Employment and Training Administration Washington, D.C. 20210	CORRESPONDENCE SYMBOL TEUMC
	DATE May 4, 1994

DIRECTIVE: UIS INFORMATION BULLETIN NO. 11-94

TO: ALL REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

FROM: MARY ANN WYRSCH
Director
Unemployment Insurance Service

SUBJECT: The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System: Identification Methods, Test State Analyses, and Provisions of Technical Assistance

The attached paper on the above subject describes the identification methods, statistical analyses, and technical assistance strategy for the development of statistical models and characteristic screens. These processes are the first steps in the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WP/RS) System described in Field Memorandum No. 35-94 (Implementation of a System of Profiling Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants and Providing Them with Reemployment Services), and will be used to identify UI claimants who are likely to exhaust their benefits and therefore are likely to need reemployment services.

The information provided should prove useful to all Regional Office staff and State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs) in developing the identification components of their WP/RS Systems.

Attachment

RESCISSIONS None	EXPIRATION DATE

The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System:

Identification Methods, Test State Analyses, and Provisions of Technical Assistance

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
Unemployment Insurance Service

May 3, 1994

INTRODUCTION

On November 24, 1993, P.L. 103-152 (The Extended Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993) was enacted. It included provisions that require States to establish and utilize a system of profiling all new claimants for regular compensation that:

> "A) identifies which claimants will be likely to exhaust regular compensation and will need job search assistance services to make a successful transition to new employment;
>
> B) refers claimants identified pursuant to [A] to reemployment services, such as job search assistance services,...;
>
> C) collects follow-up information relating to the services received by such claimants and the employment outcomes for such claimants subsequent to receiving such services and utilizes such information in making identifications pursuant to [A]; and
>
> D) meets such other requirements as the Secretary of Labor determines are appropriate."

The U.S. Department of Labor plans to provide technical assistance (TA) with respect to the entire Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services (WP/RS) system; the Unemployment Insurance Service (UIS) plans to provide technical assistance (TA) with respect to the identification portion of the larger system. As such, this paper addresses: 1) the development and implementation of two claimant identification methods -- statistical models and characteristic screens; 2) a comparison of these two approaches to identification, and 3) how UIS plans to provide technical assistance to the States.

UIS' TA will cover the claimant identification process through the point of referral to services; such TA will not specifically include reemployment services, but will include certain procedures and methods that will facilitate the feedback of information from reemployment service providers to UI. Since the identification component of the WP/RS system needs to be in place before the feedback mechanism, the identification portion is the focus of this paper. Further issuances will address the reemployment services and feedback componentss of the WP/RS system.

TA for the reemployment services portion of the WP/RS system is the joint responsibility of UIS, the Employment Service (ES) and Office of Work Base Learning (OWBL) entities, as well as the One Stop Career Centers (OSCC) Team. The reemployment assistance approach has been jointly developed by the relevant programs of the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) and is expected to follow the procedures outlined in Appendix E of Field

Memorandum 35-94, "Implementation of a System of Profiling UI Claimants and Providing Them with Reemployment Services".

PART I.- BACKGROUND: PROFILING AND REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES SYSTEM

A. System Goals

The goal of a WP/RS system is to assist the customer by:

(1) identifying claimants who are likely to exhaust their benefits and need reemployment services early in their unemployment spells;

(2) linking selected claimants with reemployment services appropriate to their individual needs; and

(3) promoting an earlier return to the workforce.

B. Role of the Federal Partner

(1) The Employment and Training Administration (ETA) is charged with the responsibility of providing direction, guidance, and technical assistance to States in implementing the WP/RS initiative. To this end, guidance and direction have been made available to States through a number of Federal issuances:

- Field Memorandum (FM) 35-94, "Implementation of a System of Profiling UI Claimants and Providing Them with Reemployment Services";
- Unemployment Insurance Program Letter (UIPL) No. 45-93, "Profiling of Unemployment Insurance Claimants";
- UIPL 13-94, with Change 1, The Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993, P.L. 103-152, - "Provisions Affecting the Federal-State Unemployment Compensation Program";
- UIS Information Bulletin No. 4-94, Profiling Model Paper - Profiling Dislocated Workers for Early Referral to Reemployment Services;
- Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-3, The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project;
- Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-1, The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project Follow-Up Report; and

- UIPL 16-90, Technical Assistance Guide (TAG): "The Identification and Referral of Dislocated Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants to Reemployment Services based on the New Jersey UI Reemployment Demonstration Project".

(2) Technical assistance, described in Part II of this paper, will be provided to States to facilitate the analysis, design, and implementation of the claimant identification portion of the WP/RS system.

(3) Each State agency that administers unemployment compensation is responsible for implementing the identification and referral portion of the system defined in P.L. 103-152; however the system must also be coordinated with the agencies or offices that are responsible for providing reemployment services. Entities such as labor market information (LMI) units within the SESAs or other government agencies responsible for the development and publication of labor market information also can be sources of knowledge, experience and data and can facilitate the development of a successful profiling identification system.

PART II - IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS AND STRATEGIES FOR PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

UIS has resources available to assist States in developing and implementing the identification portion of the WP/RS system. Assistance will be available in the areas of statistics, econometric modeling, systems analysis and design, and computer programming. The identification component can be implemented using either of two methodologies: characteristic screens or a statistical model[1]. Though the Department encourages the development of a statistical model using State-specific data, it will support the use of characteristic screens; therefore, technical assistance will be geared toward helping States work through the development and implementation of either identification method.

A. <u>Characteristic screens</u>. Characteristic screens have been used successfully by States to identify UI claimants for referral to reemployment services. With characteristic screens, each identifying data element is used as a decision variable--yes or no, in or out--to screen claimants either into or out of the target group of likely benefit exhaustees. The use of such screens was discussed in detail in "The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project" and the New Jersey

---

[1] As explained in Field Memorandum 35-94, the process of using a statistical model actually includes the use of several "initial screens" in order to identify those claimants who are permanently separated.

study's follow-up report (UI Occasional Papers 89-3 and 91-1, respectively); also, the Technical Assistance Guide (TAG, UIPL 16-90) that was issued in conjunction with the New Jersey study demonstrates how characteristic screens were used to identify UI claimants who were likely to exhaust their benefits.

In accordance with FM 35-94, some of the data elements that were used in the New Jersey study may currently be useful in developing a characteristic screening methodology. It is important to remember that, as specified in FM 35-94, the current profiling initiative requires that both permanent separation and the likelihood of long-term unemployment be inherent in any claimant identification system; therefore, characteristic screens or data elements have to be used that relate to these two conditions. This requirement is, in part, reflective of the fact that individuals referred to reemployment services after being identified as needing such services will also be considered EDWAA-eligible. The written reports and TAG for the New Jersey study will prove useful in providing a discussion and general framework for those States that opt to develop and implement a characteristic screening methodology. States that would like to have any of the written materials from the New Jersey study should contact the appropriate Regional Office.

B. **Statistical models**. The use of a statistical model involves a process that considers all of the identifying data elements simultaneously. With this method, each data element receives a specific weight known as a "coefficient". These elements are then combined in an equation that generates a unique probability of UI benefit exhaustion for each claimant--a score that reflects a weighted average of all of the claimant's characteristics combined. Those claimants whose estimated probability scores are the highest are likely to have the greatest likelihood of benefit exhaustion and therefore have the greatest need for reemployment services, while those whose scores are the lowest are least likely to need such services.

While no specific guidelines have been set with respect to what statistical equation or procedure has to be used to develop a statistical model, all UIS analyses have been conducted through the use of the "logistic regression" or "logit" procedure. A methodology that is fairly common in statistical analyses, this procedure enables one to examine the degree to which each data element is linked to UI benefit exhaustion and facilitates the selection of those data elements that have the most predictive power. This ensures that the statistical model uses UI benefit exhaustion as its focal point and is in harmony with the conditions set forth in Public Law 103-152.

Research indicates that a statistical model is a more efficient identification mechanism than characteristic screens because it

is more responsive to variations among sub-state localities and it provides a more predictive means for selection and referral of the claimants most in need of services. (see Appendix A, Results of Test-State Analysis). The use of a statistical model can be of assistance to States in matching the flow of dislocated UI claimants to available reemployment services. It should be emphasized that model development is an ongoing process; those States that implement a statistical model will find that, as they become more familiar with it and they are able to see how it functions operationally, they will need to adjust the model over time. Model adjustment may be needed to reflect a change in economic conditions, a change to more predictive data elements than the ones initially used, or a change resulting more efficiently identifying the target group of permanently separated UI claimants who are likely to exhaust benefits and are likely to experience long-term unemployment.

There are two separate phases involved in using a statistical model: **model development** and **model operation**. The Development Phase includes all processes aimed at developing a statistically, operationally, and legally acceptable identification model. The Operational Phase includes all processes involved in using this model to identify UI claimants as part of a WP/RS system. After a period of time using the operational model, the model must be evaluated and refined as needed.

1. Model Development Phase

(1) Inputs and Prerequisites

(a) Initially, some States will be able to implement a WP/RS system using a statistical model, while others may not have the historical data available and may have to use characteristic screens. The reason for this is that statistical model development requires as input at least one year's worth of recent historical data containing both claimant-specific data elements and labor market information; some States will not have a year's worth of data available and will have to acquire it over time.

The historical data set is used to construct a statistical model which will subsequently be used as the identification mechanism in the WP/RS system. A year's worth of data is needed in order to "smooth" or lessen the effects of seasonal variations. The historical data may be acquired and merged from multiple sources. The timeliness of the data collection is not as significant to the Development Phase as it is to the Operational Phase.

Aside from the "Prohibited Data Elements" outlined in Field Memo 35-94, all data elements considered potentially useful predictors of UI benefit exhaustion may be contained in the

historical data set for testing purposes. This includes any or all of the "Key Data Elements" mentioned in FM 35-94. Generally, this data would come from UI claimant and ES registration files, and from labor market information (LMI) units or sources such as the State LMI agency or the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Claimant identification data such as name and social security number are not necessary components of the historical data set; only those data elements that address permanent separation and that may affect the duration of the unemployment spell are essential.

(b) Seven "Key Data Elements" that were found to be significant in the development of a statistical model were discussed in Field Memo 35-94. The first two of these elements-- recall status and the existence of a union hiring hall agreement--are used as "initial screens" on all individuals who have received a first payment. These initial screens are used to include in the profiling data set only those individuals who are permanently separated from their jobs and to omit those who are job-attached. States also may use additional or alternative initial screens.

Though initial screening data elements should be acquired and included in the historical profiling data sets that are established, initial screens will NOT appear in actual statistical model calculations; they serve the important preliminary function of narrowing the claimant population to reflect only those that are members of the target group of permanently separated individuals who are likely to experience long-term unemployment. The remaining five "Key Data Elements"--education, job tenure, pre-UI industry, pre-UI occupation and total unemployment rate--are used in actual model calculations.

It is important to note that individuals that are excluded during the Development Phase of statistical modeling should also be excluded during the Operational Phase. For example, if claimants on recall will be excluded from the Development Phase through the application of the initial screen "recall status" on the data set, they should be excluded from the Operational Phase also. Otherwise, the characteristics of job-attached claimants will be considered by the model, causing the model to lose predictive power.

(c) Personnel with training that includes statistics and econometric analysis should be tasked with conducting the historical data analysis and developing the model. The UI TA Team will also provide assistance in the development of these models. Technical requirements in this area are discussed in Part V.

(2) Level of Statistical Analysis

(a) There are several levels of analysis which can be used in developing a statistical profiling model. Typically, the more thorough the analysis, the more accurate a model will be. Factors such as time and historic data availability may understandably constrain the scope of analysis.

(b) A simple analysis could involve a pre-determined decision to use only the "Key Data Elements" specified in Field Memo 35-94 and UIS Information Bulletin 4-94. In this case, experimentation would only involve testing different formats of these data elements (e.g., number of years of education vs. educational categories).

(c) A more in-depth analysis could involve experimenting with many different available State data elements and combinations of data elements to determine the State-specific data elements that are most significant. In this case, experimentation would actually determine which data elements would actually be used in the State's model, as well as the respective formats of these elements. Such an analysis might include some or all of the "Key Data Elements" but would also include other data elements, labor market information in particular, resident in a state's historic data sources.

(d) A "test-state" analysis has been conducted by UIS which resembles the "simple" analysis cited above. The results of this research to date are shown in Part IV and Appendix A.

(e) Regardless of the level of analysis used, the output of the model development phase is an equation with a set of coefficients. These coefficients become the basic input for the operational phase.

2. Operational Phase

(1) Inputs

(a) The Operational Phase may require inputs from several sources. These include, but are not limited to:

(1) Data collected from UI initial claims
(2) Data from other system components, such as the Employment Service and agencies offering reemployment services funded by EDWAA, if these data are not collected by UI.
(3) Coefficients from the model Development Phase.
(4) Labor Market Information supplied by either the State LMI agency or the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), as described below.

UIS is working with BLS to facilitate the provision of twelve-month moving average unemployment rates (on a quarterly basis) at the sub-state level, and rate-of-change data for industries and at both the State and sub-State levels and for occupations at the State level. These data are offered to assist States that wish to use it. The BLS rate-of-change data is derived from the same source data used by BLS' LASER (Labor market information Adapted to Skills-based Employment Relationship) system. These data are expected to be available for use in model development by the end of summer, 1994. Information on the availability, format, and delivery of this data will be distributed as it becomes available.

(b) The individual data elements obtained from each source will vary among States. Part IV details the data elements used in the Test State analysis.

(c) Using the production computer language specified by SESA computer standards (such as COBOL), these inputs can be synthesized and used to calculate a probability of benefit exhaustion for each UI claimant profiled during a given time period. The programs used in the Operational Phase need to incorporate the exact equation structure used in the Development Phase, whether this equation is a logit equation or otherwise.

(d) Once probability scores are derived, the profiled claimants can be prioritized according to the these scores and, as detailed in Field Memo 35-94, be referred to reemployment services as resources warrant.

3. <u>UIS Technical Assistance</u>

In addition to the TA that will be provided for the development of statistical models and characteristic screens, TA will also be offered in the forms listed below. Requests or suggestions for additional forms of technical assistance will be considered by ETA staff as time and resources allow.

(1) <u>Papers and Written Materials</u>: The UI TA Team will assist in the preparation of technical assistance documents to be made available to all States. These will describe the experience of the Test State and the Prototype States and will include written descriptions of methods and processes, lessons learned, and analysis conducted. A UI Information Bulletin incorporating the Test State experience will be issued in August 1994. A Technical Assistance Guide (TAG) incorporating the Prototype States' experience will be issued in November 1994.

(2) <u>Completed Systems</u>: The team will facilitate the transfer of completed processing systems or parts of systems from State to State, where all parties agree to the

transfer. All test and demonstration systems developed by the UI TA Team will be available. The UI TA Team may assist in documenting and otherwise preparing system software for transfer. It will serve as a technology broker, bringing together States with similar processing requirements.

(3) Telephone Assistance: Members of the UI TA Team will be available by telephone during normal work hours to discuss problems and concerns of States. Questions can also be sent to the TA Team via fax (202-219-8506) or via ETA's e-mail system, attention: Wayne Zajac.

(4) On-site Visits: The UI TA Team will be available for limited on-site assistance, working in partnership with SESA staff to design and implement models, systems, and processes.

(5) Profiling Methods Seminar: The UI NO plans to offer a seminar covering the methodology involved in developing an optimal state-specific model for use in Worker Profiling. The seminar is scheduled for July 25-29, 1994 in Phoenix, AZ. More information will be distributed as plans for the seminar are finalized.

C. Phased Technical Assistance Strategy

(1). Test State

As a precursor to working with States on the development of their models, specifications for a "test system" have been developed that demonstrate how a statistical model can work in the States. Furthermore, in order for the Department to gain further knowledge and operational experience beyond "test system" simulations, the State of Maryland volunteered to be a "Test State". The Test State development that is occurring in Maryland will provide the UI TA Team with exposure to potential implementation problems; any such problems that are uncovered in Maryland will be solved directly with Maryland staff. The UI TA Team will then transfer the lessons learned from the "test system", including model development, data flow, and output report products, to the actual operational environment of Maryland. The goal is to gain additional information, knowledge and experience from working in an actual operational environment that can be shared with the Prototype, First and Second Wave States.

(2). Prototype States

The UI TA Team will work extensively with the Prototype States, both to facilitate these States' efforts and to gain additional

experience that will be transferred to First and Second Wave States. TA to be given to the Prototype States will include:

(a) Statistical Model/ Characteristic Screens Development: TA can be provided to the States in performing the analysis necessary to decide whether to use characteristic screens or statistical models, what data elements are best for that State, and for establishing initial elements and values for data collection. This type of assistance is expected to take place on-site over approximately three or four work days and is likely to include State staff from unemployment insurance, job service, and labor market information offices.

(b) System Design: The UI TA Team will be available to work with State staff as part of the technical design effort to solve data flow and process step problems for the initial indentification mechanism of the WP/RS system. This is expected to take place on-site and last approximately four or five work days.

(c) System Implementation: The TA Team will be able to assist States with implementation of the identification component by providing resources and experience available to address issues as they arise. Lessons learned in any one State can be transferred to benefit all States. This type of TA could last about three or four days, on-site.

(d) System Review: The team can assist State personnel in conducting a post-implementation review of the project and document lessons learned during the project. This will contribute to the pool of experience and knowledge the team will be able to transfer to first and second wave States in their implementation efforts.

(3). First and Second Wave States

Following the phased implementation strategy, TA will be offered to first and second wave States to the extent that time and funds allow. States have been asked to identify their estimated needs for assistance in the proposal that will be submitted in response to Field Memo 35-94. Specific requests for technical assistance should be sent to the appropriate DOL Regional Office.

PART III. EXAMPLE OF DATA ELEMENTS USED IN A WP/RS SYSTEM

If a statistical model is implemented, two sets of data are required--historic data and current data. The Development Phase, where statistical analysis is being conducted to establish a model, requires **historic data**, while the Operational Phase, where claimants are actually being profiled and referred requires **current data** (if characteristic screens are used, historic data

is not necessary). Historic data, at least one year's worth, must include complete benefit year data for each claimant. Current data reflects present claimants at the time of their first benefit payment.

A. Claimant Data

Claimant data include elements which have been shown to be predictive of UI benefit exhaustion. In the Operational Phase additional data identifying the individual will be required. Other data, such as service provider information and feedback data for outcome, may be recorded as part of the claimant record system, but is not required as part of the worker profiling portion of the system.

Claimant-specific data used to run the model may include:

Education level;
Job Tenure;
Industry code;
Occupation code; and
Area of residence code;
*-(The industry, occupation and area codes would be used in tandem with the LMI/BLS data described in Section B below).

Claimant identification data used in generating reports may include:

Social Security Number;
Name;
Address; and
Phone number.

B. LMI/BLS Rate of Change Data

Three pieces of labor market information are used in the Department's proposed Worker Profiling model. They are: employment change within a claimant's industry, employment change within a claimant's occupation, and unemployment rate in a claimant's sub-state region. These elements need to be available for the time period depicted by the historic data set for use in the Development Phase. These elements also need to be as current as possible for use in the Operation Phase. The LMI data, both historic and current, should be kept as separate tables which can be updated to allow the model to reflect economic changes. Thus, updates will need to be done on a regular basis, perhaps quarterly.

C. Table of Coefficients

The products of the model Development Phase will be a set of coefficients and an equation which uses the coefficients and current data elements to compute each claimant's probability of exhausting his or her benefits. The equation must be coded or programmed into the State computer system. The coefficients should be kept as a separate table of values which can be updated to reflect economic change and refine the model. It is likely that these updates will not need to be done as frequently as the LMI updates.

D. Service Provider Data

A State may want the system to automatically produce referral reports and notifications informing claimants of referral to services. The data needed to do so includes:

UI local office contact name and number;
Service Provider name and address;
Service Provider referral agreement capacity; and
Scheduled date and time of reemployment service session to which claimant is referred.

Systems capable of automatic referrals require agreements be established between UI and the service providers which specify referral flow control, capacity planning and control, holding or waiting periods, etc. Additional software may be required to operationalize automatic referrals. Further issuances will provide technical assistance in these areas.

PART IV- TEST STATE ANALYSIS

A. Background

The research contained in Unemployment Insurance Information Bulletin 4-94 was the initial basis for recommending the use of a statistical model in State WP/RS systems. Since this research was done using national-level survey data, numerous parties expressed interest in seeing how the model would perform if applied at the state and local levels. Thus, UI TA Team staff at the National Office are in the process of conducting a "Test State" analysis with the State of Maryland to illustrate how a statistical model could be developed and made operational in a State agency. The analysis is basic, using the data elements cited in Field Memo 35-94 to develop a single State-level model. The results of this analysis to date are summarized below, along with a discussion of some operational issues that have been encountered. More detailed results are shown in Appendix A (Results of Test-State Analysis).

B. Model Development Simulation Using Maryland Data

(1) Inputs

(a) In the State of Maryland, historic UI and ES files were used as source data for developing the initial Test State model. A one-year time frame that ended seven months prior was designated as the period the analysis should cover. There were 225,000 claimants who filed initial claims within this period. The seven-month lag made it possible to discern with sufficient accuracy whether or not each claimant exhausted his/her basic UI benefits. It was necessary to merge UI and ES data in order to obtain all of the "Key Data Elements" described in FM 35-94, because some of the data elements were resident in the UI database and some were in the ES database (for example, in Maryland, both education and occupation are collected by ES).

(b) A data extraction process was run against the 225,000 records in order to create a sample data set for analysis. The "initial screens" (recall status, union hiring hall, and first UI benefit payment) were incorporated into the extraction process as a means of deleting job-attached and UI-ineligible claimants. This extraction produced a file containing 85,000 records of both UI exhaustees and non-exhaustees. Only data elements being considered for use in predicting UI benefit exhaustion were included in this file. In this case, the elements identified in the National analysis (UI Information Bulletin 4-94) were selected as a starting point. Thus, each claimant's occupation code, industry code, first and last day of work (used to calculate job tenure) years of education, benefit payment amounts, and residence code were the data elements extracted in Maryland.

(c) A sample of approximately 5,000 records would have been statistically sufficient enough to conduct the data analysis in Maryland; however, since a 3.5" floppy disk could hold approximately 17,000 non-compressed records, a 20% random sample of the 85,000-record sub-set was taken, which yielded 17,000 records of exhaustees and non-exhaustees.

(d) A review of the 17,000 records showed that slightly more than half (about 8,900 records) did not contain valid data for one or more of the data elements. Of the records with missing data elements, about 75% appeared to have occurred because the claimant did not register with ES; the remaining 25% were due to a variety of administrative and processing problems. Maryland is changing administrative procedures to minimize these problems in the future, particularly by increasing ES registration rates.

(e) The statistical procedure used to examine the data requires that all records have full data present. This resulted in excluding the 8,900 records with missing data, leaving a sample size of 8,100 exhaustees and non-exhaustees. Both exhaustees and non-exhaustees have to be examined together in order to focus on those characteristics that are correlated with exhaustion, and to determine what claimant characteristics separate the two groups.

(f) The sample of 8,100 records was examined using a procedure known as "logit". This procedure determines the extent to which each data element contributes to UI benefit exhaustion. The logit procedure also allows for comparing the use of different combinations of elements and for using a particular data element in different formats. For example, education may be compared using the number of years of education or using categories such as high school, college, etc.

(2) Maryland Results- Individual Data Elements

This section provides a summary of how the five "Key Data Elements" that appear in the model were treated in the Test State analysis. For a more detailed description of these formats and how they compare to the formats used in UI Information Bulletin 4-94, see Appendix A: "Results of Test State Analysis."

(a) Education level proved to be a very strong predictor of benefit exhaustion; less education suggests a greater probability of exhaustion. Educational categories (i.e. high school diploma, Bachelor's degree, etc.) similar to those shown in UI Information Bulletin 4-94 were shown to be significant predictors of UI benefit exhaustion. A comparison of the data elements used in the Test State analysis and in the National analysis (UI Information Bulletin 4-94) is shown in Appendix A.

(b) Job tenure proved to be a significant predictor of benefit exhaustion, though not as strong as education; longer tenure on the pre-UI job suggests a greater probability of exhaustion. The categories used in the National analysis (0 to 3 years, etc.) did not produce the same effects in the Test State analysis. The Maryland analysis uses the actual number of years of tenure, which produced equal or better results.

(c) Industry employment change proved to be a significant predictor of benefit exhaustion at the sub-state level. The sub-state divisions used were Service Delivery Areas; the industry divisions used were SIC Industry Divisions. The BLS rate-of-change data was used to calculate weighted percent employment changes incorporating these divisions.

(d) BLS data on occupation employment change has not yet been incorporated into the analysis. This is primarily due to the fact that BLS uses the OES coding scheme and Maryland uses the DOT coding scheme. While the intuitive value of occupation employment change is unquestionable, the feasibility of measuring these effects at the state or local level is uncertain until data become available.

(e) Sub-state total unemployment rate was a very strong predictor of exhaustion. As with industry employment change, the sub-state divisions used were Service Delivery Areas.

(3) Results - A Statistical Model vs. Characteristic Screens

(a) The State of Maryland had experience using characteristic screens, offering a basis for comparison of these two methods.

(b) Maryland's screening system had five screens: no recall date, no union hiring hall, first UI payment, separation due to lack of work, and at least 3 years' tenure on pre-UI job. Claimants meeting all these criteria are "screened in"; if they fail to meet even one, they are "screened out." To compare this screening system to the statistical model, both were applied to the historic data set. One comparison was conducted at the state level and five others were conducted at the local-office level. In each comparison, two groups of equal size were targeted, one by the statistical model and one by the characteristic screens. Conclusions are based upon a comparison of these "target groups". Detailed results of these comparisons can be found in Appendix A, "Results of Test State Analysis".

(c) The statistical model proved to be 10 to 25 percent more accurate in targeting UI benefit exhaustees than the characteristic screening system. Characteristics that were strongly associated with UI benefit exhaustion (e.g., lack of a high-school diploma) were more prevalent among claimants in the "model target group" than among claimants in the "screen target group".

C. Model Operation Phase - Maryland

(1) Inputs

(a) Normally, the input records for the Operational Phase will come from initial claims filed in a State during a current period. However, the only data available to UIS for use in the Maryland analysis were the historical data. Therefore, the Operational Phase was simulated using these data. Due to the data constraints, the process of selecting only current-period data was omitted. All other processes were conducted as they would be in a real-world setting.

(b) The data-element formats, equation structure, and coefficients described in Section B above were incorporated into mainframe, batch-operated computer programs written in COBOL. The historic data was loaded onto the mainframe as VSAM data files. This combination comprises the current production environment in Maryland.

(2) Results

(a) The entire sample was "run through" the profiling model, generating exhaustion probability scores for all claimants. Not

all scores are unique; claimants having the same characteristics will derive the same score, creating clusters within the output list when viewed at a state-wide level. However, Maryland distributes data to and delivers services at the local-office level. This clustering effect was found to be negligible when the data were distributed to the local-office level. The number of data elements in the model and the number of discrete values possible for each data element control the degree of clustering. For example, using actual years of tenure produces less clustering than using more limited tenure categories (e.g. 0-3 years, 3-5 years, etc.) Some data elements are more naturally represented as categories, such as education, showing that trade-offs exist in this area.

(b) A sample local office probability list is shown in Appendix B. This list shows how the output of a statistical model could look at the local office level. A list such as this could be generated periodically and used in conjunction with a "Referral Agreement", as specified in FM 35-94, to equate the flow of profiling-related referrals with the supply of available services.

(c) This exercise also underscored the importance of coordination between personnel responsible for model development and personnel responsible for model operation. The data used in the Operational Phase may have to be transformed to fit the specifications of the model. Also, probabilities must be calculated exactly as specified by the equation. For this purpose, it is a useful check to generate probability scores from the same data set using both the statistical package and the operational program. Except for possible variations in rounding, these lists should be identical.

Part V - TECHNICAL ISSUES

A. <u>ADP Issues</u>

(1) Mainframe vs PC

For approximately two decades, a majority of State unemployment insurance systems have been developed and operated in an IBM or compatible mainframe environment and most programs were written in COBOL. Consequently, the model profiling system has been developed to utilize the existing systems as much as possible. The UI TA Team has developed model programs in COBOL utilizing mainframe environments.

However, during the last few years, the technological advancement in computer hardware/software has made it possible to utilize PC's in many applications. Some States UI operations will be or are taking advantage of client/server environments. Therefore, the UI TA Team is also exploring developing alternative model

programs in a PC environment. The UI TA Team will support PC-based profiling systems.

Mainframe computers and personal computers share basic computing characteristics; however, they are still quite different. There are advantages and disadvantages in utilizing mainframe or PC technology. For example, note the following:

(2) Developing the Profiling System in a Mainframe Environment

Advantages:

(a) The existing system can be utilized without structural changes.
(b) Standardization of system is easily accomplished and more cost-effective.
(c) Data storage capacity is much higher than PC client/server structural environment.
(d) Hardware/software professionals are abundant.
(e) Security is more readily attained.
(f) Accessibility is more available from all regions without LAN/WAN connection.

Disadvantages:

(a) Expensive to operate.
(b) Centralized down time - once system is down, nobody can use the computer.
(c) Overloading due to the customer usage/time sharing.
(d) In some States, less responsive to customers.
(e) Changes are sometimes harder to make and take longer.

(3) Developing the profiling system in a PC environment

Advantages:

(a) Operating cost is far less than in mainframe.
(b) Software/hardware are available to provide flexibility.
(c) Downtime of one PC does not affect entire system.

Disadvantages:

(a) Decentralization means less control of access and security.
(b) In some cases, modem-access interrupt phone usage.
(c) Without LAN/WAN connection, the usage of PC is limited.
(d) Data storage capacity is less than the mainframe although the technological advancements are narrowing this gap.

B. Operational Issues

(1) Data Collection and Availability

(a) The Operational Phase of Worker Profiling requires that all claimant data elements be available at the time designated for referral processing. Many States do not collect the full set of data elements as part of the UI initial claims process, but often collect some as part of Job Service or Employment Service processing.

(b) For any State-specific claimant identification approach, the full set of data elements must be collected for all initial claimants before Worker Profiling can be done. This will likely require modifications to initial claims forms, data entry screens and processing, and data file structures. The full set of data elements required may vary from State to State. The Maryland statistical model uses union hiring hall status, recall status, education level, job tenure, industry, occupation, and local unemployment rate.

(2) Mathematical Equation

The model Development Phase employs a statistical analysis package such as SPSS or SAS to derive the optimum combination of data elements and weight coefficients to comprise the model. The Operational Phase will use a computer programming language such as COBOL and a combination of simple math functions that can be used to replicate the logistic probability function, or logit model, derived in the Development Phase. Care must be taken to implement the formula exactly as derived by the statistical analysis package.

C. Model Specification Issues

(1) Skills Needed to Perform Statistical Analysis

(a) Personnel with training including statistics and econometric analysis should be tasked with conducting the historic data analysis and developing the model. Experience conducting analyses involving binary dependent variables, logit models and the logistic regression procedure would be preferable. Informal contacts and discussions indicate that some States plan to use universities or outside research organizations to assist in their model development.

(b) Personnel with experience that involves programming and problem-solving with a statistical software package, conducting statistical analyses, and working with large data sets are also needed. This type of background and experience programming in COBOL (or whatever computer language will be used) would be particularly well-suited to developing a model.

(2) Statistical Analysis Package and Functions

The process of developing a Profiling model requires iterative evaluation of historical data. Software packages such as SPSS, SAS, LIMDEP and NCSS are available to perform these types of analysis. States with older versions of statistical software may need to upgrade if they plan to use the logistic regression procedure. The test system made use of SPSS, Version 4.0.

APPENDIXES:

A	**RESULTS OF TEST-STATE ANALYSIS**
B	**TEST STATE PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT [DRAFT] LOCAL OFFICE 29**

APPENDIX A: RESULTS OF TEST-STATE ANALYSIS

This appendix details the format, or specification, of each data element used in building the model from the Test State data. These formats are compared to the formats used in UI Information Bulletin 4-94, "Profiling Dislocated Workers for Early Referral to Reemployment Services", referred to in this Appendix as the "National" analysis.

The Test State analysis disclosed that some of the data elements that appear on the merged UI/ES file should be converted to a form that has greater statistical meaning. For example, education level was stored as number of years of education, but using categories such as high school graduate proved to be more meaningful. In executing the Operational Phase and generating the list shown in Appendix B, data elements were converted to the formats discussed below.

A. Dependent Variable Specification

(1) A statistical model is basically an attempt to explain the behavior of a particular variable. This variable is typically referred to as the "dependent variable".

(2) In the National analysis (UI Info Bulletin 4-94), the dependent variable used to represent UI benefit exhaustion was the duration of each claimant's unemployment spell. For claimants with spells of 6 months or longer, the dependent variable was assigned a value of 1, signifying that the claimant exhausted his/her benefits. For claimants with spells of less than 6 months, the dependent variable was assigned a value of 0, indicating that the claimant did not exhaust his/her benefits.

(3) In the Test State analysis, the dependent variable used to discern UI benefit exhaustion for each historic observation was calculated as follows:

Total Proportion Drawn = (Paid Benefit Amount/Maximum Benefit Amount)

If the Proportion Drawn was greater than or equal to 1, the dependent variable was assigned a value of 1, signifying that the claimant exhausted his/her basic UI benefits. If the Proportion Drawn was less than 1, the dependent variable was assigned a value of 0, signifying that the claimant did not exhaust his/her basic UI benefits. In this test, it was disclosed that the data may have included EUC amounts and disqualified claimants. Adjustments are being made to correct for this in future testing.

B. Independent Variable Specifications

(1) Education

(a) In the National analysis, education was specified as a series of categories. This format implies that the effects of certain milestones in educational attainment are extremely significant in obtaining reemployment and thus in predicting UI exhaustion. These effects would obscure the effects of individual years, making a variable such as "years of education" an unreliable predictor. The National analysis divided education into the categories shown below:

-H.S. Diploma
-Less than H.S. Diploma
-More than H.S. Diploma, less than Bachelors
-Bachelors Degree or more

(b) In the Test State analysis, education proved to be a very strong predictor of UI benefit exhaustion. After testing different formats and classifications, the following categorical specification was selected:

-H.S. Diploma
-Less than H.S. Diploma
-More than H.S. Diploma, less than Bachelors
-Bachelors
-Masters/PhD

The only difference between this and the National-analysis specification is the separation of claimants with Bachelors Degrees from claimants with Masters Degrees and PhD's. In the Test State analysis, claimants in the latter group showed a significantly lower exhaustion probability than claimants in the former.

(2) <u>Tenure</u>

(a) In the National analysis, tenure was specified in a manner similar to education. This implies that the effects of certain pre-UI job tenure milestones are extremely important in predicting UI exhaustion. The categories are as follows:

-Less than 3 years
-3-5 years
-6-9 years
-10+ years

(b) In the Test State analysis, the above formats could not be statistically confirmed in the area of pre-UI job tenure. Tenure as actual number of years proved slightly more significant than the series of categories; thus, the actual number of years was used.

(3) <u>Industry</u>

(a) In the National analysis, SIC Industry Division codes were used to discern the state-level percent employment change within each claimant's Industry Division. This percent-change value was the actual data element used in the model.

(b) In the Test State analysis, 6-digit SIC codes were converted to Industry Division codes based on standard SIC classifications. These were used to discern the employment change within each claimant's Industry Division during the period covered by the sample. Changes were calculated at both the state level and the SDA level. The state-level change proved insignificant; however, the SDA-level change, provided by BLS, proved to be a significant predictor of UI benefit exhaustion.

(4) Occupation

(a) In the National analysis, 1-digit SOC codes were used to discern the national-level employment change with each claimant's occupation classification. This entered the model as a binary variable; if the occupation was growing, the variable was coded as a 1, and if the occupation was declining, the variable was coded as a 0.

(b) In the Test State analysis, 3-digit DOT codes were converted into 1-digit codes based on Test State classifications. These codes have not yet been used in tandem with labor market information. Occupational employment changes have proven difficult to measure at the state or local level, in part because no standardized coding scheme currently exists. A "crosswalk" between the DOT and OES schemes will eventually be used to facilitate the analysis of occupation employment data from BLS. Currently, occupation enters the model as a series of categories, similar to education. As a whole, these categories are significant in predicting UI exhaustion. The specification is as follows:

-Managerial, technical, professional
-Sales, clerical
-Service occupations
-Farming, fishing, forestry
-Processing occupations
-Machine operators
-Bench Work
-Structural Work
-Miscellaneous

(5) Total Unemployment Rate

(a) In the National analysis, State total unemployment rate (TUR) was included for each claimant, attempting to account for different labor market conditions across States.

(b) Since different labor markets exist within States as well, SDA unemployment rate was included for each claimant in the Test State analysis. FIPS codes based on residence were used to assign claimants to the proper SDA. This variable was very significant in predicting benefit exhaustion at the State level; claimants from high-unemployment areas have higher probabilities of exhaustion.

(c) In an operational environment, services will be available in local areas. For example, in the Test State, services are offered by local offices. Most claimants within a local office have the same SDA code. Thus, this variable was not particularly helpful in identifying claimants at the local level.

(d) However, the Test State system will initially consist of a single State-level model. Omitting the SDA TUR would make this model much less sensitive to local conditions. Thus, for a State-level model, it is desirable to include a measure of sub-state TUR. Furthermore, by having a model that is sensitive to local conditions, managers and analysts will be able to make a better assessment of the operation of both the worker profiling component and the provision of reemployment services between sub-state areas.

Comparison of Target Groups

Six tables are shown on the following pages which compare the compositions of the following groups at the State level and within five local offices:

(1) MODEL- refers to the statistical model described above and in Section V.

(2) SCREEN- refers to the claimants who would be selected by the screening mechanism described in Section V. (In addition to the union hiring hall, recall, and first-pay screens, it requires separation due to lack of work and at least 3 years' tenure.)

In the State-wide comparison, the SCREEN model "targeted" 1,786 of the 8,047 claimants, about 22 percent. Thus, the ranked probability list generated by the model was cut off at the 1,786th observation. These groups, the "screen target group" and the "model target group" were compared to the groups shown below:

(3) SAMPLE- the entire sample of 8,047 claimants

(4) EXSTEES- the 4,249 actual exhaustees in this sample

The same comparison was conducted in five local offices; these results are shown on the following tables. The results show that the model focuses on claimants with characteristics shown to be closely associated with UI benefit exhaustion.

Attachments:

Table 1- Sample and Target Group Percentages- Statewide

Table 2- Sample and Target Group Percentages- Local Office 1

Table 3- Sample and Target Group Percentages- Local Office 2

Table 4- Sample and Target Group Percentages- Local Office 3

Table 5- Sample and Target Group Percentages- Local Office 4

Table 6- Sample and Target Group Percentages- Local Office 5

TABLE 1- SAMPLE AND TARGET GROUP PERCENTAGES- STATEWIDE

	SAMPLE	EXSTEES	SCREEN	MODEL
EXST%	52	100	53	65
EDUC%				
HS Dipl	50	50	47	46
No Dipl	19	21	18	44
Sm Coll	20	19	20	9
Bachlrs	8	7	10	1
Mst/PhD	2	2	4	0
TENURE%				
Less 3	65	64	0	57
3-5	17	17	42	16
6-9	8	8	24	10
10+	10	11	33	17

This table shows that, in terms of the state-wide sample, the model is more accurate than the characteristic screens in identifying UI benefit exhaustees. The model target group consists of 65% exhaustees, compared to 53% for the screen target group.

TABLE 2-SAMPLE AND TARGET GROUP PERCENTAGES- LOCAL OFFICE 1

	SAMPLE	EXSTEES	SCREEN	MODEL
TOTAL	1244	783	233	233
EXST %	63	100	57	63
EDUC %				
HS Dipl	47	49	40	22
No Dipl	29	29	36	77
Sm Coll	20	19	20	1
Bachlrs	3	3	3	0
Mst/PhD	1	1	1	0
TENURE%				
Less 3	68	69	0	41
3-5	15	15	42	22
6-9	7	8	24	11
10+	9	8	34	26

This office is located in an inner-city area with an exceptionally high exhaustion rate of 63%. The model target group contains the same percentage, concentrated among less-educated and long-tenured workers. The screen target group contains a percentage below that of the overall sample, 57%.

TABLE 3- SAMPLE AND TARGET GROUP PERCENTAGES- LOCAL OFFICE 2

	SAMPLE	EXSTEES	SCREEN	MODEL
TOTAL	717	388	151	151
EXST %	54	100	49	61
EDUC %				
HS Dipl	43	47	34	55
No Dipl	23	22	23	43
Sm Coll	20	20	26	1
Bachlrs	11	9	13	0
Mst/PhD	3	2	5	0
TENURE%				
Less 3	66	67	0	54
3-5	18	18	46	26
6-9	9	7	31	6
10+	7	8	24	14

This office is in a high-density, lower-income suburb which contains a university. The model target group contains 61% exhaustees, compared to 49% for the screen target group. The model focuses more on less-tenured workers here than in some other areas, while the screen picks up a high percentage of college graduates, perhaps attributable to the university setting.

TABLE 4- SAMPLE AND TARGET GROUP PERCENTAGES- LOCAL OFFICE 3

	SAMPLE	EXSTEES	SCREEN	MODEL
TOTAL	448	181	107	107
EXST %	40	100	43	54
EDUC %				
HS Dipl	52	51	53	62
No Dipl	16	19	11	37
Sm Coll	19	18	22	1
Bachlrs	10	10	10	0
Mst/PhD	3	2	4	0
TENURE%				
Less 3	63	59	0	51
3-5	16	18	39	22
6-9	10	10	27	11
10+	11	13	34	16

This office is in a more sparsely populated suburban area where the exhaustion rate is only 40%. The screen targets a slightly larger percentage, while the model is able to target a group made up of 54% exhaustees.

TABLE 5- SAMPLE AND TARGET GROUP PERCENTAGES- LOCAL OFFICE 4

	SAMPLE	EXSTEES	SCREEN	MODEL
TOTAL	470	285	104	104
EXST %	61	100	64	69
EDUC %				
HS Dipl	54	55	59	40
No Dipl	27	30	26	53
Sm Coll	17	14	15	6
Bachlrs	2	1	0	0
Mst/PhD	0	0	0	0
TENURE%				
Less 3	66	65	0	47
3-5	15	16	37	18
6-9	9	7	25	10
10+	10	12	37	25

This office is in an inner-city area with an exhaustion rate of 61%. Unlike in the first office, both target groups surpass this percentage. The model again focuses on claimants with less education.

TABLE 6- SAMPLE AND TARGET GROUP PERCENTAGES- LOCAL OFFICE 5

	SAMPLE	EXSTEES	SCREEN	MODEL
TOTAL	927	425	210	210
EXST %	46	100	49	59
EDUC %				
HS Dipl	36	38	35	62
No Dipl	13	15	10	32
Sm Coll	20	22	18	6
Bachlrs	23	20	27	0
Mst/PhD	7	6	11	0
TENURE%				
Less 3	62	59	0	58
3-5	21	22	55	16
6-9	8	9	22	9
10+	8	10	22	17

This office is in a high-income suburban area with an exhaustion rate of 46%. The model focuses on high-school graduates, while the screen picks up a great deal of college graduates. Again, the model targets a higher percentage of exhaustees, with 59%.

APPENDIX B

TEST STATE PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT [DRAFT]
LOCAL OFFICE 29

TEST STATE
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.75119	07229	970-[redacted]	MAL******	SUSAN	370 BRI**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	Y
29	+0.71556	08943	980-[redacted]	SMI******	DOMINIC	380 COL**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	Y
29	+0.70225	03159	020-[redacted]	YAN******	LORA	250 DEX**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.69896	05273	030-[redacted]	XEN******	CARRIE	240 EDG**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.69511	02241	990-[redacted]	YOR******	FREDERICK	390 EDG**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	Y
29	+0.69037	04432	050-[redacted]	VEZ******	PHILLIP	230 EVE**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.68700	11284	960-[redacted]	FER******	STEVEN	360 GLE**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	Y
29	+0.68700	04619	070-[redacted]	THO******	VERONICA	220 GRA**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.67605	11262	080-[redacted]	SIE******	MARILYN	210 HIG**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	Y
29	+0.66842	05318	100-[redacted]	QUA******	TIMOTHY	200 INW**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	Y
29	+0.66510	04167	120-[redacted]	O'B******	PHYLLIS	190 KAN**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.65831	00340	130-[redacted]	NEL******	VICKKI	180 LUZ**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	Y
29	+0.65458	02916	950-[redacted]	AND******	KEVIN	350 NEW**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	Y
29	+0.65173	05860	150-[redacted]	LLO******	KIMBERLEY	170 NOL**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.64911	04019	170-[redacted]	JUS******	BRUCE	160 PIE**********	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	Y
29	+0.64643	14620	180-[redacted]	IRV******	VERONICA	150 ROW**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	Y
29	+0.64523	04408	200-[redacted]	GAR******	KURT	140 STE**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.64520	11631	220-[redacted]	EGG******	DARLENE	130 TEN**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y
29	+0.64396	09904	230-[redacted]	DUN******	PETER	120 TUL**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	Y
29	+0.64163	13460	250-0[redacted]	BAK******	MICHAEL	110 WAT**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	Y
29	+0.64163	05368	981-0[redacted]	VAL******	SCOTT	381 BAL**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	Y
29	+0.63981	05641	971-0[redacted]	MAN******	JOHN	371 BRI**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	Y

*** PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STA
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.63605	12412	010-[redacted]	ZAGXXXXXX	ROBERT	251 CROXXXXXXXXXX	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	Y
29	+0.63459	07524	030-[redacted]	XENXXXXXX	SUEANN	241 ECCXXXXXXXXXX	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	Y
29	+0.63376	02343	050-[redacted]	VEGXXXXXX	JAMES	231 ETOXXXXXXXXXX	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	Y
29	+0.63226	10557	060-[redacted]	UNDXXXXXX	EKATERINA	221 FREXXXXXXXXXX	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.63198	02149	961-[redacted]	GARXXXXXX	JENNIFER	361 GROXXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.63035	15110	080-[redacted]	SIMXXXXXX	ADRIENNE	211 HIGXXXXXXXXXX	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.62927	04172	100-[redacted]	QUIXXXXXX	CALVIN	201 IRIXXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.62860	07802	130-[redacted]	NESXXXXXX	LINDA	181 LORXXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.62860	15292	110-[redacted]	PACXXXXXX	GAIL	191 JUNXXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.62363	04554	991-[redacted]	YOUXXXXXX	TOM	391 NAYXXXXXXXXXX	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.61846	01255	150-[redacted]	LEWXXXXXX	GRACE	171 NEWXXXXXXXXXX	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.61650	09262	160-[redacted]	KENXXXXXX	HANS	161 OAKXXXXXXXXXX	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.61303	07835	180-[redacted]	IREXXXXXX	MEG	151 QUIXXXXXXXXXX	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.61148	11023	200-[redacted]	GULXXXXXX	MARK	141 SPRXXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.61006	15396	200-[redacted]	GREXXXXXX	KIRK	141 ST.XXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.60927	10509	210-[redacted]	FINXXXXXX	MICHELLE	131 SYCXXXXXXXXXX	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.60774	07440	230-[redacted]	DRAXXXXXX	FREDERICK	121 TRIXXXXXXXXXX	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.60722	04683	250-[redacted]	BARXXXXXX	SHEILA	111 WESXXXXXXXXXX	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.60500	14728	951-[redacted]	APPXXXXXX	KEVIN	351 WHOXXXXXXXXXX	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.60322	02586	260-[redacted]	AARXXXXXX	CHRIS	101 YORXXXXXXXXXX	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.60089	08992	952-[redacted]	BARXXXXXX	GLORIA	352 BLAXXXXXXXXXX	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N

XXX PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STA.
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.60067	08957	982-0[redacted]	VAN******	TAIRE	382 BRA**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.60005	16364	972-0[redacted]	NAR******	EMILIO	372 BRO**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.59810	07165	010-[redacted]	ZEG******	WAYNE	252 CRE**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.59706	05590	030-[redacted]	XAV******	JACK	242 EAS**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.59588	16374	050-[redacted]	VER******	MARTIN	232 ETH**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.59427	01296	060-[redacted]	UGE******	LINDA	222 FRA**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.59305	05648	962-[redacted]	GAL******	JOHN	362 HAM**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.59186	08758	080-1[redacted]	SHE******	THOMAS	212 HIC**********	MAYFIELD	ST	96661	N
29	+0.59019	07950	100-1[redacted]	QUA******	OLIVER	202 ISL**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.58871	03466	110-[redacted]	PAD******	CHELSEA	192 JUL**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.58829	01479	130-[redacted]	NIC******	DENNIS	182 LOC**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.58565	05376	150-[redacted]	LYN******	GEORGEANNE	172 NEW**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.58482	04344	160-[redacted]	KIB******	LEIF	162 OCA**********	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.58437	02418	992-0[redacted]	YOW******	WAYNE	392 PAL**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.58245	11295	180-[redacted]	ISL******	WILLIE	152 QUI**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.58055	07572	210-0[redacted]	FIS******	PATRICIA	132 SUT**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.57907	03548	230-0[redacted]	DOU******	JUDITH	122 TRA**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.57822	02619	250-[redacted]	BAR******	JEFFREY	112 WHI**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.57602	08421	260-[redacted]	ABI******	CARL	102 WYN**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.57461	10239	973-[redacted]	NAR******	HERMANN	373 BRU**********	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.57376	00664	010-2[redacted]	ZEL******	MARK	253 CRE**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.57252	05644	030-[redacted]	XEI******	CHARLES	243 EAS**********	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N

*** PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STA.
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.57198	11287	040-[redacted]	WOL×××××××	TERRI	233 EST××××××××××××	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.57131	07294	060-[redacted]	UMB×××××××	SUSAN	223 FRA××××××××××××	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.57036	06594	953-[redacted]	BAR×××××××	KEVIN	353 GRE××××××××××××	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.56937	09744	983-[redacted]	WAT×××××××	DOROTHY	383 HAM××××××××××××	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.56867	11061	080-[redacted]	SHE×××××××	RUSSELL	213 HER××××××××××××	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.56777	14010	090-[redacted]	RUS×××××××	BECKY	203 HUD××××××××××××	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.56551	04972	110-[redacted]	PAG×××××××	ROBIN	193 JON××××××××××××	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.56232	07223	130-[redacted]	NIV×××××××	TODD	183 LIN××××××××××××	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.55872	02188	140-[redacted]	MES×××××××	GUS	173 MYR××××××××××××	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.55574	11040	160-[redacted]	KIN×××××××	VINCENT	163 OLD××××××××××××	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.55484	06934	993-[redacted]	YUL×××××××	EMILY	393 OWE××××××××××××	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.55271	16515	180-[redacted]	IZU×××××××	RANDY	153 QUI××××××××××××	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.55094	15275	190-[redacted]	HED×××××××	ROSS	143 ROA××××××××××××	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.55018	11595	963-[redacted]	HAR×××××××	OLGA	363 SEV××××××××××××	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.54894	05566	210-[redacted]	FLA×××××××	DEBBY-ANN	133 SUT××××××××××××	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.54822	05231	230-[redacted]	DOW×××××××	JOHN	123 TOL××××××××××××	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.54763	02958	240-[redacted]	CAC×××××××	PEDRO	113 VIO××××××××××××	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.54689	07019	260-[redacted]	ABN×××××××	KATHERINE	103 WOR××××××××××××	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.54637	01729	974-[redacted]	O'C×××××××	ARLENE	374 CAL××××××××××××	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.54603	16396	010-[redacted]	ZET×××××××	MARGARET	254 COR××××××××××××	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.54538	02322	030-[redacted]	XEI×××××××	STEPHEN	244 DUV××××××××××××	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.54499	07947	040-[redacted]	WOO×××××××	DELORIS	234 ERI××××××××××××	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N

××× PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STA_
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.54452	00401	060-[redacted]	URQ******	ROBERT	224 FOR**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.54398	11886	080-[redacted]	SHE******	MARCUS	214 HEM**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.54333	04060	090-[redacted]	ROS******	CYNTHIA	204 HOU**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.54213	07863	110-[redacted]	PAL******	SCOTT	194 JES**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.54202	03478	130-[redacted]	NOR******	WAYMAN	184 LEO**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.54079	03009	954-[redacted]	CAR******	MAGGIE	354 LOC**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.53963	05856	140-[redacted]	MER******	THOMAS	174 MOS**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.53823	11423	160-[redacted]	KEL******	ELAINE	164 ORC**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.53702	07871	180-[redacted]	ING******	VERNON	154 QUE**********	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.53702	11766	984-[redacted]	WAS******	WARDELL	384 RAD**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.53637	11446	190-[redacted]	HEI******	STANLEY	144 RIP**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.53436	08387	964-[redacted]	HAR******	NORMAN	364 SHE**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.53313	10301	210-[redacted]	FON******	HARLEY	134 SUS**********	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.53246	02268	230-[redacted]	DOU******	BETHANNE	124 TIM**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.53161	00645	240-[redacted]	CAI******	MARY	114 VIN**********	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.53021	07736	260-[redacted]	ABR******	DEBORAH	104 WOO**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.52952	07869	975-[redacted]	PAS******	WILLIAM	375 CHA**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.52815	16905	010-[redacted]	ZIM******	EMILY	255 CON**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.52698	11616	020-[redacted]	YUR******	RICHARD	245 DUN**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.52621	15218	040-[redacted]	WOO******	LILLIAN	235 ELW**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.52567	15879	060-[redacted]	UST******	WILLIAM	225 FOL**********	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.52554	07018	070-[redacted]	THO******	KEVIN	215 GWY**********	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N

*** PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STATE
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.52475	02420	090-[redacted]	RUBxxxxxx	RHONDA	205 HOLxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.52466	06657	110-[redacted]	PARxxxxxx	ORLANDO	195 JEFxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.52335	10671	120-[redacted]	ORTxxxxxx	HENRY	185 LEExxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.52129	15437	955-[redacted]	CARxxxxxx	CATHERINE	355 LYNxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.52010	13636	140-[redacted]	MELxxxxxx	KENNETH	175 MORxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.51750	15145	160-[redacted]	KLAxxxxxx	KENDRA	165 ORExxxxxxxxxx	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.51507	02203	170-[redacted]	JONxxxxxx	BETTY	155 PARxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.51244	05762	985-[redacted]	WATxxxxxx	ROGER	385 PIExxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.51137	07856	190-[redacted]	HEMxxxxxx	JEROME	145 RICxxxxxxxxxx	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.51006	12586	965-[redacted]	IRExxxxxx	VERONICA	365 SLIxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50955	16595	210-[redacted]	FORxxxxxx	RONALD	135 SUNxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.50869	04659	220-[redacted]	EASxxxxxx	GERALD	125 TILxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50754	03195	240-[redacted]	CALxxxxxx	DAVID	115 VERxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50621	15355	260-[redacted]	ACKxxxxxx	RENE	105 WILxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50581	05572	976-[redacted]	QUExxxxxx	OLIVER	376 CHAxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50510	03897	010-[redacted]	ZUCxxxxxx	CHERYL	256 COLxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50476	00063	020-[redacted]	YOUxxxxxx	LEO	246 DRAxxxxxxxxxx	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.50361	16220	040-[redacted]	WORxxxxxx	GEORGE	236 ELLxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50220	15819	956-[redacted]	DALxxxxxx	ROBERT	356 FLExxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50089	08657	060-[redacted]	ULAxxxxxx	RAYMOND	226 FLOxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.50075	13862	070-[redacted]	THOxxxxxx	JESSE	216 GUIxxxxxxxxxx	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.49871	16434	090-[redacted]	ROYxxxxxx	MICHAEL	206 HOLxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N

xxx PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STA).
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.49866	00570	110-16-[redacted]	PAYxxxxxx	ROLEN	196 JENxxxxxxxxxx	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.49766	09495	120-15-[redacted]	OSTxxxxxx	SAMUEL	186 KOHxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.49662	12369	140-13-[redacted]	MONxxxxxx	JOYCE	176 MONxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.49478	15594	986-01-[redacted]	WASxxxxxx	BELINDA	386 OAKxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.49352	12048	160-11-[redacted]	KNUxxxxxx	RITA	166 OSBxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.49145	02823	170-10-[redacted]	JORxxxxxx	LESLIE	156 PARxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.49046	07593	190-08-[redacted]	HENxxxxxx	VIVIAN	146 REVxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.48864	12052	210-07-[redacted]	FRAxxxxxx	PAUL	136 SUDxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.48684	00366	966-01-[redacted]	JADxxxxxx	THEODORE	366 SWIxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.48562	07350	220-06-[redacted]	ESCxxxxxx	MOHAMED	126 THRxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.48388	06953	240-03-[redacted]	CLAxxxxxx	PATRICIA	116 VALxxxxxxxxxx	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.48239	10530	260-01-[redacted]	ADAxxxxxx	LARRY	106 WILxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.48188	03667	020-25-[redacted]	YOCxxxxxx	ARTHUR	247 DONxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.48050	09280	040-23-[redacted]	WORxxxxxx	EDWARD	237 ELKxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.47982	15653	050-22-[redacted]	VOLxxxxxx	ELIZABETH	227 FAIxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.47921	04427	957-01-[redacted]	DANxxxxxx	JOYCELYN	357 FORxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.47790	14739	987-01-[redacted]	YAHxxxxxx	NANCY	387 GOOxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.47715	13131	070-20-[redacted]	TISxxxxxx	CHRISTIAN	217 GRUxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.47583	04723	090-18-[redacted]	ROWxxxxxx	STEVEN	207 HOLxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.47387	13618	100-17-[redacted]	QUAxxxxxx	YVONNE	197 IMPxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.47281	00613	120-15-[redacted]	O'Hxxxxxx	ROBERTO	187 KNOxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.47157	00823	140-13-[redacted]	MORxxxxxx	SANDRA	177 MINxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N

xxx PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STATE
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.46965	07349	150-12-[redacted]	LYOxxxxxx	LAWRENCE	167 NOYxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.46865	07359	977-01-[redacted]	REIxxxxxx	GREGORY	377 OLDxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.46745	07584	170-10-[redacted]	JOUxxxxxx	BARBARA	157 PEGxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.46545	13754	190-08-[redacted]	HERxxxxxx	PAULA	147 RAYxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.46479	15083	200-08-[redacted]	GARxxxxxx	JOE	137 STRxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.46211	04444	967-01-[redacted]	KAZxxxxxx	RUSSEL	367 TELxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.46089	13914	220-06-[redacted]	ESPxxxxxx	MARSHALL	127 THOxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.46067	08312	240-03-[redacted]	CLAxxxxxx	JOSEPH	117 VALxxxxxxxxxx	SOUTHBRIDGE	ST	96661	N
29	+0.45946	15102	250-02-[redacted]	BACxxxxxx	AGNES	107 WHIxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.45744	01978	020-25-[redacted]	YEDxxxxxx	SANDRA	248 DOGxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.45452	02155	040-23-[redacted]	WRIxxxxxx	DONALD	238 ELKxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.45108	01854	050-22-[redacted]	VITxxxxxx	VICTORIA	228 FALxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.44906	16248	958-01-[redacted]	ELLxxxxxx	NORMA	358 FRExxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.44664	14759	988-01-[redacted]	YATxxxxxx	MARY	388 GOOxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.44536	10589	978-01-[redacted]	SABxxxxxx	QUINTA	378 GRExxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.44412	05023	070-20-[redacted]	TYSxxxxxx	ANNJANETTE	218 GROxxxxxxxxxx	NORTH DOVER	ST	44777	N
29	+0.44298	11335	090-18-[redacted]	RUNxxxxxx	BOBBY	208 HOLxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.44188	00565	100-17-[redacted]	QUIxxxxxx	CAROL	198 INDxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.44119	06577	120-15-[redacted]	OLIxxxxxx	LOWANDA	188 KINxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.44007	05095	140-13-[redacted]	MOUxxxxxx	ANGELINE	178 MILxxxxxxxxxx	WESTWOOD	ST	06200	N
29	+0.43855	01363	150-12-[redacted]	LUCxxxxxx	MORTON	168 NOYxxxxxxxxxx	EASTHAM	ST	04562	N
29	+0.43741	10833	170-10-[redacted]	JUSxxxxxx	BARRY	158 PENxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N

xxx PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS

TEST STA.
PROFILING INITIATIVE REPORT (TEST)
LOCAL OFFICE 29

LOC OFF	BEFS EXHAUST PROBABILITY	CLAIM ID	CLAIMANT SS #	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	STREET ADDRESS	TOWN	STATE	ZIP CODE	SERVCS REF
29	+0.39400	00623	969-01-[redacted]	LEBxxxxxx	COLLEEN	369 TUCxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.38814	14933	230-04-[redacted]	DUMxxxxxx	LORETTA	119 TWIxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N
29	+0.38144	11665	250-02-[redacted]	BAIxxxxxx	VENUS	109 WALxxxxxxxxxx	ROCKPORT	ST	05312	N

xxx PLEASE NOTE : ALL NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS ARE FICTITIOUS