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Observation Only:

- It was observed that the Green Track approves only Expedited applications at the
time of screening. There are instances where the applicant may not be screened
expedited, but provides all the needed documentation to complete the application at
the initial interview. When a What You Still Need form is given to the applicant that
shows all information is provided, that application could be approved at time of
screening per section 8.100.130.11, rather than routed to the processing unit.

- Through observation it is noted that expedited service is being provided when the
household has not attended an interview by the seven-day deadline nor has been
contacted by telephone. Before certifying a household for expedited services the
county office must interview the household.

Processing Unit:
Observation Only:

- Through observation it was noted that files are being processed by date of receipt,
"the oldest first," resulting in clients who have recently turned in all the information
necessary, having to wait more than the three work days as required by section
8.100.130.11. Clients have a right to have their eligibility determined once all
information has been received.

Management Team Coordination:

This office should be commended on the "Team Work" put forth by the management team
and the willingness to step in to cover areas as the need arises. This attitude is found in the
workers as well and they too should be commended in their flexibility to help one another.
APPLICATION PROCESSING

Review Elements: This review included a reception evaluation, interviews with staff, County Director (CD), Outreach agencies, and applicants/recipients, as well as a case file review. The findings listed in this report are reflective of an analysis of each of the evaluation methods. The results from each of the evaluation methods are contained in the addendum to this report. The case file review sample included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applications Reviewed</th>
<th>Ethnic Breakdown</th>
<th>Approvals</th>
<th>Denials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 SNAP</td>
<td>Hispanic: 9</td>
<td>10 SNAP</td>
<td>10 SNAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Medicaid</td>
<td>Caucasian: 7</td>
<td>1 Medicaid</td>
<td>3 Medicaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-declared: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checkerboard Navajo: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application Screening Results:

The findings requiring corrective action are those identified as not receiving 100% accuracy rating.

- In 81% of the applications sampled, the county office did complete and/or offer the informal conference with a supervisor for applicants who were denied expedited SNAP services as demonstrated by Section Four A of the application screening form.

County Response: During the staff meeting conducted on 7/15/09, staff were reminded to always offer a client the option to speak with a supervisor when they do not receive expedited SNAP. Staff were also reminded to complete section Four A to show proof they offered the client the option to speak with a supervisor.

- In 100% of the applications sampled, the expedited SNAP screening was completed on the same day that the application was received.

- In 100% of the case files sampled, the county office did appropriately provide the “Appointment for an Interview” form on the same day the application was submitted, as required.
In 100% of the case files sampled, the county office did appropriately schedule the appointment for an interview within the required 10 working days.

**Verification Results:**

- The WYSN form was filled out completely:
  - The timeframes for providing verifications were completed in 64% the SNAP cases reviewed as required. This is a 55% improvement. The timeframes for providing verifications were completed in 33% in the MAWC cases reviewed as required. This is a 33% improvement.
  - The WYSN forms did include the applicant’s initials or the date, which acknowledge that alternative verifications were explained in 45% of the cases when required. This is an 18% improvement.

**County Response:** During a staff meeting on 7/15/09, we discussed the importance of completing the entire WYSN including the timeframe for the client to provide verification. This will be verified through spot checks.

- In 82% of the cases sampled, the county office only requested verification items that were readily available and necessary to determine eligibility. This is consistent with the previous evaluation.

**County Response:** During a staff meeting on 7/15/09, the county director reviewed the verification policy and emphasized the importance of not over-verifying, not verifying negative statements, and assisting the client to obtain verification when they have difficulty. This will be reviewed through spot checks.

- In 100% of the cases sampled the county did not request verification of already established eligibility factors.

- In 100% of the cases sampled the county did not request verification of a negative statement.

- 78% of the cases sampled did contain a copy of the “Receipt for Proof” form in the file for information provided by the applicant during the appointment for an interview. This is a 3% improvement.

**County Response:** During a staff meeting on 7/15/09, it was explained that all clients need a receipt for proof once the interview is conducted. This will be reviewed by intake supervisors through spot checks.

- 75% of the cases sampled contained a copy of the “Receipt for Proof” form in the file for information provided by the applicant after the appointment for an interview.
County Response: During a staff meeting on 7/15/09, it was explained that all clients need a receipt for proof for verification provided after the interview. This will be reviewed by the pending supervisor through spot checks.

Application Disposition Results:

The findings requiring corrective action are those identified as not receiving 100% accuracy rating.

The following are the findings for the Timeliness of application processing section:

- Regular SNAP Timeliness: 95% (19 out of 20)

  Application dated 4/22/09 with a denial date of 6/11/09. “I” code was entered on 5/22/09.

County Response: CTS Notes:
4/22/09 134423171: GREEN INTAKE; CLIENT SUBMITTED APPL FOR A PHONE INTERVIEW; FAA CALLED CLIENT AT 4:50 AND AT 5:05 AND COULD NOT REACH CLIENT; APPOINTMENT LETTER SENT TO CLIENT; SENT CASE TO PENDING. 903 4/22/2009 5:08:32

05/01/09 CLT CALLED RE APPT LETTER REC’D, C/S SHE IS ILL AND unable TO COME IN, WILL COME IN ON MONDAY 05/04/09. PB 0369 5/1/2009 11:08:33

05/13/09 humad sent for appt date, in na appt ltrs date 23rd. 0346
5/13/2009 10:34:07

05/22/09 Telephone interview for 039. WYSN for check stubs for the month of April/May 2009 from Mountain Bus Co. C/R in my office. SSR#595 5/22/2009 4:41:35

5/22/09 Delay coded entered "I" as client interview was conducted today (auto deny date) and verification of income was requested. Case to NA Pending - DUE 6/1/09. syb300 5/22/2009 4:56:49

6/1/09- No response to WYSN for income verification. HUMAD sent & another I function done (per #800, okay to do). CR in NA Pending behind the 11th. AV #504 6/1/2009 4:40:30

6/11/09- No response to WYSN or HUMAD for income verification. CR in NA Pending behind the 11th (AD date). AV #504 6/11/2009 8:15:20

6/12/09- Cat. 39 auto-denied for failure to provide income verification. CR forwarded to closed. AV #504 6/12/2009 8:51:47

According to CTS notes the original HUMAD was sent a week late, however, the
reason for the delay was due to the client getting the interview on the auto-deny date and given a WYSN for income verification. Client didn’t respond to WYSN and a second delay was done in order to send a second HUMAD. Case was an untimely denial, but for better customer service it was appropriate to delay the case.

- Expedite SNAP Timeliness: 100% (2 out of 2)
  - The county office should be commended for 100% accuracy in Expedite SNAP timeliness.

- Medicaid Timeliness: 100% (3 out of 3). (1 still pending)
  - The county office should be commended for 100% accuracy in Medicaid timeliness.

Application Denials

- Of the SNAP application denials that were sampled, 90% were valid denials.
  - Application dated 6/23/09 with a denial date of 6/23/09. Denied on code 565. All information provided at time of interview: should have denied code 320, gross income.

County Response: CTS Notes:

FAA should have denied case on 320 as all information was available to make a denial based on income.

- Of the Medicaid application denials that were sampled, 100% were valid denials.
  - The county office should be commended for 100% accuracy in Medicaid denials.

Application Approvals

- Of the SNAP application approvals that were sampled, 100% were correct.
  - The county office should be commended for the accuracy in SNAP application processing.
Management Evaluation Report
SE Bernalillo County
07/10/09 page 12

- Of the MAWC application approvals that were sampled, 100% were correct.

- The county office should be commended for the accuracy in Medicaid application processing.

Timely Processing:

The following timeliness rates are taken from the MSR for the past year. Timeliness rates for the SE Bernalillo County office are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/08</th>
<th>09/08</th>
<th>10/08</th>
<th>11/08</th>
<th>12/08</th>
<th>01/09</th>
<th>02/09</th>
<th>03/09</th>
<th>04/09</th>
<th>05/09</th>
<th>06/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedite</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation/Findings

- Expedited application processing timeliness rates fell below the Federal 98% eight out of the last twelve months.
- Regular application processing timeliness rates fell below the standard of 98% one out of the twelve months.

County Response: Expedited applications will be logged and a supervisor will review each case on ISD2 to make sure the application has been processed. Each expedite denial will be reviewed on the same or next day for accuracy and the supervisor will initial next to the denial box on the screening form. All process numbers will be reviewed on the Q-Screen at least twice per week to ensure all SNAP cases about to auto-deny are checked to ensure they will auto-deny correctly. If it is determined that it needs a HUMAD or is ready to be processed it will be taken care of immediately. The daily FS report will be printed out and reviewed daily for all cases processed beyond 30 days and given to the CD weekly with an explanation. A weekly report with all Q-Screen and Daily FS report information is given to the ROM.

30 Day Untimely:

- Manual Section 8.100.130.11 specifically addresses the timeframes for processing of cases. Also, according to manual section 8.139.110.13A, “Opportunity to participate” means having benefits authorized on or before the 27th day after the application is filed so the household will have benefits available by the 30th day after the application was filed.
- The following applicants were not afforded the opportunity to participate, due to untimely approval of their applications.
Timely Processing Corrective Action

Based on the review elements in this area, the ME team has identified the above findings and/or trends. It is required that the county office management team develops and implements Corrective Action and amend the CPO to improve timely processing. The reason for approving each applicant listed below beyond the appropriate time frame must be responded to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>Case number</th>
<th>Application date</th>
<th>Approval date</th>
<th>Pending days</th>
<th>County response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/19/09</td>
<td>06/25/09</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Faxed application was received 5/19 (not expedited). Case forwarded to processing on and reviewed on 5/26/09. Case submitted as “RETURN” by processing FAA 5/26/09 (pages 8, 11 &amp; 12 of application missing). WYSN sent 5/29 with no response so HUMAD sent 6/8/09. Client provided wrong verification and the case was delayed on 6/18/09. Verification received 6/24. Case reinstated &amp; processed 6/25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/04/09</td>
<td>06/09/09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>From CTS: Client was given WYSN at interview, but only partially provided verification and a HUMAD was sent 5/14/09, due 5/24/09. Client called on the 5/20/09 to report she is having difficult getting the verification and so a request was made directly to the employer. Employer didn’t respond to our request so on 6/2/09, FAA discussed with client income verification needed and HUMAD was sent on 6/2 with due date 6/12. Delay function was completed on 6/3. Verification provided 6/4. Case processed 6/9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/07/09</td>
<td>06/12/09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Verification provided 6/4. Case processed, 6/9, “earned income.” Reviewed &amp; released 6/12. Case should have been caught on Q-screen review and forwarded to processing for immediate action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expedited Untimely: