

HB 2262 – Answers to questions we’ve been getting

Isn't the asset test needed to keep people who don't need TANF off the program and prevent fraud?

- No because the stringent work requirement keeps people who aren't truly needy off the program.
- In addition, cases are re-determined every 6 months and the recipient must prove they meet income, residence and other eligibility requirements.
- DHS conducted 192,000 individual case reviews last year and found only 8 cases where the family's assets exceeded \$3000; this demonstrates that the asset test is not needed to limit the program to the truly needy

Would we stop checking bank accounts if this bill passes?

- Yes, we would stop verifying assets since it is a waste of the taxpayer's money.
- Last year, IDHS did 192,000 individual eligibility reviews and found only 8 cases that with assets over the \$3000 limit.
- According to DHS, those checks consumed \$960,000 worth of caseworker time.
- Thus, we spent \$1 million to find 8 cases where the TANF applicant or recipient had assets greater than \$3000.

Why should we make it possible for TANF recipients to save when people working and living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to save?

- Saving money is hard for everyone.
- HB 2262 would eliminate a barrier that prevents families on TANF from saving.
- The asset test forces families to get rid of a second car needed to get to work or look for a job if it's worth more than \$3000.

You say there were only 8 cases that were over-asset but I don't believe DHS' numbers.

- The numbers make sense given TANF's stringent work requirement.
- The general accuracy of DHS' numbers is confirmed by Virginia's experience, where 30 families were over-asset.

How is this different from Maximus finding that 65% of the medical assistance cases they reviewed were ineligible?

- DHS admits that it hadn't reviewed the medical assistance cases for 2-3 years whereas TANF cases are reviewed every 6 months.
- The first round of Maximus cases were low-hanging fruit, i.e., cases that were selected because they were likely living out-of-state.