APPENDIX B SURVEY OF UI ADMINISTRATORS



State: [PRE-FILLED] OMB Approval No.: XXXX-XXXX Expiration Date: XX/XX/XXXX

EVALUATION OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROVISIONS OF THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT (ARRA) OF 2009

SURVEY OF UI ADMINISTRATORS

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your participation. The purpose of this survey is to gather information about your state's decision to newly adopt, modify, or not adopt the provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) that pertain to the Unemployment Compensation system. This survey is part of an evaluation of these provisions. It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The questions in this survey relate to the Total Unemployment Rate (TUR) trigger and the Unemployment Insurance (UI) Modernization provisions. If your state adopted one or more of these provisions, you will also be asked about the implementation of the provisions. A brief description of each of the provisions follows for reference.

- The TUR Trigger for Extended Benefits (EB): Upon passage of ARRA legislation on February 19, 2009, (which was subsequently extended through 2011) states were eligible for 100 percent federal funding of EB, regardless of whether they had a TUR trigger in place. However, states with a TUR trigger in place might qualify sooner for EB and/or remain on it longer than states relying on the Insured Unemployment Rate trigger only. Moreover, claimants in states that adopted the TUR could qualify for an additional 7 weeks of benefits if the TUR in the state was 8 percent or higher.
- **UI Modernization:** As part of ARRA, the federal government apportioned \$7 billion in incentive funds across states for the adoption of specific provisions designed to increase access to benefits or the generosity of benefits for certain segments of the population. In order to receive one-third of the state's total allocation of federal incentive funds, the state had to have an Alternate Base Period for computing UI benefits that met the requirements specified in the legislation. To receive the remaining two-thirds, the state had to have two of the four remaining provisions, described below.
 - Alternate Base Period (ABP): The benefit amount is calculated using the most recent completed quarter of earnings, rather than the first four of the last five completed quarters under the traditional base period.
 - Part-Time Work Provision: UI benefits are expanded to include individuals seeking only part-time work.
 - Compelling Family Reasons Provision: The definition of "compelling family reasons" is expanded
 to include those who voluntarily quit their jobs for specific family-related reasons.
 - **Dependents' Allowance Provision:** A dependents' allowance of at least \$15 per week per dependent with an optional cap of \$50 per family, in addition to regular benefits, is provided to eligible claimants.
 - **Training Provision:** Benefits are extended for 26 weeks for UI exhaustees who are enrolled in and making satisfactory progress in either a state-approved training program or a job training program authorized under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.

Section A of the survey, on the next page, is a fact sheet. Please review and confirm or correct the data. Then, please complete the remaining questions in the sections that follow. If you have any questions, you may contact XXXXX toll free at XXX-XXXX.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is xxxx-xxxx. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 20 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collected. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Labor, XXXXXXXX. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: XXXXXXXX.

Λ .	Fact	Ch	
Α.	гаст	Sn	eer

STATE OF: [PRE-FILLED]	
-------------------------------	--

The table below presents the information we have regarding your state's adoption of the ARRA provisions that pertain to the Unemployment Compensation system. The information is accurate to the best of our knowledge, but **please confirm or correct** information for your state.

- Column 1 lists each provision.
- Column 2 shows the date the provision was adopted, either through legislative or administrative action, in your state, if applicable.
- Column 3 indicates the date the provision became effective.
- Column 4 indicates, for those states that did adopt a provision, whether the provision was: (1) Newly adopted: the provision did not exist prior to ARRA, (2) Modified: the provision existed in some form prior to ARRA, but was modified to meet ARRA requirements (for example, removing a sunset clause), or (3) Existing: the provision was already in place prior to ARRA and fulfilled ARRA requirements; this includes administrative and case law precedent, as long as ARRA requirements were met.

Please review the table and make any corrections in Column 5. If the pre-printed information is accurate, please confirm this by placing a \checkmark in the "Confirm" column for each row.

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3	COLUMN 4	COLUMN 5		
Provision	Adoption Date	Effective Date	Adoption Type	Confirm (√)	Corrections	
TUR Trigger	Not adopted	N/A	N/A	Ø		
Alternate Base Period	March 15, 2010	June 1, 2010	New		We made only minor changes to an existing ABP.	
Part-time work provision	May 15, 2010	June 1, 2010	New	Ø		
Compelling family reasons provision	Not adopted	N/A	N/A	Ø		
Dependents' allowance provision	May 15, 2010	June 1, 2010	New	Ø		
Training provision	Not adopted	N/A	N/A	Ø		

B. Decision to A	Adopt TUR	Trigger fo	or EB
------------------	-----------	------------	-------

The questions below ask about your state's decision to newly adopt, modify, or not adopt a TUR trigger as specified by ARRA legislation of February 19, 2009, referred to as an ARRA-specified TUR trigger.

B1.	Which of the following best describes your
	state's action regarding the adoption of a TUR
	trigger as specified by ARRA (an ARRA-specified
	TUR trigger) between February 19, 2009 and the
	present?

ĺ	— ₁□	Newly adopted an ARRA-specified TUR trigger
ļ	2 🗆	Already had a TUR trigger in place, but modified or changed it to meet ARRA
		specifications

- ₃ ☐ Already had a TUR trigger meeting ARRA specifications and made no changes → GO TO SECTION C
- 4 ☐ Did not adopt an ARRA-specified TUR trigger → GO TO B3

B2. Was the ARRA-specified TUR trigger permanent?

_	res	
2 🗖	No, it was set to end when 100%	
	federal financing of EB ended	

B2a. What was the sunset date?

	/	/
Month	Day	Year

B3. In your state, what were the key factors discussed, if any, in favor of adopting an ARRA-specified TUR trigger?

Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important.

Becoming e	eligible i	ror	EB	ın	generai
------------	------------	-----	----	----	---------

- Becoming eligible for EB while EB was 100% federally financed
- Extending customer eligibility for an additional seven weeks of EB
- Maintaining eligibility for EB (for example, if expected to trigger off if using only the IUR)
- ___ Other (Please specify)

B4. What were the key factors discussed, if any, against adopting an ARRA-specified TUR trigger?

Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important.

 a TUR trigger
 One-time administrative costs to implement it

 One time administrative costs to implement it
(e.g., start-up costs) would be prohibitive

 Administrative costs that would be incurred on
an ongoing basis would be prohibitive

 Philosophical objections, such as accepting
federal payment of EB

 Concern about increased duration of regular
state UI claim spells because of additional
weeks of federal benefits

Concern	about	increased	emplove	er costs
 001100111	aboat	II IOI OGGGG	Citipicy	,, 00000

	Concern	about	increasing	federal	deficits
--	---------	-------	------------	---------	----------

Other	(Please	specify

B5. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

In your state, the discussion about whether to adopt an ARRA-specified TUR trigger was characterized by intense debate.

MARK ONLY ONE

1 🗆	Strongly	agree
-----	----------	-------

B3

B6. What were the biggest challenges your state faced in implementing the ARRA-specified TUR	C. Alternate Base Period (ABP)		
trigger? ☐ CHECK HERE IF YOU DID NOT ADOPT AN ARRA-SPECIFIED TUR TRIGGER, THEN GO TO B7 Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. ☐ Reprogramming data systems ☐ Hiring/retraining additional staff ☐ Communicating the changes to eligible claimants ☐ Processing EB benefits payments	The questions below ask about your state's decision to newly adopt, modify, or not adopt an ABP as specified by ARRA legislation of February 19, 2009, referred to as an ARRA-specified ABP. C1. Which of the following best describes your state's action regarding the adoption of an ABP as specified by ARRA (an ARRA-specified ABP)? MARK ONLY ONE Already had an ABP in place, but modified or changed it to meet ARRA specifications		
 Increased volume of claimants Keeping track of claimants' job search activities as required by EB Other (Please specify) 	Already had an ARRA-specified ABP and made no changes □ Did not have and did not adopt an ARRA-specified ABP → GO TO C3		
GO TO SECTION C If your state did not adopt an ARRA-specified TUR trigger, please answer question B7. B7. How far did your state get in the discussion of whether to adopt an ARRA-specified TUR trigger? MARK ONLY ONE 1 Not far; there was little discussion of adopting it 2 It was considered, but no legislation was introduced 3 Legislation was introduced, but died in state legislature 4 Legislation was passed, but the governor did not sign it 5 Other (Please specify)	C2. Which version of an ARRA-specified ABP does your state have? MARK ONLY ONE 1 An ABP that includes the most recently completed calendar quarter before the start of the benefit year. 2 An ABP that includes the most recently completed calendar quarter, when the claimant cannot meet monetary qualifying requirements using a "regular" base period that excludes this quarter. IF YOU HAD AN ARRA-SPECIFIED ABP AND MADE NO CHANGES, GO TO SECTION D ON PAGE 6.		

C3.	In your state, what were the key factors discussed, if any, in favor of adopting an ARRA-specified ABP?	C5a.		nt was the rough cost estimate, and over time period was it estimated?
	Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important.		Note	e: Your best estimate is fine.
			\$	
	Sustained high unemployment rate		d \square	Don't know
	Desire to increase access to the program by workers with low earnings	C5b.	Wha	nt factors went into this cost estimate?
	Desire to increase access to the program by workers who are new to the labor force		MAR	K ALL THAT APPLY
	The most recent quarter of employment is more relevant for determining UI eligibility than is employment in the distant past			One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
	Desire to access UI Modernization incentive funds			Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
	Other (Please specify)		з 🗆	Other long-term administrative costs
	<u> </u>		4 🗆	Expanded eligibility/benefits payments
			5 🗆	Costs to update data systems
C4.	What were the key factors discussed, if any, against adopting an ARRA-specified ABP?		6 🗆	Other capital improvements
	Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important.		7 🗆	Other (Please specify)
	One-time administrative costs to implement it (e.g., start-up costs) would be prohibitive		d \square	Don't know
	Administrative costs that would be incurred on an ongoing basis (e.g., higher rates of monetary and nonmonetary determinations) would be prohibitive			GO TO C6
	Costs of the benefits paid out to claimants using the ABP	C5c.		didn't your state estimate costs of adopting ARRA-specified ABP?
	— Philosophical objections to adopting an ARRA-specified ABP, such as accepting		MAR	K ALL THAT APPLY
	federal incentive funds Other (Please specify)			Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs
				Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates
C5.	Did your state develop cost estimates when deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified			Already had an ABP that required only a minor revision
	ABP?		з 🗆	Other (Please specify)
	1 ☐ Yes → GO TO C5a			
	$_{0}\square$ No \longrightarrow GO TO C5c		d \square	Don't know
	d □ Don't know → GO TO C6			
		1		

C6.	Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by an ARRA-specified ABP?	C8a.	What is the main reason the actual costs have been greater than estimated costs?
			MARK ONLY ONE
Г	-1□ Yes		¹ □ One-time administrative costs have been higher
	∘ □ No → GO TO C7		than expected
	d □ Don't know ——J		$_2\square$ Labor costs have been higher than estimated
Ψ C6a.	What was the estimated number of claimants, and over what period?	laimants, ³	3 ☐ Other long-term administrative costs have been higher than expected
	Note: Your best estimate is fine.		₄ □ Benefits payments have been higher than estimated
	, , over _ years		
	d □ Don't know		6 ☐ Other (Please specify)
C7.	How strongly do you agree or disagree with the		one canon (nodes openny)
	following statement?		
	In your state, the discussion about whether to adopt an ARRA-specified ABP was characterized by intense debate.		GO TO C9
	MARK ONLY ONE	C8b.	What is the main reason the actual costs have
	₁ ☐ Strongly agree		been less than estimated costs?
	2 ☐ Somewhat agree		MARK ONLY ONE
	₃ ☐ Somewhat disagree		¹ □ One-time administrative costs have been lower
	4 ☐ Strongly disagree		than expected
-			2 ☐ Labor costs have been lower than estimated
	IF YOUR STATE DID NOT ADOPT AN ARRA- SPECIFIED ABP, GO TO C11, NEXT PAGE.		3 ☐ Other long-term administrative costs have been lower than expected
C8.	How have your state's actual costs compared		₄ ☐ Benefits payments have been lower than estimated
	with the cost estimates?	-	
	MARK ONLY ONE		6 ☐ Other (Please specify)
	□ Actual costs have been greater than estimated costs → GO TO C8a		
	2 ☐ Actual costs have been less than estimated costs → GO TO C8b	C9.	What is the likelihood that your state will repeal
	□ Actual costs have been roughly in line with estimated costs	The state of the	the ARRA-specified ABP?
	4 ☐ State did not estimate costs		MARK ONLY ONE
	9, 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		□ Very likely
	determine how actual costs will compare to estimates		2 ☐ Somewhat likely
	d □ Don't know		₃ Not likely

C10.	What were the biggest challenges your state faced in implementing the ARRA-specified ABP?	D. Other UI Modernization Provisions		
	Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. Reprogramming data systems	The questions below ask about the decision to newly adopt, modify, or not adopt two of the four other modernization provisions as specified by ARRA legislation of February 19, 2009, referred to as		
	Hiring/retraining additional staff	ARRA-specified provisions.		
	•	The four provisions are:		
	Redistributing staff to cover needed areas temporarily	a. Part-time work provision		
	Communicating the changes to eligible claimants	b. Compelling family reasons provisionc. Dependents' allowance provision		
	Communicating the changes to employers	d. Training provision		
	Processing the increased volume of claims			
	Getting timely information to determine monetary eligibility from employers, including alternative documentation such as affidavits when necessary	D1. Which of the following best describes your state's action regarding the adoption of all or parts of any of the four non-ABP provisions specified by ARRA (ARRA-specified provisions)?		
	Other (Please specify)	 □ Already had two ARRA-specified provisions and made no changes → GO TO D33, PAGE 13 		
	GO TO SECTION D	2 ☐ Newly adopted two ARRA-specified provisions		
pleas	r state did not adopt an ARRA-specified ABP, e answer question C11. How far did your state get in the discussion of whether to adopt an ARRA-specified ABP?	 Already had all or parts of one or two provisions in place, but modified or changed one or both to meet ARRA specifications Already had all or parts of one or two provisions in place, and did not modify or change one or both to meet ARRA specifications 		
	MARK ONLY ONE	₅ ☐ Did not have and did not adopt any of the four		
	Not far; there was little discussion of it	ARRA-specified provisions		
	2 ☐ It was considered, but no legislation was introduced			
	Legislation modifying the existing ABP or putting in a new ABP was introduced, but died in state legislature			
	4 ☐ Legislation was passed, but it was not signed by the governor			
	5 ☐ Other (Please specify)			

In your state, what were the key factors discussed, if any, in favor of fully adopting two ARRA-specified modernization provisions? Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. Already had all or parts of one or two provisions in place Would offer increased access to the program by certain segments of the population Would provide additional financial support to unemployed workers with dependents Would provide additional financial support to unemployed workers participating in approved training Desire to access UI Modernization incentive	D4.	Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified part-time work provision? 1 ☐ Yes No → GO TO D6 Don't know → GO TO D7 What was the rough cost estimate for the part-time work provision, and over what time period was it estimated? Note: Your best estimate is fine.
funds Other (Please specify)		d □ Don't know
	D5a.	What factors went into this cost estimate?
		MARK ALL THAT APPLY
What were the key factors discussed, if any, against fully adopting two ARRA-specified modernization provisions?		One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important.		2 ☐ Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
One-time administrative costs to implement them (e.g., start-up costs) Administrative costs that would be incurred on an ongoing basis (e.g., higher rates of monetary and nonmonetary determinations) Costs of the benefits paid out to claimants		3 ☐ Other long-term administrative costs
		↓ Increased benefits payments
		□ Costs to update data systems
		6 ☐ Other capital improvements
Did not want to accept federal incentive funds		¬ □ Other (Please specify)
 Philosophical objections to adopting ARRA-specified provisions, such as accepting federal incentive funds Other (<i>Please specify</i>) 		GO TO D7
	discussed, if any, in favor of fully adopting two ARRA-specified modernization provisions? Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. Already had all or parts of one or two provisions in place Would offer increased access to the program by certain segments of the population Would provide additional financial support to unemployed workers with dependents Would provide additional financial support to unemployed workers participating in approved training Desire to access UI Modernization incentive funds Other (Please specify) What were the key factors discussed, if any, against fully adopting two ARRA-specified modernization provisions? Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. One-time administrative costs to implement them (e.g., start-up costs) Administrative costs that would be incurred on an ongoing basis (e.g., higher rates of monetary and nonmonetary determinations) Costs of the benefits paid out to claimants Did not want to accept federal incentive funds Philosophical objections to adopting ARRA-specified provisions, such as accepting federal incentive funds	discussed, if any, in favor of fully adopting two ARRA-specified modernization provisions? Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. Already had all or parts of one or two provisions in place Would offer increased access to the program by certain segments of the population Would provide additional financial support to unemployed workers with dependents Would provide additional financial support to unemployed workers participating in approved training Desire to access UI Modernization incentive funds Other (Please specify) D5a. What were the key factors discussed, if any, against fully adopting two ARRA-specified modernization provisions? Rank in order the three most important, with 1 being the most important. One-time administrative costs to implement them (e.g., start-up costs) Administrative costs that would be incurred on an ongoing basis (e.g., higher rates of monetary and nonmonetary determinations) Costs of the benefits paid out to claimants Did not want to accept federal incentive funds Philosophical objections to adopting ARRA-specified provisions, such as accepting federal incentive funds

D6.	Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the part-time work provision? MARK ALL THAT APPLY		Compelling Family Reasons Provision	
			Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified compelling family reasons provision?	
	Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs		- ₁□ Yes	
	² □ Already had a part-time work provision		₀□ No → GO TO D11	
	₃ ☐ Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates		d ☐ Don't know → GO TO D12	
	4□ Other (Please specify)	D9.	What was the rough cost estimate for the compelling family reasons provision, and over what time period was it estimated?	
	d □ Don't know		Note: Your best estimate is fine.	
D.7	Did state estimate the mumb or of alcimants		\$, over _ years	
D7.	Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by the <u>part-time work provision</u> ?		d ☐ Don't know	
	-ı□ Yes	D10.	What factors went into this cost estimate?	
	₀ □ No □		MARK ALL THAT APPLY	
	d □ Don't know		 One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs) 	
	What was the estimated number of affected claimants, and over what period? Note: Your best estimate is fine.		2 ☐ Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)	
			3 ☐ Other long-term administrative costs	
	, , over _ years		4 ☐ Increased benefits payments	
	d □ Don't know			
			6 ☐ Other capital improvements	
			¬□ Other (Please specify)	
			d □ Don't know	
			GO TO D12	

es in -specified or the id over what
_ years
mate?
g., start-up
personnel,
sts

D16.	Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the dependents' allowance provision? D1 MARK ALL THAT APPLY		Training Provision	
			Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified training provision?	
	Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs	_	-ı□ Yes	
	2 ☐ Already had a dependents' allowance provision	↓ D19.	$_{0}\square$ No \longrightarrow GO TO D21	
	₃ ☐ Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates		d □ Don't know → GO TO D22	
	4 ☐ Other (Please specify)		What was the rough cost estimate for the training provision, and over what time period was it estimated?	
			Note: Your best estimate is fine.	
	d □ Don't know		\$, over years d Don't know	
D17.	Did your state estimate the number of claimants		and Dollt Know	
	who would be affected by the <u>dependents'</u> <u>allowance provision</u> ?	D20.	What factors went into this cost estimate?	
	-ı□ Yes		MARK ALL THAT APPLY 1 ☐ One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up)	
			costs)	
	□ No → GO TO D18	2 ☐ Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)		
	d □ Don't know — J		3 ☐ Other long-term administrative costs	
V			4 ☐ Increased benefits payments	
D17a	. What was the estimated number of affected claimants, and over what period?		5 ☐ Costs to update data systems	
		7 🗆	6 □ Other capital improvements7 □ Other (Please specify)	
	e: Your best estimate is fine.		7 Differ (Fledde Speelly)	
	, _ , over _ years		d □ Don't know	
	d □ Don't know		GO TO D22	
		D21.	Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the training provision?	
			MARK ALL THAT APPLY	
			Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs	
			2 ☐ Already had a training provision	
			₃ ☐ Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates	
			⁴ □ Other (<i>Please specify</i>)	
			d □ Don't know	

D22.	Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by the <u>training provision</u> ?		lid your state adopt these two particular sions, out of the four possible?	
	-1 ☐ Yes □ ☐ No	Rank in order the three most important, wit being the most important.		
	d □ Don't know —		he state already had all or parts of two rovisions in place	
D22a	. What was the estimated number of affected claimants, and over what period?		osts were expected to be lowest for the vo adopted	
	Note: Your best estimate is fine.		nplementation was expected to be easiest or the two adopted	
	, _ , over _ years		he two provisions adopted required the east staff re-training	
	d □ Don't know		he two provisions adopted required the ewest upgrades to data systems	
D23.	How strongly do you agree or disagree with the	Т	he two provisions fit together the best	
	following statement.	т	he two provisions expanded eligibility	
	In your state, the discussion about whether to fully adopt two ARRA-specified provisions was characterized by intense debate.		he fixed incentive payment outweighed stimated costs of adopting the two provisions	
	MARK ONLY ONE		he provisions increased the weekly benefit mount	
	1 ☐ Strongly agree	C	other (Please specify)	
	2 ☐ Somewhat agree		, ,,	
	₃ ☐ Somewhat disagree			
	⁴ □ Strongly disagree		ver questions D26 to D28 about the ou designated as Provision 1.	
D24.	Which two ARRA-specified provisions did your state newly adopt, modify, or already have in place?		were the challenges your state faced in menting Provision 1?	
	If more than two, please indicate the two included in the application for modernization incentive funds.		in order the three most important, with 1 the most important.	
	Designate one provision with a number 1 and the	R	eprogramming data systems	
	other with the number 2 (number does not indicate ranking; it is used in responding to later questions). MARK TWO	Н	iring/retraining additional staff	
			edistributing staff to cover needed areas emporarily	
	Part-time work provision		ommunicating the changes to eligible	
	Compelling family reasons provision		aimants	
	Dependents' allowance provision		communicating the changes to employers	
	Training provision		rocessing the increased volume of claims	
	Did not adopt or have these provisions in place → GO TO D32, PAGE 13	C	ther (Please specify)	

		 		
D27.	How have your state's actual costs of implementing Provision 1 compared with the cost estimates?	D28.	What is the likelihood that your state will repeal Provision 1?	
			MARK ONLY ONE	
	MARK ONLY ONE 1 ☐ Actual costs have been greater than estimated costs 2 ☐ Actual costs have been less than estimated costs → GO TO D27b		1 ☐ Very likely	
			2 ☐ Somewhat likely	
			₃ □ Not likely	
	₃ ☐ Actual costs have been roughly in ☐ line with estimated costs		se answer questions D29 to D31 about the ision you designated as Provision 2.	
	4 ☐ State did not estimate costs → GO TO	D29.	What were the biggest challenges your state	
			faced in implementing Provision 2?	
	determine how actual costs will compare to estimates		Rank in order the three most important, with 1	
	d □ Don't know		being the most important.	
D27a.	What is the main reason the actual costs have		Reprogramming data systems	
	been greater than estimated costs?		Hiring/retraining additional staff	
	MARK ONLY ONE		Redistributing staff to cover needed areas	
	One-time administrative costs have been higher than expected		temporarily Communicating the changes to eligible	
	2 ☐ Labor costs have been higher than estimated		claimants	
	Other long-term administrative costs have been higher than expected □ Benefits payments have been higher than estimated □ Technological upgrades have been more expensive than estimated □ Other (Please specify) GO TO D28		Communicating the changes to employers	
			Processing the increased volume of claims	
			Other (Please specify)	
			How have your state's actual costs of implementing Provision 2 compared with the cost estimates?	
D27b.	What was the main reason the actual costs have		MARK ONLY ONE	
	been less than estimated costs?		□ Actual costs have been greater than	
	MARK ONLY ONE		estimated costs → GO TO D30a	
			2 ☐ Actual costs have been less than estimated costs → GO TO D30b	
	Labor costs have been lower than estimated		₃ ☐ Actual costs have been roughly ☐	
	3 ☐ Other long-term administrative costs have		in line with estimated costs	
	been lower than expected 4 Benefits payments have been lower than estimated 5 Technological upgrades have been less expensive than estimated		₄ ☐ State did not estimate costs	
			5 ☐ Not enough time has passed to ☐ D31	
			determine how actual costs will compare to estimates	
	6 ☐ Other (Please specify)		d □ Don't know	

D30a.	. What is the main reason the actual costs have been greater than estimated costs?		If your state did not adopt two ARRA-specified UI Modernization provisions, please answer question D32.		
	MA	MARK ONLY ONE		Stion D32.	
	1 🗆	One-time administrative costs have been higher than expected	D32.	How far did your state get in the discussion of whether to fully adopt two modernization	
	2 🔲	Labor costs have been higher than estimated		provisions?	
	з 🗆	Other long-term administrative costs have been higher than expected		MARK ONLY ONE	
	4 🗆	Benefits payments have been higher than estimated		Not far; there was little discussion of adopting either provision	
	5 🗆	Technological upgrades have been more expensive than estimated		2 Adopting one or two was considered, but no legislation was introduced	
	6 🗆	Other (Please specify)		3 ☐ Legislation was introduced, but died in state legislature	
		GO TO D31		⁴ □ Legislation was passed, but the governor did not sign it	
D30b.		at is the main reason the actual costs have en less than estimated costs?		Other (Please specify)	
	MA	IARK ONLY ONE			
	1 🗆	One-time administrative costs have been lower than expected	D33.	Thank you for participating in this important study! Your input is very important and much	
	2 🗆	Labor costs have been lower than estimated		appreciated. Please use the space below to share any comments related to the adoption of	
	з 🗆	Other long-term administrative costs have been lower than expected		ARRA provisions as they pertain to the Unemployment Compensation system.	
	4 🗆	Benefits payments have been lower than estimated			
	5 🗆	Technological upgrades have been less expensive than estimated			
	6 🗆	Other (Please specify)			
D31.		at is the likelihood that your state will repeal vision 2?			
	MA	RK ONLY ONE			
	1 🗆	Very likely			
	2 🗆	Somewhat likely			
	з 🗆	Not likely			
		GO TO D33			

RESPONDENT INFORMATION Please print your contact information below. _____ Telephone Number: (_____) - ____ Your Name:_ (PRINT) Today's Date: Title: Email Address: If anyone else on your staff helped complete this survey, or collaborated with you, please provide a name, title, and telephone number for them. Colleague #1 Title Phone # Name Colleague #2 Title Name Colleague #3 Title Name Phone

Thank you very much. We appreciate your participation in this survey.

RETURN INSTRUCTIONS

Please mail your completed survey in the pre-paid envelope provided. If you have misplaced your envelope, please mail your completed survey to:

Pat Nemeth, Survey Director UCP Project Mathematica Policy Research P.O. Box 2393 Princeton, NJ 08543-2393