State: Washington Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2017				
Overall Report Two-parent Repo	ort \underline{XX} (check one)	Apply the overall credit to the two-parent <u>XX</u> participation rate?	yes no	
	0.	Changes Made Since FY 2005 ection for EACH change)		
. Name of eligibility cl	hange: Full-Family Sanction	IS		
2. Implementation date	of eligibility change: 09/01/	2006		
3. Description of policy	, including the change from	prior policy:		
•		ction. As a result, there were no cases sanctioned from per 1, 2014 the period in sanction was further reduced		
months before termin	nation. ethodology used to calculate	the estimated impact of this eligibility change	to tv	
 months before termin 4. Description of the me (attach supporting ma In December, 2016 a list to determine if the case h 	nation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified	view	
 months before termin 4. Description of the me (attach supporting ma in December, 2016 a list o determine if the case h 	nation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H nad at least a one-month brea	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified	view	
months before termin Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list o determine if the case h	hation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H had at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in 010CT2015	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was rek in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below.	view	
months before termin . Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list o determine if the case h	hation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H had at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in 010CT2015 01NOV2015	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was rek in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below.	view	
months before termin . Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list o determine if the case h	hation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H had at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in 010CT2015 01NOV2015 01DEC2015	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284	view	
months before termin Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list determine if the case h	ation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H nad at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in 010CT2015 010CC2015 01DEC2015 01JAN2016	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified is in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301	view	
months before termin . Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list o determine if the case h	ation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H nad at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed 010CT2015 01NOV2015 01DEC2015 01JAN2016 01FEB2016	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301 341	view	
months before termin Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list determine if the case h	ation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H nad at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in 010CT2015 010CC2015 01DEC2015 01JAN2016	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301 341 335	view	
months before termin Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list determine if the case h	hation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H had at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed 010CT2015 01NOV2015 01DEC2015 01JAN2016 01FEB2016 01MAR2016	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301 341 335 374	view	
months before termin Description of the me (attach supporting ma n December, 2016 a list o determine if the case h	ation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H ad at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed a 010CT2015 01NOV2015 01DEC2015 01JAN2016 01FEB2016 01APR2016	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was re k in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301 341 335	view	
 months before termin 4. Description of the me (attach supporting ma In December, 2016 a list to determine if the case h 	ation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H ad at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in 010CT2015 01NOV2015 01DEC2015 01DEC2015 01JAN2016 01FEB2016 01APR2016 01APR2016	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was rek in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301 341 335 374 327	view	
 months before termin 4. Description of the me (attach supporting ma In December, 2016 a list to determine if the case h 	ation. ethodology used to calculate aterials to this form): of cases terminated during H ad at least a one-month brea d. The results are displayed in d. The r	the estimated impact of this eligibility change FY 2016 using the Sanction Reason Code 252 was rek in service after the case was closed. This identified in the chart below. Total # of Families Terminated 318 336 284 301 341 335 374 327 323	view	

				ASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT
Da	te o	of Completion	<u>December 9, 2016</u>	
Sta	ate:	<u>Washington</u>		Fiscal Year to which credit applies: <u>2017</u>
1.	Na	me of eligibility cha	ange: Child-Only Means Tes	sting
2.	Imj	plementation date o	f eligibility change: : 11/01/	/2011
3.	De	scription of policy,	including the change from pr	ior policy:
		/ grants by counting the Means testing applies Households with incon i. At or below 2	income for all household members to kinship or legal guardian child-on ne: 00% of FPL receive a grant based	on the payment standard for TANF/SFA families.
		ii. Between 200	% and 300% of FPL receive a gran	t based on reduced payment standards:
			FPL 201% thru 225% of FPL 226% thru 250% of FPL 251% thru 275% of FPL 276% thru 300% of FPL	Payment Standard 80% of payment standard 60% of payment standard 40% of payment standard 20% of payment standard
	C. d.	Requires SSN for anyo	PL are not eligible for a child-only c one in the household when needed en placed by a state or tribal child w	
	e.	to means testing. The means testing ass caregiver, and other pe	sistance unit (household) includes t ersons who are financially responsi	he person applying on the child's behalf, any dependents of the ble for the caregiver or the TANF child. For example: the n, and TANF/SFA recipient child(ren).
	f.		est for non-parental child-only care	
	g.		ent child(ren)'s income and resourd Id means test has been applied.	ces against the payment standard will remain the same but will occur
	h.	•	change medical, food and child car	re eligibility.

State: <u>Washington</u>		_ Fiscal Year to which credit applies: <u>2017</u>		
4. Description of the meth (attach supporting math		calculate the estimated impact of this elip	igibility change:	
In December 2016 a list o	f child only cases	terminated as over income was reviewe	d to determine if the case h	
	•	ne case was closed. This identified any c		
results are displayed in the				
		# of Families		
		Terminated		
010	CT2015	4		
01N	OV2015	0		
01D	EC2015	2		
01J/	AN2016	1		
01FI	EB2016	2		
01M	AR2016	2		
	PR2016	3		
	AY2016	2		
	JN2016	2		
	JL2016	4		
	UG2016	0		
015	EP2016	2		

- 1. Name of eligibility change: 60-Month Non-Recipient Parent Time Limit
- 2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 11/01/2011
- 3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: In accordance with *Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5921*, the department initially imposed the 60-month time limit on all parents of children who receive Child-Only TANF, provided this is "consistent with federal funding requirements and makes hardship extensions available to these parents effective September 1, 2011.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) In December, 2016 a list of child-only cases terminated in FFY 2015 as over the 60-month limit was reviewed to determine if the case had at least a one-month break in service after the case was closed. This excluded any cases that were reinstated. The result was a list of cases that closed due to 60-month time limit for non-recipient parent child-only cases and which were not reinstated as

	# of Families
	Terminated
01OCT2015	21
01NOV2015	27
01DEC2015	11
01JAN2016	21
01FEB2016	32
01MAR2016	21
01APR2016	23
01MAY2016	24
01JUN2016	12
01JUL2016	11
01AUG2016	13
01SEP2016	13
shown below.	
Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility	y change on caselo

5.

- 1. Name of eligibility change: Permanent Disqualification Due to 3 or More Non-compliance Sanction (NCS) Terminations
- 2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 11/01/2011
- 3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:

Permanent TANF/SFA disqualifications for clients who have had 3 or more WorkFirst non-compliance sanction (NCS) terminations since March 1, 2007 when the NCS termination policy was implemented.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)

In December, 2016 a list of cases terminated NCS the third time was reviewed to determine if the case had at least a one-month break in service after the case was closed. This identified any cases that were reinstated on appeal. The result was a list of cases that closed due to having had 3 or more WorkFirst NCS terminations and which were not reinstated as displayed below:

	Total # of Families Terminated
01OCT2015	11
01NOV2015	8
01DEC2015	6
01JAN2016	6
01FEB2016	6
01MAR2016	4
01APR2016	11
01MAY2016	11
01JUN2016	8
01JUL2016	10
01AUG2016	18
01SEP2016	18

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -103

- 1. Name of eligibility change: Mandatory Orientation
- 2. Implementation date of eligibility change:

Effective June 1, 2014, completion of a new WorkFirst (WF) Orientation is required as a condition of eligibility for all Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and State Funded Assistance (SFA) applicants.

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:

Effective June 1, 2014, completion of a new WorkFirst (WF) Orientation was required as a condition of eligibility for all Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and State Funded Assistance (SFA) applicants. The new orientation was implemented to ensure clients receive consistent information statewide about the TANF program, including the services and supports available and activities that may be required for participation in the program. Previously, some local offices offered their own orientation, all of which differed greatly from each other.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)

In December 2016 the client data for FFY 2016 was reviewed. All applications that were denied were screened by reason code to determine if the denial was based on lack of the new Mandatory Orientation. The resulting list was further screened to eliminate repetitions of clients who subsequently reapplied and successfully completed the Mandatory Orientation. This is displayed in the table below.

	Total
	# of Families Denied
Oct-15	81
Nov-15	90
Dec-15	129
Jan-16	80
Feb-16	98
Mar-16	93
Apr-16	85
May-16	82
Jun-16	82
Jul-16	101
Aug-16	119
Sep-16	132

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -1,149

- 1. Name of eligibility change: Changing Grant Standards
- 2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 2/1/2011
- 3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: In accordance with the operating budget passed by the State Legislature from year to year, the department needed to adjust the client benefit amounts effective with the date of the change. The client benefit amount is also used to determine eligibility for TANF benefits. The Legislature first changed the benefit amount by raising it 3% starting 7/1/2008. As a result, a number of clients were added to the caseload that otherwise would have been denied in 2005. Subsequently, in February 2011 the Legislature responded to the effects of the Great Recession with a number of austerity measures, including a 15% reduction in the grant standard. Finally, in July 2014 the State Legislature again changed the benefit amount again this time raising the benefit standard 9%. The net result of these eligibility changes needed to be factored together in order to determine the true change from 2005.
- 4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)

The allowable grant standard was determined for each family size during the period of the reported change. See Table 1. All cases denied or terminated during the current report period for reasons of being over the income limit were examined to determine if they would have been acceptable under the 2005 standard. A list of such cases was tabulated, resulting in Table 2.

Table 1. Changing Grant Standards						
ΗH	2005	7/1/2008 (+3%)	2/1/2011 (-15%)	7/1/2015 (+9%)		
1	\$349	\$359	\$305	\$332		
2	\$440	\$453	\$385	\$420		
3	\$546	\$562	\$478	\$521		
4	\$642	\$661	\$562	\$613		
5	\$740	\$762	\$648	\$706		
6	\$841	\$866	\$736	\$802		
7	\$971	\$1,000	\$850	\$927		
8	\$1,075	\$1,107	\$941	\$1,026		
9	\$1,180	\$1,215	\$1,033	\$1,126		
10	\$1,283	\$1,321	\$1,123	\$1,224		

Table 2 - Effects of Changing Payment Standards	Impacted by Payment Standard Policy (Would Have Been Approved)	Impacted by Payment Standard Policy (Would Have Remained Open)	Total Effected
OCT15	11	30	41
NOV15	11	37	48
DEC15	14	35	49
JAN16	12	24	36
FEB16	14	30	44
MAR16	20	34	54
APR16	8	41	49
MAY16	13	28	41
JUN16	9	22	31
JUL16	22	22	44
AUG16	12	26	38
SEP16	12	26	38

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -979

1.Name of eligibility change: Two-Parent Pregnancy to Employment Solely State Funded Program

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 02/01/2016

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:

In February 2016 the State began to fund, as a solely-state funded activity, that portion of the Two Parent caseload that State law exempts from participation, but for which the federal rules still require participation. This primarily consists of parents choosing to take the Infant Exemption, as this federal exemption only applies to single parents. By funding them as a Solely State Funded Program (non-MOE) they are removed from the WPR computation. This was an element of the State's Corrective Compliance Plan.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change:

In December 2016 the client data for FFY 2016 were reviewed. All cases that were removed from the federally-funded TANF caseload as a result of this policy were reviewed. The tabulated results are shown below.

	Total
	# of All
	Families
	Set Aside
Oct-15	0
Nov-15	0
Dec-15	0
Jan-16	0
Feb-16	744
Mar-16	762
Apr-16	643
May-16	585
Jun-16	555
Jul-16	487
Aug-16	456
Sep-16	484

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -393

- 1. Name of eligibility change: 60-Month All Family Time Limit Exceptions
- 2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 1/01/2011
- 3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:

In January 2011 the agency changed the approach by which exceptions to the existing 60-month time limit were granted. While the State disputes the contention that changes to exceptions to policy constitutes new policy that must be tracked, ACF requested these additional cases be included in future tallies, pending the outcome of that dispute.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)

In December 2016 the client data for FFY 2016 were reviewed. All cases that were terminated were screened by reason code to determine if the termination was based on reaching the 60-month time limit. The resulting list was further screened to determine if the case was reinstated for successful completion of a Time Limit exception. The tabulated results are shown below.

	Total
	# of Families
	Terminated
01OCT2015	92
01NOV2015	84
01DEC2015	80
01JAN2016	97
01FEB2016	85
01MAR2016	82
01APR2016	75
01MAY2016	69
01JUN2016	58
01JUL2016	85
01AUG2016	66
01SEP2016	75

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -1,192

1.

PART 2 – Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit

(Complete Part 2 using Excel Workbook provided.)

Date o	f Completion		
State:	Washington	Fiscal Year to which credit applies: _	2017

PART 3 -- Certification

I certify that we have provided the public an appropriate opportunity to comment on the estimates and methodology used to complete this report and considered those comments in completing it. Further, I certify that this report incorporates all reductions in the caseload resulting from State eligibility changes and changes in Federal requirements since Fiscal Year 2005.

(signature)

David Stillman

(name)

Assistant Secretary, Economic Services Administration

(title)