



## FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT

**Date of Completion** 12-02-09

**State:** Alabama

**Fiscal Year to which credit applies:** 2010

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-compliance with JOBS - Recipients
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: 3<sup>rd</sup> incidence of non-compliance lasting more than three months resulted in 25% reduction of payment for the assistance unit size for three months followed by a six-month disqualification. New policy: 3<sup>rd</sup> incidence of non-compliance results in an immediate 12 month disqualification. Impart begins in the 7<sup>th</sup> month and continues for six months. Under old policy, the case would have been disqualified for six months. The new policy disqualifies the case for six additional months.
4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of recipients will be identified by termination reason code in the State's automated system (FACETS). Those numbers will then be used beginning six months later for six months, i.e., the negative effect of the change begins with month 7 and the duration is six months.

NOTE: For the impact of this change on the two parent caseload, the state determined the percent of the broader caseload affected by this change and applied that percentage to the two parent caseload thus concluding it would be similarly impacted. That impact is indicated in parenthesis.

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -442 (-5)

## FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT

**Date of Completion**    12-02-09

**State:**    Alabama

**Fiscal Year to which credit applies:** 2010

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-cooperation with Child Support - Recipients
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: 3<sup>rd</sup> incidence of non-cooperation lasting more than three months resulted in 25% reduction of payment for the assistance unit size for three months followed by a six-month disqualification. New policy: 3<sup>rd</sup> incidence of non-cooperation results in an immediate 12 month disqualification. Impart begins in the 7<sup>th</sup> month and continues for six months. Under old policy, the case would have been disqualified for six months. The new policy disqualifies the case for six additional months.
  
4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of recipients will be identified by termination reason code in the State's automated system (FACETS). Those numbers will then be used beginning six months later for six months, i.e., the negative effect of the change begins with month 7 and the duration is six months.

NOTE: For the impact of this change on the two parent caseload, the state determined the percent of the broader caseload affected by this change and applied that percentage to the two parent caseload thus concluding it would be similarly impacted. That impact is indicated in parenthesis.

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -107 (-1)

## FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT

**Date of Completion** 12-02-09

**State:** Alabama

**Fiscal Year to which credit applies:** 2010

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-cooperation with Child Support - Applicants
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8-1-06
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: Award with benefit reduction followed by disqualification dependent on number of months of non-cooperation. New Policy – deny the application. Ineligible for application period. Maximum of two months.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of applicants denied for non-cooperation with Child Support during the application process will be identified by denial reason code entered into the State's automated system (FACETS). The number of such denied applicants each month will be counted for two months.

NOTE: For the impact of this change on the two parent caseload, the state determined the percent of the broader caseload affected by this change and applied that percentage to the two parent caseload thus concluding it would be similarly impacted. That impact is indicated in parenthesis.

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -4 (0)

**FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT**

**Date of Completion**    12-02-09

**State:**    Alabama

**Fiscal Year to which credit applies:** 2010

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-compliance with JOBS - Applicants
2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06
3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: None. New Policy – deny the application. Ineligible for application period. Maximum of two months.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of applicants denied for non-compliance with JOBS during the application process will be identified by denial reason code entered into the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of such denied applicants each month will be counted for two months.

NOTE: For the impact of this change on the two parent caseload, the state determined the percent of the broader caseload affected by this change and applied that percentage to the two parent caseload thus concluding it would be similarly impacted. That impact is indicated in parenthesis.

5. Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year: -3 (0)

## Alabama

### Earned Income Disregard

Time of Closure	Impact on Each Month in FY 2009												Grand Total	
	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09		
May-08	972													31,716
Jun	925	925												
Jul	920	920	920											
Aug		1054	1054	1054										
Sep			1035	1035	1035									
Oct-08				957	957	957								
Nov					847	847	847							
Dec						622	622	622						
Jan-09							787	787	787					
Feb								726	726	726				
Mar									888	888	888			
Apr										840	840	840		
May											854	854		
Jun												1158		
Jul														
Aug														
Sep														
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,817</b>	<b>2,899</b>	<b>3,009</b>	<b>3,046</b>	<b>2,839</b>	<b>2,426</b>	<b>2,256</b>	<b>2,135</b>	<b>2,401</b>	<b>2,454</b>	<b>2,582</b>	<b>2,852</b>		
<b>FY 2009 monthly average</b>												<b>2,643</b>		

## Alabama

### Non-cooperation with Child Support - Applicants

Time Of Closure	Impact on Each Month in FY 2009												Grand Total	
	Oct-08	Nov	Dec	Jan-08	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
Oct-08	-4	-4												
Nov		-5	-5											
Dec			-1	-1										
Jan-09				-3	-3									
Feb					-2	-2								
Mar						-1	-1							
Apr							-1	-1						
May								-1	-1					
Jun									-4	-4				
Jul										-2	-2			
Aug											0	0		
Sep													0	
Total	-4	-9	-6	-4	-5	-3	-2	-2	-5	-6	-2	0	0	-48
FY 2009 monthly average													-4	

## Alabama

### Non-cooperation with Child Support - Recipients (12 Month DQ)

Time Of Closure	Impact on Each Month in FY 2009												Grand Total	
	Oct-08	Nov	Dec	Jan-08	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
Oct-08	13							22	22	22	22	22		- 1,284
Nov	24	24							19	19	19	19		
Dec	16	16	16							20	20	20		
Jan-09	22	22	22	22							29	29		
Feb	14	14	14	14	14								23	
Mar	18	18	18	18	18	18								
Apr		16	16	16	16	16	16							
May			18	18	18	18	18	18						
Jun				15	15	15	15	15	15					
Jul					16	16	16	16	16	16				
Aug						16	16	16	16	16	16			
Sep							16	16	16	16	16	16		
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>129</b>		
FY 2009 monthly average												-107		

**Alabama**  
Non-compliance with JOBS - Recipients (12 Month DQ)

Time Of Closure	Impact on Each Month in FY 2009												Grand Total	
	Oct-08	Nov	Dec	Jan-08	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
Oct-08	53							59	59	59	59	59		- 5,303
Nov	69	69							82	82	82	82		
Dec	71	71	71							79	79	79		
Jan-09	92	92	92	92							72	72		
Feb	59	59	59	59	59								88	
Mar	87	87	87	87	87	87								
Apr		66	66	66	66	66	66							
May			79	79	79	79	79	79						
Jun				72	72	72	72	72	72					
Jul					60	60	60	60	60	60				
Aug						80	80	80	80	80	80			
Sep							80	80	80	80	80	80		
<b>Total</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>460</b>		
FY 2009 monthly average												- 442		

## Alabama

### Non-compliance with JOBS - Applicants

Time Of Closure	Impact on Each Month in FY 2009												Grand Total	
	Oct-08	Nov	Dec	Jan-08	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep		
Sep-08	-3													-39
Oct-08	-3	-3												
Nov		-1	-1											
Dec			-3	-3										
Jan-09				-3	-3									
Feb					0	0								
Mar						-2	-2							
Apr							-1	-1						
May								0	0					
Jun									-2	-2				
Jul										0	0			
Aug											-3	-3		
Sep												0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-39</b>	
FY 2009 monthly average												<b>-3</b>		

**FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT**  
**Overall Credit**

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	<b>Alabama</b>			<b>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</b>		<b>2010</b>
2				<b>Date of Completion:</b>	12/2/2009	
3	<b>PART 2 – Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit</b>					
4						
5	<b>Impact of All Changes</b>			<b>Caseload Reduction Calculation</b>		
6	Earned Income Disregard	2643		FY 2005 TANF Caseload	20,040	
7	NonCompliance JOBS Applicants	-3		FY 2005 SSP Caseload	257	
8	NonCompliance JOBS Recipients	-442		<b>Total FY 2005 Caseload</b>	<b>20,297</b>	
9	NonCooperation CS Applicants	-4		FY 2009 TANF Caseload	18,442	
10	NonCooperation CS Recipients	-107		FY 2009 SSP Caseload	0	
11				<b>Total FY 2009 Caseload</b>	<b>18,442</b>	
12				Excess MOE Cases in FY 2009	2,266	
13				<b>Adjusted FY 2009 Caseload</b>	<b>16,176</b>	
14				Caseload Decline	4,121	20.3%
15				Decline – Net Impact	6,208	
16						
17				Caseload Reduction Credit =		<b>20.3%</b>
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26	<b>Net Impact</b>	<b>2,087</b>				
27						
28						

**FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT  
Two-Parent Credit**

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Alabama			Fiscal Year to which credit applies:		2010
2				Date of Completion:	12/2/2009	
3	<b>PART 2 – Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit -- 2-Parent Caseload</b>					
4						
5	<u>Impact of All Changes</u>			<u>Caseload Reduction Calculation</u>		
6	Earned Income Disregard	12		FY 2005 TANF 2-Parent Caseload	0	
7	NonCompliance JOBS Applicants	0		FY 2005 SSP 2-Parent Caseload	257	
8	NonCompliance JOBS Recipients	-5		<b>Total FY 2005 Caseload</b>	<b>257</b>	
9	NonCooperation CS Applicants	0		FY 2009 TANF 2-Parent Caseload	81	
10	NonCooperation CS Recipients	-1		FY 2009 SSP 2-Parent Caseload	0	
11				<b>Total FY 2009 2-Parent Caseload</b>	<b>81</b>	
12				Excess MOE 2-Parent Cases in FY 2009	10	
13				<b>Adjusted FY 2009 Caseload</b>	<b>71</b>	
14				Caseload Decline	186	72.4%
15				Decline – Net Impact	192	
16						
17				2-Parent Caseload Reduction Credit =		<b>72.4%</b>
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26	<b>Net Impact</b>		<b>6</b>			
27						
28						

**FORM ACF-202 – TANF CASELOAD REDUCTION REPORT**  
**Excess MOE Worksheet**

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	<b>Alabama</b>			<b>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</b>		<b>2010</b>
2				<b>Date of Completion:</b>		12/2/2009
3	<b>Excess MOE Calculation Worksheet</b>					
4						
5	<b>Caseload Data</b>			<b>Expenditure Data</b>		
6	FY 2005 TANF Caseload	20,040		<b>Total Expenditures</b>		
7	FY 2005 SSP Caseload	257		FY 2009 Total Federal Expenditures		\$86,039,389
8	<b>Total FY 2005 Caseload</b>	<b>20,297</b>		FY 2009 Total MOE Expenditures		\$59,737,342
9	FY 2009 TANF Caseload	18,442		<b>Total Expenditures (Federal + MOE)</b>		\$145,776,731
10	FY 2009 SSP Caseload	0				
11	<b>Total FY 2009 Caseload</b>	<b>18,442</b>		<b>Assistance Expenditures</b>		
12				FY 2009 Federal Expenditures on Assistance		\$44,304,941
13	<b>2-Parent Caseload Data</b>			FY 2009 MOE Expenditures on Assistance		\$3,882,256
14	FY 2005 2-p TANF Caseload	0		<b>Total Expenditures on Assistance (Federal + MOE)</b>		\$48,187,197
15	FY 2005 2-p SSP Caseload	257		Percentage of Expenditures on Assistance		33.06%
16	<b>Total FY 2005 Caseload</b>	<b>257</b>				
17	FY 2009 2-p TANF Caseload	81		<b>Expenditures Per Case</b>		
18	FY 2009 2-p SSP Caseload	0		Average Expenditures per Case		\$7,905
19	<b>Total FY 2009 Caseload</b>	<b>81</b>		Average Expenditures per Case on Assistance		\$2,613
20						
21				<b>MOE and Excess MOE</b>		
22				Required MOE (80% or 75%)		\$41,828,393
23				Excess MOE Expenditures		\$17,908,949
24				Excess MOE Expenditures on Assistance		\$5,919,889
25	<b>Adjusted Caseload Data</b>					
26	Adjusted FY 2009 Overall Caseload	16,176		<b>Assistance Cases Funded by Excess MOE</b>		<b>2,266</b>
27	Adjusted FY 2009 2-parent Caseload	71		<b>2-Parent Assistance Cases Funded by Excess MOE</b>		<b>10</b>
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						