

ELECTRONIC CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

e-CFR data is current as of March 24, 2021

Title 7 → Subtitle B → Chapter II → Subchapter C → Part 275

Title 7: Agriculture

PART 275—PERFORMANCE REPORTING SYSTEM

Contents

Subpart A—Administration

- §275.1 General scope and purpose.
- §275.2 State agency responsibilities.
- §275.3 Federal monitoring.
- §275.4 Record retention.

Subpart B—Management Evaluation (ME) Reviews

- §275.5 Scope and purpose.
- §275.6 Management units.
- §275.7 Selection of sub-units for review.
- §275.8 Review coverage.
- §275.9 Review process.

Subpart C—Quality Control (QC) Reviews

- §275.10 Scope and purpose.
- §275.11 Sampling.
- §275.12 Review of active cases.
- §275.13 Review of negative cases.
- §275.14 Review processing.

Subpart D—Data Analysis and Evaluation

- §275.15 Data management.

Subpart E—Corrective Action

- §275.16 Corrective action planning.
- §275.17 State corrective action plan.

§275.18 Project area/management unit corrective action plan.

§275.19 Monitoring and evaluation.

Subpart F—Responsibilities for Reporting on Program Performance

§275.20 ME review schedules.

§275.21 Quality control review reports.

§275.22 Administrative procedure.

Subpart G—Program Performance

§275.23 Determination of State agency program performance.

§275.24 High performance bonuses.

AUTHORITY: 7 U.S.C. 2011-2036.

EDITORIAL NOTE: OMB control numbers relating to this part 275 are contained in §271.8.

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart A—Administration

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.1 General scope and purpose.

Under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, each State agency is responsible for the administration of SNAP in accordance with the Act, Regulations, and the State agency's plan of operation. To fulfill the requirements of the Act, each State agency shall have a system for monitoring and improving its administration of the program. The State agency is also responsible for reporting on its administration to FNS. These reports shall identify program deficiencies and the specific administrative action proposed to meet the program requirements established by the Secretary. If it is determined, however, that a State has failed without good cause to meet any of the program requirements established by the Secretary, or has failed to carry out the approved State plan of operation, the Department shall suspend and/or disallow from the State such funds as are determined to be appropriate in accordance with part 276 of this chapter.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15898, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3407, Feb. 4, 1987; Amdt. 328, 56 FR 60051, Nov. 27, 1991; 75 FR 33436, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.2 State agency responsibilities.

(a) *Establishment of the performance reporting system.* (1) The State agency shall establish a continuing performance reporting system to monitor program

administration and program operations. The method for establishing each component of the system is identified and explained in subparts B through F of this part. The components of the State agency's performance reporting system shall be:

- (i) Data collection through management evaluation (ME) reviews and quality control (QC) reviews;
- (ii) Analysis and evaluation of data from all sources;
- (iii) Corrective action planning;
- (iv) Corrective action implementation and monitoring; and
- (v) Reporting to FNS on program performance.

(2) The State agency must ensure corrective action is effected at the State and project area levels.

(b) *Staffing standards.* The State agency shall employ sufficient State level staff to perform all aspects of the Performance Reporting System as required in this part of the regulations. The staff used to conduct QC reviews shall not have prior knowledge of either the household or the decision under review. Where there is prior knowledge, the reviewer must disqualify her/himself. Prior knowledge is defined as having:

(1) Taken any part in the decision that has been made in the case; (2) any discussion of the case with staff who participated in the decision; or (3) any personal knowledge of or acquaintance with persons in the case itself. To ensure no prior knowledge on the part of QC or ME reviewers, local project area staff shall not be used to conduct QC or ME reviews; exceptions to this requirement concerning local level staff may be granted with prior approval from FNS. However, local personnel shall not, under any circumstances, participate in ME reviews of their own project areas.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15898, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3407, Feb. 4, 1987]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.3 Federal monitoring.

The Food and Nutrition Service shall conduct the review described in this section to determine whether a State agency is operating SNAP and the Performance Reporting System in accordance with program requirements. The Federal reviewer may consolidate the scheduling and conduction of these reviews to reduce the frequency of entry into the State agency. FNS regional offices will conduct additional reviews to examine State agency and project area operations, as

considered necessary to determine compliance with program requirements. FNS shall notify the State agency of any deficiencies detected in program or system operations. Any deficiencies detected in program or system operations which do not necessitate long range analytical and evaluative measures for corrective action development shall be immediately corrected by the State agency. Within 60 days of receipt of the findings of each review established below, State agencies shall develop corrective action addressing all other deficiencies detected in either program or system operations and shall ensure that the State agency's own corrective action plan is amended and that FNS is provided this information at the time of the next formal semiannual update to the State agency's Corrective Action Plan, as required in §275.17.

(a) *Reviews of State Agency's Administration/Operation of SNAP.* FNS shall conduct an annual review of certain functions performed at the State agency level in the administration/operation of the program. FNS will designate specific areas required to be reviewed each fiscal year.

(b) *Reviews of State Agency's Management Evaluation System.* FNS will review each State agency's management evaluation system on a biennial basis; however, FNS may review a State agency's management evaluation system on a more frequent basis if a regular review reveals serious deficiencies in the ME system. The ME review will include but not be limited to a determination of whether or not the State agency is complying with FNS regulations, an assessment of the State agency's methods and procedures for conducting ME reviews, and an assessment of the data collected by the State agency in conducting the reviews.

(c) *Validation of State Agency error rates.* FNS shall validate each State agency's payment error rate, as described in §275.23(c), during each annual quality control review period. Federal validation reviews shall be conducted by reviewing against the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the regulations, taking into account any FNS-authorized waivers to deviate from specific regulatory provisions. FNS shall validate each State agency's reported negative error rate. Any deficiencies detected in a State agency's QC system shall be included in the State agency's corrective action plan. The findings of validation reviews shall be used as outlined in §275.23(d)(4).

(1) *Payment error rate.* The validation review of each State agency's payment error rate shall consist of the following actions:

(i) FNS will select a subsample of a State agency's completed active cases, as follows:

(A) For State agencies that determine their active sample sizes in accordance with §275.11(b)(1)(ii), the Federal review sample for completed active cases is determined as follows:

Average monthly reviewable caseload (N)	Federal subsample target (n')
31,489 and over	$n' = 400$
10,001 to 31,488	$n' = .011634 N + 33.66$
10,000 and under	$n' = 150$

(B) For State agencies that determine their active sample sizes in accordance with §275.11(b)(1)(iii), the Federal review sample for completed active cases is determined as follows:

Average monthly reviewable caseload (N)	Federal subsample target (n')
60,000 and over	$n' = 400$
10,001 to 59,999	$n' = .005 N + 100$
10,000 and under	$n' = 150$

(C) In the above formula, n' is the minimum number of Federal review sample cases which must be selected when conducting a validation review, except that FNS may select a lower number of sample cases if:

(1) The State agency does not report a change in sampling procedures associated with a revision in its required sample size within 10 days of effecting the change; and/or

(2) The State agency does not complete the number of case reviews specified in its approved sampling plan.

(D) The reduction in the number of Federal cases selected will be equal to the number of cases that would have been selected had the Federal sampling interval been applied to the State agency's shortfall in its required sample size. This number may not be exact due to random starts and rounding.

(E) In the above formula, N is the State agency's minimum active case sample size as determined in accordance with §275.11(b)(1).

(ii) FNS Regional Offices will conduct case record reviews to the extent necessary to determine the accuracy of the State agency's findings using the household's certification records and the State agency's QC records as the basis of determination. The FNS Regional Office may choose to verify any aspects of a State agency's QC findings through telephone interviews with participants or collateral contacts. In addition, the FNS Regional Office may choose to conduct field investigations to the extent necessary.

(iii) Upon the request of a State agency, the appropriate FNS Regional Office will assist the State agency in completing active cases reported as not completed due to household refusal to cooperate.

(iv) FNS will also review the State agency's sampling procedures, estimation procedures, and the State agency's system for data management to ensure compliance with §§275.11 and 275.12.

(v) FNS validation reviews of the State agency's active sample cases will be conducted on an ongoing basis as the State agency reports the findings for individual cases and supplies the necessary case records. FNS will begin the remainder of each State agency's validation review as soon as possible after the State agency has supplied the necessary information regarding its sample and review activity.

(2) *Underissuance error rate.* The validation review of each State agency's underissuance error rate shall occur as a result of the Federal validation of the State agency's payment error rate as outlined in paragraph (c)(1) of this section.

(3) *Negative case error rate.* The validation review of each State agency's negative case error rate shall consist of the following actions:

(i) FNS will select a subsample of a State agency's completed negative cases, as follows:

Average monthly reviewable negative caseload (N)	Federal subsample target (n')
5,000 and over	$n' = 160$
501 to 4,999	$n' = .0188 N + 65.7$
Under 500	$n' = 75$

(A) In the above formula, n' is the minimum number of Federal review sample cases which must be selected when conducting a validation review, except that FNS may select a lower number of sample cases if:

(1) The State agency does not report a change in sampling procedures associated with a revision in its required sample size within 10 days of effecting the change; and/or

(2) The State agency does not complete the number of case reviews specified in its approved sampling plan.

(B) The reduction in the number of Federal cases selected will be equal to the number of cases that would have been selected had the Federal sampling interval been applied to the State agency's shortfall in its required sample size. This number may not be exact due to random starts and rounding.

(C) In the above formula, N is the State agency's minimum negative case sample size as determined in accordance with §275.11(b)(2).

(ii) FNS Regional Offices will conduct case record reviews to the extent necessary to determine whether the household case record contained sufficient

documentation to justify the State agency's QC findings of the correctness of the State agency's decision to deny, suspend or terminate a household's participation.

(iii) FNS will also review each State agency's negative case sampling and review procedures against the provisions of §§275.11 and 275.13.

(iv) FNS will begin each State agency's negative sample case validation review as soon as possible after the State agency has supplied the necessary information, including case records and information regarding its sample and review activity.

(4) *Arbitration.* (i) Whenever the State agency disagrees with the FNS regional office concerning individual QC case findings and the appropriateness of actions taken to dispose of an individual case, the State agency may request that the dispute be arbitrated on a case-by-case basis by an FNS Arbitrator, subject to the following limitations.

(A) The State agency may only request arbitration when the State agency's and FNS regional office's findings or disposition of an individual QC case disagree.

(B) The arbitration review shall be limited to the point(s) within the Federal findings or disposition that the State agency disputes. However, if the arbitrator in the course of the review discovers a mathematical error in the computational sheet, the arbitration shall correct the error while calculating the allotment.

(ii) The FNS Arbitrator(s) shall be an individual or individuals who are not directly involved in the validation effort.

(iii) With the exception of the restrictions contained in paragraph (c)(4)(iii), for an arbitration request to be considered, it must be received by the appropriate FNS regional office within 20 calendar days of the date of receipt by the State agency of the regional office case findings. In the event the last day of this time period falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal or State holiday, the period shall run to the end of the next work day. The State agency shall be restricted in its eligibility to request arbitration of an individual case if that case was not disposed of and the findings reported in accordance with the timeframes specified in §275.21(b)(2). For each day late that a case was disposed of and the findings reported, the State agency shall have one less day to request arbitration of the case.

(iv) When the State agency requests arbitration, it shall submit all required documentation to the appropriate FNS regional office addressed to the attention of the FNS Arbitrator. The FNS regional office QC staff may submit an explanation of the Federal position regarding a case to the FNS Arbitrator.

(A) A complete request is one that contains all information necessary for the arbitrator to render an accurate, timely decision.

(B) If the State agency's request is not complete the arbitrator shall make a decision based solely on the available documents.

(v) The FNS Arbitrator shall have 20 calendar days from the date of receipt of a State agency's request for arbitration to review the case and make a decision.

(5) *Household cooperation.* Households are required to cooperate with Federal QC reviewers. Refusal to cooperate shall result in termination of the household's eligibility. The Federal reviewer shall follow the procedures in §275.12(g)(1)(ii) in order to determine whether a household is refusing to cooperate with the Federal QC reviewer. If the Federal reviewer determines that the household has refused to cooperate, as opposed to failed to cooperate, the household shall be reported to the State agency for termination of eligibility.

(d) *Assessment of Corrective Action.* (1) FNS will conduct will conduct a comprehensive annual assessment of a State agency's corrective action process by compiling all information relative to that State agency's corrective action efforts, including the State agency's system for data analysis and evaluation. The purpose of this assessment and review is to determine if: identified deficiencies are analyzed in terms of causes and magnitude and are properly included in either the State or Project Area/Management Unit corrective action plan; the State agency is implementing corrective actions according to the appropriate plan; target completion dates for reduction or elimination of deficiencies are being met; and, corrective actions are effective. In addition, FNS will examine the State agency's corrective action monitoring and evaluative efforts. The assessment of corrective action will be conducted at the State agency, project area, and local level offices, as necessary.

(2) In addition, FNS will conduct on-site reviews of selected corrective actions as frequently as considered necessary to ensure that State agencies are implementing proposed corrective actions within the timeframes specified in the State agency and/or Project Area/Management Unit corrective action plans and to determine the effectiveness of the corrective action. The on-site reviews will provide State agencies and FNS with a mechanism for early detection of problems in the corrective action process to minimize losses to the program, participants, or potential participants.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15898, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 237, 47 FR 57669, Dec. 28, 1982; Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6303, Feb. 17, 1984; Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3407, Feb. 4, 1987; 53 FR 1604, Jan. 21, 1988; 54 FR 23951, June 5, 1989; Amdt. 309, 55 FR 1672, Jan. 18, 1990; Amdt. 328, 56 FR 60051, Nov. 27, 1991; Amdt. 366, 62 FR 29658, June 2, 1997; Amdt. 373, 64 FR 38294, July 16, 1999; 68 FR 59523, Oct. 16, 2003; 75 FR 33436, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.4 Record retention.

(a) The State agency shall maintain Performance Reporting System records to permit ready access to, and use of, these records. Performance Reporting System records include information used in data analysis and evaluation, corrective action plans, corrective action monitoring records in addition to ME review records and QC review records as explained in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section. To be readily accessible, system records shall be retained and filed in an orderly fashion. Precautions should be taken to ensure that these records are retained without loss or destruction for the 3-year period required by these regulations. Information obtained on individual households for Performance Reporting System purposes shall be safeguarded in accordance with FNS policies on disclosure of information for SNAP.

(b) ME review records consist of thorough documentation of review findings, sources from which information was obtained, procedures used to review SNAP requirements including sampling techniques and lists, and ME review plans. The State agency must submit documented evidence of review findings to the FNS Regional Office upon request for purposes of evaluating State corrective action plans.

(c) QC review records consist of Forms FNS-380, Worksheet for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, FNS-380-1, Quality Control Review Schedule, FNS-245, Negative Quality Control Review Schedule; other materials supporting the review decision; sample lists; sampling frames; tabulation sheets; and reports of the results of all quality control reviews during each review period.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15898, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6304, Feb. 17, 1984; Amdt. 262, 49 FR 50597, Dec. 31, 1984; 75 FR 33436, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart B—Management Evaluation (ME) Reviews

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.5 Scope and purpose.

(a) *Objectives.* Each State agency shall ensure that project areas operate SNAP in accordance with the Act, regulations, and FNS-approved State Plan of Operation. To ensure compliance with program requirements, ME reviews shall be conducted to measure compliance with the provisions of FNS regulations. The objectives of an ME review are to:

(1) Provide a systematic method of monitoring and assessing program operations in the project areas;

(2) Provide a basis for project areas to improve and strengthen program operations by identifying and correcting deficiencies; and

(3) Provide a continuing flow of information between the project areas, the States, and FNS, necessary to develop the solutions to problems in program policy and procedures.

(b) *Frequency of review.* (1) State agencies shall conduct a review once every year for large project areas, once every two years for medium project areas, and once every three years for small project areas, unless an alternate schedule is approved by FNS. The most current and accurate information on active monthly caseload available at the time the review schedule is developed shall be used to determine project area size.

(2) A request for an alternate review schedule shall be submitted for approval in writing with a proposed schedule and justification. In any alternate schedule, each project area must be reviewed at least once every three years. Approval of an alternate schedule is dependent upon a State agency's justification that the project areas that will be reviewed less frequently than required in paragraph (b)(1) of this section are performing adequately and that previous reviews indicate few problems or that known problems have been corrected. FNS retains the authority for approving any alternate schedule and may approve a schedule in whole or in part. Until FNS approval of an alternate schedule is obtained, the State agency shall conduct reviews in accordance with paragraph (b)(1) of this section.

(3) FNS may require the State agency to conduct additional on-site reviews when a serious problem is detected in a project area which could result in a substantial dollar or service loss.

(4) State agencies shall also establish a system for monitoring those project areas' operations which experience a significant influx of migratory workers during such migrations. This requirement may be satisfied by either scheduling ME reviews to coincide with such migrations or by conducting special reviews. As part of the review the State agency shall contact local migrant councils, advocate groups, or other organizations in the project area to ensure that migrants are receiving the required services.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15900, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 262, 49 FR 50597, Dec. 31, 1984; Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3408, Feb. 4, 1987]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.6 Management units.

(a) *Establishment of management units.* For the purpose of ME reviews, State agencies may, subject to FNS approval, establish "management units" which are different from project areas designated by FNS for participation in the program. For example, State-established welfare districts, regions or other administrative structures within a State may be so designated. Management units can be designated as either large, medium, or small for purposes of frequency of review.

However, establishment of management units solely for the purpose of reducing the frequency of review will not be approved by FNS.

(b) *FNS approval of management units.* State agencies shall submit requests for establishment of management units to FNS, which shall have final authority for approval of such units as well as any changes in those previously approved by FNS.

(1) The following minimum criteria must be met prior to requesting FNS approval:

(i) The proposed management unit must correspond with existing State-established welfare districts, regions, or other administrative structures; and

(ii) The unit must have supervisory control over SNAP operations within that geographic area and have authority for implementation of corrective action.

(2) In submitting the request for FNS approval, the State agency shall include the following information regarding the proposed management unit:

(i) That the proposed management unit meets the minimum criteria described in paragraphs (b)(1) (i) and (ii) of this section;

(ii) Geographic coverage, including the names of the counties/project areas within the unit and the identification (district or region number) and location (city) of the office which has supervisory control over the management unit;

(iii) SNAP participation, including the number of persons and number of households;

(iv) The number of certification offices;

(v) The number of issuance units;

(vi) The dollar value of allotments issued as reflected in the most recent available data; and

(vii) Any other relevant information.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15900, Mar. 11, 1980; 45 FR 23637, Apr. 8, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3408, Feb. 4, 1987]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.7 Selection of sub-units for review.

(a) *Definition of sub-units.* Sub-units are the physical locations of organizational entities within project areas responsible for operating various aspects of SNAP and

include but are not limited to certification offices, call centers, and employment and training offices.

(b) *Selection of Sub-units for Review.* State agencies shall select a representative number of sub-units of each category for review in order to determine a project area's compliance with program standards.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15900, Mar. 11, 1980; 45 FR 23638, Apr. 8, 1980; 45 FR 46784, July 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3408, Feb. 4, 1987; 81 FR 2741, Jan. 19, 2016]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.8 Review coverage.

(a) During each review period, State agencies shall review the national target areas of program operation specified by FNS. FNS will notify State agencies of the minimum program areas to be reviewed at least 90 days before the beginning of each annual review period, which is the Federal fiscal year. FNS may add additional areas during the review period if deemed necessary. The FNS headquarters office will add national target areas during the review period only for deficiencies of national scope. State agencies have 60 days in which to establish a plan schedule for such reviews.

(b) State agencies shall be responsible for reviewing each national target area or other program requirement based upon the provisions of the regulations governing SNAP and the FNS-approved Plan of Operation. If FNS approves a State agency's request for a waiver from a program requirement, any different policy approved by FNS would also be reviewed. When, in the course of a review, a project area is found to be out of compliance with a given program requirement, the State agency shall identify the specifics of the problem including: the extent of the deficiency, the cause of the deficiency, and, as applicable, the specific procedural requirements the project area is misapplying.

[Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3408, Feb. 4, 1987, as amended by Amdt. 356, 59 FR 29713, June 9, 1994]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.9 Review process.

(a) *Review procedures.* State agencies shall review the program requirements specified for review in §275.8 of this part using procedures that are adequate to identify problems and the causes of those problems. As each project area's operational structure will differ, State agencies shall review each program requirement applicable to the project area in a manner which will best measure the project area's compliance with each program requirement.

(b) *ME review plan.* (1) State agencies shall develop a review plan prior to each ME review. This review plan shall specify whether each project area is large, medium, or small and shall contain:

(i) Identification of the project area to be reviewed, program areas to be reviewed, the dates the review will be conducted, and the period of time that the review will cover;

(ii) Information secured from the project area regarding its caseload and organization;

(iii) Identification of the sub-units selected for review and the techniques used to select them;

(iv) At State agency option it may also indicate whether the State agency is using the ME review process to perform non-discrimination reviews; and

(v) A description of the review method(s) the State agency plans to use for each program area being reviewed.

(2) ME review plans shall be maintained in an orderly fashion and be made available to FNS upon request.

(c) *Review methods.* (1) State agencies shall determine the method of reviewing the program requirements associated with each program area. For some areas of program operation it may be necessary to use more than one method of review to determine if the project area is in compliance with program requirements. The procedures used shall be adequate to identify any problems and the causes of those problems.

(2) State agencies shall ensure that the method used to review a program requirement does not bias the review findings. Bias can be introduced through leading questions, incomplete reviews, incorrect sampling techniques, etc.

(d) *Review worksheet.* (1) State agencies shall use a review worksheet to record all review findings. For each sub-unit reviewed the State agency shall, on the worksheet, identify:

(i) The sub-unit being reviewed;

(ii) Each program requirement reviewed in the sub-unit;

(iii) The method used to review each program requirement;

(iv) A description of any deficiency detected;

(v) The cause(s) of any deficiency detected, if known;

(vi) The number of casefiles and/or program records selected and examined within the sub-unit, identification of those selected (record case number, household name, etc.), the proportion which were not subject to review, as well as the method used to select the sample;

(vii) Where applicable, the numerical extent of any deficiency detected through examination of program records; and

(viii) Any pertinent comments concerning the sub-unit's operation.

(2) State agencies shall promptly forward review findings to the appropriate State office for analysis, evaluation, and corrective action planning. Review worksheets shall be retained in an orderly fashion and made available to FNS upon request.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15900, Mar. 11, 1980; 45 FR 25375, Apr. 15, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3409, Feb. 4, 1987; Amdt. 356, 59 FR 29713, June 9, 1994; 81 FR 2741, Jan. 19, 2016]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart C—Quality Control (QC) Reviews

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.10 Scope and purpose.

(a) As part of the Performance Reporting System, each State agency is responsible for conducting quality control reviews. For SNAP quality control reviews, a sample of households shall be selected from two different categories: Households which are participating in SNAP (called active cases) and households for which participation was denied, suspended or terminated (called negative cases). Reviews shall be conducted on active cases to determine if households are eligible and receiving the correct allotment of SNAP benefits. The determination of whether the household received the correct allotment will be made by comparing the eligibility data gathered during the review against the amount authorized on the master issuance file. Reviews of negative cases shall be conducted to determine whether the State agency's decision to deny, suspend or terminate the household, as of the review date, was correct. Quality control reviews measure the validity of SNAP cases at a given time (the review date) by reviewing against SNAP standards established in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the Regulations, taking into account any FNS authorized waivers to deviate from specific regulatory provisions. FNS and the State agency shall analyze findings of the reviews to determine the incidence and dollar amounts of errors, which will determine the State agency's liability for payment errors in accordance with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and to plan corrective action to reduce excessive levels of errors for any State agency.

(b) The objectives of quality control reviews are to provide:

(1) A systematic method of measuring the validity of the SNAP caseload;

(2) A basis for determining error rates;

(3) A timely continuous flow of information on which to base corrective action at all levels of administration; and

(4) A basis for establishing State agency liability for errors that exceed the National performance measure.

(c) The review process is the activity necessary to complete reviews and document findings of all cases selected in the sample for quality control reviews. The review process shall consist of:

(1) Case assignment and completion monitoring;

(2) Case reviews;

(3) Supervisory review of completed worksheets and schedules; and

(4) Transmission of completed worksheets and schedules to the State agency for centralized data compilation and analysis.

[Amdt. 149, 44 FR 45893, Aug. 3, 1979, as amended by Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6304, Feb. 17, 1984; 54 FR 7016, Feb. 15, 1989; Amdt. 328, 56 FR 60051, Nov. 27, 1991; Amdt. 373, 64 FR 38294, July 16, 1999; 75 FR 33436, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.11 Sampling.

(a) *Sampling plan.* Each State agency shall develop a quality control sampling plan which demonstrates the integrity of its sampling procedures.

(1) *Content.* The sampling plan shall include a complete description of the frame, the method of sample selection, and methods for estimating characteristics of the population and their sampling errors. The description of the sample frames shall include: source, availability, accuracy, completeness, components, location, form, frequency of updates, deletion of cases not subject to review, and structure. The description of the methods of sample selection shall include procedures for: estimating caseload size, overpull, computation of sampling intervals and random starts (if any), stratification or clustering (if any), identifying sample cases, correcting over- or undersampling, and monitoring sample selection and assignment. A time schedule for each step in the sampling procedures shall be included.

(2) *Criteria.* Sampling plans proposing non-proportional or other alternative designs shall document compliance with the approval criteria in paragraph (b)(4) of this section. All sampling plans shall:

(i) Conform to principles of probability sampling;

(ii) Specify and explain the basis for the sample sizes chosen by the State agency;

(iii) If the State agency has chosen an active sample size as specified in paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of this section, include a statement that, whether or not the sample size is increased to reflect an increase in participation as discussed in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, the State agency will not use the size of the sample chosen as a basis for challenging the resulting error rates.

(iv) If the State agency has chosen a negative sample size as specified in paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section, include a statement that, whether or not the sample size is increased to reflect an increase in negative actions as discussed in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, the State agency will not use the size of the sample chosen as a basis for challenging the resulting error rates.

(3) *Design.* FNS generally recommends a systematic sample design for both active and negative samples because of its relative ease to administer, its validity, and because it yields a sample proportional to variations in the caseload over the course of the annual review period. (To obtain a systematic sample, a State agency would select every k th case after a random start between 1 and k . The value of k is dependent upon the estimated size of the universe and the sample size.) A State agency may, however, develop an alternative sampling design better suited for its particular situation. Whatever the design, it must conform to commonly acceptable statistical theory and application (see paragraph (b)(4) of this section).

(4) *FNS review and approval.* The State agency shall submit its sampling plan to FNS for approval as a part of its State Plan of Operation in accordance with §272.2(e)(4). In addition, all sampling procedures used by the State agency, including frame composition, construction, and content shall be fully documented and available for review by FNS.

(b) *Sample size.* There are two samples for the SNAP quality control review process, an active case sample and a negative case sample. The size of both these samples is based on the State agency's average monthly caseload during the annual review period. Costs associated with a State agency's sample sizes are reimbursable as specified in §277.4.

(1) *Active cases.* (i) All active cases shall be selected in accordance with standard procedures, and the review findings shall be included in the calculation of the State agency's payment error rate.

(ii) Unless a State agency chooses to select and review a number of active cases determined by the formulas provided in paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of this section and has included in its sampling plan the reliability certification required by paragraph (a)(2)(iii) of this section, the minimum number of active cases to be selected and reviewed by a State agency during each annual review period shall be determined as follows:

Average monthly reviewable caseload (N)	Minimum annual sample size (n)
60,000 and over	n = 2400
10,000 to 59,999	n = 300 + [0.042(N-10,000)]
Under 10,000	n = 300

(iii) A State agency which includes in its sampling plan the statement required by paragraph (a)(2)(iii) of this section may determine the minimum number of active cases to be selected and reviewed during each annual review period as follows:

Average monthly reviewable caseload (N)	Minimum annual sample size (n)
60,000 and over	n = 1020
12,942 to 59,999	n = 300 + [0.0153(N-12,941)]
Under 12,942	n = 300

(iv) In the formulas in paragraphs (b)(1)(ii) and (iii) of this section n is the required active case sample size. This is the minimum number of active cases subject to review which must be selected each review period. Also in the formulas, N is the average monthly participating caseload subject to quality control review (i.e., households which are included in the active universe defined in paragraph (e) (1) of this section) during the annual review period.

(2) *Negative cases.* (i) Unless a State agency chooses to select and review a number of negative cases determined by the formulas provided in paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section and has included in its sampling plan the reliability certification required by paragraph (a)(2)(iv) of this section, the minimum number of negative cases to be selected and reviewed by a State agency during each annual review period shall be determined as follows:

Average monthly reviewable negative caseload (N)	Minimum annual sample size (n)
5,000 and over	n = 800
500 to 4,999	n = 150 + [0.144(N-500)]
Under 500	n = 150

(ii) A State agency which includes in its sampling plan the statement required by paragraph (a)(2)(iv) of this section may determine the minimum number of negative cases to be selected and reviewed during each annual review period as follows:

Average monthly reviewable negative caseload (N)	Minimum annual sample size (n)
5,000 and over	n = 680

684 to 4,999	$n = 150 + [0.1224(N-683)]$
Under 684	$n = 150$

(iii) In the formulas in this paragraph (b)(2), n is the required negative sample size. This is the minimum number of negative cases subject to review which must be selected each review period.

(iv) In the formulas in this paragraph (b)(2), N is the average monthly number of negative cases which are subject to quality control review (i.e., households which are part of the negative universe defined in paragraph (e)(2) of this section) during the annual review period.

(3) *Unanticipated changes.* Since the average monthly caseloads (both active and negative) must be estimated at the beginning of each annual review period, unanticipated changes can result in the need for adjustments to the sample size. FNS shall not penalize a State agency that does not adjust its sample size if the actual caseload during a review period is less than 20 percent larger than the estimated caseload initially used to determine sample size. If the actual caseload is more than 20 percent larger than the estimated caseload, the larger sample size appropriate for the actual caseload will be used in computing the sample completion rate.

(4) *Alternative designs.* The active and negative sample size determinations assume that State agencies will use a systematic or simple random sample design. State agencies able to obtain results of equivalent reliability with smaller samples and appropriate design may use an alternative design with FNS approval. To receive FNS approval, proposals for any type of alternative design must:

(i) Demonstrate that the alternative design provides payment error rate estimates with equal-or-better predicted precision than would be obtained had the State agency reviewed simple random samples of the sizes specified in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section.

(ii) Describe all weighting, and estimation procedures if the sample design is non-self-weighted, or uses a sampling technique other than systematic sampling.

(iii) Demonstrate that self-weighting is actually achieved in sample designs claimed to be self-weighting.

(c) *Sample selection.* The selection of cases for quality control review shall be made separately for active and negative cases each month during the annual review period. Each month each State agency shall select for review approximately one-twelfth of its required sample, unless FNS has approved other numbers of cases specified in the sampling plan.

(1) *Substitutions.* Once a household has been identified for inclusion in the sample by a predesigned sampling procedure, substitutions are not acceptable. An

active case must be reviewed each time it is selected for the sample. If a household is selected more than once for the negative sample as the result of separate and distinct instances of denial, suspension or termination, it shall be reviewed each time.

(2) *Corrections.* Excessive undersampling must be corrected during the annual review period. Excessive oversampling may be corrected at the State agency's option. Cases which are dropped to compensate for oversampling shall be reported as not subject to review. Because corrections must not bias the sample results, cases which are dropped to compensate for oversampling must comprise a random subsample of all cases selected (including those completed, not completed, and not subject to review). Cases which are added to the sample to compensate for undersampling must be randomly selected from the entire frame in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraphs (b), (c)(1), and (e) of this section. All sample adjustments must be fully documented and available for review by FNS.

(d) *Required sample size.* A State agency's required sample size is the larger of either the number of cases selected which are subject to review or the number of cases chosen for selection and review according to paragraph (b) of this section.

(e) *Sample frame.* The State agency shall select cases for quality control review from a sample frame. The choice of a sampling frame shall depend upon the criteria of timeliness, completeness, accuracy, and administrative burden. Complete coverage of the sample universes, as defined in paragraph (f) of this section, must be assured so that every household subject to quality control review has an equal or known chance of being selected in the sample. Since the SNAP quality control review process requires an active and negative sample, two corresponding sample frames are also required.

(1) *Active cases.* The frame for active cases shall list all households which were: (i) Certified prior to, or during, the sample month; and (ii) issued benefits for the sample month, except for those households excluded from the universe in paragraph (f)(1) of this section. State agencies may elect to use either a list of certified eligible households or a list of households issued an allotment. If the State agency uses a list of certified eligible households, those households which are issued benefits for the sample month after the frame has been compiled shall be included in a supplemental list. If the State agency uses an issuance list, the State agency shall ensure that the list includes those households which do not actually receive an allotment because the entire amount is recovered for repayment of an overissuance in accordance with the allotment reduction procedures in §273.18.

(2) *Negative cases.* The frame for negative cases shall list:

(i) All actions to deny an application in the sample month except those excluded from the universe in paragraph (f)(2) of this section. If a household is subject to

more than one denial action in a single sample month, each action shall be listed separately in the sample frame; and

(ii) All actions to suspend or terminate a household in the sample month except those excluded from the universe in paragraph (f)(2) of this section. Each action to suspend or terminate a household in the sample month shall be listed separately in the sample frame.

(3) *Unwanted cases.* A frame may include cases for which information is not desired (e.g., households which have been certified but did not actually participate during the sample month). When such cases cannot be eliminated from the frame beforehand and are selected for the sample, they must be accounted for and reported as being not subject to review in accordance with the provisions in §§275.12(g) and 275.13(e).

(f) *Sample universe.* The State agency shall ensure that its active and negative case frames accurately reflect their sample universes. There are two sample universes for the SNAP quality control review process, an active case universe and a negative case universe. The exceptions noted below for both universes are households not usually amenable to quality control review.

(1) *Active cases.* The universe for active cases shall include all households certified prior to, or during, the sample month and receiving SNAP benefits for the sample month, except for the following:

(i) A household in which all the members had died or had moved out of the State before the review could be undertaken or completed;

(ii) A household receiving SNAP benefits under a disaster certification authorized by FNS;

(iii) A household which is under investigation for intentional Program violation, including a household with a pending administrative disqualification hearing;

(iv) A household appealing an adverse action when the review date falls within the time period covered by continued participation pending the hearing; or

(v) A household receiving restored benefits in accordance with §273.17 but not participating based upon an approved application. Other households excluded from the active case universe during the review process are identified in §275.12(g).

(2) *Negative cases.* The universe for negative cases shall include all actions taken to deny, suspend, or terminate a household in the sample month except the following:

(i) A household which had its case closed due to expiration of the certification period;

(ii) A household denied SNAP benefits under a disaster certification authorized by FNS;

(iii) A household which withdrew an application prior to the agency's determination;

(iv) A household which is under active investigation for Intentional Program Violation;

(v) A household which has been sent a notice of pending status but which was not actually denied participation;

(vi) A household which was terminated for failure to file a complete monthly report by the extended filing date, but reinstated when it subsequently filed the complete report before the end of the issuance month;

(vii) Other households excluded from the negative case universe during the review process as identified in §275.13(e).

(g) *Demonstration projects/SSA processing.* Households correctly classified for participation under the rules of an FNS-authorized demonstration project which FNS determines to significantly modify the rules for determining households' eligibility or allotment level, and households participating based upon an application processed by Social Security Administration personnel shall be included in the selection and review process. They shall be included in the universe for calculating sample sizes and included in the sample frames for sample selection as specified in paragraphs (b) through (e) of this section. In addition, they shall be included in the quality control review reports as specified in §275.21(e) and included in the calculation of a State agency's completion rate as specified in §275.23(b)(2). The review of these cases shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions specified in §§275.12(h) and 275.13(f). FNS shall establish on an individual demonstration project basis whether the results of the reviews of active and negative demonstration project cases shall be included or excluded from the determination of State agencies' error rates as described in §275.23(b). Cases processed by SSA in accordance with §273.2(k) of this chapter, except demonstration project cases, shall be excluded from the determination of State agencies' error rates. FNS shall establish on an individual project basis whether demonstration project cases processed by SSA shall be included or excluded from the determination of State agencies' error rates.

[Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6304, Feb. 17, 1984; 49 FR 14495, Apr. 12, 1984, as amended by Amdt. 262, 49 FR 50598, Dec. 31, 1984; Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3409, Feb. 4, 1987; Amdt. 328, 56 FR 60051, Nov. 27, 1991; Amdt. 366, 62 FR 29658, June 2, 1997; Amdt. 373, 64 FR 38295, July 16, 1999; 68 FR 59523, Oct. 16, 2003; 75 FR 33436, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.12 Review of active cases.

(a) *General.* A sample of households which were certified prior to, or during, the sample month and issued SNAP benefits for the sample month shall be selected for quality control review. These active cases shall be reviewed to determine if the household is eligible and, if eligible, whether the household is receiving the correct allotment. The determination of a household's eligibility shall be based on an examination and verification of all elements of eligibility (i.e., basic program requirements, resources, income, and deductions). The elements of eligibility are specified in §§273.1 and 273.3 through 273.9 of this chapter. The verified circumstances and the resulting benefit level determined by the quality control review shall be compared to the benefits authorized by the State agency as of the review date. When changes in household circumstances occur, the reviewer shall determine whether the changes were reported by the participant and handled by the agency in accordance with the rules set forth in §§273.12, 273.13 and 273.21 of this chapter, as appropriate. For active cases, the review date shall always fall within the sample month, either the first day of a calendar or fiscal month or the day of certification, whichever is later. The review of active cases shall include: a household case record review; a field investigation, except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section; the identification of any variances; an error analysis; and the reporting of review findings.

(b) *Household case record review.* The reviewer shall examine the household case record to identify the specific facts relating to the household's eligibility and basis of issuance. If the reviewer is unable to locate the household case record, the reviewer shall identify as many of the pertinent facts as possible from the household issuance record. The case record review shall include all information applicable to the case as of the review month, including the application and worksheet in effect as of the review date. Documentation contained in the case record can be used as verification if it is not subject to change and applies to the sample month. If during the case record review the reviewer can determine and verify the household's ineligibility the review can be terminated at that point, provided that if the determination is based on information not obtained from the household then the correctness of that information must be confirmed as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section. The reviewer shall utilize information obtained through the case record review to complete column (2) of the Form FNS-380, and to tentatively plan the content of the field investigation.

(c) *Field investigation.* A full field investigation shall be conducted for all active cases selected in the sample month except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section. A full field investigation shall include a review of any information pertinent to a particular case which is available through the State Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) as specified in §272.8 of this chapter. If during the field investigation the reviewer determines and verifies the household's ineligibility, the review can be terminated at that point, provided that if the determination is based on information not obtained from the household then the correctness of that information

must be confirmed as provided in paragraph (c)(2) of this section. In Alaska an exception to this requirement can be made in those isolated areas not reachable by regularly scheduled commercial air service, automobile, or other public transportation provided one fully documented attempt to contact the household has been made. Such cases may be completed through casefile review and collateral contact. The field investigation will include interviews with the head of household, spouse, or authorized representative; contact with collateral sources of information; and any other materials and activity pertinent to the review of the case. The scope of the review shall not extend beyond the examination of household circumstances which directly relate to the determination of household eligibility and basis of issuance status. The reviewer shall utilize information obtained through the field investigation to complete column (3) of the Form FNS-380.

(1) *Personal interviews.* Personal interviews shall be conducted in a manner that respects the rights, privacy, and dignity of the participants. Prior to conducting the personal interview, the reviewer shall notify the household that it has been selected, as part of an ongoing review process, for review by quality control, and that a personal face-to-face interview will be conducted in the future. The method of notifying the household and the specificity of the notification shall be determined by the State agency, in accordance with applicable State and Federal laws. The personal interview may take place at the participant's home, at an appropriate State agency certification office, or at a mutually agreed upon alternative location. The State agency shall determine the best location for the interview to take place, but would be subject to the same provisions as those regarding certification interviews at §273.2(e)(2) of this chapter. Those regulations provide that an office interview must be waived under certain hardship conditions. Under such hardship conditions the quality control reviewer shall either conduct the personal interview with the participant's authorized representative, if one has been appointed by the household, or with the participant in the participant's home. Except in Alaska, when an exception to the field investigation is made in accordance with this section, the interview with the participant may not be conducted by phone. During the personal interview with the participant, the reviewer shall:

(i) Explore with the head of the household, spouse, authorized representative, or any other responsible household member, household circumstances as they affect each factor of eligibility and basis of issuance;

(ii) Establish the composition of the household;

(iii) Review the documentary evidence in the household's possession and secure information about collateral sources of verification; and

(iv) Elicit from the participant names of collateral contacts. The reviewer shall use, but not be limited to, these designated collateral contacts. If required by the State, the reviewer shall obtain consent from the head of the household to secure collateral information. If the participant refuses to sign the release of information

form, the reviewer shall explain fully the consequences of this refusal to cooperate (as contained in paragraph (g)(1)(ii) of this section), and continue the review to the fullest extent possible.

(2) *Collateral contacts.* The reviewer shall obtain verification from collateral contacts in all instances when adequate documentation was not available from the participant. This second party verification shall cover each element of eligibility as it affects the household's eligibility and allotment. The reviewer shall make every effort to use the most reliable second party verification available (for example, banks, payroll listings, etc.), in accordance with FNS guidelines, and shall thoroughly document all verification obtained. If any information obtained by the QC reviewer differs from that given by the participant, then the reviewer shall resolve the differences to determine which information is correct before an error determination is made. The manner in which the conflicting information is resolved shall include recontacting the participant unless the participant cannot be reached. When resolving conflicting information reviewers shall use their best judgement based on the most reliable data available and shall document how the differences were resolved.

(d) *Variance identification.* The reviewer shall identify any element of a basic program requirement or the basis of issuance which varies (i.e., information from review findings which indicates that policy was applied incorrectly and/or information verified as of the review date that differs from that used at the most recent certification action). For each element that varies, the reviewer shall determine whether the variance was State agency or participant caused. The results of these determinations shall be coded and recorded in column (4) of the Form FNS-380.

(1) *Variances included in error analysis.* Except for those variances in an element resulting from one of the situations described in paragraph (d)(2) of this section, any variance involving an element of eligibility or basis of issuance shall be included in the error analysis. Such variances shall include but not be limited to those resulting from a State agency's failure to take the disqualification action related to SSN's specified in §273.6(c) of this chapter, and related to work requirements, specified in §273.7(f) of this chapter.

(2) *Variances excluded from error analysis.* The following variances shall be excluded from the determination of a household's eligibility and basis of issuance for the sample month:

(i) Any variance resulting from the nonverified portion of a household's gross nonexempt income where there is conclusive documentation (a listing of what attempts were made to verify and why they were unsuccessful) that such income could not be verified at the time of certification because the source of income would not cooperate in providing verification and no other sources of verification were available. If there is no conclusive documentation as explained above, then the

reviewer shall not exclude any resulting variance from the error determination. This follows certification policy outlined in §273.2(f)(1)(i) of this chapter.

(ii) Any variance in cases certified under expedited certification procedures resulting from postponed verification of an element of eligibility as allowed under §273.2(i)(4)(i) of this chapter. Verification of gross income, deductions, resources, household composition, alien status, or tax dependency may be postponed for cases eligible for expedited certification. However, if a case certified under expedited procedures contains a variance as a result of a residency deficiency, a mistake in the basis of issuance computation, a mistake in participant identification, or incorrect expedited income accounting, the variance shall be included in the error determination. This exclusion shall only apply to those cases which are selected for QC review in the first month of participation under expedited certification.

(iii) Any variance subsequent to certification in an element of eligibility or basis of issuance which was not reported and was not required to have been reported as of the review date. The elements participants are required to report and the time requirements for reporting are specified in §§273.12(a) and 273.21(h) and (i) of this chapter, as appropriate. If, however, a change in any element is reported, and the State agency fails to act in accordance with §§273.12(c) and 273.21(j) of this chapter, as appropriate, any resulting variance shall be included in the error determination.

(iv) Any variance in deductible expenses which was not provided for in determining a household's benefit level in accordance with §273.2(f)(3)(i)(B) of this chapter. This provision allows households to have their benefit level determined without providing for a claimed expense when the expense is questionable and obtaining verification may delay certification. If such a household subsequently provides the needed verification for the claimed expense and the State agency does not redetermine the household's benefits in accordance with §273.12(c) of this chapter, any resulting variance shall be included in the error determination.

(v) Any variance resulting from use by the State agency of information concerning households or individuals from an appropriate Federal source, provided that such information is correctly processed by the State agency. An appropriate Federal source is one which verifies: Income that it provides directly to the household; deductible expenses for which it directly bills the household; or other household circumstances which it is responsible for defining or establishing. To meet the provisions for correct processing, the eligibility worker must have appropriately acted on timely information. In order to be timely, information must be the most current that was available to the State agency at the time of the eligibility worker's action.

(vi) Two variances relating to the Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS) Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) Program.

(A) A variance based on a verification of alien documentation by INS. The reviewer shall exclude such variance only if the State agency properly used SAVE and the State agency provides the reviewer with:

(1) The alien's name;

(2) The alien's status; and

(3) Either the Alien Status Verification Index (ASVI) Query Verification Number or the INS Form G-845, as annotated by INS.

(B) A variance based on the State agency's wait for the response of INS to the State agency's request for official verification of the alien's documentation. The reviewer shall exclude such variance only if the State agency properly used SAVE and the State agency provides the reviewer with either:

(1) The date of request, if the State agency was waiting for an automated response; or

(2) A copy of the completed Form G-845, if the State agency was waiting for secondary verification from INS.

(vii) Subject to the limitations provided in paragraphs (d)(2)(vii)(A) through (d)(2)(vii)(F) of this section, any variance resulting from application of a new Program regulation or implementing memorandum of a mandatory or optional change in Federal law that occurs during the first 120 days from the required implementation date. The variance exclusion shall apply to any action taken on a case directly related to implementation of a covered provision during the 120-day exclusionary period until the case is required to be recertified or acted upon for some other reason.

(A) When a regulation allows a State agency an option to implement prior to the required implementation date, the date on which the State agency chooses to implement may, at the option of the State, be considered to be the required implementation date for purposes of this provision. The exclusion period would be adjusted to begin with this date and end on the 120th day that follows. States choosing to implement prior to the required implementation date must notify the appropriate FNS Regional Office, in writing, prior to implementation that they wish the 120 day variance exclusion to commence with actual implementation. Absent such notification, the exclusionary period will commence with the required implementation date.

(B) A State agency shall not exclude variances which occur prior to the States implementation.

(C) A State agency which did not implement until after the exclusion period shall not exclude variances under this provision.

(D) Regardless of when the State agency actually implemented the regulation, the variance exclusion period shall end on the 120th day following the required implementation date, including the required implementation date defined in paragraph (d)(2)(vii)(A) of this section.

(E) For purposes of this provision, implementation occurs on the effective date of State agency's written statewide notification to its eligibility workers.

(F) This variance exclusion applies to changes occasioned by final regulations or interim regulations. In the case of a final regulation issued following an interim regulation, the exclusion applies only to significant changes made to the earlier interim regulation. A significant change is one which the final regulation requires the State agency to implement on or after publication of a final rule.

(viii) Any variance resulting from incorrect written policy that a State agency acts on that is provided by a Departmental employee authorized to issue SNAP policy and that the State agency correctly applies. For purposes of this provision, written Federal policy is that which is issued in regulations, notices, handbooks, category three and four Policy Memoranda under the Policy Interpretation Response System, and regional policy memoranda issued pursuant to these. Written Federal policy is also a letter from the Food and Nutrition Service to a State agency which contains comments on the State agency's SNAP manual or instructions.

(ix) Any variance in a child support deduction which was the result of an unreported change subsequent to the most recent certification action shall be excluded from the error determination.

(3) *Other findings.* Findings other than variances made during the review which are pertinent to the SNAP household or the case record may be acted on at the discretion of the State agency. Examples of such findings are: an incorrect age of a household member which is unrelated to an element of eligibility; an overdue subsequent certification; no current application on file; insufficient documentation; incorrect application of the verification requirements specified in part 273 of this chapter; and deficiencies in work registration procedural requirements. Such deficiencies include: inadequate documentation of each household member's exempt status; work registration form for each nonexempt household member not completed at the time of application and every six months thereafter; and the household not advised of its responsibility to report any changes in the exempt status of any household member.

(e) *Error analysis.* The reviewer shall analyze all appropriate variances in completed cases, in accordance with paragraph (d) of this section, which are based upon verified information and determine whether such cases are either eligible, eligible with a basis of issuance error, or ineligible. The review of an active case determined ineligible shall be considered completed at the point of the ineligibility determination. For households determined eligible, the review shall be completed to

the point where the correctness of the basis of issuance is determined, except in the situations outlined in paragraph (g) of this section. In the event that a review is conducted of a household which is receiving restored or retroactive benefits for the sample month, the portion of the allotment which is the restored or retroactive benefit shall be excluded from the determination of the household's eligibility and/or basis of issuance. A SNAP case in which a household member(s) receives public assistance shall be reviewed in the same manner as all other SNAP cases, using income as received. The determination of a household's eligibility and the correctness of the basis of issuance shall be determined based on data entered on the computation sheet as well as other information documented on other portions of the Form FNS-380, as appropriate.

(f) *Reporting of review findings.* All information verified to be incorrect during the review of an active case shall be reported to the State agency for appropriate action on an individual case basis. This includes information on all variances in elements of eligibility and basis of issuance in both error and nonerror cases. In addition, the reviewer shall report the review findings on the Form FNS-380-1, in accordance with the following procedures:

(1) *Eligibility errors.* If the reviewer determines that a case is ineligible, the occurrence and the total allotment issued in the sample month shall be coded and reported. Whenever a case contains a variance in an element which results in an ineligibility determination and there are also variances in elements which would cause a basis of issuance error, the case shall be treated as an eligibility error. The reviewer shall also code and report any variances that directly contributed to the error determination. In addition, if the State agency has chosen to report information on all variances in elements of eligibility and basis of issuance, the reviewer shall code and report any other such variances which were discovered and verified during the course of the review.

(2) *Basis of issuance of errors.* If the reviewer determines that SNAP allotments were either overissued or underissued to eligible households in the sample month, the State agency shall code and report any variances that directly contributed to the error determination that were discovered and verified during the course of the review. For fiscal year 2014, only variances that exceed \$37.00 (the threshold) shall be included in the calculation of the underissuance error rate, overissuance error rate, and payment error. For fiscal years 2015 and thereafter, this QC tolerance level shall be adjusted annually by the percentage by which the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) for the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia is adjusted. If the State agency has chosen to report information on all variances in elements of eligibility and basis of issuance, the reviewer shall code and report any other such variances that were discovered and verified during the course of the review.

(g) *Disposition of case reviews.* Each case selected in the sample of active cases must be accounted for by classifying it as completed, not completed, or not

subject to review. These case dispositions shall be coded and recorded on the Form FNS-380-1.

(1) *Cases reported as not complete.* Active cases shall be reported as not completed if the household case record cannot be located and the household itself is not subsequently located; if the household case record is located but the household cannot be located unless the reviewer attempts to locate the household as specified in this paragraph; or if the household refuses to cooperate, as discussed in this paragraph. All cases reported as not complete shall be reported to the State agency for appropriate action on an individual case basis. Without FNS approval, no active case shall be reported as not completed solely because the State agency was unable to process the case review in time for it to be reported in accordance with the timeframes specified in §275.21(b)(2).

(i) If the reviewer is unable to locate the participant either at the address indicated in the case record or in the issuance record and the State agency is not otherwise aware of the participant's current address, the reviewer shall attempt to locate the household by contacting at least two sources which the State agency determines are most likely to be able to inform the reviewer of the household's current address. Such sources include but are not limited to:

(A) The local office of the U.S. Postal Service;

(B) The State Motor Vehicle Department;

(C) The owner or property manager of the residence at the address in the case record; and

(D) Any other appropriate sources based on information contained in the case record, such as public utility companies, telephone company, employers, or relatives. Once the reviewer has attempted to locate the household and has documented the response of each source contacted, if the household still cannot be located and the State agency has documented evidence that the household did actually exist, the State agency shall report the active case as not subject to review. In these situations documented evidence shall be considered adequate if it either documents two different elements of eligibility or basis of issuance, such as a copy of a birth certificate for age and pay status for income; or documents the statement of a collateral contact indicating that the household did exist. FNS Regional Offices will monitor the results of the contacts which State agencies make in attempting to locate households.

(ii) If a household refuses to cooperate with the quality control reviewer and the State agency has taken other administrative steps to obtain that cooperation without obtaining it, the household shall be notified of the penalties for refusing to cooperate with respect to termination and reapplication, and of the possibility that its case will be referred for investigation for willful misrepresentation. If a household refuses to

cooperate after such notice, the reviewer must- attempt to complete the case and shall report the household's refusal to the State agency for termination of its participation without regard for the outcome of that attempt. For a determination of refusal to be made, the household must be able to cooperate, but clearly demonstrate that it will not take actions that it can take and that are required to complete the quality control review process. In certain circumstances, the household may demonstrate that it is unwilling to cooperate by not taking actions after having been given every reasonable opportunity to do so, even though the household or its members do not state that the household refuses to cooperate. Instances where the household's unwillingness to cooperate in completing a quality control review has the effect of a refusal to cooperate shall include the following:

(A) The household does not respond to a letter from the reviewer sent Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested within 30 days of the date of receipt;

(B) The household does not attend an agreed upon interview with the reviewer and then does not contact the reviewer within 10 days of the date of the scheduled interview to reschedule the interview; or

(C) The household does not return a signed release of information statement to the reviewer within 10 days of either agreeing to do so or receiving a request from the reviewer sent Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested. However, in these and other situations, if there is any question as to whether the household has merely failed to cooperate, as opposed to refused to cooperate, the household shall not be reported to the State agency for termination.

(2) *Cases not subject to review.* Active cases which are not subject to review, if they have not been eliminated in the sampling process, shall be eliminated in the review process. In addition to cases listed in §275.11(f)(1), these shall include:

(i) Death of all members of a household if they died before the review could be undertaken or completed;

(ii) The household moved out of State before the review could be undertaken or completed;

(iii) The household, at the time of the review, is under active investigation for intentional SNAP violation, including a household with a pending administrative disqualification hearing;

(iv) A household receiving restored benefits in accordance with §273.17 of this chapter but not participating based upon an approved application for the sample month;

(v) A household dropped as a result of correction for oversampling;

(vi) A household participating under disaster certification authorized by FNS for a natural disaster;

(vii) A case incorrectly listed in the active frame;

(viii) A household appealing an adverse action when the review date falls within the time period covered by continued participation pending the hearing;

(ix) A household that did not receive benefits for the sample month; or

(x) A household that still cannot be located after the reviewer has attempted to locate it in accordance with paragraph (g)(1)(i) of this section.

(h) *Demonstration projects/SSA processing.* Households correctly classified for participation under the rules of a demonstration project which establishes new FNS-authorized eligibility criteria or modifies the rules for determining households' eligibility or allotment level shall be reviewed following standard procedures provided that FNS does not modify these procedures to reflect modifications in the treatment of elements of eligibility or basis of issuance in the case of a demonstration project. If FNS determines that information obtained from these cases would not be useful, then they may be excluded from review. A household whose most recent application for participation was processed by Social Security Administration personnel shall be reviewed following standard procedures. This includes applications for recertification, provided such an application is processed by the SSA as allowed in §273.2(k)(2)(ii) of this chapter.

[Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6306, Feb. 17, 1984; 49 FR 14495, Apr. 12, 1984]

EDITORIAL NOTE: For FEDERAL REGISTER citations affecting §275.12, see the List of CFR Sections Affected, which appears in the Finding Aids section of the printed volume and at www.govinfo.gov.

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.13 Review of negative cases.

(a) *General.* A sample of actions to deny applications, or suspend or terminate a household in the sample month shall be selected for quality control review. These negative actions shall be reviewed to determine whether the State agency's decision to deny, suspend, or terminate the household, as of the review date, was correct. Depending on the characteristics of individual State systems, the review date for negative cases could be the date of the agency's decision to deny, suspend, or terminate program benefits, the date on which the decision is entered into the computer system, or the date of the notice to the client. State agencies must consistently apply the same definition for review date to all sample cases of the same classification. The review of negative cases shall include a household case record review; an error analysis; and the reporting of review findings, including

procedural problems with the action regardless of the validity of the decision to deny, suspend or terminate. In certain instances, contact with the household or a collateral contact may be permitted.

(b) *Household case record review.* The reviewer shall examine the household case record and verify through documentation in it whether the reason given for the denial, suspension, or termination is correct. Through the review of the household case record, the reviewer shall complete the household case record sections and document the reasons for denial, suspension or termination on the Negative Quality Control Review Schedule, Form FNS-245.

(c) *Error analysis.* (1) A negative case shall be considered valid if the reviewer is able to verify through documentation in the household case record that a household was correctly denied, suspended, or terminated from the program in accordance with the reason for the action given by the State agency in the notice. Whenever the reviewer is unable to verify the correctness of the State agency's decision to deny, suspend, or terminate a household's participation through such documentation, the QC reviewer may contact the household or a collateral contact to verify the correctness of the specific negative action under review. If the reviewer is unable to verify the correctness of the State agency's decision to deny, suspend, or terminate the case for the specific reason given for the action, the negative case shall be considered invalid.

(2) The reviewer shall exclude a variance when the State agency erroneously denied, suspended or terminated a household's participation based on an erroneous verification of alien documentation by the Immigration and Nationalization Services (INS) Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) Program. The reviewer shall exclude the variance only if the State agency properly used SAVE, and the State agency provides the reviewer with:

(i) The alien's name;

(ii) The alien's status; and

(iii) Either the Alien Status Verification Index (ASVI) Query Verification Number or the INS Form G-845, as annotated by INS.

(d) *Reporting of review findings.* When a negative case is incorrect, this information shall be reported to the State agency for appropriate action on an individual case basis, such as recomputation of the allotment and restoration of lost benefits. In addition, the reviewer shall code and record the error determination on the Negative Quality Control Review Schedule, Form FNS-245.

(e) *Disposition of case review.* Each case selected in the sample of negative cases must be accounted for by classifying it as completed, not completed, or not

subject to review. These case dispositions shall be coded and recorded on the Negative Quality Control Review Schedule, Form FNS-245.

(1) *Cases reported as not complete.* Negative cases shall be reported as not completed if the reviewer, after all reasonable efforts, is unable to locate the case record. In no event, however, shall any negative case be reported as not completed solely because the State agency was unable to process the case review in time for it to be reported in accordance with the timeframes specified in §275.21(b)(2), without prior FNS approval. This information shall be reported to the State agency for appropriate action on an individual case basis.

(2) *Cases not subject to review.* Negative cases which are not subject to review, if they have not been eliminated in the sampling process, shall be eliminated in the review process. In addition to cases listed in §275.11(f)(2), these shall include:

(i) A household which was dropped as a result of a correction for oversampling;

(ii) A household which was listed incorrectly in the negative frame.

(f) *Demonstration projects/SSA processing.* A household whose application has been denied or whose participation has been suspended or terminated under the rules of an FNS-authorized demonstration project shall be reviewed following standard procedures unless FNS provides modified procedures to reflect the rules of the demonstration project. If FNS determines that information obtained from these cases would not be useful, then these cases may be excluded from review. A household whose application has been processed by SSA personnel and is subsequently denied participation shall be reviewed following standard procedures.

[Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6309, Feb. 17, 1984, as amended at 53 FR 39443, Oct. 7, 1988; Amdt. 373, 64 FR 38296, July 16, 1999; 75 FR 33437, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.14 Review processing.

(a) *General.* Each State agency shall use FNS handbooks, worksheets, and schedules in the quality control review process.

(b) *Handbooks.* The reviewer shall follow the procedures outlined in the Quality Control Review Handbook, FNS Handbook 310, to conduct quality control reviews. In addition, the sample of active and negative cases shall be selected in accordance with the sampling techniques described in the Quality Control Sampling Handbook, FNS Handbook 311.

(c) *Worksheets.* The Form FNS-380, shall be used by the reviewer to record required information from the case record, plan and conduct the field investigation, and record findings which contribute to the determination of eligibility and basis of

issuance in the review of active cases. In some instances, reviewers may need to supplement Form FNS-380 with other forms. The State forms for appointments, interoffice communications, release of information, etc., should be used when appropriate.

(d) *Schedules*. Decisions reached by the reviewer in active case reviews shall be coded and recorded on the Integrated Review Worksheet, Form FNS-380-1. Such active case review findings must be substantiated by information recorded on the Integrated Review Worksheet, Form FNS-380. In negative case reviews, the review findings shall be coded and recorded on the Negative Quality Control Review Schedule, Form FNS-245, and supplemented as necessary with other documentation substantiating the findings.

[Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6310, Feb. 17, 1984, as amended by Amdt. 262, 49 FR 50598, Dec. 31, 1984; 75 FR 33438, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart D—Data Analysis and Evaluation

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.15 Data management.

(a) *Analysis*. Analysis is the process of classifying data, such as by areas of program requirements or use of error-prone profiles, to provide a basis for studying the data and determining trends including significant characteristics and their relationships.

(b) *Evaluation*. Evaluation is the process of determining the cause(s) of each deficiency, magnitude of the deficiency, and geographic extent of the deficiency, to provide the basis for planning and developing effective corrective action.

(c) Each State agency must analyze and evaluate at the State and project area levels all management information sources available to:

- (1) Identify all deficiencies in program operations and systems;
- (2) Identify causal factors and their relationships;

(3) Identify magnitude of each deficiency, where appropriate (This is the frequency of each deficiency occurring based on the number of program records reviewed and where applicable, the amount of loss either to the program or participants or potential participants in terms of dollars. The State agency shall include an estimate of the number of participants or potential participants affected by the existence of the deficiency, if applicable);

(4) Determine the geographic extent of each deficiency (e.g., Statewide/individual project area or management unit); and,

(5) Provide a basis for management decisions on planning, implementing, and evaluating corrective action.

(d) In the evaluation of data, situations may arise where the State agency identifies the existence of a deficiency, but after reviewing all available management information sources sufficient information is not available to make a determination of the actual causal factor(s), magnitude, or geographic extent necessary for the development of appropriate corrective action. In these situations, the State agency shall be responsible for gathering additional data necessary to make these determinations. This action may include, but is not limited to, conducting additional full or partial ME reviews in one or more project areas/management units or discussions with appropriate officials.

(e) Deficiencies identified from all management information sources must be analyzed and evaluated together to determine their causes, magnitude, and geographic extent. Causes indicated and deficiencies identified must be examined to determine if they are attributable to a single cause and can be effectively eliminated by a single action. Deficiencies and causes identified must also be compared to the results of past corrective action efforts to determine if the new problems arise from the causal factors which contributed to the occurrence of previously identified deficiencies.

(f) Data analysis and evaluation must be an ongoing process to facilitate the development of effective and prompt corrective action. The process shall also identify when deficiencies have been eliminated through corrective action efforts, and shall provide for the reevaluation of deficiencies and causes when it is determined that corrective action has not been effective.

(g) *Identification of High Error Project Areas/Counties/Local Offices.* FNS may use quality control information to determine which project areas/counties/local offices have reported payment error rates that are either significantly greater than the State agency average or greater than the national error standard of the Program. When FNS notifies a State agency that a “high error” area exists, the State agency shall ensure that corrective action is developed and reported in accordance with the provisions of §275.17. If FNS identifies a “high error” locality which a State agency has previously identified as error-prone and taken appropriate action, no further State agency shall be required. If a State agency's corrective action plan fails to address problems in FNS-identified “high error” areas, FNS may require a State agency to implement new or modified cost-effective procedures for the certification of households.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15909, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3409, Feb. 4, 1987; Amdt. 320, 55 FR 6240, Feb. 22, 1990]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart E—Corrective Action

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.16 Corrective action planning.

(a) Corrective action planning is the process by which State agencies shall determine appropriate actions to reduce substantially or eliminate deficiencies in program operations and provide responsive service to eligible households.

(b) The State agency and project area(s)/management unit(s), as appropriate, shall implement corrective action on all identified deficiencies. Deficiencies requiring action by the State agency or the combined efforts of the State agency and the project area(s)/management unit(s) in the planning, development, and implementation of corrective action are those which:

(1) Result from a payment error rate of 6 percent or greater (actions to correct errors in individual cases, however, shall not be submitted as part of the State agency's corrective action plan);

(2) Are the causes of other errors/deficiencies detected through quality control, including error rates of 1 percent or more in negative cases (actions to correct errors in individual cases, however, shall not be submitted as part of the State agency's corrective action plan);

(3) Are identified by FNS reviews, GAO audits, contract audits, reports to FNS regarding the implementation of major changes (as discussed in §272.15) or USDA audits or investigations at the State agency or project area level (except deficiencies in isolated cases as indicated by FNS); and,

(4) Result from 5 percent or more of the State agency's QC sample being coded "not complete" as defined in §275.12(g)(1) of this part. This standard shall apply separately to both active and negative samples.

(5) Result in underissuances, improper denials, improper suspensions, improper termination, or improper systemic suspension of benefits to eligible households where such errors are caused by State agency rules, practices, or procedures.

(c) The State agency shall ensure that appropriate corrective action is taken on all deficiencies including each case found to be in error by quality control reviews and those deficiencies requiring corrective action only at the project area level. Moreover, when a substantial number of deficiencies are identified which require State agency level and/or project area/management unit corrective action, the State agency and/or project area/management unit shall establish an order of priority to

ensure that the most serious deficiencies are addressed immediately and corrected as soon as possible. Primary factors to be considered when determining the most serious deficiencies are:

- (1) Magnitude of the deficiency as defined in §275.15(c)(3) of this part;
- (2) Geographic extent of the deficiency (e.g., Statewide/project area or management unit);
- (3) Anticipated results of corrective actions; and
- (4) High probability of errors occurring as identified through all management evaluation sources.

(d) In planning corrective action, the State agency shall coordinate actions in the areas of data analysis, policy development, quality control, program evaluation, operations, administrative cost management, civil rights, and training to develop appropriate and effective corrective action measures.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15909, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 169, 46 FR 7263, Jan. 23, 1981; Amdt. 262, 49 FR 50598, Dec. 31, 1984; Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3409, Feb. 4, 1987; Amdt. 328, 56 FR 60052, Nov. 27, 1991; 68 FR 59523, Oct. 16, 2003; 75 FR 33438, June 11, 2010; 81 FR 2741, Jan. 19, 2016]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.17 State corrective action plan.

(a) State agencies shall prepare corrective action plans addressing those deficiencies specified in §275.16(b) requiring action by the State agency or the combined efforts of the State agency and the project area(s)/management unit(s). This corrective action plan is an open-ended plan and shall remain in effect until all deficiencies in program operations have been reduced substantially or eliminated. State agencies shall provide updates to their corrective action plans through regular, semiannual updates. These semiannual updates shall be received by FNS by May 1st and November 1st respectively. Such updates must contain:

- (1) Any additional deficiencies identified since the previous corrective action plan update;
- (2) Documentation that a deficiency has been corrected and is therefore being removed from the plan; and
- (3) Any changes to planned corrective actions for previously reported deficiencies.

(b) *Content.* State corrective action plans shall contain, but not necessarily be limited to, the following, based on the most recent information available:

(1) Specific description and identification of each deficiency;

(2) Source(s) through which the deficiency was detected;

(3) Magnitude of each deficiency, if appropriate, as defined in §275.15(c)(3) of this part;

(4) Geographic extent of the deficiency (e.g., Statewide/project area or management unit—specific project areas in which the deficiency occurs);

(5) Identification of causal factor(s) contributing to the occurrence of each deficiency;

(6) Identification of any action already completed to eliminate the deficiency;

(7) For each deficiency, an outline of actions to be taken, the expected outcome of each action, the target date for each action, and the date by which each deficiency will have been eliminated; and

(8) For each deficiency, a description of the manner in which the State agency will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the corrective action in eliminating the deficiency.

(c) FNS will provide technical assistance in developing corrective action plans when requested by State agencies.

(d) State agencies will be held accountable for the efficient and effective operation of all areas of the program. FNS is not precluded from issuing a warning as specified in part 276 because a deficiency is included in the State agency's corrective action plan.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15909, Mar. 11, 1980, as amended by Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3409, Feb. 4, 1987]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.18 Project area/management unit corrective action plan.

(a) The State agency shall ensure that corrective action plans are prepared at the project area/management unit level, addressing those deficiencies not required to be included in the State corrective action plan. State agencies may elect to prepare these plans for or in cooperation with the project area. These project area/management unit corrective action plans shall be open-ended and shall remain in effect until all deficiencies in program operations have been reduced substantially

or eliminated. Any deficiencies detected through any source not previously reported to the State agency which require incorporation into the Project Area/Management Unit Corrective Action Plan shall be submitted to the State agency within 60 days of identification. As deficiencies are reduced substantially or eliminated, the project area/management unit shall notify the State agency in writing. The project area/management unit shall be responsible for documenting why each deficiency is being removed from the Plan. The removal of any deficiency from the Plan will be subject to State agency and FNS review and validation.

(b) *Content.* Project area/management unit corrective action plans shall contain all the information necessary to enable the State agency to monitor and evaluate the corrective action properly. Also, State agencies shall establish requirements for project area/management units in planning, implementing and reporting corrective action to assist the State agency's efforts to fulfill its responsibilities for determining which deficiencies must be addressed in the State corrective action plan. States should consider requiring project area/management unit plans to include the following, based on the most recent information available:

- (1) Specific description and identification of each deficiency;
- (2) Source(s) through which the deficiency was detected;
- (3) Magnitude of each deficiency, if appropriate, as defined in §275.15(c)(3) of this part;
- (4) Geographic extent of the deficiency (throughout the project area/management unit or only in specific offices);
- (5) Identification of causal factor(s) contributing to the occurrence of each deficiency;
- (6) Identification of any action already completed to eliminate the deficiency;
- (7) For each deficiency, an outline of actions to be taken, the expected outcome of each action, the target date for each action, the date by which each deficiency will have been eliminated; and
- (8) For each deficiency, a description of the manner in which the project area/management unit will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the corrective action in eliminating the deficiency.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15909, Mar. 11, 1980]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.19 Monitoring and evaluation.

(a) The State agency shall establish a system for monitoring and evaluating corrective action at the State and project area levels. Monitoring and evaluation shall be an ongoing process to determine that deficiencies are being substantially reduced or eliminated in an efficient manner and that the program provides responsive service to eligible households.

(b) The State agency shall ensure that corrective action on all deficiencies identified in the State Corrective Action Plan and Project Area/Management Unit Corrective Action Plan is implemented and achieves the anticipated results within the specified time frames. The State agency shall monitor and evaluate corrective action at the State and project levels through a combination of reports, field reviews, and examination of current data available through program management tools and other sources.

(c) In instances where the State agency and/or the project area/management unit determines that the proposed corrective action is not effective in reducing substantially or eliminating deficiencies, the State agency and/or the project area/management unit shall promptly reevaluate the deficiency, causes, and the corrective action taken, and develop and implement new corrective actions.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15909, Mar. 11, 1980]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart F—Responsibilities for Reporting on Program Performance

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.20 ME review schedules.

(a) Each State agency shall submit its review schedule to the appropriate FNS regional office at least 60 days prior to the beginning of the next year's review period (the Federal fiscal year). These schedules must ensure that all project areas/management units will be reviewed within the required time limits. Each schedule shall identify the project areas/management units in each classification and list each project area to be reviewed by month or by quarter. A State agency may submit a request to use an alternate review schedule at any time. The alternate schedule shall not be effective until approved by FNS in accordance with §275.5(b) (2).

(b) State agencies shall notify the appropriate FNS regional office of all changes in review schedules.

[Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3410, Feb. 4, 1987]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.21 Quality control review reports.

(a) *General.* Each State agency shall submit reports on the performance of quality control reviews in accordance with the requirements outlined in this section. These reports are designed to enable FNS to monitor the State agency's compliance with Program requirements relative to the Quality Control Review System. Every case selected for review during the sample month must be accounted for and reflected in the appropriate report(s).

(b) *Individual cases.* The State agency shall report the review findings on each case selected for review during the sample month. For active cases, the State agency shall submit the edited findings of the Form FNS-380-1. For negative cases, the State agency shall submit a summary report which is produced from the edited findings on individual cases which are coded on the Negative Quality Control Review Schedule, Form FNS-245. The review findings shall be reported as follows:

(1) The State agency shall input and edit the results of each active and negative case into the FNS supplied computer terminal and transmit the data to the host computer. For State agencies that do not have FNS supplied terminals, the State agency shall submit the results of each QC review in a format specified by FNS. Upon State agency request, FNS will consider approval of a change in the review results after they have been reported to FNS.

(2) The State agency shall have at least 115 days from the end of the sample month to dispose of and report the findings of all cases selected in a sample month. FNS may grant additional time as warranted upon request by a State agency for cause shown to complete and dispose of individual cases.

(3) The State agency shall supply the FNS Regional Office with individual household case records and the pertinent information contained in the individual case records, or legible copies of that material, as well as legible hard copies of individual Forms FNS-380, FNS-380-1, and FNS-245 or other FNS-approved report forms, within 10 days of receipt of a request for such information.

(4) For each case that remains pending 115 days after the end of the sample month, the State agency shall immediately submit a report that includes an explanation of why the case has not been disposed of, documentation describing the progress of the review to date, and the date by which it will be completed. If FNS extends the time frames in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, this date will be extended accordingly. If FNS determines that the above report does not sufficiently justify the case's pending status, the case shall be considered overdue. Depending upon the number of overdue cases, FNS may find the State agency's QC system to be inefficient or ineffective and suspend and/or disallow the State agency's Federal share of administrative funds in accordance with the provisions of §276.4.

(c) *Monthly status.* The State agency shall report in a manner directed by the regional office the monthly progress of sample selection and completion within 125 days after the end of the sample month. Each report shall reflect sampling and review activity for a given sample month. If FNS extends the time frames in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, this date will be extended accordingly.

(d) *Demonstration projects/SSA processing.* The State agency shall identify the monthly status of active and negative demonstration project/SSA processed cases (*i.e.*, those cases described in §275.11(g)) in accordance with paragraph (c) of this section.

[Amdt. 260, 49 FR 6310, Feb. 17, 1984, as amended by Amdt. 262, 49 FR 50598, Dec. 31, 1984; Amdt. 266, 52 FR 3410, Feb. 4, 1987; 75 FR 33438, June 11, 2010]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.22 Administrative procedure.

Reports on program performance are intended to provide the State an opportunity to determine compliance with program requirements, identify and resolve emerging problems, and assess the effectiveness of actions that have been taken to correct existing problems. States' reports enable FNS to assess the nationwide status of eligibility and basis of issuance determinations, to ensure State compliance with Federal requirements, to assist States in improving and strengthening their programs, and to develop Federal policies. Reports must be submitted in duplicate to the appropriate FNS Regional Office according to the time frames established in §§275.20, 275.21, and 275.22 of this part.

[Amdt. 160, 45 FR 15911, Mar. 11, 1980. Redesignated at 52 FR 3410, Feb. 4, 1987]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

Subpart G—Program Performance

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.23 Determination of State agency program performance.

(a) *Determination of efficiency and effectiveness.* FNS shall determine the efficiency and effectiveness of a State's administration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by measuring State compliance with the standards contained in the Food and Nutrition Act, regulations, and the State Plan of Operation and State efforts to improve program operations through corrective action. This determination shall be made based on:

(1) Reports submitted to FNS by the State;

(2) FNS reviews of State agency operations;

(3) State performance reporting systems and corrective action efforts; and

(4) Other available information such as Federal audits and investigations, civil rights reviews, administrative cost data, complaints, and any pending litigation.

(b) *State agency error rates.* FNS shall estimate each State agency's active case, payment, and negative case error rate based on the results of quality control review reports submitted in accordance with the requirements outlined in §275.21. The determination of the correctness of the case shall be based on certification policy as set forth in part 273 of this chapter.

(1) *Demonstration projects/SSA processing.* FNS shall make a determination for each individual project whether the reported results of reviews of active and negative demonstration project cases shall be included or excluded from the estimate of the active case error rate, payment error rate, and negative case error rate. The reported results of reviews of cases processed by SSA in accordance with §273.2(k) of this chapter shall be excluded from the estimate of the active case error rate, payment error rate, and negative case error rate. FNS shall make a project by project determination whether the reported results of reviews of active and negative demonstration project cases processed by SSA shall be included or excluded from the estimate of the active case error rate, payment error rate, and negative case error rate.

(2) *Determination of payment error rates.* As specified in §275.3(c), FNS will validate each State agency's estimated payment error rate by rereviewing the State agency's active case sample and ensuring that its sampling, estimation, and data management procedures are correct.

(i) Once the Federal case reviews have been completed and all differences with the State agency have been identified, FNS shall calculate regressed error rates using the following linear regression equations.

(A) $y_1' = y_1 + b_1 (X_1 - x_1)$, where y_1' is the average value of allotments overissued to eligible and ineligible households; y_1 is the average value of allotments overissued to eligible and ineligible households in the rereview sample according to the Federal finding, b_1 is the estimate of the regression coefficient regressing the Federal findings of allotments overissued to eligible and ineligible households on the corresponding State agency findings, x_1 is the average value of allotments overissued to eligible and ineligible households in the rereview sample according to State agency findings, and X_1 is the average value of allotments overissued to eligible and ineligible households in the full quality control sample according to State agency's findings. In stratified sample designs Y_1 , X_1 , and x_1 are weighted averages and b_1 is a combined regression coefficient in which stratum

weights sum to 1.0 and are proportional to the estimated stratum caseloads subject to review.

(B) $y_2' = y_2 + b_2(X_2 - x_2)$, where y_2' is the average value of allotments underissued to households included in the active error rate, y_2 is the average value of allotments underissued to participating households in the rereview sample according to the Federal finding, b_2 is the estimate of the regression coefficient regressing the Federal findings of allotments underissued to participating households on the corresponding State agency findings, x_2 is the average value of allotments underissued to participating households in the rereview sample according to State agency findings, and X_2 is the average value of allotments underissued to participating households in the full quality control sample according to the State agency's findings. In stratified sample designs y_2 , X_2 , and x_2 are weighted averages and b_2 is a combined regression coefficient in which stratum weights sum to 1.0 and are proportional to the estimated stratum caseloads subject to review.

(C) The regressed error rates are given by $r_1' = y_1'/u$, yielding the regressed overpayment error rate, and $r_2' = y_2'/u$, yielding the regressed underpayment error rate, where u is the average value of allotments issued to participating households in the State agency sample.

(D) After application of the adjustment provisions of paragraph (b)(2)(iii) of this section, the adjusted regressed payment error rate shall be calculated to yield the State agency's payment error rate. The adjusted regressed payment error rate is given by $r_1'' + r_2''$.

(ii) If FNS determines that a State agency has sampled incorrectly, estimated improperly, or has deficiencies in its QC data management system, FNS will correct the State agency's payment and negative case error rates based upon a correction to that aspect of the State agency's QC system which is deficient. If FNS cannot accurately correct the State agency's deficiency, FNS will assign the State agency a payment error rate or negative case error rate based upon the best information available. After consultation with the State agency, the assigned payment error rate will then be used in the liability determination. After consultation with the State agency, the assigned negative case error rate will be the official State negative case error rate for any purpose. State agencies shall have the right to appeal assessment of an error rate in this situation in accordance with the procedures of Part 283 of this chapter.

(iii) Should a State agency fail to complete 98 percent of its required sample size, FNS shall adjust the State agency's regressed error rates using the following equations:

(A) $r_1'' = r_1' + 2(1-C)S_1$, where r_1'' is the adjusted regressed overpayment error rate, r_1' is the regressed overpayment error rate computed from the formula in paragraph (b)(2)(i)(C) of this section, C is the State agency's rate of completion of its

required sample size expressed as a decimal value, and S_1 is the standard error of the State agency sample overpayment error rate. If a State agency completes all of its required sample size, then $r_1'' = r_1'$.

(B) $r_2'' = r_2' + 2(1-C)S_2$, where r_2'' is the adjusted regressed underpayment error rate, r_2' is the regressed underpayment error rate computed from the formula in paragraph (b)(2)(i)(C) of this section, C is the State agency's rate of completion of its required sample size expressed as a decimal value, and S_2 is the standard error of the State agency sample underpayment error rate. If a State agency completes all of its required sample size, then $r_2'' = r_2'$.

(c) *FNS Time frames for completing case review process, arbitration, and issuing error rates.* The case review process and the arbitration of all difference cases shall be completed by May 31 following the end of the fiscal year. FNS shall determine and announce the national average payment and negative case error rates for the fiscal year by June 30 following the end of the fiscal year. At the same time FNS shall notify all State agencies of their individual payment and negative case error rates and payment error rate liabilities, if any. FNS shall provide a copy of each State agency's notice of potential liability to its respective chief executive officer and legislature. FNS shall initiate collection action on each claim for such liabilities before the end of the fiscal year following the reporting period in which the claim arose unless an appeal relating to the claim is pending. Such appeals include administrative and judicial appeals pursuant to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act. While the amount of a State's liability may be recovered through offsets to their letter of credit as identified in §277.16(c) of this chapter, FNS shall also have the option of billing a State directly or using other claims collection mechanisms authorized under the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-134) and the Federal Claims Collection Standards (31 CFR Parts 900-904), depending upon the amount of the State's liability. FNS is not bound by the time frames referenced in paragraph (c) of this section in cases where a State fails to submit QC data expeditiously to FNS and FNS determines that, as a result, it is unable to calculate the State's payment error rate and payment error rate liability within the prescribed time frame.

(d) *State agencies' liabilities for payment error rates.* At the end of each fiscal year, each State agency's payment error rate over the entire fiscal year will be computed and evaluated to determine whether the payment error rate goal (national performance measure) established in paragraph (d)(1) of this section has been met. Each State agency that fails to achieve its payment error rate goal during a fiscal year shall be liable as specified in the paragraph (d)(2) of this section.

(1) *National performance measure.* FNS shall announce a national performance measure not later than June 30 after the end of the fiscal year. The national performance measure is the sum of the products of each State agency's error rate multiplied by that State agency's proportion of the total value of national allotments issued for the fiscal year using the most recent issuance data available at the time

the State agency is notified of its payment error rate. Once announced, the national performance measure for a given fiscal year will not be subject to administrative or judicial appeal.

(2) *Liability.* For fiscal year 2003 and subsequent years, liability for payment shall be established whenever there is a 95 percent statistical probability that, for the second or subsequent consecutive fiscal year, a State agency's payment error rate exceeds 105 percent of the national performance measure. The amount of the liability shall be equal to the product of the value of all allotments issued by the State agency in the second (or subsequent consecutive) fiscal year; multiplied by the difference between the State agency's payment error rate and 6 percent; multiplied by 10 percent.

(3) *Right to appeal payment error rate liability.* Determination of a State agency's payment error rate or whether that payment error rate exceeds 105 percent of the national performance measure shall be subject to administrative or judicial review only if a liability amount is established for that fiscal year. Procedures for good cause appeals of excessive payment error rates are addressed in paragraph (f) of this section. The established national performance measure is not subject to administrative or judicial appeal, nor is any prior fiscal year payment error rate subject to appeal as part of the appeal of a later fiscal year's liability amount. However, State agencies may address matters related to good cause in an immediately prior fiscal year that impacted the fiscal year for which a liability amount has been established. The State agency will need to address how year 2 was impacted by the event(s) in the prior year.

(4) *Relationship to warning process and negligence.* (i) States' liability for payment error rates as determined above in paragraphs (d)(1) through (d)(3) of this section are not subject to the warning process of §276.4(d) of this chapter.

(ii) FNS shall not determine negligence (as described in §276.3 of this chapter) based on the overall payment error rate for issuances to ineligible households and overissuances to eligible households in a State or political subdivision thereof. FNS may only establish a claim under §276.3 of this chapter for dollar losses from failure to comply, due to negligence on the part of the State agency (as defined in §276.3 of this chapter), with specific certification requirements. Thus, FNS will not use the result of States' QC reviews to determine negligence.

(iii) Whenever a State is assessed a liability amount for an excessive payment error rate, the State shall have the right to request an appeal in accordance with procedures set forth in part 283 of this chapter. While FNS may determine a State to be liable for dollar loss under the provisions of this section and the negligence provisions of §276.3 of this chapter for the same period of time, FNS shall not bill a State for the same dollar loss under both provisions. If FNS finds a State liable for dollar loss under both the QC liability system and the negligence provisions, FNS

shall adjust the billings to ensure that two claims are not made against the State for the same dollar loss.

(e) *Liability amount determinations.* (1) FNS shall provide for each State agency whose payment error rate subjects it to a liability amount the following determinations, each expressed as a percentage of the total liability amount. FNS shall:

(i) Require the State agency to invest up to 50 percent of the liability in activities to improve program administration (new investment money shall not be matched by Federal funds) and

(ii) Designate up to 50 percent of the liability as “at-risk” for repayment if a liability is established based on the State agency's payment error rate for the subsequent fiscal year, or

(iii) Choose any combination of these options.

(2) Once FNS determines the percentages in accordance with paragraphs (e)(1)(i) through (e)(1)(iv) of this section, the amount assigned as at-risk is not subject to settlement negotiation between FNS and the State agency and may not be reduced unless an appeal decision revises the total dollar liability. FNS and the State agency shall settle any waiver percentage amount or new investment percentage amount before the end of the fiscal year in which the liability amount is determined. The determination of percentages for waiver, new investment, and/or at-risk amounts by the Department is not appealable. Likewise, a settlement of the waiver and new investment amounts cannot be appealed.

(f) *Good cause.* When a State agency with otherwise effective administration exceeds the tolerance level for payment errors as described in this section, the State agency may seek relief from liability claims that would otherwise be levied under this section on the basis that the State agency had good cause for not achieving the payment error rate tolerance. State agencies desiring such relief must file an appeal with the Department's Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) in accordance with the procedures established under part 283 of this chapter. Paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(5) of this section describe the unusual events that are considered to have a potential for disrupting program operations and increasing error rates to an extent that relief from a resulting liability amount or increased liability amount is appropriate. The occurrence of an event(s) does not automatically result in a determination of good cause for an error rate in excess of the national performance measure. The State agency must demonstrate that the event had an adverse and uncontrollable impact on program operations during the relevant period, and the event caused an uncontrollable increase in the error rate. Good cause relief will only be considered for that portion of the error rate/liability amount attributable to the unusual event. The following are unusual events which State agencies may use as a

basis for requesting good cause relief and specific information that must be submitted to justify such requests for relief:

(1) *Natural disasters and civil disorders.* Natural disasters such as those under the authority of The Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Amendments of 1988 (Pub. L. 100-707), which amended The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Pub. L. 93-288), or civil disorders that adversely affect program operations.

(i) When submitting a request for good cause relief based on this example, the State agency shall provide the following information:

(A) The nature of the disaster(s) (*e.g.*, a tornado, hurricane, earthquake, flood, etc.) or civil disorder(s) and evidence that the President has declared a disaster;

(B) The date(s) of the occurrence;

(C) The date(s) after the occurrence when program operations were affected;

(D) The geographic extent of the occurrence (*i.e.*, the county or counties where the disaster occurred);

(E) The proportion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload whose management was affected;

(F) The reason(s) why the State agency was unable to control the effects of the disaster on program administration and errors.

(G) The identification and explanation of the uncontrollable nature of errors caused by the event (types of errors, geographic location of the errors, time period during which the errors occurred, etc.).

(H) The percentage of the payment error rate that resulted from the occurrence and how this figure was derived; and

(I) The degree to which the payment error rate exceeded the national performance measure in the subject fiscal year.

(ii) (A) The following criteria and methodology will be used to assess and evaluate good cause in conjunction with the appeals process, and to determine that portion of the error rate/liability amount attributable to the uncontrollable effects of a disaster or civil disorder:

(1) Geographical impact of the disaster;

(2) State efforts to control impact on program operations;

(3) The proportion of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload affected; and/or

(4) The duration of the disaster and its impact on program operations.

(B) Adjustments for these factors may result in a waiver of all, part, or none of the liability amount for the applicable period. As appropriate, the waiver amount will be adjusted to reflect States' otherwise effective administration of the program based upon the degree to which the error rate exceeds the national performance measure. For example, a reduction in the waiver amount may be made when a State agency's recent error rate history indicates that even absent the events described the State agency would have exceeded the national performance measure in the review period.

(iii) If a State agency has provided insufficient information to determine a waiver amount for the uncontrollable effects of a natural disaster or civil disorder using factual analysis, the waiver amount shall be evaluated using the following formula and methodology which measures both the duration and intensity of the event. Duration will be measured by the number of months the event had an adverse impact on program operations. Intensity will be a proportional measurement of the issuances for the counties affected to the State's total issuance. This ratio will be determined using issuance figures for the first full month immediately preceding the disaster. This figure will not include issuances made to households participating under disaster certification authorized by FNS and already excluded from the error rate calculations under §275.12(g)(2)(vi). The counties considered affected will include counties where the disaster/civil disorder occurred, and any other county that the State agency can demonstrate had program operations adversely impacted due to the event (such as a county that diverted significant numbers of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program certification or administrative staff). The amount of the waiver of liability will be determined using the linear equation $W = \frac{I_a}{I_b} \times \left[\frac{M}{12} \text{ or } \frac{M_p}{18} \right] \times L$, where I_a is the issuance for the first full month immediately preceding the unusual event for the county affected; I_b is the State's total issuance for the first full month immediately preceding the unusual event; $M/12$ is the number of months in the subject fiscal year that the unusual event had an adverse impact on program operations; $M_p/18$ is the number of months in the last half (April through September) of the prior fiscal year that the unusual event had an adverse impact on program operations; L is the total amount of the liability for the fiscal year. Mathematically this formula could result in a waiver of more than 100 percent of the liability amount; however, no more than 100 percent of a State's liability amount will be waived for any one fiscal year. Under this approach, unless the State agency can demonstrate a direct uncontrollable impact on the error rate, the effects of disasters or civil disorders that ended prior to the second half of the prior fiscal year will not be considered.

(2) *Strikes*. Strikes by State agency staff necessary to determine Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program eligibility and process case changes.

(i) When submitting a request for good cause relief based on this example, the State agency shall provide the following information:

(A) Which workers (*i.e.*, eligibility workers, clerks, data input staff, etc.) and how many (number and percentage of total staff) were on strike or refused to cross picket lines;

(B) The date(s) and nature of the strike (*i.e.*, the issues surrounding the strike);

(C) The date(s) after the occurrence when program operations were affected;

(D) The geographic extent of the strike (*i.e.*, the county or counties where the strike occurred);

(E) The proportion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload whose management was affected;

(F) The reason(s) why the State agency was unable to control the effects of the strike on program administration and errors;

(G) Identification and explanation of the uncontrollable nature of errors caused by the event (types of errors, geographic location of the errors, time period during which the errors occurred, etc.);

(H) The percentage of the payment error rate that resulted from the strike and how this figure was derived; and

(I) The degree to which the payment error rate exceeded the national performance measure in the subject fiscal year.

(ii) (A) The following criteria shall be used to assess, evaluate and respond to claims by the State agency for a good cause waiver of a liability amount in conjunction with the appeals process, and to determine that portion of the error rate/liability amount attributable to the uncontrollable effects of the strike:

(1) Geographical impact of the strike;

(2) State efforts to control impact on program operations;

(3) The proportion of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload affected; and/or

(4) The duration of the strike and its impact on program operations.

(B) Adjustments for these factors may result in a waiver of all, part, or none of the liability amount for the applicable period. For example, the amount of the waiver might be reduced for a strike that was limited to a small area of the State. As

appropriate, the waiver amount will be adjusted to reflect States' otherwise effective administration of the program based upon the degree to which the error rate exceeded the national performance measure.

(iii) If a State agency has provided insufficient information to determine a waiver amount for the uncontrollable effects of a strike using factual analysis, a waiver amount shall be evaluated by using the formula described in paragraph (f)(1) of this section. Under this approach, unless the State agency can demonstrate a direct uncontrollable impact on the error rate, the effects of strikes that ended prior to the second half of the prior fiscal year will not be considered.

(3) *Caseload growth.* A significant growth in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload in a State prior to or during a fiscal year, such as a 15 percent growth in caseload. Caseload growth which historically increases during certain periods of the year will not be considered unusual or beyond the State agency's control.

(i) When submitting a request for good cause relief based on this example, the State agency shall provide the following information:

(A) The amount of growth (both actual and percentage);

(B) The time the growth occurred (what month(s)/year);

(C) The date(s) after the occurrence when program operations were affected;

(D) The geographic extent of the caseload growth (*i.e.* Statewide or in which particular counties);

(E) The impact of caseload growth;

(F) The reason(s) why the State agency was unable to control the effects of caseload growth on program administration and errors;

(G) The percentage of the payment error rate that resulted from the caseload growth and how this figure was derived; and

(H) The degree to which the error rate exceeded the national performance measure in the subject fiscal year.

(ii) (A) The following criteria and methodology shall be used to assess and evaluate good cause in conjunction with the appeals process, and to determine that portion of the error rate/liability amount attributable to the uncontrollable effects of unusual caseload growth:

(1) Geographical impact of the caseload growth;

(2) State efforts to control impact on program operations;

(3) The proportion of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload affected; and/or

(4) The duration of the caseload growth and its impact on program operations.

(B) Adjustments for these factors may result in a waiver of all, part, or none of the liability amount for the applicable period. As appropriate, the waiver amount will be adjusted to reflect States' otherwise effective administration of the program based upon the degree to which the error rate exceeded the national performance measure. For example, a reduction in the waiver amount may be made when a State agency's recent error rate history indicates that even absent the events described the State agency would have exceeded the national performance measure in the review period. Under this approach, unless the State agency can demonstrate a direct uncontrollable impact on the error rate, the effects of caseload growth that ended prior to the second half of the prior fiscal year will not be considered.

(iii) If the State agency has provided insufficient information to determine a waiver amount for the uncontrollable effects of caseload growth using factual analysis, the waiver amount shall be evaluated using the following five-step calculation:

(A) Step 1—determine the average number of households certified to participate Statewide in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for the base period consisting of twelve consecutive months ending with March of the prior fiscal year;

(B) Step 2—determine the percentage of increase in caseload growth from the base period (Step 1) using the average number of households certified to participate Statewide in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for any twelve consecutive months in the period beginning with April of the prior fiscal year and ending with June of the current year;

(C) Step 3—determine the percentage the error rate for the subject fiscal year, as calculated under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, exceeds the national performance measure determined in accordance with paragraph (d)(1) of this section;

(D) Step 4—divide the percentage of caseload growth increase arrived at in step 2 by the percentage the error rate for the subject fiscal year exceeds the national performance measure as determined in step 3; and

(E) Step 5—multiply the quotient arrived at in step 4 by the liability amount for the current fiscal year to determine the amount of waiver of liability.

(iv) Under this methodology, caseload growth of less than 15% and/or occurring in the last three months of the subject fiscal year will not be considered. Mathematically this formula could result in a waiver of more than 100 percent of the liability amount; however, no more than 100 percent of a State's liability amount will be waived for any one fiscal year.

(4) *Program changes.* A change in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or other Federal or State program that has a substantial adverse impact on the management of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program of a State. Requests for relief from errors caused by the uncontrollable effects of unusual program changes other than those variances already excluded by §275.12(d)(2)(vii) will be considered to the extent the program change is not common to all States.

(i) When submitting a request for good cause relief based on unusual changes in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or other Federal or State programs, the State agency shall provide the following information:

(A) The type of changes(s) that occurred;

(B) When the change(s) occurred;

(C) The nature of the adverse effect of the changes on program operations and the State agency's efforts to mitigate these effects;

(D) Reason(s) the State agency was unable to adequately handle the change(s);

(E) Identification and explanation of the uncontrollable errors caused by the changes (types of errors, geographic location of the errors, time period during which the errors occurred, etc.);

(F) The percentage of the payment error rate that resulted from the adverse impact of the change(s) and how this figure was derived; and

(G) The degree to which the payment error rate exceeded the national performance measure in the subject fiscal year.

(ii) (A) The following criteria will be used to assess and evaluate good cause in conjunction with the appeals process and to determine that portion of the error rate/liability amount attributable to the uncontrollable effects of unusual changes in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or other Federal and State programs:

(1) State efforts to control impact on program operations;

(2) The proportion of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload affected; and/or

(3) The duration of the unusual changes in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or other Federal and State programs and the impact on program operations.

(B) Adjustments for these factors may result in a waiver of all, part, or none of the liability amount for the applicable period. As appropriate, the waiver amount will be adjusted to reflect States' otherwise effective administration of the program based upon the degree to which the error rate exceeded the national performance measure.

(5) *Significant circumstances beyond the control of a State agency.* Requests for relief from errors caused by the uncontrollable effect of a significant circumstance other than those specifically set forth in paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(4) of this section will be considered to the extent that the circumstance is not common to all States, such as a fire in a certification office.

(i) The State agency shall provide the following information when submitting a request for good cause relief based on significant circumstances, the State agency shall provide the following information:

(A) The significant circumstances that the State agency believes uncontrollably and adversely affected the payment error rate for the fiscal year in question;

(B) Why the State agency had no control over the significant circumstances;

(C) How the significant circumstances had an uncontrollable and adverse impact on the State agency's error rate;

(D) Where the significant circumstances existed (*i.e.* Statewide or in particular counties);

(E) When the significant circumstances existed (provide specific dates whenever possible);

(F) The proportion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload whose management was affected;

(G) Identification and explanation of the uncontrollable errors caused by the event (types of errors, geographic location of the errors, time period during which the errors occurred, etc.);

(H) The percentage of the payment error rate that was caused by the significant circumstances and how this figure was derived; and

(I) The degree to which the payment error rate exceeded the national performance measure in the subject fiscal year.

(ii) (A) The following criteria shall be used to assess and evaluate good cause in conjunction with the appeals process, and to determine that portion of the error rate/liability amount attributable to the uncontrollable effects of a significant circumstance beyond the control of the State agency, other than those set forth in paragraph (f)(5) of this section:

(1) Geographical impact of the significant circumstances;

(2) State efforts to control impact on program operations;

(3) The proportion of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program caseload affected; and/or

(4) The duration of the significant circumstances and the impact on program operations.

(B) Adjustments for these factors may result in a waiver of all, part, or none of the liability amount for the applicable period. As appropriate, the waiver amount will be adjusted to reflect States' otherwise effective administration of the program based upon the degree to which the error rate exceeded the national performance measure.

(6) *Adjustments.* When good cause is found under the criteria in paragraphs (f) (1) through (f)(5) of this section, the waiver amount may be adjusted to reflect States' otherwise effective administration of the program based upon the degree to which the error rate exceeds the national performance measure.

(7) *Evidence.* When submitting a request to the ALJ for good cause relief, the State agency shall include such data and documentation as is necessary to support and verify the information submitted in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (f) of this section so as to fully explain how a particular significant circumstance(s) uncontrollably affected its payment error rate.

(8) *Finality.* The initial decision of the ALJ concerning good cause shall constitute the final determination for purposes of judicial review as established under the provisions of §283.17 and §283.20 of this chapter.

(g) *Results of appeals on liability amount determinations.* (1) If a State agency wholly prevails on appeal and, consequently, its liability amount is reduced to \$0 through the appeal, and if the State agency began new investment activities prior to the appeal determination, FNS shall pay to the State agency an amount equal to 50 percent of the new investment amount that was expended by the State agency.

(2) If FNS wholly prevails on a State agency's appeal, FNS will require the State agency to invest all or a portion of the amount designated for new investment to be invested or to be paid to the Federal government.

(3) If neither the State agency nor FNS wholly prevails on a State agency's appeal, FNS shall apply the original waiver, new investment, and at-risk percentage determinations to the liability amount established through the appeal. If the State agency began new investment prior to the appeal decision and has already expended more than the amount produced for new investment as a result of the appeal decision, the Department will match the amount of funds expended in excess of the amount now required by the Department for new investment.

(h) *New investment requirements.* Once FNS has determined the percentage of a liability amount to be invested or following an appeal and recalculation by FNS of an amount to be invested, a State agency shall submit a plan of offsetting investments in program administration activities intended to reduce error rates.

(1) The State agency's investment plan activity or activities must meet the following conditions to be accepted by the Department:

(i) The activity or activities must be directly related to error reduction in the ongoing program, with specific objectives regarding the amount of error reduction, and type of errors that will be reduced. The costs of demonstration, research, or evaluation projects under sections 17(a) through (c) of the Act will not be accepted. The State agency may direct the investment plan to a specific project area or implement the plan on a Statewide basis. In addition, the Department will allow an investment plan to be tested in a limited area, as a pilot project, if the Department determines it to be appropriate. A request by the State agency for a waiver of existing rules will not be acceptable as a component of the investment plan. The State agency must submit any waiver request through the normal channels for approval and receive approval of the request prior to including the waiver in the investment plan. Waivers that have been approved for the State agency's use in the ongoing operation of the program may continue to be used.

(ii) The program administration activity must represent a new or increased expenditure. The proposed activity must also represent an addition to the minimum program administration required by law for State agency administration including corrective action. Therefore, basic training of eligibility workers or a continuing correction action from a Corrective Action Plan shall not be acceptable. The State agency may include a previous initiative in its plan; however, the State agency would have to demonstrate that the initiative is entirely funded by State money, represents an increase in spending and there are no remaining Federal funds earmarked for the activity.

(iii) Investment activities must be funded in full by the State agency, without any matching Federal funds until the entire amount agreed to is spent. Amounts spent in excess of the settlement amount included in the plan may be subject to Federal matching funds.

(2) The request shall include:

(i) A statement of the amount of money that is a quality control liability claim that is to be offset by investment in program improvements;

(ii) A detailed description of the planned program administration activity;

(iii) Planned expenditures, including time schedule and anticipated cost breakdown;

(iv) Anticipated impact of the activity, identifying the types of error expected to be affected;

(v) Documentation that the funds would not replace expenditures already earmarked for an ongoing effort; and

(vi) A statement that the expenditures are not simply a reallocation of resources.

(3) A State agency may choose to begin expending State funds for any amount of the liability designated as "new investment" in the liability amount determination prior to any appeal. FNS reserves the right to approve whether the expenditure meets the requirements for new investment. Expenditures made prior to approval by the Department will be subject to approval before they are accepted. Once a new investment plan is approved, the State agency shall submit plan modifications to the Department for approval, prior to implementation.

(4) Each State agency which has part of a liability designated for new investment shall submit periodic documented reports according to a schedule in its approved investment plan. At a minimum, these reports shall contain:

(i) A detailed description of the expenditure of funds, including the source of funds and the actual goods and services purchased or rented with the funds;

(ii) A detailed description of the actual activity; and

(iii) An explanation of the activity's effect on errors, including an explanation of any discrepancy between the planned effect and the actual effect.

(5) Any funds that the State agency's reports do not document as spent as specified in the new investment plan may be recovered by the Department. Before the funds are withdrawn, the State agency will be provided an opportunity to provide the missing documentation.

(6) If the funds are recovered, the Department shall charge interest on the funds not spent according to the plan in accordance with paragraph (j) of this section.

(i) *At-risk money*. If appropriate, FNS shall initiate collection action on each claim for such liabilities before the end of the fiscal year following the reporting

period in which the claim arose unless an administrative appeal relating to the claim is pending. Such appeals include administrative and judicial appeals pursuant to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act. If a State agency, in the subsequent year, is again subject to a liability amount based on the national performance measure and the error rate issued to the State agency, the State agency will be required to remit to FNS any money designated as at-risk for the prior fiscal year in accordance with either the original liability amount or a revised liability amount arising from an appeal, as appropriate, within 30 days of the date of the final billing. The requirement that the State agency pay the at-risk amount for the prior year will be held in abeyance pending the outcome of any pending appeal for the subsequent liability. If the subsequent year's liability is reduced to \$0, the at-risk money from for the prior fiscal year will not be required to be paid. If the subsequent year's liability is not reduced to \$0, the State agency will be required to pay the at-risk money within 30 days of the date of the appeal decision. The amount of a State's at-risk money may be recovered through offsets to the State agency's letter of credit as identified in §277.16(c) of this chapter. FNS shall also have the option of billing a State directly or using other claims collection mechanisms authorized under the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-134) and the Federal Claims Collection Standards (31 CFR Parts 900-904), depending upon the amount of the State's liability.

(j) *Interest charges.* (1) To the extent that a State agency does not pay an at-risk amount within 30 days from the date on which the bill for collection is received by the State agency, the State agency shall be liable for interest on any unpaid portion of such claim accruing from the date on which the bill for collection was received by the State agency. If the State agency is notified that it failed to invest funds in accordance with an approved new investment plan, the State agency has 30 days from the date of receipt of notification of non-expenditure of new investment funds to pay the Department the amount of funds not so invested. If the State agency does not pay the Department the amount of funds not invested within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notification of non-expenditure, the State agency shall be liable for interest on the non-expended funds from the date on which the notification was received by the State agency. If the State agency agrees to pay the claim through reduction in Federal financial participation for administrative costs, this agreement shall be considered to be paying the claim. If the State agency appeals such claim (in whole or in part), the interest on any unpaid portion of the claim shall accrue from the date of the decision on the administrative appeal, or from a date that is one year after the date the bill is received, whichever is earlier, until the date the unpaid portion of the payment is received.

(2) A State agency may choose to pay the amount designated as at-risk prior to resolution of any appeals. If the State agency pays such claim (in whole or in part) and the claim is subsequently overturned or adjusted through administrative or judicial appeal, any amounts paid by the State agency above what is actually due shall be promptly returned with interest, accruing from the date the payment was received until the date the payment is returned.

(3) Any interest assessed under paragraph (j)(1) of this section shall be computed at a rate determined by the Secretary based on the average of the bond equivalent of the weekly 90-day Treasury bill auction rates during the period such interest accrues. The bond equivalent is the discount rate (*i.e.*, the price the bond is actually sold for as opposed to its face value) determined by the weekly auction (*i.e.*, the difference between the discount rate and face value) converted to an annualized figure. The Secretary shall use the investment rate (*i.e.*, the rate for 365 days) compounded in simple interest for the period for which the claim is not paid. Interest billings shall be made quarterly with the initial billing accruing from the date the interest is first due. Because the discount rate for Treasury bills is issued weekly, the interest rate for State agency claims shall be averaged for the appropriate weeks.

[75 FR 33438, June 11, 2010, as amended at 80 FR 53243, Sept. 3, 2015]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

§275.24 High performance bonuses.

(a) *General rule.* (1) FNS will award bonuses totaling \$48 million for each fiscal year to State agencies that show high or improved performance in accordance with the performance measures under paragraph (b) of this section.

(2) FNS will award the bonuses no later than September 30th of the fiscal year following the performance measurement year.

(3) A State agency is not eligible for a bonus payment in any fiscal year for which it has a liability amount established as a result of an excessive payment error rate in the same year. If a State is disqualified from receiving a bonus payment under this paragraph (a)(3), and the State is not tied for a bonus, the State with the next best performance will be awarded a bonus payment.

(4) The determination whether, and in what amount, to award a performance bonus payment is not subject to administrative or judicial review.

(5) In determining the amount of the award, FNS will first award a base amount of \$100,000 to each State agency that is an identified winner in each category. Subsequently, FNS will divide the remaining money among the States in each category (see paragraph (b) of this section) in proportion to the size of their caseloads (the average number of households per month for the fiscal year for which performance is measured).

(6) A State cannot be awarded two bonuses in the same category; the relevant categories are payment accuracy (which is outlined in paragraph (b)(1) of this section), negative error rate (which is outlined in paragraph (b)(2) of this section), or program access index (which is outlined in paragraph (b)(3) of this section). If a State is determined to be among the best and the most improved in a category, it

will be awarded a bonus only for being the best. The next State in the best category will be awarded a bonus as being among the best States.

(7) Where there is a tie to the fourth decimal point for the categories outlined in paragraphs (b)(1) through (b)(4) of this section, FNS will add the additional State(s) into the category and the money will be divided among all the States in accordance with paragraph (a)(5) of this section.

(8) Bonus award money shall be used only on SNAP-related expenses including, but not limited to, investments in technology; improvements in administration and distribution; and actions to prevent fraud, waste and abuse.

(i) Bonus payments shall not be used for household benefits, including incentive payments.

(ii) State agency awardees shall submit their intended spending plans of bonus payments to FNS to verify appropriate use.

(b) *Performance measures.* FNS will measure performance by and base awards on the following categories of performance measures:

(1) *Payment accuracy.* FNS will divide \$24 million among the 10 States with the lowest and the most improved combined payment error rates as specified in paragraphs (b)(1)(i) and (b)(1)(ii) of this section.

(i) *Excellence in payment accuracy.* FNS will provide bonuses to the 7 States with the lowest combined payment error rates based on the validated quality control payment error rates for the performance measurement year as determined in accordance with this part.

(ii) *Most improved in payment accuracy.* FNS will provide bonuses to the 3 States with the largest percentage point decrease in their combined payment error rates based on the comparison of the validated quality control payment error rates for the performance measurement year and the previous fiscal year, as determined in accordance with this part.

(2) *Negative error rate.* FNS will divide \$6 million among the 6 States with the lowest and the most improved negative error rates as specified in paragraphs (b)(2)(i) and (b)(2)(ii) of this section.

(i) *Lowest negative error rate.* FNS will provide bonuses to the 4 States with the lowest negative error rates based on the validated quality control negative error rates for the performance year as determined in accordance with this part.

(ii) *Most improved negative error rate.* FNS will provide bonuses to the 2 States with the largest percentage point decrease in their negative error rates, based on the comparison of the performance measurement year's validated quality control

negative error rates with those of the previous fiscal year, as determined in accordance with this part. A State agency is not eligible for a bonus under this criterion if the State's negative error rate for the fiscal year is more than 50 percent above the national average.

(3) *Program access index (PAI)*. FNS will divide \$12 million among the 8 States with the highest and the most improved level of participation as specified in paragraphs (b)(3)(i) through (b)(3)(iii) of this section. The PAI is the ratio of participants to persons with incomes below 125 percent of poverty, as calculated in accordance with paragraph (b)(3)(iii) of this section (the PAI was formerly known as the participant access rate (PAR)).

(i) *High program access index*. FNS will provide bonuses to the 4 States with the highest PAI as determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(3)(iii) of this section.

(ii) *Most improved program access index*. FNS will provide bonuses to the 4 States with the most improved PAI as determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(3)(iii) of this section.

(iii) *Data*. For the number of participants (numerator), FNS will use the administrative annual counts of participants minus new participants certified under special disaster program rules by State averaged over the calendar year. For the number of people below 125 percent of poverty (denominator), FNS will use the Census Bureau's March Supplement to the Current Population Survey's (CPS) count of people below 125 percent of poverty for the same calendar year. FNS will reduce the count in each State where a Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) program is operated by the administrative counts of the number of individuals who participate in this program averaged over the calendar year. FNS will reduce the count in California by the Census Bureau's percentage of people below 125% of poverty in California who received Supplemental Security Income in the previous year. FNS reserves the right to use data from the American Community Survey (ACS) in lieu of the CPS, and to use the count of people below 130 percent of poverty, should these data become available in a timely fashion and prove more accurate. Such a substitution would apply to all States.

(4) *Application processing timeliness*. FNS will divide \$6 million among the 6 States with the highest percentage of timely processed applications.

(i) *Data*. FNS will use quality control data to determine each State's rate of application processing timeliness.

(ii) *Timely processed applications*. A timely processed application is one that provides an eligible applicant the "opportunity to participate" as defined in §274.2 of this chapter, within thirty days for normal processing or 7 days for expedited processing. New applications that are processed outside of this standard are

untimely for this measure, except for applications that are properly pended in accordance with §273.2(h)(2) of this chapter because verification is incomplete and the State agency has taken all the actions described in §273.2(h)(1)(i)(C) of this chapter. Such applications will not be included in this measure. Applications that are denied will not be included in this measure.

(iii) *Evaluation of applications.* Only applications that were filed on or after the beginning of the performance measurement (fiscal) year will be evaluated under this measure.

[70 FR 6322, Feb. 7, 2005, as amended at 80 FR 53243, Sept. 3, 2015]

[↑ Back to Top](#)

[Need assistance?](#)