

APPENDIX B
SURVEY OF UI ADMINISTRATORS

State: _____

OMB Approval No.: 1225-0089
Expiration Date: 09/30/2015

**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 and detailed in UIPL 14-09. This survey is part of an evaluation of these provisions. It is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor. Responses from the survey will be used for research purposes and, after your name and contact information is removed, be provided in a public use data file to DOL.

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. Please refer to UIPL 14-09 (February 26, 2009) and related updates for a more detailed description of each provision.

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) Provision:** 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 to care for an ill family member, to follow a spouse, or because of domestic violence.
- **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, confirm, correct, or fill in the data. Then, please complete the remaining questions in the sections that follow. If you have any questions, you may contact Pat Nemeth, Survey Director, at (609) 275-2294 or Annalisa Matri, Deputy Task Leader at (609) 275-2390.

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 1225-0089. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 40 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, Rm. S2312, 200 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20210. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: The UCP Project.

A. Fact Sheet

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, correct, or fill in** 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) **New**: the provision, or any parts thereof, did not exist prior to ARRA, (2) **Modified**: the provision (or parts of it) 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 no changes were needed to fulfill 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 ✓ 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 (permanent)	Fill in: _____	Fill in: _____	Existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Alternate Base Period	5/25/2009	1/1/2010	New	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Part-time work provision	Not adopted	n/a	n/a	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Compelling family reasons provision (family illness, trailing spouse, domestic violence)	3/24/2010	4/24/2010	Existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Dependents' allowance provision	Fill in: _____	Fill in: _____	Existing	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Training provision	Not adopted	n/a	n/a	<input type="checkbox"/>	

NOTE: n/a = not applicable

B. Decision to Adopt TUR Trigger for EB

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

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

- Newly adopted an ARRA-specified TUR trigger
- Already had a TUR trigger in place, but modified or changed it to meet ARRA specifications
- Already had a TUR trigger meeting ARRA specifications and made no changes → **GO TO SECTION C, PAGE 2**
- Did not adopt an ARRA-specified TUR trigger → **GO TO B3**

B2. Was the ARRA-specified TUR trigger permanent?

- Yes → **GO TO B3**
- No, it was set to end when 100% federal financing of EB ended → **GO TO B3**
- No, it had a sunset clause

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 eligible for EB in general
- ___ 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.

- ___ State would not have triggered onto EB using a TUR trigger
- ___ 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 while EB was active
- ___ Philosophical objections, such as accepting federal payment of EB
- ___ Concern about lengthening the duration of UI claims because of additional weeks of federal benefits
- ___ Concern about increased employer costs
- ___ 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

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

B6. What were the biggest challenges your state faced in implementing the ARRA-specified TUR 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
 - ___ Increased volume of claimants
 - ___ Keeping track of claimants' job search activities as required by EB
 - ___ Other (*Please specify*)
-

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

- Not far; there was little discussion of adopting it
 - It was considered, but no legislation was introduced
 - Legislation was introduced, but died in state legislature
 - Legislation was passed, but the governor did not sign it
 - Other (*Please specify*)
-

C. Alternate Base Period (ABP)

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

C1. Which of the following best describes your state's action regarding the adoption of an ARRA-specified ABP?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Newly adopted an ARRA-specified ABP
- Already had an ABP in place, but modified or changed it to meet ARRA specifications
- Already had an ARRA-specified ABP and made no changes
- Did not have and did not adopt an ARRA-specified ABP → **GO TO C3**

C2. Which version of an ARRA-specified ABP does your state have?

MARK ONLY ONE

- An ABP that includes the most recently completed calendar quarter before the start of the benefit year.
 - 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.
 - Other (*Please specify*)
-

IF YOU HAD AN ARRA-SPECIFIED ABP AND MADE NO CHANGES, GO TO SECTION D ON PAGE 5.

C3. In your state, what were the key factors discussed, if any, in favor of adopting an ARRA-specified ABP?

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

- Sustained high unemployment rate
- Desire to increase access to the program by workers with low earnings
- Desire to increase access to the program by workers who are new to the labor force
- The most recent quarter of employment is more relevant for determining UI eligibility than is employment in the distant past
- Desire to access UI Modernization incentive Funds
- A significant number of claimants would become eligible anyway
- Other (*Please specify*)

C4. What were the key factors discussed, if any, against adopting an ARRA-specified ABP?

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

- 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 (e.g., higher rates of monetary and nonmonetary determinations) would be prohibitive
- Costs of the benefits paid out to claimants using the ABP
- Philosophical objections to adopting an ARRA-specified ABP, such as accepting federal incentive funds
- Most claimants' would become eligible when next quarter begins so no need to legislate ABP
- Other (*Please specify*)

C5. Did your state develop cost estimates when deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified ABP?

- Yes → **GO TO C5a**
- No → **GO TO C5c**
- Don't know → **GO TO C6**

C5a. What was the rough cost estimate per year?

\$ _____ per year

OR

What was the estimated total cost and over what period of time was it estimated?

\$ _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

Don't know

C5b. What factors went into this cost estimate?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
- Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
- Other long-term administrative costs
- Expanded eligibility/benefits payments
- Costs to update data systems
- Other capital improvements
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

GO TO C6

C5c. Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting an ARRA-specified ABP?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs
- Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates
- Already had an ABP that required only a minor revision
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

C6. Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by an ARRA-specified ABP?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

→ GO TO C7

C6a. What was the estimated number of claimants per year?

Claimants _____ per year

OR

What was the estimated total of claimants and over what period of time was it estimated?

Claimants _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

- Don't know

C7. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

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

MARK ONLY ONE

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

IF YOUR STATE DID NOT ADOPT AN ARRA-SPECIFIED ABP, GO TO C11, PAGE 5.

C8. How have your state's actual costs compared with the cost estimates?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Actual costs have been greater than estimated costs → GO TO C8a
- Actual costs have been less than estimated costs → GO TO C8b
- Actual costs have been roughly in line with estimated costs
- State did not estimate costs
- Not enough time has passed to determine how actual costs will compare to estimates
- Don't know

→ GO TO C9

C8a. What is the main reason the actual costs have been greater than estimated costs?

MARK ONLY ONE

- One-time administrative costs have been higher than expected
- Labor costs have been higher than estimated
- 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 C9

C8b. What is the main reason the actual costs have been less than estimated costs?

MARK ONLY ONE

- One-time administrative costs have been lower than expected
- Labor costs have been lower than estimated
- Other long-term administrative costs have been lower than expected
- Benefits payments have been lower than estimated
- Technological upgrades have been less expensive than estimated
- Other (*Please specify*)

C9. What is the likelihood that your state will repeal the ARRA-specified ABP?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Very likely
- Somewhat likely
- Not likely

C10. What were the biggest challenges your state faced in implementing the ARRA-specified ABP?

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

- Reprogramming data systems
- Hiring/retraining additional staff
- Redistributing staff to cover needed areas temporarily
- Communicating the changes to eligible claimants
- Communicating the changes to employers
- Processing the increased volume of claims
- Getting timely information to determine monetary eligibility from employers, including alternative documentation such as affidavits when necessary
- Other (*Please specify*)

GO TO SECTION D

If your state did not adopt an ARRA-specified ABP, please answer question C11.

C11. How far did your state get in the discussion of whether to adopt an ARRA-specified ABP?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Not far; there was little discussion of it
- 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
- Legislation was passed, but it was not signed by the governor
- Other (*Please specify*)

D. Other UI Modernization Provisions

The questions below ask about your state's decision to newly adopt, modify, or not adopt two of the four ARRA-specified modernization provisions included in the ARRA legislation of February 19, 2009.

The four ARRA-specified modernization provisions are:

- a. Part-time work provision
- b. Compelling family reasons provision (family illness, trailing spouse, domestic violence)
- c. Dependents' allowance provision
- d. Training provision

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)?

- Already had two ARRA-specified provisions and made no changes → **GO TO D35, PAGE 12**
- Newly adopted two ARRA-specified provisions
- Had some but not all of the requirements for two provisions in place and modified and/or adopted one to meet ARRA specifications
- Had some but not all of the requirements for two provisions in place and did NOT modify and/or adopt one to meet ARRA specifications
- Did not have and did not adopt any of the four ARRA-specified provisions

D2. 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 funds
- ___ A significant number of claimants would become eligible anyway
- ___ Other (*Please specify*)

D3. 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
- ___ Philosophical objections to accepting federal incentive funds
- ___ Other philosophical objections to adopting ARRA-specified provisions (e.g., considering them an inappropriate expansion of the UI program)
- ___ Other (*Please specify*)

Part-Time Work Provision

D4. Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified part-time work provision?

- Yes
- No → **GO TO D6**
- Don't know → **GO TO D7**

C5. What was the rough cost estimate for part-time work provisions per year?

\$ _____ per year

OR

What was the rough cost estimate for part-time work provisions and over what period of time was it estimated?

\$ _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

Don't know

D5a. What factors went into this cost estimate?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
- Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
- Other long-term administrative costs
- Increased benefits payments
- Costs to update data systems
- Other capital improvements
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

GO TO D7

D6. Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the part-time work provision?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- Expected that making changes to other provisions to qualify for modernization funds would be easier and/or cheaper
- Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs
- Already had a part-time work provision
- Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates
- Changes were expected to be cost neutral
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

D7. Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by the part-time work provision?

- Yes
- No → **GO TO D8**
- Don't know → **GO TO D8**

D7a. What was the estimated number of affected claimants per year?

Affected Claimants _____ per year

OR

What was the estimated total of affected claimants and over what period of time was it estimated?

Affected Claimants _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

Don't know

Compelling Family Reasons Provision

D8. Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified compelling family reasons provision?

- Yes
- No → **GO TO D11**
- Don't know → **GO TO D12**

D9. What was the rough cost estimate for the compelling family reasons provision per year?

\$ _____ per year

OR

What was the rough cost estimate for the compelling family reasons provision and over what period of time was it estimated?

\$ _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

Don't know

D10. What factors went into this cost estimate?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
- Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
- Other long-term administrative costs
- Increased benefits payments
- Costs to update data systems
- Other capital improvements
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

GO TO D12

D11. Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the compelling family reasons provision?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- Expected that making changes to other provisions to qualify for modernization funds would be easier and/or cheaper
- Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs
- Already had a compelling family reasons provision
- Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates
- Changes were expected to be cost neutral
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

D12. Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by the compelling family reasons provision?

- Yes
- No → **GO TO D13**
- Don't know → **GO TO D13**

D12a. What was the estimated number of affected claimants per year?

Affected Claimants _____ per year

OR

What was the estimated total of affected claimants and over what period of time was it estimated?

Affected Claimants _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

Don't know

Dependents' Allowance Provision

D13. Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified dependents' allowance provision?

- Yes
- No → **GO TO D16**
- Don't know → **GO TO D17**

D14. What was the rough cost estimate for the dependents' allowance provision per year?

\$ _____ per year

OR

What was the rough cost estimate for the dependents' allowance provision and over what period of time was it estimated?

\$ _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

Don't know

D15. What factors went into this cost estimate?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
- Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
- Other long-term administrative costs
- Increased benefits payments
- Costs to update data systems
- Other capital improvements
- Other (*Please specify*)

Don't know

GO TO D17

D16. Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the dependents' allowance provision?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- Expected that making changes to other provisions to qualify for modernization funds would be easier and/or cheaper
- Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs
- Already had a dependents' allowance provision
- Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates
- Changes were expected to be cost neutral
- Other (*Please specify*)

- Don't know

D17. Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by the dependents' allowance provision?

- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
- **GO TO D18**

D17a. What was the estimated number of affected claimants per year?

Affected Claimants _____ per year

OR

What was the estimated total of affected claimants and over what period of time was it estimated?

Affected Claimants _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

- Don't know

Training Provision

D18. Did your state develop cost estimates in deciding whether to adopt an ARRA-specified training provision?

- Yes
- No → **GO TO D21**
- Don't know → **GO TO D22**

D19. What was the rough cost estimate for the training provision per year?

\$ _____ per year

OR

What was the rough cost estimate for the training provision and over what period of time was it estimated?

\$ _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

- Don't know

D20. What factors went into this cost estimate?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- One-time administrative costs (e.g., start-up costs)
- Labor costs (e.g., hiring additional personnel, re-training staff)
- Other long-term administrative costs
- Increased benefits payments
- Costs to update data systems
- Other capital improvements
- Other (*Please specify*)

- Don't know

GO TO D22

D21. Why didn't your state estimate costs of adopting the training provision?

MARK ALL THAT APPLY

- Expected that making changes to other provisions to qualify for modernization funds would be easier and/or cheaper
- Political and/or philosophical considerations made adoption infeasible, no matter the costs
- Already had a training provision
- Lacked an appropriate methodology for computing estimates
- Changes were expected to be cost neutral
- Other (*Please specify*)

- Don't know

D22. Did your state estimate the number of claimants who would be affected by the training provision?

- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
- **GO TO D23**

D22a. What was the estimated number of affected claimants per year?

Affected Claimants _____ per year

OR

What was the estimated total of affected claimants and over what period of time was it estimated?

Affected Claimants _____ over _____ Years
Number of Years

- Don't know

D23. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement.

In your state, the discussion about whether to fully adopt two ARRA-specified provisions was characterized by intense debate.

MARK ONLY ONE

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

D24. Which two ARRA-specified provisions did your state include in its application for modernization incentive funds?

- Check here if your state did not adopt or have these provisions in place → **GO TO D34, PAGE 12**

Please designate one provision with a number 1 and the other with the number 2 (number does not indicate ranking; it is used in responding to later questions).

MARK TWO

- ___ Part-time work provision
- ___ Compelling family reasons provision
- ___ Dependents' allowance provision
- ___ Training provision

D25a. Why did your state adopt Provision 1?

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

- ___ The state already had all or parts of **Provision 1** in place
- ___ Extra costs of benefits to be paid out were expected to be low for this provision
- ___ The provision required little staff re-training
- ___ The provision required few changes to data systems
- ___ The provision expanded eligibility for benefits
- ___ The provision increased the weekly benefit amount
- ___ Considering Provisions 1 and 2 together, the modernization incentive payment outweighed the estimated costs of the provisions
- ___ Other (*Please specify*)

D25b. Why did your state adopt Provision 2?

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

- ___ The state already had all or parts of **Provision 2** in place
- ___ Extra costs of benefits to be paid out were expected to be low for this provision
- ___ The provision required little staff re-training
- ___ The provision required few changes to data systems
- ___ The provision expanded eligibility for benefits
- ___ The provision increased the weekly benefit amount
- ___ Considering Provisions 1 and 2 together, the modernization incentive payment outweighed the estimated costs of the provisions
- ___ Other (*Please specify*)

Please answer questions D26 to D28 about the provision you designated as Provision 1 in D24.

D26. Did Provision 1 already conform to ARRA specifications, with no changes necessary?

- Yes → **GO TO D30**
- No → **GO TO D27**

D27. What were the challenges your state faced in implementing Provision 1?

- Check here if there were no challenges.

GO TO D30

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

- ___ Reprogramming data systems
 - ___ Hiring/retraining additional staff
 - ___ Redistributing staff to cover needed areas temporarily
 - ___ Communicating the changes to eligible claimants
 - ___ Communicating the changes to employers
 - ___ Processing the increased volume of claims
 - ___ Other (*Please specify*)
-

D28. How have your state's actual costs of implementing Provision 1 compared with the cost estimates?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Actual costs have been greater than estimated costs
- Actual costs have been less than estimated costs → **GO TO D28b**
- Actual costs have been roughly in line with estimated costs
- State did not estimate costs
- Not enough time has passed to determine how actual costs will compare to estimates
- Don't know

GO TO D29

D28a. What is the main reason the actual costs have been greater than estimated costs?

MARK ONLY ONE

- One-time administrative costs have been higher than expected
 - Labor costs have been higher than estimated
 - 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 D29

D28b. What was the main reason the actual costs have been less than estimated costs?

MARK ONLY ONE

- One-time administrative costs have been lower than expected
 - Labor costs have been lower than estimated
 - Other long-term administrative costs have been lower than expected
 - Benefits payments have been lower than estimated
 - Technological upgrades have been less expensive than estimated
 - Other (*Please specify*)
-

D29. What is the likelihood that your state will repeal Provision 1?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Very likely
- Somewhat likely
- Not likely

Please answer questions D30 to D33 about the provision you designated as Provision 2 in D24.

D30. Did Provision 2 already conform to ARRA specifications, with no changes necessary?

- Yes → **GO TO D35**
- No

D31. What were the biggest challenges your state faced in implementing Provision 2?

- Check here if there were no challenges.
GO TO D35

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

- ___ Reprogramming data systems
 - ___ Hiring/retraining additional staff
 - ___ Redistributing staff to cover needed areas temporarily
 - ___ Communicating the changes to eligible claimants
 - ___ Communicating the changes to employers
 - ___ Processing the increased volume of claims
 - ___ Other (*Please specify*)
-

D32. How have your state's actual costs of implementing Provision 2 compared with the cost estimates?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Actual costs have been greater than estimated costs → **GO TO D32a**
- Actual costs have been less than estimated costs → **GO TO D32b**
- Actual costs have been roughly in line with estimated costs
- State did not estimate costs
- Not enough time has passed to determine how actual costs will compare to estimates → **GO TO D33**
- Don't know

D32a. What is the main reason the actual costs have been greater than estimated costs?

MARK ONLY ONE

- One-time administrative costs have been higher than expected
 - Labor costs have been higher than estimated
 - 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 D33

D32b. What is the main reason the actual costs have been less than estimated costs?

MARK ONLY ONE

- One-time administrative costs have been lower than expected
 - Labor costs have been lower than estimated
 - Other long-term administrative costs have been lower than expected
 - Benefits payments have been lower than estimated
 - Technological upgrades have been less expensive than estimated
 - Other (*Please specify*)
-

D33. What is the likelihood that your state will repeal Provision 2?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Very likely
- Somewhat likely
- Not likely

GO TO D35

If your state did not adopt two ARRA-specified UI Modernization provisions, please answer question D34.

D34. How far did your state get in the discussion of whether to fully adopt two modernization provisions?

MARK ONLY ONE

- Not far; there was little discussion of adopting any of the UI modernization provisions
- Adopting one or two was considered, but no legislation was introduced (*Please specify provisions*)

- Legislation was introduced, but died in state legislature (*Please specify provisions*)

- Legislation was passed, but the governor did not sign it (*Please specify provisions*)

- Other (*Please specify*)

D35. Thank you for participating in this important study! Your input is very important and much appreciated. Please use the space below to share any comments related to the adoption of ARRA provisions as they pertain to the Unemployment Compensation system.

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Please print your contact information below.

Your Name: _____ Telephone Number: (_____) - _____
(PRINT) Area Code

Title: _____ Today's Date: _____

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 _____ (_____) _____
Name Title Phone #

Colleague #2 _____ (_____) _____
Name Title Phone #

Colleague #3 _____ (_____) _____
Name Title Phone #

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

RETURN INSTRUCTIONS

Please fax or mail your completed survey to:

Pat Nemeth, Survey Director
UCP Project
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Fax #: (609) 799-0005
Email: pnemeth@mathematica-mpr.com