FACT SHEET | Methodology Conflicts with OLA Audit

The Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) has reviewed 52 cases and identified 12 cases with 9 different issues. In addition, in two of these cases, the Office of the Legislative Auditor (OLA) made determinations based on self-employment information that DHS does not have the authority to view, and that it is not required by law to review. Examples of these types of cases:

EXAMPLE CASE ONE
A single man (under 65 years old and not a person with disabilities) was subject to renewal of Medical Assistance in January 2015.

Non-financial Eligibility Factors: He was found to meet all requirements.

DHS Financial Eligibility Determination:
1. The man attested to his income and a family size of one.
2. The system calculates program income based on the information provided.
   • His current income is found to be within the Medical Assistance income limit.
3. The system attempts to verify his income based on available data sources.
   • His income is found reasonably compatible with data sources.
4. His Medical Assistance is renewed.
   • A notice is issued informing him that his eligibility has been renewed. The notice includes a summary of the information used to renew his eligibility for MA, and directions to contact the county agency if the information shown is incorrect or has changed.

OLA FINDING: The OLA found this man is eligible for MA, but was placed into the wrong eligibility category due to a household composition error.

DHS FINDING: DHS disagrees with the OLA’s finding. DHS confirmed all the necessary steps were performed. The OLA’s reliance on data not available to DHS was in error, and led to a determination contrary to what DHS finds when applying the standards required by law.

EXAMPLE CASE TWO
A single adult woman (under 65 years old and not pregnant) applied in February 2015 and was determined eligible for MinnesotaCare.

Non-financial Eligibility Factors: She was found to meet all requirements.

DHS Financial Eligibility Determination:
1. This woman attested to a family size of one, and to income from wages and Social Security.
2. The system calculates program income based on the information provided.
   a. Her current income was found to be above the income limit for Medical Assistance.
   b. Her projected annual income was found to be within the income limit for MinnesotaCare.
      i. For MinnesotaCare, financial eligibility is based on the income expected for the entire year, and not just at the point in time the application is filed.
3. The system attempts to verify her income based on available data sources.
4. Her projected annual income could not be verified, or was not reasonably compatible with data sources.
5. MinnesotaCare eligibility is correctly approved based on the applicant's attestation.

OLA FINDING: This woman was not eligible for MinnesotaCare because her income was above the MinnesotaCare income limit.

DHS RESPONSE: DHS disagrees with the OLA’s finding. The OLA used data that was not available to DHS at the time of this woman’s application to determine her projected annual income. The auditor did not contact this woman to confirm or refute the data.