

CalSAWS | CalWORKs_CalFresh Committee

Date: 01/12/2022	Location: MS Teams
Time: 1:30pm-5:00pm	Meeting Called by: CalWORKs CalFresh Facilitators

Attendees:

1	Monterey	Maria Pacheco for Liza 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	Lovena DeCamp
3	Butte	Brannon Hill
3	Humboldt	Gordon Radder
3	Shasta	Mark Bueb
3	Tehama	Matt Sanchez for Sarah Hoss
4	Kern	Shawna Mimnaugh
4	Merced	Michelle L. Smith
4	San Luis Obispo	Jannine Lambert
4	Stanislaus	Jennifer Hill
4	Tulare	Lori Catuto
5	Orange	Ana Arevalo
5	Riverside	Jessica Gomez
5	San Bernardino	Andrea Brayboy for Trayonna Bradley
5	San Diego	Linda Sevilla
5	Santa Barbara	Maria Guerrero
6	Los Angeles	Anna Chebishian
6	Los Angeles	Lilit Afrikyan for April Goode
6	Los Angeles	Itza Girgis
6	Los Angeles	Norma Castaneda for Diego Echeverri
6	Los Angeles	Ve Tran

Shawn Doris – CDSS

Meeting Notes: **Region 6** – By Wednesday of next week 1/19/2022

Topic	Lead	Time
Roll Call	Caroline Bui	1:30
SCRs for Review and Vote		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CA-50776: CalFresh WTW Eligibility Non-Compliance Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This SCR will eliminate the manual process of creating a non-compliance record; batch program will create non-compliance instead of an online solution. Sanction and penalty page to store and populate the summary page for both status records. WtW sweep jobs to trigger EDBC when the CWs is impacted to register for CalFresh. A two parent HH batch job will be created. ▪ R6 asked about adding an automatic End Date to the non-compliance. AI: R6 will send verbiage for the CRPC, and Caroline will forward to the State for assumption #2 - (referencing R4s email) ▪ GA/GR will have a separate effort with SCR #232977. ▪ 2nd and 3rd assumptions do not impact non-compliance, the rest of the listed are going away. ▪ System also needs to look at the CFWR exemption to ensure that we do not miss out the individuals that are not in the home. For example, the customer cares for a child under 6 that is not in the home/case. ▪ Sanctions are evaluated at Intake and RC; system needs to check for CFWR that are not WtW participants. Committee recommends checking for manually entered exemptions on the Work Registration page and ignore the "participating with WTW" exemption records since the penalty is being applied for not participating (YES). ▪ Assumption #5 looks at the income used in the case. For example, if a record exists on the Income page, the system will use to add an exemption (even if the income is zero). ▪ If no exemption is found, the system will enter the non-compliance record, with effective date month along with the instances. The instances need to follow the specific types that count, there are some instances that should not count. They must be related to the WTW in order to be applied. AI: R4 will provide an email with specific information. No overlapping records will be created. ▪ If exemption found, system will create a Journal entry. ▪ <u>How does it work for a two-parent household?</u> If one or both are sanctioned, it will create a non-compliance for one or both based on who is not complying. It will create a task for the worker to determine eligibility and determine which parent gets the sanction, and which one does not. (Manual workload) Based on CF policy - the parent who is the primary caretaker would get the exemption if child under 6 or if the second parent meets another exemption must be reviewed. AI: determine how to automate. ▪ R4 - Reported a production defect created for NOA indicating that the HH is sanctioned for zero months back in July 2021. Needs an update. ▪ AI for the project to provide the NOA verbiage – does it state that the HH needs to reapply? ▪ No vote, there are some action items 	Thomas Lazio	1:35
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CA-234795: Update CF PACF Determination Based on Non-Managed GA Status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update logic to determine a person receiving Public Assistance from Non-Managed GA only when the GA program status is active. Not updating existing logic for the Managed GR cases. ▪ R6 requested to add an Assumption to specify this affects only non-managed GA (GA cases are worked outside of CalSAWS). 	Yale Yee	2:05

Topic	Lead	Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The PACF indicator will remain unchanged, this SCR is only looking at the active status. ▪ System will look at the individual person eligibility to determine the PACF indicator. If "Yes" in the PACF field, the design indicates the person receiving Public Assistance. ▪ <u>How is MCE determined?</u> There are no changes for the non-managed. ▪ If the HH is a PA HH, they are no longer MCE because they would be CE. Could be reworded to "Update CalFresh EDBC when determining a Person's Receipt of Public Assistance"? ▪ Region 1 – 2 Yes ▪ Region 2 – 1 YES ▪ Region 3 – 1 YES ▪ Region 4 – 2 Yes ▪ Region 5 – 3 Yes ▪ Region 6 – 3 Yes (with condition to add verbiage for managed GR in CalSAWS) ▪ SCR APPROVED 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CA 235770: Households Not Eligible to TCF When CW is Discontinued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is confusion on the purpose of this SCR. ▪ Tabled to add clarity. 	Yale Yee	2:35 3:05
Break		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CA-234658: Prevent Benefit Reduction without the 10-day NOA for late SAR 7 and RD Processing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update logic to allow benefit reduction with 10-day NOA. This SCR will continue to add manual workload impact. ▪ SCR 232056 - Update functionality to allow the user to issue decreased CalFresh benefits as of the first month of the new certification period. If processing the CalFresh recertification with changes made after NOA deadline, it will result in a negative action. ▪ CA 200863 – ACL 19-10: Separate SCR to add an additional rescind reason of "Recertification Restoral" which would function identically to the rescind reason of "Restoration of Aid Waiver." ▪ CA 218060 will be moved to future-future month. ▪ Example #2 will add an additional error to the CF RE results, attendants expressed a concern. Additionally, the attendees disagree that the 10-day rule for decreasing benefits does not apply to RC process. ▪ Regions disagree to move forward with SCR, vote to reject as written. ▪ R1-No ▪ R2 -No ▪ R3-No ▪ R4-No ▪ R5-No ▪ R6-No ▪ SCR Rejected – Regions wish to combine all the SCRs into one – Caroline will share the SCR number ▪ Monica and Justin Stephenson are RM sponsors. 	Srinivasa Meenavalli R1 R5	3:15 3:45 4:00

Discussion Items

- Is automation needed to track the 30-day signature requirement specified in ACL 21-134?
 - How will the counties track the 30-days deadline for the CalWORKs signature? SCR 226838 was created.
 - Shawn Dorris confirmed that it is a requirement.
 - Do we need to track? Or is it done manually?
 - Most counties have a way to accept telephonic and electronic signatures. There might be a small population until all counties have the electronic process.
- CF Applications received from SSA Offices—SCR CA-239270 Placeholder
 - CA 208406 was created to track SSA applications.
 - ESAP CA-220040
 - All Threshold Languages NOAs covered under this SCR are being removed and will be released in a separate SCR in April 2022.
 - The English CF 377.2B version has a minor mistake
 - CF 377.2B -No Central Print functionality, R6 submitted an issue

#	Action Item	Assigned To	Assigned Date	Due Date	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Project to provide the NOA verbiage – does it state that the HH need to reapply at the end of the non-compliance? ➤ R6 to provide the question need for CRPC ➤ R4 to provide the instances that do not apply to non-compliance ➤ R4 to provide defect number for the incorrect NOA verbiage 				

2022 Next Meetings:

February 9, 2022

March 9, 2022

