitional Services to the FAMIS system. In June 1992, Maine decided to add Medicaid Eligibility to the proposed FAMIS functionality. An Implementation Advanced Planning Document (IAPD) was submitted in October 1992. FNS approved the IAPD in March 1993, and DHHS approval was obtained in May of that year. The State released a Request for Proposals (RFP) in July 1993 to select a contractor for the system transfer. Proposals are due in September 1993, and the planning phase has been extended through January, 1994.

Maine contracted with a planning contractor, Maximus, in December 1991. Maximus has assisted Maine in the development of Advanced Planning Documents (APD) and the RFP.

4.4 Conversion Approach

The specific conversion approach has not been determined. The conversion approach is dependent, to a large degree, upon responses to the outstanding RFP.

4.5 Project Management

The current project manager has previous experience as the data processing director of a community action program agency in Maine. Project-related experience includes 10 years in public assistance programs, 12 years of MIS experience, and 12 years of project management experience. The project manager's experience includes projects of similar size and scope to the FAMIS system.

The project management team is comprised of: the FAMIS project manager, a management analyst from the Income Maintenance Division, systems analysts from the MIS Division, systems personnel from the DHS Division of Data Processing, and a regional manager. The project management team's primary responsibilities involve project control and communication.

User groups were utilized during the planning process. These groups, which met bi-weekly during periods of project activity, consisted of both field staff and State level administrative personnel. User groups assisted in establishing requirements, making recommendations about features and functions of the new system, and reviewing documents prepared by the project management team and the planning contractor.

The State also had contractor assistance during the planning phase. Maximus performed most of the work required for overall planning and alternative analysis. Maximus staff worked with in-house staff to prepare a cost/benefit analysis, APDs, and the RFP. The contractor's work was reviewed by the project management team, the oversight committee, and the functional work group. Maximus has extensive experience in public assistance program areas, in the systems that support these functions, and as a planning and quality assurance contractor in many FAMIS system planning and implementation projects across the country. State staff believe that the work performed by Maximus has been excellent.

4.6 FSP Participation

FSP personnel serve on both the oversight committee and within the functional work groups. They have been involved since the inception of the project.

4.7 MIS Participation

MIS participation includes both management and advisory functions. MIS staff have been involved in FAMIS planning since the beginning of the project.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

Maine is still in the planning stage of the FAMIS project; however, several delays have occurred that have impacted project costs and timeframes. Most of these delays were due to the inclusion of additional program areas. State staff indicated that the overall success of the project was not impacted by these delays. State staff also expressed grave concern about possible reductions in Federal Financial Participation (FFP) rates due to pending Federal legislation.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

To date, there have not been any system transfers into or out of Maine. The State has not yet selected a transfer candidate for its new FAMIS system. Maine's current system is not a viable transfer candidate because of its age and limited functionality. The new FAMIS system may offer transfer possibilities, but its transferability potential is not known yet.

Although Maine has not selected a transfer system, the State has initiated its system review. State systems that have been examined as potential transfer candidates include: Ohio's CRIS-E, Rhode Island's INRHODES, Minnesota's MAXIS, Maryland's CARES/CDB, and South Carolina's system. The Merced County, California MAGIC system also is being considered.

State staff indicated that system selection criteria include: similarity in caseworker roles and responsibilities, degree of application integration, desirability of functions and capabilities, FAMIS certification, and vendor characteristics. Furthermore, State staff favor a distributed type system capable of more advanced FAMIS features including on-line help, policy manuals, and alerts, and electronic mail.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting the State's current system, MICS, are as follows:

- **Mainframe:** Honeywell DPS 90
GCOS8, TP8, Tape Management, File Management
- **Disk:** IBM 3380
- **Tape:** HW MTU 820
- **Printers:** Impact - HW PRU 1200
Laser - Xerox 9790
- **Front Ends:** Comten 5655
- **Workstations:** Variety of 3270 type terminals and PCs running in 3270 emulation
- **Telecommunications:** SNA/SDLC 9.6 KB multi-dropped circuits connected to Augusta

A detailed list of components supporting the State systems is provided in Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A. The State has two mainframe systems to support DHS and other State agencies. The components that comprise each system are detailed in the exhibit.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

This section describes the operating environment in Maine. Areas addressed include operations and maintenance, telecommunications, system performance, system response, and system downtime. Current activities in the systems area and future plans also are addressed.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The Maine Department of Administrative and Financial Services (MDAFS) operates the data center and provides technical and application support to the current MICS system through the Bureau of Information Services (BIS) and Bureau of Information Processing. The data center is operational 24 hours per day, seven days per week.

The data center contains two processor platforms: a Honeywell DPS 90, which runs MICS, and an IBM 3090 - 200J system. The two platforms are stand-alone systems that do not interface with each other. The Honeywell platform has been used since the 1970s and was the State data center's only platform until 1989. Since 1989, the State has discontinued application development for the Honeywell system. The IBM platform was

upgraded to process a Child Support Enforcement application and has become the direction for future development efforts. While the State plans to phase out the DPS 90 as its current application base is rewritten for the IBM system, Maine has not ruled out the use of the Honeywell platform for its planned FAMIS system. The State plans to adopt the best contractor solution without regard to processor platform requirements.

Peripherals used for both systems include: IBM 3380 and 3390 direct access storage devices (DASD), Honeywell and IBM tape drives, IBM impact printers, Xerox 9790 laser printers, and Comten Front End Processors. The IBM 3380s are directly connected to the DPS 90 via its input/output (I/O) processors and provide excellent disk support for the public assistance system.

The State has initiated planning for the development of an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system. State staff hope that the project will be approved this year. If so, Maine expects to have a battery and generator system installed in 1994.

A general plan is in place for disaster recovery, but specific details have not been approved or funded. Several possibilities are being investigated, including hot site, cold site, and commercially available vendor sites, such as Comdisco and Sungard.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

BIS provides technical support staff for MICS and all other Maine applications, with the exception of the Department of Labor which is required -- by legislative mandate -- to have its own data center. BIS has 141 personnel supporting computer operations, telecommunications, and technical support activities.

All application support for MICS is provided by State staff, and contractors are not used. The MIS group within the Department of Human Services has four programmers dedicated to providing MICS support.

State staff believe that current staffing levels are inadequate to provide effective systems support; however, the State does not have plans to increase staffing in this area. The State's staffing shortages are due to budget constraints rather than problems in recruiting and retaining technical staff. State staff indicated that Maine's weak economy, State government wage levels, and the perceived stability of government employment makes the State competitive with the private sector.

The two processors contain a total of seven production regions -- CICS on the IBM and TPS-8 on the Honeywell -- and up to four test regions. Development and production workloads share processor resources during the first shift, while the second and third shifts are dedicated to batch and backup activities.

Hardware and software maintenance normally are performed on Sundays from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. Full DASD backups of all files are done each weekend and rotated to one

of two off-site storage areas. Incremental backups of critical or application sensitive data are performed every night.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Maine has positioned itself to take advantage of several technological directions that may be taken in hardware and/or software development. The current network that supports the public assistance system consists of approximately 195 SNA/SDLC circuits with speeds ranging from 4.8 KB to 56 KB with an average speed of 9.6 KB. The circuits are linked directly to the Comten 5655 located in the BIS data center in Augusta. There is a conversion underway to install eight Stratacom hubs within the State and use the hubs as T1 concentrators for all current State networks, including the DHS systems. Four of the hubs already are installed and four are pending.

The full statewide T1 backbone network will operate under the TCP/IP protocol and support a variety of other protocols based on the needs of the network users. Local area networks (LAN) and wide area networks (WAN) will be installed throughout the State to provide the most effective level of service to local users.

The State also has a Honeywell network of 40 4.8 KB to 19.2 KB circuits that connect to the Comten front end. Even though the MICS application resides on the Honeywell DPS 90 mainframe, it utilizes the SNA/SDLC network rather than the Honeywell version. Protocol conversion in the Comten and dual cross connections from the Comten to both processors allow this configuration to work effectively.

6.2.4 System Performance

The Honeywell DPS 90 averages approximately 61 percent utilization with peaks of over 80 percent during the first shift. The average number of transactions processed daily was not available. Since MICS represents roughly 80 percent of the total system workload, there is sufficient capacity to handle workload increases in the foreseeable future. Assuming that the FAMIS system becomes operational as planned during 1996, the current system must be able to support the MICS application until then.

The 3090 - 200J operates at approximately 64 percent utilization with peaks of 74 percent during the first half of 1993. Projected growth rates for system workload on the 200J were not available, but Maine staff expects that an upgrade for the 200J will be required within a year due to application growth.

6.2.5 System Response

The State does not maintain terminal response time -- the time needed to get a response after the enter key is hit -- data, and State staff expressed different judgments regarding system response. BIS staff indicated that there were no response-time issues for MICS. DHS MIS application support staff, however, felt that there were some response-time

delays. Since response-time measurements were not available, support was unavailable for either perspective.

6.2.6 System Downtime

During FY 1993, the Honeywell DPS 90 has averaged 99.7 percent uptime, while the IBM 200J has averaged 99.0 percent. State staff did not express concern about hardware, software, or communications network reliability. The only reliability issue raised by State staff was the consistency of external power. The State plans to implement a UPS system in 1994 to address this issue.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Plans are in place to make the following system changes:

- Upgrade the IBM 3090-200J to an IBM ES/9000 series by the end of 1994
- Migrate to MVS/ESA from MVS/XA in 1993

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the planning costs and estimated costs to transfer, modify, and implement the Maine FAMIS; the current operating costs charged to FNS via the SF-269 for Food Stamp Program support; and the three methodologies used to allocate costs to the Food Stamp Program: the approved methodology currently used to allocate Maine FAMIS planning costs; the proposed methodology to be used to allocate Maine transfer, modification, and implementation costs; and the methodology currently used to allocate Food Stamp Program system operating costs to FNS.

The information presented in this section was gathered from the Federally-approved Maine FAMIS Planning Advanced Planning Document, which was submitted in February 1991; the Federally-approved Maine FAMIS Implementation APD, which was submitted in October 1992; the Federally-approved Division of Data Processing Cost Allocation Plan; and Maine Department of Human Services personnel.

7.1 FAMIS Development Costs and Federal Funding

A 1985 review of the Maine current system concluded that the costs to upgrade the system to meet FAMIS requirements would not produce significant benefits. DHHS recommended that an existing acceptance tested FAMIS system be transferred to Maine and modified to meet that State's unique requirements.

In February 1991, Maine submitted a revised PAPD which requested Federal funding for planning costs of \$875,000 and transfer and implementation costs of \$4.346 million.³ FNS and the Family Support Administration (FSA) approved this PAPD in March 1991. FNS approved a 35 percent FSP share of the planning costs, or \$306,250, to be reimbursed at a 75 percent FFP, or \$229,688.

In May 1992, Maine requested Federal funding approval of additional planning costs for integrating functionality into FAMIS to support JOBS and Educational Training and Transitional Services.⁴ Planning costs were increased by \$74,582, to \$949,582; the FSP share was increased by \$12,072 to be reimbursed at 63 percent FFP, or \$7,606. Since the addition of these requirements necessitated additional time to complete the IAPD and the RFP for a transfer contractor, the planning phase was extended to December 31, 1992.

In June 1992, Maine expanded the scope of FAMIS by including functionality to support Medicaid eligibility.⁵ This decision increased total planning costs by \$81,448, to \$1,031,030. The FSP share of planning costs did not change.

The Implementation APD was submitted to Federal funding agencies in October 1992. FNS and all agencies except the Agency for Children and Families (ACF) approved the IAPD by March 1993; ACF granted approval in May 1993. The estimated total cost to transfer and implement a system was \$22,218,969. FNS approved a 39.98 percent FSP share of this amount, or \$8,883,144, to be reimbursed at a 63 percent FFP, or \$5,596,381. At the same time, FNS closed the February 1991 PAPD so that no further costs would be applied to the planning phase.

The RFP for the transfer agent was submitted for approval along with the IAPD. The RFP was issued to the public on July 6, 1993, and Maine expects to receive responses by September 1993.

By December 31, 1992, \$876,575 in FAMIS planning costs had been expended. The Food Stamp Program was allocated 23.27 percent of this amount, or \$204,021.⁶ Only \$154,455 in approved planning funds remained to complete planning activities. In February 1993, Maine requested approval for an additional time extension and increased funding for the planning phase.⁷ The request involved an extension of the planning phase through September 30, 1993, increased funding for State personnel, and an extension of the planning services contract. The additional cost was \$368,145, bringing total planning

³ The initial PAPD submitted in August 1989 was disapproved by FNS because it lacked specific Food Stamp Program requirements. The submission of this PAPD prompted the recommendation to transfer rather than develop or modify.

⁴ Source: First update to February 1991 PAPD.

⁵ Source: Second update to February 1991 PAPD.

⁶ Source: State-provided worksheet of FAMIS planning expenditures through December 31, 1992.

⁷ Source: Third update to February 1991 PAPD.

costs to \$1,399,175. FNS approved the time extension and additional funding in March 1993; DHHS followed in May 1993. The FNS-approved FSP share of this increase was \$147,184, to be reimbursed at 63 percent FFP, or \$92,726. FNS also rescinded formal closure of the planning phase. The total share of planning costs approved by FNS through September 1993 is \$465,506; the FNS FFP totals \$330,020.

7.1.1 FAMIS System Components

Initially, the State planned to develop the Maine FAMIS to support only the AFDC and Food Stamp Programs. During the planning process, however, support for all programs administered by Income Maintenance, with the exception of Child Support Enforcement, was added to FAMIS. The programs added to FAMIS include Medicaid, JOBS, Child Care, and Transitional Services.

7.1.2 Major FAMIS Development Cost Components

This section addresses cost components for the planning phase which began in February 1991, and the transfer, modification, and implementation phase scheduled to begin October 1, 1993.

7.1.2.1 FAMIS Planning Cost Components

FAMIS costs for the planning phase total nearly \$1.4 million. The major components of these planning costs are addressed below:

- **Contractor Support.** Maximus, Inc. was awarded a planning services contract in December 1991 for \$334,180.⁸ The contract was amended in May 1992 to accommodate requirements for JOBS and Educational Training and Transitional Services; the increase was \$74,582.⁹ The contract was increased again in June 1992 to accommodate the addition of Medicaid eligibility requirements to the Maine FAMIS; this increase totalled \$81,448.¹⁰ The total value of the contract was \$490,211.

The costs for major deliverables produced by Maximus were as follows:

- Requirements Definitions, \$48,860
- Alternatives Analysis, \$49,528
- Cost Benefit Analysis, \$37,481
- Medicaid Eligibility Requirements Definition, \$81,448
- JOBS and Transitional Services Requirements Definition, \$74,582

⁸ Source: Letter, 11/4/91.

⁹ Source: Letter, 5/29/92.

¹⁰ Source: Letter, 6/1/92.

- IAPD and RFP, \$167,691

An additional amendment was requested in the PAPD submitted in February 1993 to increase the contract by \$92,500 and extend the period of performance to September 30, 1993. The value of the contract increased to \$582,711.

- **Service Contract.** The Bureau of Information Services maintains a service contract with the Department to provide data processing services and technical support to the FAMIS planning efforts. Initial estimates for technical support totalled \$261,000. Through December 1992, this organization had billed the FAMIS project for \$203,000.¹¹ The February 1993 PAPD update requested an additional \$164,514 for BIS services through the end of the planning phase, September 30, 1993.
- **State Personnel.** Costs accumulated for the FAMIS planning effort conducted between April 1, 1991 and December 31, 1992 totalled \$95,285. The February 1993 PAPD update requested \$86,131 for FAMIS planning through September 30, 1993.

7.1.2.2 Estimated FAMIS Transfer, Modification, and Implementation Cost Components

Exhibit A-7.1, IAPD Budget, presents the Federally-approved budget for the Maine FAMIS Transfer, Modification, and Implementation (TMI) phase and the subsequent 12-month operational period designated as the warranty period. The estimated cost to develop and implement an operational system is \$22.216 million. The \$6.231 million in months 31 through 42 includes the costs of operating the statewide system for one year. For the 42-month period, Maine's FAMIS is estimated to cost \$28.447 million.

The major IAPD budget items are addressed below:

- **Hardware.** Hardware will be acquired throughout the 30-month TMI phase. An enhancement to the State-owned central processing unit (CPU) and DASD is scheduled for months 18 and 19. The cost of this hardware will be depreciated over 60 months using a straight-line method. The monthly depreciation for the CPU upgrade and the DASD upgrade is budgeted at \$16,667 and \$8,333 respectively, for a total of \$25,000 per month. For the four-month period in the transfer and modification period of the TMI phase, from month 18 through and including month 21, the depreciation charge is \$100,000.

Additional hardware will be acquired throughout the implementation period of the TMI phase. This hardware includes 710 enhanced workstations, 33 LAN file servers, 323 printers, and 33 modems. The total depreciation for this equipment

¹¹ Source: State invoices.

for the entire period is estimated at \$473,044. When \$48,750 in line costs are added to the hardware costs for this 12-month period, the total hardware costs for the implementation period are \$521,794.

The \$1.106 million in estimated hardware costs for the warranty phase are split between depreciation (\$803,292), hardware maintenance costs (\$203,655), and line costs (\$99,000).

- **Contractor Support.** Total project contractor costs are estimated at \$15.36 million, which is divided between the TMI phase and the warranty phase. Contractor support during the warranty phase has an estimated cost of \$2.73 million, which is split between the transfer agent (\$926,000) and BIS (\$1.80 million).

The three contractor roles identified in the IAPD follow. Aggregate contractor costs are approximately \$12.629 million (nearly 57 percent of TMI costs).

- The **Transfer Agent** has been allocated almost 37 percent of the total TMI budget (\$8.18 million). The RFP for procuring this contractor was issued to the public in July 1993. Contract award is scheduled for late Fall 1993. Besides software modifications, coding, and testing, the transfer agent will provide comprehensive training support. The transfer agent also may procure hardware on behalf of the State if appropriate.
- The **Bureau of Information Systems** contractor maintains the State data processing center. Data processing services provided to DHS are charged back to the Department at rates contractually agreed to by both DHS and BIS. Estimated BIS costs for the TMI phase are \$2.95 million.

BIS staff will participate in the design and software modification efforts. In the implementation period, BIS staff will participate in acceptance testing (\$450,000), training for conversion and pilot testing (\$600,000), and software implementation (\$450,000). BIS will provide operations support through the TMI and warranty phases as needed. BIS also may be involved with hardware procurement.

- The **Contract Monitor** will provide technical support in the TMI and warranty phases. This support will include Quality Assurance (QA), contract monitoring, and procurement assistance as needed. The Maximus, Inc. contract allows for the option of using Maximus in this role. The budgeted amount for contract monitor support during the TMI phase is \$1.5 million.

and an additional \$1.006 million is budgeted for the warranty phase. State staff personnel costs are direct charged to the Maine FAMIS project.

7.2 Operational Costs

Table 7.1, SF-269 ADP Operating Costs, presents the FNS share of FSP costs at 50 percent FFP for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1990 through FFY 1992 and two quarters of FFY 1993.¹² The ADP operating costs presented in the table reflect only the share of costs allocated to FSP for which FNS reimburses the State. Since operational costs are funded at 50 percent FFP rate, total system costs allocated to FSP are two times the ADP operating costs presented in the table.

Table 7.1 SF-269 ADP Operating Costs

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	ADP OPERATING COSTS
1990	\$350,516
1991	\$395,851
1992	\$413,112
1993 (2 qtrs)	\$119,466

Table 7.2, Operational Charges, shows the total operational costs charged to DHS for FFY 1992 and FFY 1993 to date.¹³ For FFY 1992, the total charges for the processing applications supporting AFDC and the Food Stamp Program totalled \$714,529, which represents 12 percent of the total Departmental charges. For FFY 1993, the percentage of DHS operating costs charged to the Food Stamp Program and AFDC decreased to 10.4 percent.

As shown in the table, processing charges were divided into three categories: AFDC direct, FSP direct, and AFDC/FSP. The percentage of AFDC/FSP costs allocated to each program area is determined through periodic random moment sampling studies using procedures detailed in section 7.3.2.

¹² Source: Final SF-269, ADP OPERATIONS column, submitted for each of the Federal Fiscal Years listed.

¹³ Source: Office of Information Systems, Bureau of Data Processing, Final Distributed Charges Report.

Table 7.2 Operational Charges

ORGANIZATION/ PROGRAM CHARGED	FFY 1992 TOTAL OPERATIONS CHARGES	FFY 1993 TOTAL OPERATIONS CHARGES (3 qtrs)
DHS	5,989,045	4,279,719
FSP Direct	75,706	31,410
AFDC Direct	138,928	76,086
AFDC/FSP	499,895	336,379
Total Program Charges	714,529	443,875

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Total operational costs allocated to the FSP in FFY 1992 were \$826,224 (\$413,112 x 2). Therefore, average monthly costs were \$68,852. Based on the 1992 average monthly food stamp caseload of 62,377 households, the monthly cost per case was \$1.10.

7.2.2 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The Bureau of Information Services operates the central data processing center. The center houses mainframes and all related peripheral equipment. DHS negotiates a service contract with BIS. Based on this agreement, BIS charges back its costs of operations to DHS. The monthly BIS billing breaks out operational costs into the following components:

- Honeywell operating costs including CPU and disk usage costs
- IBM operating costs including CPU and disk usage costs
- Communications charges
- Remote job entry (RJE) charges
- On-line utilization
- On-line equipment
- On-line related
- Page print

7.3 Maine Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the methodology used to allocate FAMIS planning costs, the proposed methodology for allocating FAMIS TMI and warranty costs, and the methodology for allocating costs of the current processing applications that support the Food Stamp Program.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of FAMIS Development Cost Allocation Methodology

The methodologies for allocating Maine FAMIS costs incurred during both the planning and TMI/warranty phases are addressed below.

7.3.1.1 Planning Cost Allocation Methodology

Table 7.3, Planning Cost Allocation, shows the percentage allocations of Maine FAMIS planning costs to all Federal programs. The table addresses the approved PAPD and all updates to it through February 1993. The table shows that the initial allocations involved only AFDC and the Food Stamp Program. As additional functionality was added to the planned system, the Federal programs supported by this functionality were allocated the appropriate percentages. The methodology supporting the initial 65/35 percent AFDC/FSP allocation, as well as all subsequent allocations, was not provided.

Table 7.3 Planning Cost Allocation

	Total \$ Requested	PERCENTAGE ALLOCATED TO EACH PROGRAM						
		FSA/AFDC	FNS/FSP	HCFA/Medicaid Eligibility	Child Care	JOBS		STATE
						Title IV-A	Title IV-F	
PAPD	\$875,000	65%	35%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Update #1	\$74,582	N/A	16.18%	18.75%	18.75%	28.7%	17.62	N/A
Update #2	\$81,448	N/A	N/A	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A	50%
Update #3	\$368,145	51.93%	39.98%	7.25%	.25%	.59%		N/A

7.3.1.2 TMI and Warranty Cost Allocation Methodology

Because the transfer system has not been selected, an allocation methodology based on module complexity and number of programs supported by the module is not feasible at this time. The basis for the proposed methodology is the unduplicated case count adjusted to accommodate duplicate system requirements. Using this methodology, the proposed allocations, after adjustments, are:

- AFDC, 51.93 percent
- Food Stamp Program, 39.98 percent
- Medicaid, 7.25 percent
- JOBS, 0.59 percent
- Child Care, 0.25 percent

7.3.2 Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

Central computer services operating costs attributable to each department are billed to each department monthly. These charges are based on a distribution of the cost of

operations, including lease payments for equipment, supporting costs for operations, personnel costs, and overhead costs. These costs are apportioned to each department based on computer measured utilization.

To further allocate program operations costs to Programs supported by DHS, the department conducts an annual time study of the activities of the FSP/AFDC eligibility workers. Data from this random moment sampling (RMS) study are used in determining the Federal share of costs associated with administering the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs.

The RMS study observes the activity of workers and collects data on the number of work units completed during one randomly-selected week of the year. These data are used to determine the average length of time required to complete certain work units. The averages from this study are applied to data on work units completed each quarter to determine the percentages of costs to be applied against the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs.

Data collected during RMS also is used to allocate operations costs associated with processing joint AFDC/FSP applications and performing joint review. To determine the percentage allocation, the specific observations taken during joint applications/reviews are made. These observations count how often the processing being observed is associated specifically with the Food Stamp Program or AFDC.

For example:

350 AFDC/FSP application activities were observed
230 AFDC/FSP review activities were observed
580 Total AFDC/FSP activities

If during these 580 observed activities, 175 observations involved Food Stamp activities, and the remaining 405 observations involved AFDC activities, then:

$175 \div 580 = 0.30$ (30 percent) allocation to the Food Stamp Program for costs associated with joint reviews and applications.

$405 \div 580 = 0.70$ (70 percent) allocation to AFDC for costs associated with joint reviews and applications.

This process is used to allocate operational charges reported as AFDC/FSP charges in Table 7.2.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF MAINE

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	Y	N	N
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	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	Y	Y	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	Y	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*	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	N	N	Y
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	N
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

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

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

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
DPS 90 (Supports MICS)	Honeywell	Purchase	16 channels, 124 MB main storage, 8 MIPS
3090 - 200J	IBM	Purchase	32 channels, 128 MB main storage, 64 expanded storage, 43 MIPS
DISK			
3380/3390*	IBM	Purchase	Controllers - 4 Drives - 3380 (13), 3390 (13)
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives	Honeywell	Purchase	MTU 820 (12)
	IBM	Purchase	3420 (4)
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (8)
PRINTERS			
Impact	Honeywell	Purchase	PRU 1200 (2)
	IBM	Purchase	4245 (2)
Laser	Xerox	Purchase	9790 (2)
FRONT ENDS			
FEP	Comten	Purchase	5655 (2)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations	Various	Purchase	325 (est.)

* Disk drives are dedicated to each system: the Honeywell DPS 90 and the IBM 3090 - 200J. The Honeywell system uses only 3380 disk drives, and the IBM 3090 system uses both 3380 and 3390 disk drives.

**Exhibit A-7.1
IAPD Budget**

OCTOBER 1992 MAINE FAMIS IAPD BUDGET (in \$ millions)					
BUDGET ITEM	TMI (months 1 - 30)			WARRANTY MONTHS 31-42	TOTAL PROJECT MONTHS 1-42
	TRANSFER & MODIFICATIONS MONTHS 1-21	IMPLEMENTATION MONTHS 22-30	TOTAL TMI MONTHS 1-30		
State Personnel	\$2.354	1.240	3.594	1.006	4.600
Contractor	8.730	3.899	12.629	2.726	15.355
Transfer Agent	6.230	1.949	8.179	0.926	9.105
BIS	1.450	1.500	2.950	1.800	4.750
Contract Monitor	1.050	0.450	1.500	0	1.500
Hardware	0.100	0.522	0.622	1.106	1.728
Software	0.670	0.355	1.025	0.738	1.763
Supplies	0	0.147	0.147	0.301	0.448
Miscellaneous ADP	0.906	0.808	1.714	0.317	2.031
Site Prep	0.742	0.531	1.273	0	1.273
Data Ctr Upgrade	0.100	0	0.100	0	0.100
Postage	0	0.225	0.225	0.300	0.525
Other	0.064	0.052	0.116	0.017	0.133
Training	0.798	1.552	2.350	0	2.350
Indirect	0.091	0.044	0.135	0.037	0.172
TOTAL	13.649	8.567	22.216	6.231	28.447

APPENDIX B

STATE OF MAINE

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 Maine. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Maine. 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 Maine	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
236	63	26.7%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	33	52.4%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Maine. The response rate of 52 percent is low, producing a sample whose responses may not be representative of eligibility workers in Maine.

Summary of Findings

Most of the eligibility workers are satisfied with the computer system in Maine. They generally find it responsive, accurate, and easy to learn. Two complaints are that data is sometimes out of date and that some specific tasks are difficult to perform. All respondents think the computer system helps them do their jobs and makes them more efficient, although 24 percent feel the system adds stress to their jobs.

Since Maine's current system has been operational for several years, 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	3	8.8
Good	29	85.3
Excellent	2	5.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	19	55.9
Good	14	41.2
Excellent	1	2.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	8	23.5
Sometimes	23	67.6
Often	3	8.8

The eligibility workers who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is usually good or excellent but a majority (76 percent) agree that response time is sometimes or often slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	2	5.9
Sometimes	12	35.3
Often	20	58.8

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	26.5
Sometimes	24	70.6
Often	1	2.9

A large majority (94 percent) of the eligibility workers who responded think the system is generally available although a smaller majority (74 percent) agrees 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	2	6.1
Good	26	78.8
Excellent	5	15.2

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	78.8
Sometimes	7	21.2

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	78.1
Sometimes	7	21.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	60.6
Sometimes	13	39.4

The eligibility workers who responded consistently feel that the operations of the system are accurate, although 40 percent feel that the data in the system is sometimes out of date. A large majority (94 percent) of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	64.7
Sometimes	12	35.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	69.7
Sometimes	7	21.2
Often	3	9.1

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	96.8
Sometimes	1	3.2

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	82.4
Sometimes	5	14.7
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	89.7
Sometimes	2	6.9
Often	1	3.4

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

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

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

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

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	93.5
Sometimes	2	6.5

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	76.5
Sometimes	7	20.6
Often	1	2.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	94.1
Sometimes	2	5.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	5	45.5
Sometimes	4	36.4
Often	2	18.2

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	52.6
Sometimes	8	42.1
Often	1	5.3

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	84.8
Sometimes	4	12.1
Often	1	3.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	84.8
Sometimes	4	12.1
Often	1	3.0

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	64.7
Sometimes	11	32.4
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	12	54.5
Sometimes	6	27.3
Often	4	18.2

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	13	61.9
Sometimes	4	19.0
Often	4	19.0

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	82.8
Sometimes	4	13.8
Often	1	3.4

Most 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. Exceptions were identifying error prone cases and tracking outstanding verifications; almost 50 percent of the eligibility workers experience some difficulty with these tasks.

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	11	32.4
Often	23	67.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	73.5
Sometimes	8	23.5
Often	1	2.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	75.8
Sometimes	8	24.2

All of the eligibility workers who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work although 24 percent report that it is sometimes more of a problem than a help.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	82.4
Sometimes	4	11.8
Often	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	82.4
Sometimes	6	17.6

Most of the eligibility workers (82 percent) who responded agree that expedited service is rarely 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 Maine'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 Maine's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF MAINE

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 Maine. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Maine. 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

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	7.4
Good	21	77.8
Excellent	4	14.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	13	44.8
Good	13	44.8
Excellent	3	10.3

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	20.7
Sometimes	22	75.9
Often	1	3.4

The supervisors who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent although almost as many equal number also feel that the system response time is sometimes too slow.

Availability

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	6	20.7
Often	23	79.3

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	41.4
Sometimes	15	51.7
Often	2	6.9

Almost all the supervisors who responded think the system is generally available but about 60 percent also 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	3	10.3
Good	20	69.0
Excellent	6	20.7

The supervisors who responded generally find the information and algorithms of the system to be accurate. Most of them (90 percent) think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	37.9
Sometimes	16	55.2
Often	2	6.9

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	48.3
Sometimes	14	48.3
Often	1	3.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	26	96.3
Sometimes	1	3.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	25	89.3
Sometimes	3	10.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	22	88.0
Sometimes	3	12.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	22	81.5
Sometimes	5	18.5

About 62 percent of the supervisors responding have some difficulty obtaining information and about half have difficulty in learning the system. Despite this, those who responded rarely have any difficulty performing such specific tasks as generating adverse action notices or restoring benefits.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	10.3
Sometimes	9	31.0
Often	17	58.6

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	51.7
Sometimes	12	41.4
Often	2	6.9

Most of the supervisors who responded (90 percent) think that the current system is a great help to them in their work but almost half 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	14.8
Good	21	77.8
Excellent	2	7.4

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	13.8
Good	21	72.4
Excellent	4	13.8

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

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	30.0
Sometimes	11	55.0
Often	3	15.0

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	45.0
Sometimes	10	50.0
Often	1	5.0

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, although 55 percent reported difficulty in meeting Federal reporting requirements and 70 percent with making mass changes. Most think the reports produced by the system are good and the quality of the support provided by the technical staff 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 Maine'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 Maine's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.