DATE: October 17, 2011

SUBJECT: Claims for Transportation Assistance

TRACKING #: 11-09-013

The following is in response to the e-mail dated September 6, 2011, concerning the above subject. The situation and question are summarized below.

SITUATION: Our claims workers have asked the following questions regarding transportation assistance and possible claims. We’ve had some discrepancies with case managers filing claims for transportation payments and want everyone to be on the same page. Volumes I, III and IIIA state a claim is established when issued to an ineligible client.

QUESTION 1: When initial transportation for current month and following month is issued and the worker finds out the client did not participate at all, is there a claim?

RESPONSE: No, there would be no claim. There may have been reasons why the individual did not attend the KWP activity. The worker should begin conciliation and discuss any barriers or issues the individual may have that prevented participation. The individual was eligible for transportation at the time it was issued.

QUESTION 2: If the individual had participated but did not complete all the required hours, is there a claim?

RESPONSE: No, there would be no claim. Failure to meet participation is not a reason to establish a claim.

QUESTION 3: If transportation is issued for the following month and the client then requests K-TAP be discontinued (before cut-off of current month), is there a claim?

RESPONSE: No, there would be no claim. The individual was eligible for transportation assistance at the time it was issued.
**QUESTION 4:** If form PA-33, Verification of Kentucky Works Participation, is returned, in September to verify August participation and the worker realizes the information has been forged, do we establish a claim for the transportation they received in July for August, or for the transportation they received in August for September, or both?

**RESPONSE:** There would be no claim for either month. At the time the transportation payments were issued, the individual was eligible. In this situation, when the worker realized the September PA-33 was forged, transportation for October should not be issued. The worker should begin the conciliation process with the individual. If the worker discovered form PA-33 was forged after transportation was issued, a claim would be pursued on this payment (for October).

Volume I, MS 1200 and 1201 will be revised.

FSSB/TF/CS
There are no clarifications currently associated with Volume II.
There are no clarifications currently associated with Volume IIA.
DATE: August 30, 2012
SUBJECT: Verification of Wages in FAD Eligibility
TRACKING #: 12-08-010

The following is in response to your e-mail dated August 6, 2012, concerning the above subject. The situation and questions are summarized below.

SITUATION: Applicant lost her former job due to a medical issue and does not have a new job at this time and does not indicate she may have a job in the near future. Vol. III MS 2200 states an applicant must be self-supporting as defined by being employed and paid wages or will be employed by the end of the 3-month eligibility period. Vol. III 2203 states a good candidate for FAD is employed or will be employed within three months of the application.

QUESTION 1: Does the applicant have to verify that he/she has a new job or will have paid employment by the end of the three month period or does eligibility exist if the applicant states they will have employment by the end of the three month period.

RESPONSE 1: Yes, the applicant must verify at application he or she has new employment or that employment will resume within the three month period.

Question 2: If verification of employment is required what form of verification is acceptable?

Response 2: The applicant can use any form of verification that is normally accepted to verify employment for eligibility purposes.

Vol. III, MS 2200, Family Alternatives Diversion and MS 2203, FAD Eligibility Determination, will be revised to clarify.

If you have additional questions, please contact Lisa Pike of the Family Self-Sufficiency Branch.

TF/FSSB/LP
DATE: August 24, 2012

SUBJECT: Permanent Custody Review Date

TRACKING #: 12-07-031

The following is in response to your e-mail dated July 13, 2012, concerning the above subject. The situation and question are summarized below.

SITUATION: A clarification is requested on VOL. III, MS 5055 and MS 5010 for situations in which the application is backdated on KAMES but approved months later. Kinship Care (KC) policy states that the caregiver has 12 months from approval on KAMES before they are required to pursue permanent custody. Instructions advise workers to enter the date of permanent custody review as the last day of the month of the certification period as assigned by KAMES.

If an application is backdated 90 days and instructions from MS 5055 are followed, the caregiver’s review date would be considerably shorter than an application that was not backdated (i.e. active K-TAP payee etc.) but received KC benefits for the same time period.

QUESTION: How should workers determine the correct review date at application for KC in instances where applications are backdated up to 90 days on KAMES vs. entered and approved in the same month with retro benefits issued via special circumstance? Can MS 5055 be revised for clarity to avoid errors in the future?

RESPONSE: The requirement to pursue permanent custody begins when KC is approved on KAMES. The review date is 12 months from the date of approval, regardless of whether the application was backdated or special circumstances were issued.

For example, an application is taken on 7/1/12 and is back dated to the date of placement, 5/15/12. The application is approved on 7/2/12. KAMES will assign a certification end date of 4/30/13. But since the application is approved in July, the review date of permanent custody is 6/30/13.

Vol. III, MS 5010, KC Application Process and MS 5055, Permanency Requirements, will be revised to clarify.
If you have additional questions, please contact Clarizza Singayao of the Family Self-Sufficiency Branch.

TF/FSSB/CS
DATE: October 15, 2012

SUBJECT: Hourly Participation when a Child Turns 6 Years Old

TRACKING #: 12-10-015

The following is in response to your e-mail dated October 5, 2012, concerning the above subject. The situation and question are summarized below.

SITUATION: The only child in a K-TAP case is turning 6 years old.

QUESTION: When is the individual required to change hours from 20 to 30 hours per week?

RESPONSE: When looking at the age requirement, we look at the age of the child as of the 1\textsuperscript{st} day of the month. If the child turns 6 years old on the first of the month, he/she is considered 6 for that month and the individual is required to participate 30 hours per week.

If the child’s sixth birthday is any day after the 1\textsuperscript{st}, he/she is still considered 5 years old for the month and the individual is required to participate 20 hours per week. The requirement to participate 30 hours per week would start the month following the sixth birthday.

Vol. IIIA, MS 4005 will be revised.

TF/FSSB/MMB
DATE: June 23, 2011

SUBJECT: Required Hours for KWP Participation

TRACKING #: 11/04/063

The following is in response to your e-mail dated April 28, 2011 concerning the above subject. The situation and question are summarized below.

SITUATION: In some instances, KWP individuals complete the required number of weekly hours to meet their KWP participation requirement; however, when we divide the monthly hours by 4.33 to calculate participation for the month, the weekly average does not meet the weekly requirement because of the number of days in the month.

QUESTION: How many hours per week or month do we need to tell an individual to participate to ensure he/she meets the KWP participation requirement?

RESPONSE: Individuals must meet their requirement of 20/30/35 hours per week. The hours per week are the minimum requirement to meet participation. When you divide the total monthly hours by 4.33, if the average is 19.01/29.01/34.01 or greater, round up. Do not conciliate or sanction. The individual is considered to have met the weekly requirement.

VOL IIIA MS 4650 will be revised for clarity.

FSSB/TF/MMB
TO: Deseriee Sparrow, Program Specialist  
Northern Bluegrass Service Region

FROM: Melissa Milby, Branch Manager  
K-TAP Section

DATE: November 23, 2010

SUBJECT: Full Family Sanction Reapproval

TRACKING #: 10-10-016P

The following is in response to your e-mail October 28, 2010, concerning the above subject. The situation and question are summarized below.

**SITUATION:** An individual with a previous full family sanction reapplied for K-TAP benefits on 10/17/10. The individual was employed 30 hours per week from 10/1/10-10/15/10, but lost his/her job on 10/16/10. The individual is required to participate for half of the month in order to cure the full family sanction.

**QUESTION:** Do we consider the 15 days of employment in the beginning of the month sufficient to cure the full family sanction since the individual is no longer employed at the time of application?

**RESPONSE:** No. In order to cure the full family sanction, the participation must be current and expected to continue.

If you have additional questions, please contact Jennifer Miller of the Family Self-Sufficiency Branch.

LM/FSSB/JM
There are no clarifications currently associated with Volume IV.
There are no clarifications currently associated with Volume IVA.