



TESTIMONY

Of Don Winstead

Deputy Secretary
Florida Department of Children and Families

On behalf of the
AMERICAN PUBLIC HUMAN SERVICES ASSOCIATION

Submitted to the

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Agriculture
Subcommittee on Department Operations,
Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry

“Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program”

July 28, 2010



Chairman Baca, Ranking Member Fortenberry, and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning about the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), including its quality control policies. My name is Don Winstead and I am Deputy Secretary of the Florida Department of Children and Families, the state agency that administers the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program as well as other programs serving low-income and vulnerable children, adults, and families.

I am appearing this morning on behalf of the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA). My statement includes APHSA's assessment of the current state of SNAP and quality control, as well as some of Florida's experience in improving the performance and integrity of this vitally important program. We appreciate the opportunity to make recommendations for the upcoming reauthorization of SNAP that will support sound program integrity, administration, and customer service.

APHSA is an 80-year-old non-profit, bipartisan organization representing the nation's state and local public human service agencies. As those who administer and implement public human service programs, including SNAP, we have an important and highly relevant point of view we urge the Subcommittee to consider. APHSA has testified about SNAP before Congress on a number of occasions, but we are especially concerned about the 2012 reauthorization of this essential nutrition assistance program. We strongly believe SNAP is one of the most important means of supporting the well-being of low-income individuals and families, and that it must remain a viable way to help those in need. To continue this good record, SNAP law must support sensible and cost-effective administration and review of the program.

SNAP (the new name for the Food Stamp Program) is supervised by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and administered by the state and local human service agencies. In federal fiscal year 2009 it served an annual average of 33.7 million persons, an increase of nearly 19 percent over FY 2008. In April 2010 (the most recent month available), participation reached 40.4 million persons, another all-time record, and 42 percent higher than the FY 2008 average.

The number of states experiencing caseload increases of 25 to 40 percent is unprecedented, with some states more than doubling their caseloads since April 2007. In the past three years, the number of people served nationally grew by over 50 percent. In my state, Florida's SNAP served 1.2 million individuals in April 2007 and now, as of June 2010, is serving more than 2.7 million individuals – an extraordinary increase of 126 percent. At the same time states have and continue to face extreme pressures on finances resulting in cutbacks in human service staffing – hiring freezes, furloughs, and layoffs. Florida experienced a reduction of 43 percent of its staff between FY 2003 and 2006. Considering these conditions, it is a testament to the commitment of public human service agencies that we have achieved the highest payment accuracy level in the history of the program for FY 2009 at 95.64 percent. How was

this possible? It involved the joint efforts of Congress, the Department of Agriculture, and state and local administrators as well as the commitment of thousands of dedicated front-line staff.

In Florida, we have worked aggressively to improve program access and integrity. We learned early on that technology was the key to reaching large numbers of people and assuring quick and accurate eligibility determinations. Over 90 percent of our applications are received electronically from customers' homes, businesses, agency offices and a network of over 3,000 community partners. Through a great partnership with USDA, we developed new policies, procedures, and waivers to get the right amount of benefits to people quickly, while saving taxpayers more than \$83 million in recurring annual costs for program administration. We use telephone interviews in concert with electronic data exchanges to assure program integrity. We process over 298,000 data exchanges each month from sources such as the Social Security Administration and state unemployment agency to assure income is known and correctly counted. We match all our customers against the Social Security database to confirm Social Security numbers and identity, enabling us to find and validate other income and prevent duplicate payments. This spring, our legislature authorized expanded access to the Department of Motor Vehicles database, enabling eligibility staff to view driver's license data, signatures, and customer photographs. These combined uses of technology have helped us achieve our objectives in payment accuracy and proper stewardship of public funds.

Improved Payment Accuracy in SNAP

SNAP has a remarkably successful history in reducing improper payments. Payment accuracy is measured through a quality control system operated by the states and monitored by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). Policy options, simplifications, and administrative practices affect payment accuracy in the program. Although states were making great progress in increasing payment accuracy in the decade before the 2002 farm bill, the reforms made by that bill in both policy and performance measurement, plus its incentive bonuses for high performance, greatly enhanced program performance. States have reduced the SNAP error rate (a rather broad label for the total of overissuances plus underissuances) from 6.64 percent in FY 2003 to 4.36 percent in FY 2009. At the same time, program participation has increased from 60.4 percent of those eligible in 2004 to 67 percent in 2008. This approach dramatically demonstrates that, with the right mix of policies, it is possible to both reduce improper payments and protect program access.

My state provides an excellent example of what can be achieved. As a national leader in eligibility modernization, DCF turned its attention to accuracy and quality of service in 2006 and targeted key components necessary for improvement. Florida, the fourth largest state in the nation, achieved the best payment accuracy in the nation for the last two years, reducing the error rate from over 8 percent to 0.85 percent and then 0.70 percent. In addition to improving accuracy, each year we have also improved the timeliness of eligibility decisions in spite of rising caseloads.

Florida's emergence as the most successful state in the nation when it comes to improving SNAP performance was not attained by sleight of hand. Rather it is due to persistent and thorough analysis of program performance, followed by immediate corrective action. We combined the Quality Control and Quality Assurance functions to enhance state oversight, align focus, and

improve policies and casework. We believe case review and analysis are critical to managing program performance and developed an electronic web-based case reading tool, Quality Management System (QMS), to combat errors. This tool uses technology to select cases for review using an error-prone profile that can be adjusted based on new data and trends. It allows the state to track, in real time, error trends among all levels, i.e., worker, unit, circuit, region, and state. The data is continually analyzed at the local, regional, and state levels to detect problems and fix cases immediately—before benefits are issued incorrectly. This proactive approach enabled Florida to rapidly and dramatically improve program accuracy and maintain our standing as a national leader in program performance.

The QMS case reading tool has been supported by FNS and introduced to and shared with several other states. Just like Florida, many states have discovered the direct link of case reviews to accuracy improvement and maintenance. Florida has recognized the increased need to keep a pulse on performance during stressful caseloads to avoid a breakdown in program integrity. The commitment to this effort statewide resulted in three consecutive years of enhanced funding bonus payments. FNS has also actively supported the sharing of innovative practices through state exchange funds. Our staff have visited other states to learn their best practices, and over 40 states have visited Florida to learn about our improvements in technology and practice; in this time of rapid growth and sparse funding, we and other states know the necessity of fresh and effective new avenues to continue assuring program integrity.

Policy and Process Reforms

The groundwork for these remarkable achievements was laid in the significant policy reforms of the 2002 and 2008 Farm Bills. Prior to the 2002 bill, the program was overburdened with requirements that caused some states to adopt procedures such as monthly reporting to capture all the detailed household information the law required about household circumstances. In addition, excessive federal micromanagement, a lack of state flexibility, and conflicts with the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program and Medicaid were among the problems that contributed to a sharp decline in SNAP participation from 1995 to 2001, to high administrative costs, and to increased QC errors.

The 2002 and 2008 laws' nutrition titles included many important changes designed to improve SNAP administration and enhance access for applicants and recipients. They reflected many of the reforms that APHSA had advocated for years, particularly simpler procedures and additional administrative options. Some of the significant changes included allowing states to exclude certain types of income and resources in conformity with TANF or Medicaid; providing for a simplified utility standard; providing an option for semi-annual reporting available to most households, with requirements to report only significant changes during the six-month period; and transitional benefits for families moving from welfare. Several of these options were extended to cover additional households and circumstances in 2008. The USDA has augmented these and other important policy and process reforms through flexibility in providing waivers and through sharing and encouraging use of policy and administrative options such as categorical eligibility. Its recent support of the use of telephone interviews has been particularly helpful to states in handling the increased caseload.

In Florida, this has been an exceptionally important process and we are thankful for the great relationship we have with the regional and national offices of the Food and Nutrition Service. We have worked collaboratively to understand issues and create real solutions to real problems. Several federal options, waivers, and demonstrations were used to improve customer service and accuracy. Real and active communication has been vital to exceptional performance.

As a leader of a state human service agency, I naturally take the greatest pride in what states have done to take advantage of the policy options and administrative flexibility available to us as well as to develop modern administrative practices. Fifty states and jurisdictions have adopted semi-annual reporting; 39 have implemented broad-based categorical eligibility; 40 have adopted a simplified utility standard; 36 have adopted simplified definitions of income and resources; and 19 have adopted transitional benefits with more expected following the recent publication of regulations that provide greater flexibility for the option. In addition, over half the states currently use telephone interviews waivers—a prime example of a policy that should be changed to a state option. States have also made a significant commitment to redesigning their business processes to take advantage of technology as resources permit. States are adopting both internal and external web applications; electronic case files through the use of document imaging; call centers; closer relationships with community partners that support the program; and business process redesign to eliminate redundancies, obsolete requirements, and unnecessary activities.

Florida led the way for the now-national move to modernize program services, with a complete redesign of an antiquated service delivery model. Florida used strong technology innovations, waived old processes and policy constraints, and built a community partner relationship that has been modeled by other states. Florida created a 24/7 accessible web application, virtual case files via document imaging, specialized call centers for information, change reporting portals, and web-based systems for use by internal staff and community partners. Without this modern system and the badly needed American Recovery and Reinvestment Act administrative funding, we would have been unable to provide anywhere near timely services during the recession. With the system, we were able to withstand an unprecedented increase in our caseload as we improved accuracy and speed of determinations. Not just one option, but the full package of all options and opportunities, was employed to build this strong and effective system.

Program Performance Reforms

Prior to the 2002 program reauthorization, the quality control system was the only program performance measure that received major attention. The QC system required precise prediction and tracking of participants' income and circumstances despite the volatility of those factors among low-income families. The system was particularly unsuited for fairly evaluating earned income, which often fluctuates for this population and is therefore difficult to forecast and report. States that exceeded the error tolerance were subject to significant penalties. Those that were below the error tolerance were rewarded with an enhanced administrative match. These factors drove states to adopt policies like monthly reporting, short certification periods, and strict verification of all eligibility factors, which made the program complex and time-consuming for both staff and households and created a significant barrier to participation and effective administration.

The 2002 legislation established a program performance system that included several positive changes to the QC system and created a new system of bonuses for states with high performance in not only benefit accuracy but also other activities including application timeliness, program access, and administrative processing of “negative actions” (denials, closures, and benefit suspensions). This served to broaden the focus of the program to include areas of client service in addition to benefit accuracy. This broadened approach plus reforms made to the QC system have resulted in a welcome expansion of focus—at both the federal and state levels—on access and customer service and not just the error rate. This more inclusive approach to program assessment has in turn reinforced much of the program’s recent policy and process simplification.

The most welcome QC system reform provided that only states with persistently high error rates would face liabilities (in general, those states where the error rate exceeds 105 percent of the national average for two consecutive years). Also, USDA was given the ability to waive all or part of a liability, and/or require up to 50 percent to be reinvested in the program, and/or require 50 percent to be set aside and either paid or forgiven depending on state performance. In addition, the 2002 law provides \$48 million in bonuses to be awarded each year to the states with high performance in the established measures. Over half of the amount is directed to states with the best and most improved payment accuracy (\$24 million) and correctness of negative actions (\$6 million); the remainder is divided among the best states in application processing timeliness (\$6 million) and program access (\$12 million). These changes have achieved their purpose of sanctioning only “outliers” while encouraging steadily better performance, and are surely a major factor in the remarkably improved program integrity record states have turned in since then.

Current Challenges

While the farm bills achieved substantial simplification, additional changes are needed if we are not only to maintain but enhance these remarkable achievements and keep errors low. For example, states could benefit greatly from optional standardization in the area of expense deductions. The program also needs other reforms designed to reach the elderly and disabled, who remain a severely underserved population. One of the most useful would be making the Combined Application Projects (CAPs), under which SSI recipients can automatically receive SNAP benefits, a nationally available option rather than the currently approved small number of demonstration projects. The existing CAP projects are simple, inexpensive, and far more accessible to the elderly and disabled than the regular SNAP program. Many of them have been in place for years, and this highly successful model should no longer be considered experimental. For example, Florida has been a successful CAP state for years, yet is still required to perform separate evaluative reviews and provide reports to FNS, and these cases are also subject to the Quality Control sample. The documented success of the program should now alleviate the states from persistent and ongoing excessive reviews and yearly reports.

The program’s continuing complexities also contribute to the fact that SNAP still reaches just 67 percent of eligibles despite the recent dramatic surge in the caseload. One of the major high performance bonus categories in which states now compete is the increase in their participation rate, yet even the best outreach efforts still run headlong into SNAP’s numerous eligibility requirements and ongoing administrative burdens.

Performance Measures and Administrative Support

The high performance bonus system is insufficiently funded; it provides only \$48 million for all measures, an amount that is less than the pre-2002 enhanced funding system had been paying out for low errors alone. It also remains too entwined with process measures. For example, the \$6 million for the negative error rate primarily measures paperwork and administrative processes rather than the true validity of denials to ineligible persons. States should also always be allowed to choose reinvestment of any sanction, rather than leaving that option to USDA.

Further reforms in SNAP administrative requirements and performance measurement must be accompanied by corresponding improvements in SNAP administrative cost reimbursement policy. The program's overall administrative costs remain among the highest of any government program due to its complexity and stringent QC oversight. Before 1998, the federal government reimbursed states 50 percent of these costs. However, enactment of cost-allocation provisions that year (which were made permanent in the 2008 act) have since cut the average nationwide reimbursement of SNAP administrative costs to about 47 percent, and some states receive barely above 40 percent. Since 1998, states have lost nearly \$200 million per year—a cumulative total so far of over \$2 billion—in SNAP administrative reimbursements compared to previous policy. These losses have greatly exacerbated the difficulty states have in administering this program. The fresh infusions of administrative funds in ARRA and in last year's Defense Appropriations measure were most welcome and necessary, but only began to make up for this deficit.

Another particularly important need in SNAP administrative cost reform is modernization of the program's automated systems. While other major human service programs enjoy enhanced match for automation—as high as 90 percent—there has been no enhanced SNAP match since the early 1990s. In that time, states have lost ground in their ability to upgrade their SNAP information systems and take full advantage of new technology that is far superior to the legacy systems still in place in many states. The most common reason states report being unable to take full and prompt advantage of simplification options and process redesign is their lack of automation capacity and funding. Another critically necessary step in automated system reform is a simple, uniform, and responsive cross-agency procedure for approving Advance Planning Document requests.

Our Vision for SNAP

The combination of unprecedented demand and declining state and local capacity further highlights the need for program improvements that APHSA has advocated for many years. While Congress and the Department of Agriculture have made many significant SNAP reforms in recent years, we strongly recommend additional program simplification and removal of access barriers; additional administrative support, such as that provided last year in ARRA and the Department of Defense appropriations measure; a focus on accuracy in outcomes rather than process; additional linkages with and coordination among other federal assistance programs; stronger support for nutritious food choices and nutrition education; and far greater encouragement of program innovations.

Our recommendations for your consideration follow. While they are grouped into categories, many serve multiple purposes; for example, changes that reduce administrative barriers improve program access, streamline the workload for program administrators, and enhance payment accuracy. We also believe that simplified program rules and less red tape will help families access more of the benefits to which they are entitled and thus choose costlier but more nutritious foods, something that will help in the fight against childhood obesity.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this testimony and will be pleased to answer any questions you have. We look forward to working closely with the Subcommittee and full Committee as you develop legislative proposals for SNAP reauthorization, and will be pleased to assist you in any way to help make this critically important safety net program stronger, more responsive, and more manageable.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program APHSA Recommendations for the 2012 Farm Bill

Enhancing Program Access

- Amend SNAP law and provide funding so that states can conduct pilot programs to test a variety of innovative methods and alternative application strategies that remove additional barriers and further streamline the eligibility and benefit determination process, including a single portal for accessing multiple programs or a human services electronic home.
- Incorporate the Combined Application Projects into SNAP law as a standard state option rather than continuing them as demonstration projects; allow states to test CAP for additional categories of households; and provide the funding necessary for the Social Security Administration to support projects where automated approval of the standardized SNAP benefit is based on information shared electronically by SSA.
- Restore eligibility for legal non-citizens by reinstating the non-citizen policies in effect prior to the enactment of welfare reform in August 1996.
- Make permanent the state option in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to suspend the three-month participation limit on Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents.
- Allow up to 36-month certification periods for elderly/disabled households with no earned income.

Reducing Program Complexity

- Authorize a significant number of new demonstration projects that drastically simplify the eligibility and benefit calculation, including such examples as coupling presumptive eligibility to new health care reform eligibility tests; basing the benefit on income with only a deduction from earned income and using an altered benefit reduction rate or an additional standard deduction based on household characteristics; an option patterned on the Minnesota Family Investment Plan to allow a standardized SNAP benefit to TANF cash assistance recipients; and optional use of a standard medical expense and a standard deduction for medical insurance premiums for all households.
- Remove barriers in current law that prevent the exchange of data among public assistance programs that would streamline application processing and simplify multi-program administrative requirements.
- Adjust the law to allow flexible interview requirements that will support successful business process redesigns which may currently be implemented only under waiver authority.
- Establish a process of regular and systematic collaboration among FNS, ACF, and CMS on projects that coordinate administrative processes and projects, including a project to rationalize income policy in four areas: (1) definitions of countable income, including what is treated as earned or unearned income; (2) verification of income; (3) budgeting income (prospective, retrospective, period of income to use); and (4) calculation of self-employment income, including agreement on self-employment disregards or establishment of a standard percentage deduction for self-employment disregards.

Supporting Nutritious Food Choices and Nutrition Education

- Assure that SNAP nutrition education (SNAP-Ed) funding continues to be available at current usage and projected growth levels, and that no SNAP-Ed funding is used to offset increases in other programs; and align nutrition education requirements across all federal nutrition programs so that they provide a consistent nutrition message.
- Expand the initiatives in the 2008 farm bill to identify and implement positive incentives for recipients to choose nutritious foods, particularly those that will impact the problem of childhood obesity.
- Provide strong positive incentives for health care programs and providers to include nutrition counseling as a part of well-child care and for persons suffering from obesity-related illnesses.
- Encourage non-traditional food providers to accept SNAP benefits by developing or identifying funding to provide EBT equipment and by eliminating current rules that discourage these types of providers from applying to be authorized retailers.
- Increase the annual funding for the USDA Community Food Projects Competitive Grant Program and require USDA to actively solicit projects that have a plan for involving SNAP recipients as both customers and project participants.

Providing Adequate Funding for Nutrition Benefits

- Retain the ARRA provision that continues the increased SNAP benefit until the regular annual inflation adjustment exceeds the 13.6 percent benefit increase.
- Adopt the pre-1996 inflation adjustment formula that set benefits at 103 percent of the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan the previous June.

Strengthening Support for Administration and Systems Improvement

- Continue annual allocations of 100 percent federal administrative funds, as has been done in 2009 ARRA and the DoD appropriations legislation, as long as the present severe fiscal conditions require.
- Restore the normal SNAP administrative match rate to its historic 50 percent level in place prior to the 1998 Balanced Budget Act cost-allocation reductions.
- Provide an increased, standard federal match for automation for SNAP and all other human service programs.
- Direct FNS, ACF, and CMS to immediately and thoroughly streamline and reform the badly outdated federal Advance Planning Document requirements.
- Ensure that electronic benefit transfer and other electronic payments will continue to be exempt from Regulation E requirements and from any other mandates that would increase costs for program recipients or for state and local agencies.
- Increase funding for SNAP performance bonuses to allow more states to be rewarded for exemplary performance and to shift the performance oversight system toward one based on positive incentives.
- Provide a mechanism for funding state/private partnerships to provide inexpensive equipment to nonprofits that assist people to apply for human services benefits online.

Committee on Agriculture
U.S. House of Representatives
Required Witness Disclosure Form

House Rules* require nongovernmental witnesses to disclose the amount and source of Federal grants received since October 1, 2006.

Name: Don Winstead

Address: 1317 Winewood Blvd., Tallahassee, Florida

Telephone: (850) 921-8533

Organization you represent (if any): American Public Human Services Association
and Florida Department of Children and Families

1. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) you have received since October 1, 2006, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract. House Rules do **NOT** require disclosure of federal payments to individuals, such as Social Security or Medicare benefits, farm program payments, or assistance to agricultural producers:

Source: _____ Amount: _____

Source: _____ Amount: _____

2. If you are appearing on behalf of an organization, please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) the organization has received since October 1, 2006, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract:

Source: SEE ATTACHED Amount: _____

Source: _____ Amount: _____

Please check here if this form is NOT applicable to you: _____

Signature: Don Winstead

* Rule XI, clause 2(g)(4) of the U.S. House of Representatives provides: *Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by any entity represented by the witness.*

PLEASE ATTACH DISCLOSURE FORM TO EACH COPY OF TESTIMONY.

List of Federal Awards By CFDA Summary Since FFY 2006 Through FFY 2011
Awarded to the Department of Families

Source	CFDA	CFDA Title	FFY06	FFY07	Estimated FFY08 ₁	Estimated FFY09 ₁	Estimated FFY10 ₁	Estimated FFY11 ₂
Homeland Security	97.032	CRISIS COUNSELING	0	483,657	0	567,104	332,492	0
HUD	14.231	EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM	2,780,348	2,915,931	2,954,684	2,957,444	2,957,444	2,957,444
DHHS	93.150	COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT OF THE HOMELESS	3,336,000	3,339,000	3,273,000	3,715,000	3,715,000	3,715,000
DHHS	93.243	SA&MH SERVICES-PROJECTS OF REGIONAL & NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE	1,918,437	3,687,601	3,173,799	4,478,128	4,478,128	4,478,128
DHHS	93.556	PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES	17,876,775	16,058,441	14,932,841	14,910,444	14,598,557	14,598,557
DHHS	93.558	TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES BLOCK GRANT	438,918,829	437,922,053	437,922,053	437,922,053	500,065,542	437,922,053
DHHS	93.566	REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE STATE ADMINISTERED PROG	68,170,812	79,085,833	81,156,376	82,871,763	82,871,763	82,871,763
DHHS	93.575	CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT	132,998,875	132,665,156	133,479,788	132,965,928	132,965,928	132,965,928
DHHS	93.576	REFUGEE ENTRANTS ASSISTANCE DISCRETIONARY GRANTS	18,440,000	18,375,000	18,375,000	16,875,681	16,875,681	16,875,681
DHHS	93.579	U.S. REPATRIATE PROGRAM - HAITI	0	0	0	0	33,000,000	0
DHHS	93.584	REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE-TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROG	16,327,472	17,187,504	16,234,265	16,123,902	16,123,902	16,123,902
DHHS	93.590	COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY RESOURCE AND SUPPORT GRANTS	1,345,065	1,450,495	1,399,211	1,399,211	1,399,211	1,399,211
DHHS	93.597	GRANTS TO STATES FOR ACCESS AND VISITATION PROGRAMS	529,116	514,535	497,059	512,017	512,017	512,017
DHHS	93.599	CHAFEE EDUCATION AND TRAINING VOUCHERS PROGRAM	2,535,752	2,594,545	2,555,708	2,376,666	2,376,666	2,376,666
DHHS	93.643	CHILDREN'S JUSTICE GRANTS TO STATES	805,453	857,143	847,514	847,514	847,514	847,514
DHHS	93.645	CHILD WELFARE SERVICES-STATE GRANTS	15,703,861	15,930,592	15,259,104	15,348,265	15,160,043	15,160,043
DHHS	93.658	FOSTER CARE-TITLE IV-E	144,044,702	150,864,333	157,262,298	168,810,770	177,251,309	177,251,309
DHHS	93.659	ADOPTION ASSISTANCE	66,433,315	62,298,624	69,749,594	80,214,931	89,036,513	88,036,513
DHHS	93.667	SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT	215,017,461	163,735,275	164,416,714	189,952,968	164,176,621	164,176,621
DHHS	93.669	ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN YOUTH AND FAMILIES-CHILD ABUSE	1,250,621	1,369,413	1,323,199	1,329,020	1,316,264	1,316,264
DHHS	93.671	FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SERVICES	3,894,275	3,916,656	3,826,207	4,033,338	4,033,338	4,033,338
DHHS	93.674	INDEPENDENT LIVING	7,419,887	7,566,271	7,587,151	7,067,742	6,283,211	6,283,211
DHHS	93.714	EMERGENCY TANF FUND - ARRA	0	0	0	23,428,799	110,870,348	0
DHHS	93.958	BLOCK GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	26,484,468	27,115,633	26,755,292	26,953,073	26,953,073	26,953,073
DHHS	93.959	BLOCK GRANTS FOR PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF SUBST ABUSE	94,317,359	94,336,531	94,338,783	98,102,522	98,102,522	98,102,522
DHHS	93.767	TITLE XXI - STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM	11,712,977	11,712,977	11,712,977	11,712,977	11,712,977	11,712,977
DHHS	93.778	MEDICAID	120,935,372	107,240,116	100,979,816	100,979,816	100,979,816	100,979,816
Dept. of Justice	16.698	VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN FORMULA GRANTS	5,972,025	5,165,183	5,441,594	6,976,652	6,976,652	6,976,652
USDA	10.561	STATE ADMINISTRATIVE MATCHING GRANTS FOR FOOD STAMP PROGRAM	72,295,514	69,401,502	71,728,448	89,568,694	123,250,823	89,568,694

Note:

- (1) The awards for FFY08 through FFY10 are not final at this time. There are still pending award adjustments for grants that are not closed or have not yet been fully released.
- (2) The awards for FFY11 are estimated based on prior FFY balances. In most cases, these awards will not start to be released until 10/01/2010.

AMERICAN PUBLIC HUMAN SERVICES ASSOCIATION
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS ROLL-FORWARD
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2008

Code	Project	GIR 12/31/07	Def Revenue 12/31/07	2008 Receipts	Cash Available	2008 Expenses	w/o uncoll acct	Unresr Revenue 2008	GIR 12/31/08	Def Revenue 12/31/08	GIR Variance Explanation	2008 Receipts Amount	Date	GIR 04/13/09	FAS 87/88 Adjust
NON-FEDERAL															
908	Casey MCPP	3,170.07	-	34,360.71	31,190.64	60,536.38			29,345.74		increased activity	27,343.75	1/14 & 2/7/09	2,001.99	PPA \$2,001.99
913	Data Center	-	-	30,000.00	30,000.00	40,721.40			10,721.40			9,631.04	2/27/2009	1,090.36	PPA \$1,090.36
915	MMI 2008	-	133,584.89	623,155.93	795,740.82	759,249.82			1,500.00		Δ in Director	1,500.00	1/29/2009	-	PPA \$17,405.47
916	Transformation	-	149,875.37	137,600.00	287,475.37	120,134.14			167,341.23		Deferred Revenue	-	-	-	PPA \$1,682.90
919	GU - JJ	-	-	178,008.23	178,008.23	178,008.23			-			-	-	-	-
928	ICAMA-States-2	16,457.20	-	94,410.93	77,953.73	121,820.74			43,897.01		increased activity	36,171.63	1/29 & 3/27/09	7,695.38	PPA \$6,175.34
949	Casey PPOWI	18,576.43	-	418,651.77	400,076.34	468,182.32			97,131.00		Deferred Revenue	97,131.00	1/7 & 1/14/09	-	PPA \$10,882.34
958	CWD 2008	-	464,600.94	534,233.34	998,854.28	462,488.21			6,250.00		Deferred Revenue	6,250.00	1/29/2009	-	PPA \$872.25
975	Jim Casey NYTD	54,022.80	-	165,909.80	111,887.00	82,780.19			-		Deferred Revenue	-	-	-	-
977	ICAMA-States-1	1,114.07	-	61,605.00	60,491.93	60,491.93			-		grant completed	-	-	-	-
981	Jim Casey OYBP	-	-	27,750.00	27,750.00	5,930.71			21,818.29		Deferred Revenue	-	-	-	-
3236	Cohen Fund	-	14,382.47	-	14,382.47	-			14,382.47		Deferred Revenue	-	-	-	-
	Totals	93,338.57	762,443.67	2,305,686.71	2,974,790.81	2,359,343.07			21,473.92	804,262.89					
FEDERAL															
481	Univ of So Maine	-	-	-	-	11,901.85		6,639.56	18,541.41		Y/E Billing	18,541.41	2/11/2009	-	PPA \$366.86
922	Abt	9,042.72	-	38,716.69	29,673.97	33,665.16			3,991.19			3,991.19	1/29 & 2/12/09	-	-
923	ODEP	11,466.68	-	174,474.95	163,008.27	201,257.36			38,249.09			35,443.26	2/7 & 2/11/09	2,805.83	PPA \$2,805.83
929	MIAP	157,190.03	-	210,693.31	53,703.28	60,948.23	(7,244.95)		-		increased activity	-	-	-	-
931	HRSA 2004	86,228.89	-	91,050.00	4,820.11	4,820.11			-		grant completed	-	-	-	-
934	SAMHSA	36,789.14	-	44,000.00	5,210.86	-		5,210.86	-		grant completed	-	-	-	-
935	SAMHSA-TAG (Abt)	-	-	-	-	7,695.94			7,695.94			7,283.44	Various	412.50	Misc Income
937	SAMHSA-COE (Deloitte)	-	-	-	-	3,313.80			3,313.80			3,313.80	1/16/2009	-	S Newwaidt to bill
978	ICAMA-Federal	56,797.08	-	196,774.00	142,978.92	142,978.92			-		grant completed	-	-	-	-
	Subtotal - Federal	359,515.54	-	758,908.95	399,393.41	468,579.37	(7,244.95)	11,850.42	71,791.43	804,262.89					
	TOTAL - GRANTS	452,855.11	762,443.67	3,064,595.66	3,374,184.22	2,825,922.44	(7,244.95)	11,850.42	93,265.35	715,156.48					
											GIL Net Total				

Don Winstead

Special Advisor to the Governor and Deputy Secretary of the Department of Children and Families



In March 2009, Governor Charlie Crist called on Don Winstead to serve as Special Advisor to the Governor for the Implementation of the Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Working in coordination with the Governor's Federal Stimulus Working Group, he is responsible for overseeing and tracking the distribution of Florida's federal stimulus dollars and ensuring taxpayers have access to the information needed to hold government accountable for its use of the funds.

Don continues to serve as the Deputy Secretary of the Florida Department of Children and Families, which has responsibility for a wide range of human services. These include child and adult protective investigations, child welfare, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP), Medicaid eligibility, adult services, refugee services, domestic violence programs, mental health, substance abuse, homelessness services, and child care licensing. He began his career as a front-line caseworker and has worked in a variety of direct service, administrative and managerial positions ranging from Social Worker to Deputy Secretary.

From late 2001 to early 2005, Don served as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Services Policy at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. In this capacity he was a key advisor on human services policy and was responsible for policy development, research and evaluation related to welfare reform, supports for low-income families, and services for families, children and youth.

Don is a nationally recognized expert on federal funding issues and has negotiated ground-breaking federal waivers in welfare reform and child welfare.

Don is a member of the advisory boards of the National Poverty Center at the University of Michigan and the Center for Poverty Research at the University of Kentucky.

Don E. Winstead, Jr.

1317 Winewood Blvd., Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700

or

1604 The Capitol, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001

Office Telephone (850)487-1111

Direct Lines (850 922-0235 and 850-488-5228)

Email: Don.Winstead@myflorida.com or

Don.Winstead@dcf.state.fl.us

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE -

Office of the Governor

Special Advisor to the Governor – Tallahassee, FL (3/2009 to present)

- ♦ Appointed by Governor Crist to oversee implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.
- ♦ Heads the Florida Office of Economic Recovery responsible for all phases of implementation and the federal stimulus package.
- ♦ Represents the Office of the Governor making presentations to community groups and stakeholders within the state and represents the state in national meetings related to the Recovery Act.

Florida Department of Children and Families

Deputy Secretary – Tallahassee, FL (3/2005 to present)

- ♦ Assists Secretary in executive management of department.
- ♦ Responsible for administration and coordination of strategic planning and policy initiatives within the department.
- ♦ Responsible for coordination of priority interprogram activities and initiatives.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Services Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation – Washington, D.C. (12/2001 to 2/2005)

- ♦ Served as human services policy advisor to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
- ♦ Responsible for policy development including policy planning, policy and budget analysis, review of regulations and formulation of legislation related to human services.
- ♦ Responsible for conducting and coordinating research and evaluation on issues related to human services programs including programs related to low income people and families, child and youth development, family formation, immigrants, welfare reform and child support enforcement.
- ♦ Responsible for interdepartmental coordination on cross-cutting issues such as homelessness, delinquency prevention and poverty.

Florida Department of Children and Families (formerly Health and Rehabilitative Services).

Welfare Reform Administrator - Tallahassee, Florida (1/95 to 12/2001)

- ♦ Responsible for overall coordination of welfare reform initiatives within the department.
- ♦ Led project team that developed comprehensive plan to reorganize department.
- ♦ Completed acting assignments as Assistant Secretary for Programs and Chief of Public Assistance Policy.
- ♦ Led initial implementation of the State Children's Health Insurance program within the department.

Senior Management Analyst II - Tallahassee, Florida (11/93 to 12/94)

- ♦ Provided consultation and technical assistance in management of child care services and programs.
- ♦ Initiated strategies to increase federal matching funds for child care services resulting in multi-million dollar increase in federal funding.
- ♦ Initiated payment pilot project which significantly reduced processing delays in paying child care providers.

Assistant Secretary for Economic Services - Tallahassee, Florida (4/93 to 10/93)

- ♦ Administered income maintenance and related public assistance programs including AFDC, Food Stamps, and Medicaid eligibility.
- ♦ Managed operating budget of approximately \$1 billion with over 8,000 field staff.
- ♦ Facilitated reorganization of program headquarters absorbing 25% reduction in staff.
- ♦ Initiated quality improvement and personnel enhancement initiatives.

Deputy Secretary - Tallahassee, Florida (1/91 to 3/93)

- ♦ Assisted Secretary in executive management of department with over 40,000 employees and multi-billion dollar budget.
- ♦ Lead responsibility for legislative initiatives including comprehensive welfare reform bill and reorganization of department.
- ♦ Lead responsibility for development of productivity enhancement proposal used as a model in state government.

Assistant Secretary for Economic Services - Tallahassee, Florida (1/88 to 12/90)

- ♦ Administered income support and public assistance programs.
- ♦ Lead responsibility to implement Family Support Act of 1988 including revision of Florida Employment Opportunity Act.
- ♦ Served on national and regional task forces on public welfare and family support issues.

Deputy District Administrator - Jacksonville, Florida (3/86 to 1/88)

- ♦ Assisted District Administrator in administering seven county HRS district with 3,800 employees and \$150 million operating budget.
- ♦ Primary operational responsibility for Economic Services, Child Support and Medicaid programs.

District Administrative Services Director - Jacksonville, Florida (6/84 to 3/86)

- ♦ Directed administrative functions including personnel, financial management, purchasing, grants management, leasing, staff development and training, etc. for the district.
- ♦ Administered foster care licensure, child care licensure and child support enforcement programs.

Operations and Management Consultant - Jacksonville, Florida (7/80 to 6/84)

- ♦ Provided internal management consultation to district managers.
- ♦ Coordinated accountability systems, operational planning and administrative publications
- ♦ Provided supervisory management training.

Training Specialist - Jacksonville, Florida (3/77 to 7/80)

- ♦ Planned, developed and delivered training programs in management and supervisory skills, casework skills and a variety of program policy areas.
- ♦ Training sessions consistently rated outstanding.

Food Stamp Regional Administrator - Jacksonville, Florida (9/76 to 11/77)

- ♦ Administered food stamp program in seven county area with 14 offices.

Food Stamp Unit Supervisor - Jacksonville, Florida (2/73 to 9/76)

- ♦ Front line supervisor of food stamp unit with up to 20 employees.
- ♦ Supervised all phases of Food Stamp operations including certification and issuance.

Social Worker - Jacksonville, Florida (7/71 to 2/73)

- ♦ Determined eligibility for assistance in AFDC, Food Stamps and Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled programs.

Other work experience included classroom teacher and a variety of part-time and summer experiences.

PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

National Advisory Board, Nation Poverty Center, University of Michigan

National Advisory Board, University of Kentucky Center for Poverty Research

National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics, Program Co-Chair for 2008 National Conference

American Public Human Services Association - Council of State Human Services Administrators

University of South Florida Alumni Association

Tallahassee 2000 - Charter Member

Leadership Jacksonville Alumni Association

EDUCATION

Masters in Business Administration, (Partially completed)
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA - Jacksonville, Florida (1988)

Bachelor of Arts (English)
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA - Tampa, Florida (1969).
