

U.S. Department of Agriculture Executive Order 13520, "Reducing Improper Payments"
High-Dollar Overpayments Report
4th Quarter FY 2013

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
Forest Service (FS) Wildland Fire Suppression Management (WFSM)	Entity	Salem, OR	\$55,707	\$27,853	\$27,854	Two original invoices were sent for processing. Both invoices had the same invoice number but different dates.	Bill for collection was sent to the recipient to collect the overpayment.	Reiterated current procedures for checking for duplicate payments at time of payment processing. Also, the Duplicate Payment report will continue to be used. Additional training was provided to employees at supervisory level.
FS WFSM	Entity	St Louis, MO	\$173,233	\$0	\$173,233	Three invoices were processed and approved with the incorrect financial system vendor number.		Reiterated current payment procedures and the importance of data entry accuracy. Additional training was provided to employees at supervisory level.
Farm Service Agency (FSA) Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)	Individual	Kt Carson, CO	\$11,186	\$2,337	\$8,849	County office (COF) failed to update the appropriate CRP contract to reflect a change in the contract (sale of land) which caused an improper payment to be made.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff has been reminded of the importance to review CRP contracts and implement timely contract modifications upon notification to ensure proper annual payments are issued.
FSA CRP	Individual	Kt Carson, CO	\$11,186	\$2,337	\$8,849			
FSA Direct and Counter-Cyclical Program (DCP)	Individual	Kootenai/North Shoshone, ID	\$11,237	\$0	\$11,237	COF entered incorrect adjusted gross income (AGI) eligibility setting.		A review of responsibilities to correctly set flags was discussed during staff meeting. COFs will continue to receive training and reminders on the importance of setting eligibility flags and reviewing those flags to ensure they are accurate prior to issuance of program payments.
FSA DCP	Entity	Sutter, CA	\$200,000	\$120,000	\$80,000	COF updated the AGI Flag-eligibility criteria incorrectly.		COF staff will use caution in updating AGI eligibility flags in order to avoid overpayments in the future. COFs will continue to receive training and reminders on the importance of setting eligibility flags and reviewing those flags to ensure they are accurate prior to issuance of program payments. Second party reviews (paperwork and information technology (IT) eligibility flag settings) will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA DCP	Individual	Cochise, AZ	\$12,780	\$0	\$12,780			
FSA DCP	Individual	Poinsett, AR	\$31,178	\$0	\$31,178			
FSA DCP	Entity	Sheridan, KS	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000			
FSA DCP	Entity	Jasper, IN	\$25,888	\$0	\$25,888			
FSA DCP	Individual	Colleton, SC	\$6,584	\$0	\$6,584			
FSA DCP	Individual	Colleton, SC	\$13,302	\$0	\$13,302			
FSA DCP	Individual	Sedgwick, KS	\$5,591	\$0	\$5,591			
FSA DCP	Entity	Yuba, CA	\$34,404	\$0	\$34,404		COF contacted producer to recover the payment.	
FSA DCP	Individual	Colleton, SC	\$6,718	\$0	\$6,718		Receivable claim was established. Demand letter was sent.	
FSA DCP	Individual	Jones, TX	\$38,161	\$14,858	\$23,303	COF staff entered incorrect eligible acres in the Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments (SURE) workbook which resulted in an overpayment.	Receivable was established and offset flag set.	COF staff were instructed to review crop acreage data closely to ensure correct acres are being used to compute SURE payments. COF staff are reminded to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party review will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA Miscellaneous Disaster Programs (MDP)	Individual	Blaine, OK	\$8,081	\$4,278	\$3,803	COF personnel inadvertently overlooked other state workbooks in the system.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff was instructed to play closer attention to multi county entries on workbook. COF staff are instructed to completed second party reviews of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party reviews (paperwork and IT eligibility flag settings) will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
FSA MDP	Individual	Dawson, MT	\$11,328	\$1,280	\$10,048	COF staff entered the incorrect wheat yield which caused an incorrect payment calculation.	Finality Rule & Equitable Relief granted; therefore, repayment of the receivable/overpayment was waived. No further action will be taken.	COF discussed the importance of reviewing data loaded in support of applicable programs. Second party reviews will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Logan, OK	\$12,217	\$0	\$12,217	COF entered incorrect adjusted gross income (AGI) eligibility setting.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF management facilitated a discussion/training on proper AGI flag settings with COF staff. Second party reviews (paperwork and IT eligibility flag settings) will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Benton, MO	\$9,768	\$0	\$9,768	COF staff entered the incorrect figure in the SURE workbook.	The receivable will be collected from either the 2013 DCP payment and/or from the producer by check.	COF reviewed the handbook and revised their second party review process. Second party reviews will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Macon, IL	\$58,018	\$4,717	\$53,301	Incorrect payment shares were entered into the SURE workbook.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff are instructed to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party reviews (paperwork and IT eligibility flag settings) will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels. In addition, the National Office will remind State Offices with counties servicing multiple county offices to ensure adequate communication and attention is being provided for multiple county producers.
FSA MDP	Individual	Spink, SD	\$74,132	\$39,855	\$34,277	Incorrect production was entered in the SURE workbook.		
FSA MDP	Individual	Butler, OH	\$16,077	\$0	\$16,077	The incorrect producer was paid.		
FSA MDP	Individual	Jefferson, IL	\$9,346	\$0	\$9,346	The recording county (Marion) loaded production incorrectly in the SURE workbook. The controlling county (Jefferson) paid the SURE payment based upon this incorrect information.	A receivable was established and will be offset from future Direct and Counter Cyclical (DCP) payments.	
FSA MDP	Individual	Bates, MO	\$11,374	\$3,877	\$7,497	COF staff made error in the yield used on the application.	Repayment will be offset with SURE payment when approved.	COF staff has enhanced communication and implemented a more efficient method for using a checklists for reviewing the SURE workbook. Second party reviews will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Parke, IN	\$49,060	\$23,710	\$25,350	COF adjusted guarantee basis incorrectly in SURE workbook.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	
FSA MDP	Individual	Leavenworth, KS	\$83,237	\$8,622	\$74,615	SURE workbook was improperly loaded.		
FSA MDP	Entity	San Miguel, NM	\$29,946	\$0	\$29,946	COF staff entered incorrect data causing an incorrect payment calculation.		COF staff was instructed to be attentive and careful when loading data in the applicable program worksheet. COF staff were instructed to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party reviews will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Terry, TX	\$19,050	\$6,582	\$12,468	COF staff incorrectly calculated the Livestock Forage Program payment.		COF staff were instructed to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party review will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Lincoln, CO	\$8,324	\$0	\$8,324	COF staff entered/loaded incorrect eligible acres as part of the application process which resulted in an overpayment.		
FSA MDP	Entity	Finney, KS	\$84,119	\$0	\$84,119	Transposition of number error in SURE workbook.		
FSA MDP	Individual	Logan, CO	\$5,997	\$0	\$5,997	COF entered incorrect data in the SURE workbook with regards to an ineligible crop.		
FSA MDP	Individual	Logan, CO	\$7,552	\$0	\$7,552			
FSA MDP	Individual	Logan, CO	\$28,628	\$0	\$28,628			
FSA MDP	Individual	Lincoln, CO	\$9,320	\$0	\$9,320	COF staff entered/loaded incorrect eligible acres as part of the application process which resulted in an overpayment.		
FSA MDP	Individual	Renville, MN	\$29,156	\$19,213	\$9,943	Premium and indemnity were inadvertently overlooked when the COF staff was making entries into the SURE workbook.		
FSA MDP	Individual	Renville, MN	\$17,228	\$4,507	\$12,721			
FSA MDP	Individual	Renville, MN	\$10,301	\$5,909	\$4,392			

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
FSA MDP	Individual	Armstrong, TX	\$8,940	\$0	\$8,940	COF issued payment to incorrect producer.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff will ensure future payments are being issued to the correct producer by ensuring second party reviews are completed. Second party reviews will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Stevens, KS	\$39,311	\$0	\$39,311	COF staff issued the SURE payment to the incorrect individual/producer. It should have been issued to an entity.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff will verify name and tax identification number prior to issuing payments. COF staff are instructed to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. The second party review will remain a requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Vermillion, IN	\$12,361	\$0	\$12,361	Administering county office staff loaded indemnity payment incorrectly in the SURE workbook. COF reviewer discovered the overpayment after the workbooks were merged.	A receivable was established and demand letters was sent.	COF will ensure SURE workbook data provided by other county offices will be reviewed prior to issuing payments. The National Office has provided instructions and reminders, during biweekly Deputy Administrator Farm Program field office calls, the importance of conducting second party reviews to mitigate load errors when completing the SURE workbook. These instructions are also included in the 1-SURE handbook amendment. Second party reviews (paperwork and IT eligibility flag settings) will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Kidder, ND	\$11,308	\$0	\$11,308	The SURE workbook was improperly loaded.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	The COF staff have been instructed on the importance of tracking disaster payments and updating records (revenue and production) to ensure all applicable program requirements and policies are properly administered.
FSA MDP	Individual	Walsh, ND	\$12,016	\$667	\$11,349	COF staff entered incorrect data in the SURE workbook.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	
FSA MDP	Individual	Noble, OK	\$6,469	\$4,243	\$2,226	COF staff failed to include an ACRE payment as revenue in the SURE payment calculation due to the timing of the issuance of the payment. The SURE workbook was amended and the overpayment created.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	
FSA MDP	Individual	Worth, MO	\$8,134	\$0	\$8,134	COF loaded zero production as shown on the Risk Management Agency (RMA) report, but that was incorrect due to the group plan the producer was enrolled in. Production should be collected from the producer when the producer is enrolled in a RMA group plan.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff will monitor and double check all zero production RMA reports, especially for producers enrolled in a group plan to make sure that production records are correct and provided by the producer, when applicable.
FSA MDP	Individual	Early, GA	\$31,561	\$0	\$31,561	COF erroneously paid the individual member of the entity instead of issuing the payment to the entity.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff will verify name and entity identification number before disbursing payments as a part of the required second party review. Second party reviews (paperwork and IT eligibility flag settings) will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA MDP	Individual	Scott, KY	\$70,326	\$0	\$70,326	The SURE workbook data was incorrect. The loss data/unharvested factor was not applied to the NAP payment calculation.	Receivable was established and producer was notified by letter.	COF will implement a more extensive review of SURE applications, especially "value loss" crop applications. COF staff are instructed to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party review will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
FSA MDP	Individual	Marion, IA	\$34,898	\$14,696	\$20,202	COF staff inadvertently missed merging SURE workbooks prior to payment.	Receivable was established and producer was notified by letter.	The State Office staff discussed the error with the COF staff and stressed the importance of ensuring accurate program data is entered and all program procedures are followed prior to issuing program payments. COF staff were instructed to complete second party reviews of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party reviews will remain a requirement and will be reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
FSA Milk Income Loss Contract Program (MILC)	Individual	Fresno, CA	\$13,198	\$7,076	\$6,122	Incorrect production was loaded. The production from another producer with the same exact last name was loaded in error.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff will improve reviews of production records for applicable producers. Cross referencing and complete reviews of producer production file folders will be completed to mitigate errors in entering incorrect production. Also, the second party reviewer will ensure that the name and production matches prior to signing the payment in the National Payment System (NPS).
FSA MILC	Individual	Huron, MI	\$11,733	\$0	\$11,733	MILC software failed to retain the MILC modification (change to payee). COF also failed to confirm contract details at the time of NPS sign/certify.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff will review and conduct second party reviews to confirm payment details with current MILC contract prior to NPS sign/certify.
FSA Noninsured Assistance Program (NAP)	Individual	Tehama, CA	\$8,320	\$3,490	\$4,830	COF entered the incorrect total eligible acres which resulted in an overpayment.	Repayment will be offset with SURE payment when approved.	COF was instructed to review crop acreage data and complete second party reviews of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Modifications to the NAP software will electronically access acreage reports and this type of error should not be made in the future. The total acres will be pulled from the acreage report on file. No additional data entry will be needed.
FSA NAP	Entity	Catron, NM	\$31,160	\$15,580	\$15,580	COF staff applied the wrong percentage of loss to the 2011 NAP worksheet resulting in an incorrect payment calculation.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	COF staff has been instructed to pay more attention to the percentage of loss entries in the NAP worksheet. COF staff are instructed to complete second party review of program applications and/or payments as an internal control to reduce improper payments. Second party review will remain an important requirement and reinforced through communications at the National and State levels.
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Farm Security and Rural Investment Programs (FSRIP)	Individual	Camargo, OK	\$6,808	\$4,534	\$2,274	A non- Historically Underserved participant was mistakenly paid the Historically Underserved payment rate.	Demand letter was issued.	Training has been provided regarding Historically Underserved verification requirements.
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Farmington, NM	\$5,278	\$0	\$5,278	An advance payment was issued to a participant, but the practice has not been installed within 30 days.	Demand letter will be issued.	Queries are available to program managers/field offices to monitor the status of advance payments. Participants who fail to complete their conservation practice within the specified time, as determined by the State Conservationist, will be found in contract violation and required to refund the advance payment.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Canton, GA	\$535,173	\$0	\$535,173	Closing agent funds were released prematurely against NRCS policy.	Since NRCS received the conservation benefit and all other elements of the payment was proper, recovery efforts will not be pursued.	Training was provided in June 2013 on the current advance payment policy. Easement advance payment policy will be reviewed and updated to align with other advance payment policies.
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Fayette/Beckley, WV	\$10,475	\$0	\$10,475	Contract items were completed before the contract was officially approved and the required waiver was not obtained.	Demand letter was issued.	Training is being provided to field staff during ongoing spot checks.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Morrison, KS	\$71,828	\$23,943	\$47,885	Easement agreement required that payments be made in installments, but participant was paid in one lump sum payment instead.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	State will update internal checklists to check for installment payments.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Woodridge / Cooper, MO	\$73,745	\$36,873	\$36,873			

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Narberth, PA	\$57,239	\$0	\$57,239	Entity did not register in the System for Awards Management (SAMS) and was therefore not eligible for payment.	NRCS Headquarters provided training instructing the State Offices to pursue collection.	Training regarding SAMS registration was provided in June 2013.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Blythe, CA	\$89,250	\$0	\$89,250			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Iliff, CO	\$28,995	\$0	\$28,995			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Le Center, MN	\$73,725	\$0	\$73,725			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Neosho, MO	\$35,316	\$0	\$35,316			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Great Falls, MT	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Newberry, SC	\$61,296	\$0	\$61,296			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Milton, WI	\$31,000	\$0	\$31,000			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Smith, TX	\$13,880	\$0	\$13,880			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Smith, TX	\$6,837	\$0	\$6,837			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Larado / Grundy, MO	\$8,693	\$0	\$8,693	Participant was mistakenly paid multiple times for practice(s) due to a system error.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	NRCS is working with the Department to implement a solution to prevent these types of overpayments.
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Stratford, WI	\$6,325	\$0	\$6,325	Participant did not have control over the land for which he was paid.	Demand letter was issued.	During annual contract status reviews, field offices are reminded to verify contract acreage to ensure that land no longer under the participant's control is removed from the contract and future payment calculations.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Montague, MI	\$148,252	\$0	\$148,252			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Portales, NM	\$7,453	\$2,459	\$4,994	Participant was not eligible for payment due to a wetland violation. The producer failed to comply with a mitigation plan and was determined to be ineligible after NRCS financial assistance was provided.	Overpayment recovered. No further action required.	The State Conservationist will continue to use diligence to prevent payments in these types of unusual circumstances when similar situations occur in the future.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Minor / Ransom Co., ND	\$225,930	\$0	\$225,930			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Edinburg, VA	\$6,308	\$0	\$6,308			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Keezletown, VA	\$6,534	\$0	\$6,534			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Plano, IL	\$11,238	\$0	\$11,238			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Tazewell, VA	\$67,048	\$0	\$67,048			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Watford City / McKenzie Co., ND	\$95,369	\$0	\$95,369			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Sumter, SC	\$7,407	\$0	\$7,407			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Farmington / Dakota, MN	\$5,249	\$0	\$5,249			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Lockwood / Barton, MO	\$9,105	\$5,940	\$3,165			
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Franklin, OH	\$350,954	\$0	\$350,954	Payment was made directly to the participant instead of to the closing agent as required.	Recovery will not be pursued since the participant received the funds (not cost effective/good use of resources to request refund from participant, pay closing agent, and then pay participant again).	State financial personnel are working with the Easement Specialist to adjust the applicable forms to mitigate the risk of this happening in the future.
NRCS FSRIP	Entity	Goulds, FL	\$15,446,800	\$0	\$15,446,800	Payment was made for an easement that closed after the period of performance had expired.	Since NRCS has received the conservation benefit and all other elements of the payment was proper, recovery efforts will not be pursued.	An easement obligation review has been launched to prevent period of performance expirations. Additionally, NRCS is working to ensure that the period of performance data element is available for all payment types and is available when reports are run and viewed in the financial system.
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Durham, CA	\$13,125	\$2,615	\$10,510	Practices were not installed per contract requirements.	Demand letter was issued.	Field offices have been reminded of the need to perform a quality review prior to contract obligation. Additionally, annual quality assurance reviews will be performed to ensure that contracts are in compliance with NRCS policy.
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Box Elder, UT	\$31,662	\$17,412	\$14,250			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Prescott, MI	\$16,982	\$0	\$16,982			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Seneca, OH	\$22,770	\$0	\$22,770			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Haskell, OK	\$51,436	\$27,639	\$23,797			
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Wellsburg, IA	\$7,156	\$0	\$7,156	The incorrect amount of cubic feet was certified for a practice.	The wrong payee was paid.	Funds have been partially recovered.
NRCS FSRIP	Individual	Wellsburg, IA	\$7,156	\$0	\$7,156	The wrong payee was paid.	Funds have been partially recovered.	Financial management staff have been reminded of payment procedures and will make sure that all procedures are appropriately followed to prevent this mistake from happening in the future.

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
Rural Housing Service (RHS) Rental Assistance Program (RAP)	Individual	Homerville, GA	\$5,690	\$135	\$5,555	Income calculation/reporting issues.	Payment agreements are in place for tenant to repay improper payment. If payment is not received, debt will be sent to the Treasury Offset Program (TOP) for collection.	Legislative proposal submitted to target income reporting.
RHS RAP	Individual	Logansport, LA	\$9,084	\$3,562	\$5,522			
RHS RAP	Individual	Greensburg, LA	\$10,772	\$2,472	\$8,300			
RHS RAP	Individual	Freeport, ME	\$17,922	\$6,111	\$11,811			
RHS RAP	Individual	Lakeview, MI	\$27,679	\$17,521	\$10,158			
RHS RAP	Individual	Ravenna, MI	\$6,308	\$144	\$6,164			
RHS RAP	Individual	Clintonville, WI	\$7,328	\$430	\$6,898			
RHS RAP	Individual	Clintonville, WI	\$10,572	\$296	\$10,276			
Risk Management Agency (RMA) Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Program Fund (FCICPF)	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$168,017	\$26,812	\$141,205	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the indemnity.	Final findings were issued by the Agency to the reinsured company, accounts receivable were established for the overpayments and recovery actions initiated. Most receivables have been recovered. A small amount of contested receivables continue in due process review.	Provide corrective actions specific to each reinsured entity that address the types of errors identified relative to acreage reports, indemnity calculations, underwriting, and/or entity identification. Assess appropriate penalties on participating reinsured companies to improve improper payment rate. Use data mining to identify and spot check anomalous crop insurance participants using expanded data analysis that includes geospatial NEXRAD radar and weather information.
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$103,448	\$48,788	\$54,660	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Lubbock, TX	\$53,944	\$0	\$53,944		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$125,980	\$0	\$125,980	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$90,862	\$0	\$90,862		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$58,264	\$0	\$58,264	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$54,677	\$0	\$54,677		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$90,383	\$0	\$90,383	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$89,706	\$0	\$89,706		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$107,107	\$0	\$107,107	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$59,057	\$0	\$59,057		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Novato, CA	\$36,398	\$0	\$39,398	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$59,740	\$0	\$59,740		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$75,938	\$0	\$75,938	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$49,098	\$0	\$49,098		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$37,374	\$0	\$37,374	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$43,027	\$0	\$43,027		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Cincinnati, OH	\$376,699	\$12,701	\$363,998	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$78,978	\$0	\$78,978		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Ramsey, MN	\$240,049	\$0	\$240,049	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$97,865	\$0	\$97,865		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$73,065	\$0	\$73,065	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$73,065	\$0	\$73,065		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$132,393	\$0	\$132,393	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$110,825	\$0	\$110,825		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$69,706	\$0	\$69,706	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$68,292	\$0	\$68,292		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$35,515	\$0	\$35,515	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$28,785	\$0	\$28,785		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Anoka, MN	\$28,594	\$0	\$28,594	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$835,451	\$0	\$835,451		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$687,226	\$0	\$687,226	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$725,947	\$0	\$725,947		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$149,516	\$0	\$149,516	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$145,156	\$0	\$145,156		RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.	
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$135,341	\$0	\$135,341	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium and indemnity.		

Name of Program Responsible for Overpayment	Recipient (Entity or Individual)	City/County and State	Total Dollar Amount of the Payments Identified (Sum of Proper Amount and Overpayment Amount)	Proper Dollar Amount That Should Have Been Paid	Overpayment Dollar Amount	Reason For Overpayment	Actions Taken or Planned to Recover the Overpayment	Overall Actions and Strategies Taken or Planned to Prevent Overpayments in the Future
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$132,985	\$0	\$132,985	RMA determined the Company was not in compliance with FCIC policy or procedure in computing the premium.	Final findings were issued by the Agency to the reinsured company, accounts receivable were established for the overpayments and recovery actions initiated. Most receivables have been recovered. A small amount of contested receivables continue in due process review.	Provide corrective actions specific to each reinsured entity that address the types of errors identified relative to acreage reports, indemnity calculations, underwriting, and/or entity identification. Assess appropriate penalties on participating reinsured companies to improve improper payment rate. Use data mining to identify and spot check anomalous crop insurance participants using expanded data analysis that includes geospatial NEXRAD radar and weather information.
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$126,223	\$0	\$126,223			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$116,288	\$0	\$116,288			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$113,028	\$0	\$113,028			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$111,518	\$0	\$111,518			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$97,308	\$0	\$97,308			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$95,808	\$0	\$95,808			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$90,406	\$0	\$90,406			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$39,505	\$0	\$39,505			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$35,207	\$0	\$35,207			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$34,493	\$0	\$34,493			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$30,415	\$0	\$30,415			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Overland Park, KS	\$30,415	\$0	\$30,415			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$34,485	\$0	\$34,485			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$80,776	\$0	\$80,776			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$76,679	\$0	\$76,679			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$76,639	\$0	\$76,639			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$67,416	\$0	\$67,416			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$66,466	\$0	\$66,466			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$66,172	\$0	\$66,172			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$61,239	\$0	\$61,239			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$56,691	\$0	\$56,691			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$47,868	\$0	\$47,868			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$36,816	\$0	\$36,816			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$36,196	\$0	\$36,196			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$33,896	\$0	\$33,896			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$29,995	\$0	\$29,995			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Johnston, IA	\$29,801	\$0	\$29,801			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$46,206	\$0	\$46,206			
RMA FCICPF	Entity	Amarillo, TX	\$35,866	\$0	\$35,866			

A high-dollar overpayment is a payment in excess of 50 percent of the correct amount.

For an individual the threshold is \$5,000 as a single payment or in cumulative payments for the quarter.

For an entity the threshold is \$25,000 as a single payment or in cumulative payments for the quarter.