CALFRESH (CF) PROGRAM
REQUEST FOR POLICY/REGULATION INTERPRETATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete items 1 - 10 on the form. Use a separate form for each policy interpretation request. If additional space is needed, please use the second page. Be sure to identify the additional discussion with the appropriate number and heading. Retain a copy of the CF 24 for your records.

- *Questions from counties, including county Quality Control, must be submitted by the county CalFresh Coordinator and may be submitted directly to the CalFresh Policy analyst assigned responsibility for the county, with a copy directed to the appropriate CalFresh Policy unit manager.*
- Questions from Administrative Law Judges may be submitted directly to the CalFresh Policy analyst assigned responsibility to the county where the hearing took place, with a copy of the form directed to the appropriate CalFresh Bureau unit manager.

1. RESPONSE NEEDED DUE TO:
   - [x] Policy/Regulation Interpretation
   - [ ] QC
   - [ ] Fair Hearing
   - [ ] Other:

2. REQUESTOR NAME: Cecilia Montano

3. PHONE NO.: 951-358-3046

4. REGULATION CITE(S):

5. DATE OF REQUEST: 3-3-2015

NEED RESPONSE BY: 03-17-2015

6. COUNTY/ORGANIZATION: Riverside County

7. SUBJECT: Resulting dependent care expense changes mid-period

8. REFERENCES: *(Include ACL/ACIN, court cases, etc. in references)*
NOTE: All requests must have a regulation cite(s) and/or a reference(s).

ACL 12-25E (pg 30), ACIN I-58-13 (pg 8-9)

9. QUESTION: (INCLUDE SCENARIO IF NEEDED FOR CLARITY):

Scenario: Household (HH) of 2. Mom and daughter. Mom receives employment income and daughter receives child support income. The HH is receiving the dependent care deduction. The HH provides a voluntary mid-period report of moms employment ending mid-period and provides verification. No change in dependent care is reported. Benefits are increased based on the decreased income.

a) Are eligibility staff required to remove the dependent care deduction mid-period resulting from the change in employment/income? b) Do we ask the customer if they still have the expense and determine continued eligibility to the deduction or continue to allow the deduction for the certification period, even though the qualifying factor of employment is removed? c) Do we only act if a change in expense is also reported?

See additional information on page 2

10. REQUESTOR'S PROPOSED ANSWER:

a) If eligibility is not in question, no additional changes or requests for verification of the voluntary reported information should be pursued.

b) Requests for verification of the voluntary reported information should not be pursued. Continue to allow the dependent care deduction until next recertification.

c) Only decrease benefits when acting on dependent care changes considered VUR.

11. STATE POLICY RESPONSE *(CFPB USE ONLY)*:

CDSS concurs with the county's assessment. Because the mid-period income report is VUR the county must act upon it to increase benefits. Because there was no mention of any change in dependent care the county should not pursue the subject until the next regular reporting period. Had the client reported a change in dependent care as well, the county would act upon it if VUR, otherwise the county would wait until the next regular report to act so as to not decrease benefits.

FOR CDSS USE

DATE RECEIVED:	DATE RESPONDED TO COUNTY/ALJ:
March 3, 2015	April 1, 2015 (WEB)

CALFRESH (CF) PROGRAM
REQUEST FOR POLICY/REGULATION INTERPRETATION (Continued)

1. RESPONSE NEEDED DUE TO: ☑ Policy/Regulation Interpretation ☐ QC ☐ Fair Hearing ☐ Other:	5. DATE OF REQUEST: 3-2-2015 NEED RESPONSE BY: 3-16-2015 6. COUNTY/ORGANIZATION: Riverside County 7. SUBJECT: Resulting dependent care expense changes mid-period
2. REQUESTOR NAME: Cecilia Montano 3. PHONE NO.: (951) 358-3046 4. REGULATION CITE(S):	8. REFERENCES: *(Include ACL/ACIN, court cases, etc. in references)* **NOTE: All requests must have a regulation cite(s) and/or a reference(s).** ACL 12-25E (pg 30), ACIN I-58-13 (pg 8-9)

9 continued: The information added to question #37 in ACL 12-25E states we would act on a change in dependent care resulting from income changes considered VUR. Additional verification is required to determine whether the HH continues eligibility to the dependent care deduction prior to disallowing it. Prior instruction stated not to pursue additional requests for verification (ACIN I-58-13) due to a voluntary mid-period report.

ACL 12-25E (page 30):
37. On Page seventy-five, Example 4 states:
Example 4 (CalFresh only): The child care expense for a CalFresh household decreases from $200 to $175. At the same time, Mom's income also decreases. The CWD would not evaluate the net result of the two changes. The CWD must act to increase CalFresh benefits based on Mom's decreased income; however, the CWD cannot act to decrease benefits resulting from the decrease in child care expenses because that would result in decreased benefits. No action to decrease benefits should be taken based on the decrease in child care expenses because this is not a mandatory mid-period report.
The revised language reads:
Example 4 (CalFresh only): The child care expense for a CalFresh household decreases from $200 to $175. At the same time, Mom's income also decreases. The CWD would not evaluate the net result of the two changes. The CWD must act to increase CalFresh benefits based on Mom's decreased income; however, the CWD cannot act to decrease benefits resulting from the decrease in child care expenses because that would result in decreased benefits. No action to decrease benefits should be taken based on the decrease in child care expenses because this is not a mandatory mid-period report. However, if the report of the change in Mom's income is considered VUR for CalFresh, the CWD must act on the change.

ACIN I-58-13 (page 8/9):
28. In ACL 13-17 example four, are CWDs permitted to request verification for voluntary mid-period reports? Or does VUR only exist when the participant provides verification at the time of the mid-period voluntary report?
Answer: CWDs are permitted to request information anytime the household's eligibility is in question. A voluntary mid-period report that is not considered VUR should be noted in the case record and a No Change NOA issued to the household. However, if the household reports a decrease in income that would result in an increase in the household's allotment, the CWD must ask for verification of the decrease and act to increase benefits if the verification is received. If the household's eligibility is not in question, no additional request for verification of the voluntarily reported information should be pursued. As stated earlier, anytime the household reports that a household member has left the home, that report is considered VUR and no further verification is needed.