



PROPOSED RULE MAKING

CR-102 (December 2017) (Implements RCW 34.05.320)

Do NOT use for expedited rule making

CODE REVISER USE ONLY

OFFICE OF THE CODE REVISER
STATE OF WASHINGTON
FILED

DATE: June 15, 2018

TIME: 2:13 PM

WSR 18-13-079

Agency: Department of Social and Health Services, Economic Services Administration

Original Notice

Supplemental Notice to WSR _____

Continuance of WSR _____

Preproposal Statement of Inquiry was filed as WSR 18-08-004 ; or

Expedited Rule Making--Proposed notice was filed as WSR _____; or

Proposal is exempt under RCW 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); or

Proposal is exempt under RCW _____.

Title of rule and other identifying information: (describe subject) The department is proposing to amend WAC 388-446-0015 "What is an intentional program violation (IPV) and administrative disqualification hearings (ADH) for basic food assistance."

Hearing location(s):

Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:
July 25, 2018	10:00 a.m.	Office Building 2 DSHS Headquarters 1115 Washington Olympia, WA 98504	Public parking at 11 th and Jefferson. A map is available at: https://www.dshs.wa.gov/sesa/rules-and-policies-assistance-unit/driving-directions-office-bldg-2

Date of intended adoption: Not earlier than July 26, 2018 (Note: This is **NOT** the **effective** date)

Submit written comments to:

Name: DSHS Rules Coordinator

Address: PO Box 45850
Olympia, WA 98504

Email: DSHSRPAURulesCoordinator@dshs.wa.gov

Fax: 360-664-6185

Other:

By (date) 5:00 p.m. July 25, 2018

Assistance for persons with disabilities:

Contact Jeff Kildahl, DSHS Rules Consultant

Phone: 360-664-6092

Fax: 360-664-6185

TTY: 711 Relay Service

Email: Kildaja@dshs.wa.gov

Other:

By (date) July 11, 2018

Purpose of the proposal and its anticipated effects, including any changes in existing rules: Changes proposed under this filing will amend WAC 388-446-0015 to align with federal regulations specifying administrative law judges' jurisdiction over administrative disqualification hearings for intentional program violations of the basic food and food assistance programs.

Reasons supporting proposal: The proposed changes are necessary to clarify the jurisdiction of administrative law judges over the administrative disqualification and intentional program violation process for basic food or food assistance program recipients.

Statutory authority for adoption: RCW 74.04.500, RCW 74.04.510, RCW 74.08A.120

Statute being implemented:

Is rule necessary because of a:

Federal Law?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Federal Court Decision?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
State Court Decision?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

If yes, CITATION: 7 CFR 273.16

Agency comments or recommendations, if any, as to statutory language, implementation, enforcement, and fiscal matters: None

Name of proponent: (person or organization) Department of Social and Health Services

<input type="checkbox"/> Private
<input type="checkbox"/> Public
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governmental

Name of agency personnel responsible for:

	Name	Office Location	Phone
Drafting:	Ezra Paskus	712 Pear St SE, Olympia WA	360-725-4611
Implementation:	Ezra Paskus	712 Pear St SE, Olympia WA	360-725-4611
Enforcement:	Ezra Paskus	712 Pear St SE, Olympia WA	360-725-4611

Is a school district fiscal impact statement required under RCW 28A.305.135? Yes No

If yes, insert statement here:

The public may obtain a copy of the school district fiscal impact statement by contacting:

Name:
Address:
Phone:
Fax:
TTY:
Email:
Other:

Is a cost-benefit analysis required under RCW 34.05.328?

Yes: A preliminary cost-benefit analysis may be obtained by contacting:

Name:
Address:
Phone:
Fax:
TTY:
Email:
Other:

No: Please explain: These amendments are exempt as allowed under RCW 34.05.328(5)(b)(vii) which states in part, "this section does not apply to...rules of the Department of Social and Health Services relating only to client medical or financial eligibility and rules concerning liability for care of dependents."

Regulatory Fairness Act Cost Considerations for a Small Business Economic Impact Statement:

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, **may be exempt** from requirements of the Regulatory Fairness Act (see chapter 19.85 RCW). Please check the box for any applicable exemption(s):

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.061 because this rule making is being adopted solely to conform and/or comply with federal statute or regulations. Please cite the specific federal statute or regulation this rule is being adopted to conform or comply with, and describe the consequences to the state if the rule is not adopted.

Citation and description:

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt because the agency has completed the pilot rule process defined by RCW 34.05.313 before filing the notice of this proposed rule.

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under the provisions of RCW 15.65.570(2) because it was adopted by a referendum.

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025(3). Check all that apply:

RCW 34.05.310 (4)(b)
(Internal government operations)

RCW 34.05.310 (4)(e)
(Dictated by statute)

RCW 34.05.310 (4)(c)
(Incorporation by reference)

RCW 34.05.310 (4)(f)
(Set or adjust fees)

RCW 34.05.310 (4)(d)
(Correct or clarify language)

RCW 34.05.310 (4)(g)
((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit)

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW 19.85.025.

Explanation of exemptions, if necessary: The proposed rule does not have an economic impact on small businesses.

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES

If the proposed rule is **not exempt**, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?

No Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated. _____

Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business economic impact statement is required. Insert statement here:

The public may obtain a copy of the small business economic impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by contacting:

Name:

Address:

Phone:

Fax:

TTY:

Email:

Other:

Date: June 14, 2018

Name: Katherine I. Vasquez

Title: DSHS Rules Coordinator

Signature:

WAC 388-446-0015 What is an intentional program violation (IPV) and administrative disqualification hearing((s)) (ADH) for basic food ((assistance.))?

(1) An intentional program violation (IPV) is an act in which someone intentionally:

(a) Misrepresents, conceals, or withholds facts in order to be found eligible for benefits or to receive more benefits than their actual circumstances would allow(~~(. This includes)~~) including making a false statement regarding household circumstances(~~(.)~~);

(b) Acts in violation of the Food Nutrition Act of 2008, regulations for the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP) under Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (~~(e)~~), any state statute, or WAC relating to the use, presentation, transfer, acquisition, receipt, trafficking, or possession of food assistance benefits includ- ing(~~(+)~~); or

(c) Attempts to buy, sell, steal, or trade food assistance benefits issued and accessed via electronic benefit transfer (EBT) cards, EBT card numbers or personal identification numbers (PINs), for cash or anything other than eligible food, alone or acting with others.

(2) If we suspect someone has committed an IPV we refer their case for an administrative disqualification hearing (ADH), (~~(if)~~) un- less:

(a) ~~The ((suspected IPV causes an over issuance of four hundred fifty dollars or more))~~ case is currently referred for prosecution; or

(b) ~~((The suspected IPV is due to the trafficking of food bene- fits; and~~

~~(c) The person has not been referred for criminal proceedings))~~ A court or prosecutor already took action against the person for the same or related facts.

(3) An administrative disqualification hearing (ADH) is a formal hearing to determine if a person committed an IPV. ADHs are governed by the rules found in chapter 388-02 WAC. However, rules in this section are the overriding authority if there is a conflict.

(4) A person suspected of an IPV can choose to waive their right to an ADH by signing a disqualification consent agreement that waives their right to the hearing and accepts the IPV penalty under WAC 388-446-0020.

(5) If someone commits one or more IPV's and is suspected of committing another, we refer them for an ADH when the act of suspected violation occurred:

(a) After we mailed the disqualification notice to the client for the most recent IPV; or

(b) After criminal proceedings for the most recent IPV are con- cluded.

(6) When we (~~(suspect someone has committed an IPV, we)~~) refer (~~(their)~~) a case for an administrative disqualification hearing (ADH) (~~(.)~~), the office of administrative hearings (OAH) sends (~~(them)~~) the person notice of (~~(an)~~) the ADH at least thirty days in advance of the hearing date. OAH sends the notice by certified mail, or personal service. The notice will contain the following information:

(a) The date, time, and place of the hearing;

(b) The charges against the person;

(c) A summary of the evidence, and how and where they may examine the evidence;

(d) A warning that a decision will be based entirely on the evidence the department provides if they fail to appear at the hearing;

(e) A statement that the person has ten days from the date of the scheduled hearing to show good cause for failing to attend the hearing and to ask for a new hearing date;

(f) A warning that a determination of IPV will result in a disqualification period; and

(g) A statement that if we schedule a telephone hearing, they ~~((can))~~ may request an in-person hearing by filing a request with the administrative law judge one week or more prior to the date of the hearing.

(7) The department may combine an ADH and a regular hearing when the reason for both hearings is related.

(8) The person or a representative ~~((shall have))~~ has the right to one continuance of up to thirty days if a request is filed ten days or more prior to the hearing date.

(9) The administrative law judge (ALJ) will conduct the ADH and render a decision even if the person or representative fails to appear, unless within ten days from the date of the scheduled hearing:

(a) The person can show good cause for failing to appear; and

(b) The person or representative requests the hearing be reinstated.

(10) We may change a scheduled telephone hearing to an in-person hearing if this is requested by the person or department representative at least ~~((a))~~ one week in advance. The person requesting a change less than one week in advance must show good cause for the requested change.

(11) The ALJ issues a final decision as specified in WAC 388-02-0215 through 388-02-0525. The decision determines whether the department had established with clear and convincing evidence that the person committed and intended to commit an IPV.

(12) The department and the client each have the right to request a reconsideration of the decision as specified in WAC 388-02-0610 through 388-02-0635. The final order or the reconsideration decision is the final agency decision.

(13) We will not implement a disqualification and continue benefits at the current amount if:

(a) The client can show good cause for not attending the hearing within thirty days from the date the disqualification notice was mailed; and

(b) An administrative law judge determines the client had good cause; or

(c) The client requests reconsideration or files a petition for judicial review to appeal the disqualification as specified in WAC 388-02-0530 (1) or (4).