

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
(County Administration, Self Sufficiency, Adult Assistance)
FY 2012-13 JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE HEARING AGENDA

Monday, November 28, 2011
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

3:00-3:30 **INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING COMMENTS**

3:30-4:00 **SELF SUFFICIENCY**

Performance-based Goals

1. With respect to goal #1 (“To improve the lives of families we serve by helping them to achieve economic security”): Do you control this? Can you measure it?
2. Please review the food assistance timeliness requirement under which the State is operating pursuant to the CBMS lawsuit settlement (as amended). When are we released from these court requirements?
3. How frequently does redetermination occur for public assistance programs? Does this align across programs?

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

[The TANF program may face substantial shortfalls and require cuts beyond the level outlined in the Executive request due to Congressional decisions]

4. Please provide any additional information that may be available since the staff briefing on November 10 about the level of federal TANF funds expected to be available for FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. If funding levels are still unclear, when do you expect the situation will become clearer?
5. Are you working with counties on how you will address any additional TANF shortfall?
6. Assuming the worst case scenario (e.g., if TANF supplemental grants to the State of \$13.6 million are permanently eliminated), what will counties and the State do to address the situation? What are the options?

Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction

7. Is the Department planning for the contingency that entire programs, including TANF, could be cut at the federal level? Are counties planning for this? Is the Department reviewing charities’ potential for filling the gap?

8. What is the Department's estimate of the potential impact on federal funding the Department receives, based on decisions/lack of decisions by the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction?

Child Support Enforcement Statutory Change

[JBC staff made a verbal recommendation during the presentation that the Committee sponsor legislation to modify Section 26-13-108 (1), C.R.S., which specifies that “the state may redirect the state’s share [of recoveries] to the county pursuant to section 26-13-112.5 [state incentives to the counties for child support enforcement]”. This statute previously specified that 50 percent of the state’s share of recoveries would go to counties for child support enforcement incentives but is now open-ended, and legislative intent is therefore unclear.]

9. Staff suggests that the statute be modified to indicate that the amount of the state’s share of recoveries allocated to counties will be specified annually by Long Bill footnote. What does the Department think of this idea?

4:00-4:15 BREAK

4:15-4:30 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION

Food Assistance

10. Why are Colorado’s administrative costs for food assistance (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program/SNAP) administration high relative to other states? Is it because we have low penetration for SNAP and high fixed costs? How do we compare to states of similar size/geography with respect to SNAP penetration and administrative costs?

11. What are the demographics of people who seek SNAP food assistance? Is the penetration rate particularly poor for older people because they are less willing to seek public assistance?

4:30-5:00 ADULT ASSISTANCE

Old Age Pension (OAP) Cost of Living Increase

12. Please review how a decision of the State Board of Human Services to provide—or not provide—a cost of living increase for the OAP program would affect the federal SSI maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

13. How would the Department comply with the SSI MOE if the State Board of Human Services agrees not to provide a COLA for Old Age Pension program? What are the options?

14. Is the heat/fuel rebate either “all in” or “all out” of the SSI MOE? If we were to pull the rebate out of the MOE, what are the alternatives for substituting for it as a component for the MOE?

Home Care Allowance

[H.B. 10-1146 required that individuals be served either in Medicaid Home-and Community-based Services programs (HCBS) or receive Home Care Allowance (HCA), but not both. As a result, some people currently on the HCA program will lose HCA eligibility, including, according to advocates, a significant number of individuals on the HCBS Supported Living Services and Children's Extensive Support waivers for people with developmental disabilities.]

15. Could individuals currently on the HCA program be held harmless/grandfathered in to HCA, so that they would not lose eligibility for HCA but could maintain their HCBS services under the provisions of H.B. 10-1146? What would be the costs of this, including any cost for a CBMS change?
16. If individuals are accessing additional services using HCA that they are not able to access from the HCBS waiver programs, is there a way to adjust HCBS waived services on a temporary basis to hold these individuals harmless?
17. Why does this situation exist in the first place? Why aren't the services being provided under the HCBS waiver programs meeting individuals' needs? The idea behind H.B. 10-1146 was to serve nursing-home eligible people through the HCBS programs, thus drawing down matching federal funding. The intention was to serve individuals and not have anyone "fall off" assistance. How do we fix the problem so we do not see increased costs in other areas of the budget (e.g., anecdotal information that individuals may go to nursing homes if they are unable to access both HCA and HCBS services)?