PART 1 – Eligibility Changes Made Since FY 2005

1. Name of eligibility change: Earned Income Disregard

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 10/1/09

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Original policy provided that earned income (timely and accurately reported by the client) would be disregarded as follows: 1st 3 months wages are received – 100% of earnings disregarded; followed by six months disregard at 50% of earnings. Changed to six months at 100% effective 7/1/06. Under the previous policy most cases were ineligible at the end of the first three months and never got the 50% disregards due primarily to low benefit levels. Policy effective 7/1/06 provides three additional months of eligibility and began in month four of earnings. Effective 10/1/09 the earned income disregard was extended an additional 6 months to a total of 12.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change (attach supporting materials to this form): To determine the impact on the caseload the percent of cases with earnings in FY 2005 will be subtracted from the percent of cases with earnings for the fiscal year being reported. The resulting percentage difference will then be applied to the total caseload to determine the number of cases.

FY 2005 = 15%; FY 2015 = 25.8% Difference = 10.8%

FY 2014 caseload: 13,595 X 10.8% = 1,468 cases

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.

Date of Completion 11/23/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Alabama</th>
<th>Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-compliance with JOBS – Recipients 3rd Incidence

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: 3rd 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: 3rd incidence of non-compliance results in an immediate 12 month disqualification. Under old policy, the case would have been disqualified for six months. The new policy disqualifies the case for six additional months and eliminates the benefit reduction period.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of cases disqualified in each month of the fiscal year will be identified by termination reason code in the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of cases will then be used to show the effect of the change in months 1-3 and again in months 10-12 for a total of 6 months of the 12 month disqualification period which includes the previously existing 6 month disqualification (months 4-9). The number of cases each month after the first month will be adjusted by a 5% decay factor.

   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: -315 (-3)

OMB Control No.: 0970-0338     Expiration Date: September 30, 2017
Date of Completion  11/23/15

State:  Alabama  Fiscal Year to which credit applies:  2016

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-cooperation with Child Support – Recipients 3rd Incidence

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: 3rd 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: 3rd incidence of non-cooperation results in an immediate 12 month disqualification. Under old policy, the case would have been disqualified for six months. The new policy disqualifies the case for six additional months and eliminates the benefit reduction period.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of cases disqualified in each month of the fiscal year will be identified by termination reason code in the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of cases will then be used to show the effect of the change in months 1-3 and again in months 10-12 for a total of 6 months of the 12 month disqualification period which includes the previously existing 6 month disqualification (months 4-9). The number of cases each month after the first month will be adjusted by a 5% decay factor.

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:  -100 (-1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>11/23/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 cases 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 cases 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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>11/23/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alabama</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</strong></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 cases 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 cases 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)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>11/23/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name of eligibility change: Time Limit Hardship Extension Disqualification

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 12/1/08

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: In order to receive past 60 months the grantee or spouse of the grantee must have a hardship and s/he must be cooperating with Child Support and JOBS as appropriate. Failure to cooperate results in permanent disqualification.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of cases will be identified by termination reason code in the state automated system (FACETS). The number of such terminated cases each month will be counted for one month.

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: 0 (0)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>11/23/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name of eligibility change: Applicant Job Search

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: April 30, 2014

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Applicants are required to make application for employment at three places of business during the application process unless exempt or good cause exists for not doing so. Failure to comply with job search activities results in denial of the application.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of cases denied for failure to comply with job search activities during the application process will be identified by denial reason code entered into the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of such denied cases 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 boarder 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: -408 (-4)
**Date of Completion** 11/23/15  
**State:** Alabama  
**Fiscal Year to which credit applies:** 2016

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-compliance with JOBS due to Voluntary Quit or Job Refusal

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: April 30, 2014

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior Policy: Voluntary quitting or refusing a job without good cause is noncompliance with JOBS and resulted in penalties of a one month disqualification for the first occurrence; 6 months for a second occurrence and 12 months for third and subsequent occurrences. New policy: Permanent disqualification.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of such cases will be identified by termination reason code in the state automated system (FACETS). The number of cases terminated each month will be counted for one month. (Previously, cases affected by the prior policy were reported in the JOBS noncompliance statistics on other impact tables.)

   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: -8(0)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>11/23/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year to which credit applies:</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-Compliance with JOBS-Recipients-2\textsuperscript{nd} Incidence

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: 2\textsuperscript{nd} incidence of non-compliance lasting more than three months resulted in 25\% reduction in payment for the assistance unit size for three months followed by a six month disqualification. New policy: The new policy eliminates the benefit reduction period.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of cases disqualified in each month of the fiscal year will be identified by termination reason code in the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of cases will then be used to show the effect of the change for 3 months. The number of cases each month after the first month will be adjusted by a 5\% decay factor.

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: -163 (-1)
### Date of Completion: 11/23/15

**State:** Alabama  
**Fiscal Year to which credit applies:** 2016

1. Name of eligibility change: Non-cooperation with Child Support – Recipients - 2nd Incidence

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: 8/1/06

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Prior policy: 2nd incidence of non-compliance lasting more than three months resulted in 25% reduction in payment for the assistance unit size for three months followed by a six month disqualification. New policy: The new policy eliminates the benefit reduction period.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change:  
   (attach supporting materials to this form)  
   The number of cases disqualified in each month of the fiscal year will be identified by termination reason code in the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of cases will then be used to show the effect of the change for 3 months. The number of cases each month after the first month will be adjusted by a 5% decay factor.

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: -131 (-1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>12/15/14</th>
<th>Revised 5/27/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name of eligibility change: Failure to Repay Misspent Benefits

2. Implementation date of eligibility change: July 2, 2014

3. Description of policy, including the change from prior policy: Failure to repay misspent benefits, meaning those accessed at unauthorized locations such as liquor stores, gambling establishments and strip clubs, etc. or used to purchase unauthorized items such as alcoholic beverages, tobacco products or lottery tickets, results in case closure.

4. Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change:
   (attach supporting materials to this form) The number of cases terminated each month of the fiscal year will be identified by termination reason code in the State’s automated system (FACETS). The number of cases terminated each month will be counted for one month.

   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: 0 (0)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State: Alabama</th>
<th>Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Name of eligibility change:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Implementation date of eligibility change:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Description of policy, including the change from prior policy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Description of the methodology used to calculate the estimated impact of this eligibility change: (attach supporting materials to this form)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Estimated average monthly impact of this eligibility change on caseload in comparison year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date of Completion: 10/28/2015

Alabama

Fiscal Year to which credit applies: 2016

PART 2 – Estimate of Caseload Reduction Credit

(Complete Part 2 using Excel Workbook provided.)
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)

Faye Nelson

__________________________
(name)

Acting Director, Family Assistance Division
Deputy Commissioner for Family Resources

__________________________
(title)