# CalSAWS | CalWORKs\_CalFresh Committee

Date:	6/9/2021	Location:	MS Teams
Time:	1:30pm-5:00pm	Meeting Called by:	CalWORKS CalFresh Facilitators

			Dy.	
Attendees:				
	1	Monterey	Lisa Lopez	
	1	Napa	Alli Muller	
	1	Solano	Eurita Reed	
	1	Sonoma	Andrew Stone	
	1	Santa Clara	Michelle Demetrius	
	2	Placer	Marna Stock	
	2	Sacramento	Eva Masegian	
	2	Sacramento	Laura Hodges	
	2	Sutter	Jesse Hallford	
	2	Yuba	Erica Garcia for Lovena DeCamp	
	3	Butte	Brannon Hill	
	3	Humboldt	Gordon Radder	
	3	Shasta	Mark Bueb	
	3	Tehama	Matt for Sarah Hoss	
	4	Kern	Shawna Mimnaugh	
	4	Merced	Michelle L. Smith	
	4	San Luis Obispo	Jannine Lambert	
	4	Stanislaus	Jennifer Hill	
	4	Tulare	Idalia Gonzalez	
	5	Orange	Evette Hanford for Enrique	
			Frias	
	5	Riverside	Andrea Chavez	
	5	San Bernardino	Trayonna Bradley	
	5	San Diego	Linda Sevilla	
	5	Santa Barbara	Dario Predazzi	
	6	Los Angeles	Anna Chebishian	
	6	Los Angeles	April Goode	
	6	Los Angeles	Itza Girgis	
	6	Los Angeles	Maria Galindo	
	6	Los Angeles	<mark>Ve Tran</mark>	

Meeting Notes: R1

#### **Batch Memorandum**

PPOCs role call, they will leave call after Batch Memorandum discussion. (Sridhar Mullapudi)

# <u>CA-228338/CIV-108983 ACL 21-55 – Batch EDBC for Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)</u> for Income In-Kind (IIK) for 2021-2022

- o Implemented in production on 06/10/21 at end of day.
- o Running Batch EDBC on all programs (CW, RCA, CF, NB, IN and DV) for 07/2021
- NOAs will be sent through nightly batch
- o Automatic journal entry will be entered, one per program, per month.
- Lists will be posted on the web portal, lists include: cases that were disc due to batch run, batch run that closed a person, CW benefit reduction cases, cases that were read only, cases that were skipped, optional person added back to case due to batch run (this is a known issue, manual entry VIK cases, counties should verify the amounts.
- $\circ$  Will be tested between 06/11/21 06/19/21 and will run in production on 06/19/21 in both systems.
- o PPOCs were dismissed from the call

#### RCM role call completed

#### **SCR Review**

CA-217945 - ACL 20-115 - Increase Child Support Pass-Through and Disregard for CalWORKs Families (Yale Yee)

- o Increases from \$50 to \$100 or \$200 with 2 or more children
- Currently disregards first \$50 of child support collected and pass through to client. Change is effective 01/01/2022
- Update verbiage on CW 2215 and create new TEMP CW 2225
- Correction was requested to clarify verbiage.
- Update EDBC to apply new amount, definition of child is member of AU or MMO (SB380 only)
- Question about SSI child, or other unaided children. Is the unaided child counted to the 2 or more children and receive the higher amount? Question about undocumented children, they would also not be counted only MMO would be a SB380 child.
- Update the CF budget to update unearned income

- Batch changes: "CHILDREN\_IN\_AU" will be added to the unused space field as a new data element and values would be A: one child (or) B: Two or more children.
- Question if eligibility staff will need to take this action manually, answer was "no" it will be automatic.
- Question about \$50 income disregard record in C4 and if it will change in the page, county stated that there was a specific \$50 drop down record in the system, they think it is income received. Response: the project will look into the CIV drop-down record for impact.
- Discussion regarding if the CF income record and if it would need to be updated or is it automatically disregarding whatever the disregard amount is. If \$50 is entered manually then it will not be changed with this batch update. Would like to know what the cases are that would need to be updated manually and are requesting case lists. The project will run a case count of cases that use the disregard income record to get a number of how many cases are affected.
- Discussion if we need section 2.2 in the SCR stating change regarding Update CF EDBC to apply child support disregard as it is always been counted for CF, discussion on if it is a change. County requesting to take 2.2 section out of SCR.
- Discussion about reference table for disregard, county requested a copy of the table.
- o This SCR is currently scheduled for November 2021 release 11/22/2021.
- o Concern regarding K1/3F cases to be checked, stated that test cases have been looked at and the K1/3F cases are working correctly, the project will confirm the results and add to the design document. Counties were reminded there is a CalSAWS sandbox to test cases.
- Correspondence: CW 2215 form in system being revised to update title and verbiage on form, adding additional languages, currently only English and Spanish. CDSS website has 15 languages for the form. Not all languages are supported by the system and some may not be able to be used. Reviewed language changes. Question about 60-month clock verbiage if that change is not happening until May 2022. Response was they are using language that the State has implemented and so would be a question for the State.
- New TEMP CW 2225 to inform clients of the child support disregard changes, it will be a one time mailing in batch at least 30 days prior and will be in multiple languages. Originally it was 90 days before but with CalSAWS only option is 30 days before. Opened a new SCR CA 229005 to do the mailing so it is not done the same day as the update. Question about the 90-day mandate, project stated that State was okay with 30 days. County discussed issue with workload due to intake applicants being manually given the CW 2225, County wanted to

- have it sent automatically like a worker change NOA. Project will explore the possibility of automating to send in batch. Reminder by county that ACL was specific regarding the need for automation before it is to be implemented.
- There will be an imaging barcode included, question about why and answer was all new forms are required to have an imaging barcode as a standard. (This SCR is out for regional review until June 23<sup>rd</sup> 2021)

#### Discussion Items

Opt-In/Opt-Out to automatically remove child from CW case when they become active on Foster Care (Paul Galloway)

- There are currently three separate jobs in LA County looking for children active in CalWORKs / Foster Care and have a new placement if Foster Care / KIN-GAP.
   Wanted to share the jobs to see if other counties are interested in making these available to other counties.
- Batch jobs run at 3 times of the month, two run 2 days before 10 days NOA cutoff and one runs on the last day of month.
- For days prior to 10-day NOA cutoff, If children meet criteria, batch job updates system to remove the children from the home and remove from "purchase and prepare" and "expense contribution" for shelter and utilities summary and adds a journal entry.
- o For after 10 Day NOA cutoff (last day of month), looks to see if any changes since last run (2 days prior to 10 day), if it meets criteria it does the same as above but runs EDBC for CalWORKs program only. Discussion on if CalWORKs would aid the child for one more month and would not create an OI, will be taken back to confirm if it will actually remove child without 10-day NOA from CalWORKs
- Last batch job that looks for placement with NNR/NR and if so triggers a EDBC run for the following month.
- Question if there is a worker alert that generates to notify the worker that child has been removed? Answer was no, there would only be a journal entry.
- Request to share document by email after meeting so it could be reviewed, project stated they would send out. Project will ask counties if they have interest in this being offered to their county once they receive, not sure if it will be an all-58 county decision or a county opt in/out. If there is then an SCR can be opened.

# Break (10 minutes)

- Good Cause Exemption Update (Gingko Luna)
  - 407 reason code: shared with committee that CDSS informed project that GCE will be extended to implementation of 60-month time clock (05/2022).
  - Update to criteria, individual will need to only have time left on their 48-month clock to be eligible for this exemption.
  - o SCR is CA-228754/CIV-10917 Good Cause Exemption 407 Extension to 2022
- SB 1065 (Region 6: April/Binh Tran)
  - Request for information on implementation dates and draft ACL
  - Request to share changes regarding SB 1065 and questions regarding implementation. Purpose is to expand and streamline the THA program.
  - Overview of draft policy changes include: removal of \$100 liquid resource limit, addition of client statement of homelessness, same day issuance, removal of questionable homelessness, removal of eviction prevention reason, expanded THA for 32 days, second 16-day issuance could be issued after CalWORKs case is approved, THA can be used for disasters (not just federally declared), clients may now collect refund from PH payment including security deposit, previously it was refunded to county.
  - Region 6 has three questions: (1) according to ACL, changes are effective 9-12 months from release of ACL, please let us know when there will be a draft design document. (2) Appreciate to have enough time after design document to give adequate feedback and (3) when will it be anticipated to be implemented into system. Answers are since it is a draft they are not sure of a timeline yet, asked if there were any design suggestions from Counties? Will not forecasting implementation until draft document.
  - o SCR is CA-228806 SB 1065 Update Homeless Assistance
- Reminder for RCMs when sending emails to facilitators, please include: Caroline Bui,
   Binh Tran and Sarah Cox
- PEAF Payment Questions (Region 6 April) (Duke Vang)
  - o There were no hearing rights with the Golden State Grant payment and now have heard there is hearing rights with the PEAF payments, can project confirm that is true? Project stated that is probably due to the funding source. County asked how do we get the information about hearing rights to clients? Will there be a Back 9 on the NOA? Answer, there will not be a Back 9 on the PEAF NOA but it will have a second form (GEN 1365) that will be sent, which does not have any hearing information.
  - Do we know the impact of the PEAF payment to the CF/MC programs? Answer
     PEAF payment are not anticipated to count toward income/ resource for

- CF/MC programs. It will be considered a customer non-benefit payment type similar to the GSG payment.
- In the forthcoming ACL, RCA/TCVAP will not be eligible for the PEAF payment, is that correct? Yes, it anticipated to be the same population as the GSG payments.

#### # Action Items

# CA-218060 Read Only EDBC being created for the following month after the SAR Due Month within 10-day Negative Action (Caroline Bui)

- Update: Region 6 is in an internal review of the directions, once approved they will be forwarded to the committee.
- Question Was it also an issue with RRR? Answer, only with SAR7
- Two work arounds identified:
  - (1) Do not enter data collection information if after NOA cutoff, reauthorize and wait until benefits issue then enter data collection changes then process Over Issuance.
  - (2) wait until next month and make change and then rush benefits and create an Over Issuance.
- Asked county's what their preference would be? Discussion about when the
  issue will be fixed and there is no ETA for the fix so only options for now is the
  two work arounds.
- The change NOA would generate with 10 days' notice and an Over Issuance will be created for previous month.
- There was no agreement on a preference as both work arounds require that the case is touched multiple times. Some counties preferred option 1, they stated it was better due to not having to wait so long to take action. Other counties wanted to see the screen shots before giving their preference.

# CA-227714 - Update IEVS Tracking Functionality – county recommendations (Group feedback)

- Thanked the regions that sent feedback.
- A separate meeting will be set up with the IEVS committee and the CW/CF committee will be invited to attend.

#### **Additional Items:**

 Facilitator addressed the committee to set level of expectations when counties site information in ACL that states once fully automated. Stated that if an ACL states "automation" that does not exclude any worker action.

Facilitator requesting if we still wanted to meet in July 14th since Sate
meetings like CAT/CPC don't meet in July. Response from one county was
it depended on how many SCRs there are for review, suggestion that the
SCR could be sent out for review by email instead? Email will be sent out for
Agenda items by June 18th and if none are received the July meeting will
be cancelled.

### **2021 Next Meetings:**

<mark>July 14<sup>th</sup> (tentative)</mark> August 11<sup>th</sup>