

*Identifying Program Components and Practices
That Influence SNAP Application Processing
Timeliness Rates*

THE SNAP TIMELINESS STUDY

*Appendix E:
Supplemental Data Tables*

LIST OF TABLES

Table E–1. Research Questions and Data Sources.....	E–1
Table E–2. States Operating SNAP Administrative Waivers, by Calendar Year.....	E–3
Table E–3. State Operation of SNAP Administrative Waivers, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–5
Table E–4. State Operation of SNAP Administrative Waivers With Mean APT Rates.....	E–7
Table E–5. State Operation of Demonstration Projects, by Calendar Year.....	E–9
Table E–6. State Operation of Demonstration Projects, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–11
Table E–7. State Operation of Demonstration Projects With Mean APT Rates.....	E–12
Table E–8. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by Calendar Year.....	E–13
Table E–9. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–17
Table E–10. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options With Mean APT Rates.....	E–19
Table E–11. State Activities Resulting from Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Initiatives, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–21
Table E–12. State Activities Resulting from Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Initiatives With Mean APT Rates.....	E–22
Table E–13. State Implementation of Workflow Analyses or Process Management Strategies, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–23
Table E–14. State Implementation of Workflow Analyses or Process Management Strategies With Mean APT Rates.....	E–23
Table E–15. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by Calendar Year.....	E–24
Table E–16. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–28
Table E–17. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives and Mean APT Rates.....	E–29
Table E–18. State Actions to Make APT a Priority, by Calendar Year.....	E–30
Table E–19. State Actions to Make APT a Priority, by APT Status in FFY 2015.....	E–33
Table E–20. State Actions to Make APT a Priority and Mean APT Rates.....	E–34

Table E-1. Research Questions and Data Sources

Research Questions	FNS Reports	State Agency Survey	Local Agency Survey
Objective 1			
What waivers, if any, do the States have in place? When were they implemented?	√ ¹		
What demonstrations, if any, are the States operating? When were they implemented?		√	
What is the “business as usual” approach to receiving and certifying SNAP applications? Describe in detail how the application process flows across units within the local service offices, call centers, and (if appropriate) online application centers or other units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How and when are interviews scheduled with the applicant? How and when are households notified? ○ Does the interview process differ for online and paper applications? For regular and expedited cases? If yes, describe how they differ. ○ Does the certification process differ for online and paper applications? For regular and expedited cases? If yes, describe how they differ. ○ Are the principles of “first contact” or “same day service” built into the application process? If so, explain how. ○ Describe the process and timing of obtaining verification. ○ Determine if, and when, any changes were made to the “business as usual” approach between 2012 and 2015. 			√
How are SNAP cases assigned? Are cases shared by units of workers (casebanking)? If yes, explain how SNAP caseloads are organized.			√
What modernization features have the States added between 2012 and 2015?		√	√
Have the States implemented any business process reengineering (BPR) initiatives between 2012 and 2015? If so, describe.		√	
What is the role of the State and SNAP leadership in establishing APT as a priority, providing resources to help meet APT acceptable threshold, and support BPR?		√	√
Do States have performance incentives or penalties for APT? What, if any, performance-based incentives or penalties are in place?		√	√
What, if any, changes have been made to the States’ SNAP policy between 2012 and 2015?		√	
Objective 2			
What policy features, if any, are more commonly employed by States with Timely, Untimely, and Very Untimely APT rates?	√ ²	√	
What BPR initiatives, if any, are more commonly implemented by States with Timely, Untimely, and Very Untimely APT rates?	√ ²	√	
What technology improvements, if any are more commonly employed by States with Timely, Untimely, and Very Untimely APT rates?	√ ²	√	
What recent (2012–2015) workflow analyses and ongoing process management, if any, are more commonly employed by States with Timely, Untimely, and Very Untimely APT rates?	√ ²	√	
For States that moved from being Untimely in 2013 to being Timely in 2015, what BPR initiatives, technology improvements, or workflow analysis and process management changes took place in those States within that time period?	√ ²	√	
Objective 3			
If States implemented any changes to policy, what were the impacts of the changes? Which, if any, policies were associated with changes in APT rate?	√ ²	√	
Is the States’ APT status associated with any specific modernization initiatives? Describe initiatives.	√ ²	√	

Table E–1. Research Questions and Data Sources (Continued)

Research Questions	FNS Reports	State Agency Survey	Local Agency Survey
Is the States' APT status associated with any specific BPR initiatives? Describe the BPR initiatives.	√ ²	√	
Is the States' APT status associated with any specific waiver, demonstration, or option implemented? Describe accordingly.	√ ²	√	
How, if at all, does the States' APT status vary by the implementation of BPR initiatives and modernization initiatives?	√ ²	√	

¹ Source: SNAP Certification Policy Waiver Database, retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/waivers-rules>

² Application Processing Timeliness for 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/recognizing-states-exceptional-nutrition-assistance-service>.

Table E–2. States Operating SNAP Administrative Waivers, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating SNAP Administrative Waivers
30 Days to Provide Verification for New Household Member Waiver		
Allows the household 30 days to provide verification from date a new household member is reported.		
2012	2	DE, UT
2013	2	DE, UT
2014	2	DE, UT
2015	3	DE, LA, UT
<i>year unknown</i>	1	CT
Early Denial/10-Day Denial if Verification is Missing Waiver		
Permits States to deny an application if the applicant fails to provide verification within 10 days of the State's request, as long as the interview has been conducted. However, the applicant still has the right to provide the information by the 30th day and if she or he does so, eligibility is determined. ¹		
2012	3	DE, FL, LA
2013	4	DE, FL, IN, LA
2014	4	DE, FL, IN, LA
2015	26	AK, AR, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, ME, MI, NE, NH, NY, OH, RI, TN, VT, WA, WV, WY
Electronic Notices (e-Notices) to Client instead of Mail Waiver		
Allows States to issue notices electronically to clients instead of mailing notices to a physical address. Clients receive an email and paper confirmation notice with instructions for how to retrieve their e-notices. Each time a notice is available, households receive an email that directs them to visit a secure website/portal where they can access their account to view the notice. States currently approved for this waiver use e-notices to inform clients of a variety of case-related actions, such as the notice of missed interview, eligibility, denial, pending status, expiration, and required verification. ²		
2012	3	DE, FL, MN
2013	5	AZ, DE, FL, MA, MN
2014	11	AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, MA, ME, MN, MS, MT, WI
2015	16	AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, IL, KY, MA, ME, MI, MN, MS, MT, TX, UT, WI
Postpone Certification Interview for Certain Expedited Service Households Waiver		
Allows the States to waive regulations that require completion of the certification interview within seven days for households that meet expedited service criteria, provided identity has been verified and State agency staff have attempted to contact the household. The required interview is postponed one to two months, depending upon the date of application. If the household does not complete the required interview within this time, the case is closed and the State is not required to contact the household again. The State can only apply this waiver to 20 percent or less of its expedited service caseload.		
2012	2	FL, WI
2013	2	FL, WI
2014	5	CT, FL, MO, NM, WI
2015	9	AK, CT, FL, IL, MD, MO, NM, OK, WI

Table E–2. States Operating SNAP Administrative Waivers, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Reinstatement without New Application Waiver		
Permits States to reinstate recently ineligible households without requiring a new application if the household provides the information and/or verification required to reestablish eligibility within 30 days of the effective date of ineligibility, so long as the household has at least one month remaining in the certification period after the effective date of ineligibility. ³		
2012	2	DE, WI
2013	7	CT, DE, MA, MN, OH, WI, WV
2014	15	AL, CT, DC, DE, IA, MA, MN, NH, NJ, NY, OH, PA, VA, WI, WV
2015	25	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CT, DC, DE, IA, IL, LA, MA, ME, MN, MS, NE, NH, NJ, NY, OH, OK, PA, UT, VA, WI, WV
Telephone Interview in lieu of Face-to-Face Interview Waiver		
Permits States to waive the requirement that all households receive a face-to-face interview, either at initial certification or at recertification. Under this waiver, eligibility workers gather information during a telephone interview, although the State agency still retains the option of conducting a face-to-face interview if it is determined that one is appropriate, or if the applicant requests a face-to-face interview. ⁴		
2012	4	FL, IN, LA, WI
2013	15	AK, CA, FL, GA, HI, ID, IN, LA, MI, MN, NJ, NV, PA, VA, WI
2014	20	AK, CA, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IN, LA, ME, MI, MN, NJ, NV, PA, SC, VA, WI
2015	50	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY
Unscheduled/On-Demand Interview Waiver		
Allows States to waive the interview scheduling requirements and provides households the option to complete a telephone interview at their convenience within a specified time. Households receive a notice instructing them to contact a call center during normal business hours generally within 4 to 12 days, depending on the State. Applicants who do not successfully complete the interview within the specified timeframe are issued a notice of missed interview (NOMI) explaining that they must call for their interview by the 30th day from the date of application or the application will be denied.		
2012	2	FL, KS
2013	5	CA, CT, FL, KS, WA
2014	8	AZ, CA, CT, FL, ID, KS, SC, WA
2015	14	AZ, CA, CT, FL, ID, KS, KY, ME, MT, SC, TX, UT, VT, WA

Source: SNAP Certification Policy Waiver Database, retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/waivers-rules>. Additional States were added to some waivers based on responses to the State Agency Survey and review of State Profiles.
year unknown=State operated waiver, but years were unknown.

¹ Food and Nutrition Service, Early Denial Waivers, memo to Regional Directors, March 31, 2014. Retrieved from <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/Memo%20Early%20Denial%20Waivers%20%283%29.pdf>.

² Food and Nutrition Service, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—Guidance for State Agencies on Novel Waivers, memo to Regional Directors, May 13, 2014. Retrieved from <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/SNAP%20-%20Guidance%20for%20States%20on%20Novel%20Waivers.pdf>. Note that the majority of e-notice waivers have since been converted to a State option. Please see memo, “Electronic Notice Waivers and Options,” published November 3, 2017.

³ *SNAP Workload Management Matrix*, January 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/snap-workload-management-matrix>.

⁴ Food and Nutrition Service, *Program Access Toolkit 2013—A Guide for State Agencies for Improving Access to SNAP*. Retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/snap-program-improvement>. At the time of this study, SNAP regulations required that a household participate in a face-to-face interview with an eligibility worker at the time of initial certification and every 12 months thereafter. However, as of January 6, 2017, this regulation changed to allow States the option to use telephone interviews instead of a face-to-face interview.

Table E-3. State Operation of SNAP Administrative Waivers, by APT Status in FFY 2015

SNAP Administrative Waivers	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=22)		Very Untimely (n=19)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
30 Days to Provide Verification for New Household Member Waiver Allows the household 30 days to provide verification from date a new household member is reported.	1	10%	2	9%	1	5%
Early Denial/10-Day Denial if Verification is Missing Waiver Permits States to deny an application if the applicant fails to provide verification within 10 days of the State's request, as long as the interview has been conducted. However, the client still has the right to provide the information by the 30th day and if she or he does so, eligibility is determined. ²	3	30%	10	45%	13	68%
Electronic Notices (e-Notices) to Client instead of Mail Waiver Allows States to issue notices electronically to clients instead of mailing notices to a physical address. Clients receive an email and paper confirmation notice with instructions for how to retrieve their e-notices. Each time a notice is available, households receive an email that directs them to visit a secure website/portal where they can access their account to view the notice. States currently approved for this waiver use e-notices to inform clients of a variety of case-related actions, such as the notice of missed interview, eligibility, denial, pending status, expiration, and required verification. ³	1	10%	8	36%	7	37%
Postpone Certification Interview for Certain Expedited Service Households Waiver Allows States to waive regulations that require completion of the certification interview within seven days for households that meet expedited service criteria, provided identity has been verified and State agency staff have attempted to contact the household. The required interview is postponed one to two months, depending upon the date of application. If the household does not complete the required interview within the period of postponement, the case is closed, and the State is not required to contact the household again. The State can only apply this waiver to 20 percent or less of its expedited service caseload.	2	20%	3	14%	4	21%
Reinstatement without New Application Waiver Permits States to reinstate recently ineligible households without requiring a new application if the household provides the information and/or verification required to reestablish eligibility within 30 days of the effective date of ineligibility, so long as the household has at least one month remaining in the certification period after the effective date of ineligibility. ⁴	5	50%	9	41%	11	58%

Table E–3. State Operation of SNAP Administrative Waivers, by APT Status in FFY 2015
(Continued)

SNAP Administrative Waivers	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=22)		Very Untimely (n=19)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Telephone Interview in lieu of Face-to-Face Interview Waiver Permits States to waive the requirement that all households receive a face-to-face interview, either at initial certification or at recertification. Under this waiver, eligibility workers gather information during a telephone interview, although the State still retains the option of conducting a face-to-face interview if it is determined that one is appropriate, or if the applicant requests a face-to-face interview. Eligibility workers gather the same information and take the same actions during a telephone interview as during a face-to-face interview. ⁵	9	90%	22	100%	19	100%
Unscheduled/On-Demand Interview Waiver Allows States to waive the interview scheduling requirements and provides households the option to complete a telephone interview at their convenience within a specified time. Households receive a notice instructing them to contact a call center during normal business hours generally within 4 to 12 days, depending on the State. Applicants who do not successfully complete the interview within the specified timeframe are issued a notice of missed interview (NOMI) explaining that they must call for their interview by the 30th day from the date of application or the application will be denied.	2	20%	8	36%	5	26%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹ Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

² Food and Nutrition Service, Early Denial Waivers, memo to Regional Directors, March 31, 2014. Retrieved from <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/Memo%20Early%20Denial%20Waivers%20%283%29.pdf>.

³ Food and Nutrition Service, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—Guidance for State Agencies on Novel Waivers, memo to Regional Directors, May 13, 2014. Retrieved from <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/SNAP%20-%20Guidance%20for%20States%20on%20Novel%20Waivers.pdf>. Note that the majority of e-notice waivers have since been converted to a State option. Please see memo, “Electronic Notice Waivers and Options,” published November 3, 2017.

⁴ *SNAP Workload Management Matrix*, January 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/snap-workload-management-matrix>.

⁵ Food and Nutrition Service, *Program Access Toolkit 2013—A Guide for State Agencies for Improving Access to SNAP*. Retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/snap-program-improvement>. At the time of this study, SNAP regulations required that a household participate in a face-to-face interview with an eligibility worker at the time of initial certification and every 12 months thereafter. However, as of January 6, 2017, this regulation changed to allow States the option to use telephone interviews instead of a face-to-face interview.

Note: Percent of States in each APT status group are those that implemented administrative waivers. Not all States operated administrative waivers, so row totals may not add up to 51. States may have operated multiple administrative waivers, so column percentages may not add up to 100%.

Table E-4. State Operation of SNAP Administrative Waivers With Mean APT Rates

SNAP Administrative Waivers	FFY 2015 APT Rates With SNAP Administrative Waiver			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without SNAP Administrative Waiver			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
30 Days to Provide Verification for New Household Member Waiver Allows the household 30 days to provide verification from date a new household member is reported.	88.80%	9.5	4	90.29%	5.6	47	1.5
Early Denial/10-Day Denial if Verification is Missing Waiver Permits States to deny an application if the applicant fails to provide verification within 10 days of the State's request, as long as the interview has been conducted. However, the client still has the right to provide the information by the 30th day and if she or he does so, eligibility is determined. ¹	88.35%	6.5	26	92.08%	4.6	25	3.7
Electronic Notices (e-Notices) to Client instead of Mail Waiver Allows States to issue notices electronically to clients instead of mailing notices to a physical address. Clients receive an email and paper confirmation notice with instructions for how to retrieve their e-notices. Each time a notice is available, households receive an email that directs them to visit a secure website/portal where they can access their account to view the notice. States currently approved for this waiver use e-notices to inform clients of a variety of case-related actions, such as the notice of missed interview, eligibility, denial, pending status, expiration, and required verification. ²	89.11%	6.5	16	90.67%	5.6	35	1.6
Postpone Certification Interview for Certain Expedited Service Households Waiver Allows States to waive regulations that require completion of the certification interview within seven days for households that meet expedited service criteria, provided identity has been verified and State agency staff have attempted to contact the household. The required interview is postponed one to two months, depending upon the date of application. If the household does not complete the required interview within this time, the case is closed and the State is not required to contact the household again. The State can only apply this waiver to 20 percent or less of its expedited service caseload.	89.14%	8.1	9	90.40%	5.4	42	1.3
Reinstatement without New Application Waiver Permits States to reinstate recently ineligible households without requiring a new application if the household provides the information and/or verification required to reestablish eligibility within 30 days of the effective date of ineligibility, so long as the household has at least one month remaining in the certification period after the effective date of ineligibility. ³	88.82%	6.6	25	91.48%	4.8	26	2.7

Table E-4. State Operation of SNAP Administrative Waivers With Mean APT Rates (Continued)

SNAP Administrative Waivers	FFY 2015 APT Rates With SNAP Administrative Waiver			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without SNAP Administrative Waiver			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
<p>Telephone Interview in lieu of Face-to-Face Interview Waiver Permits States to waive the requirement that all households receive a face-to-face interview, either at initial certification or at recertification. Under this waiver, eligibility workers gather information during a telephone interview, although the State still retains the option of conducting a face-to-face interview if it is determined that one is appropriate, or if the applicant requests a face-to-face interview. Eligibility workers gather the same information and take the same actions during a telephone interview as during a face-to-face interview.⁴</p>	90.05%	5.9	50	96.38%	--	1	6.3
<p>Unscheduled/On-Demand Interview Waiver Allows States to waive the interview scheduling requirements and provides households the option to complete a telephone interview at their convenience within a specified time. Households receive a notice instructing them to contact a call center during normal business hours generally within 4 to 12 days, depending on the State. Applicants who do not successfully complete the interview within the specified timeframe are issued a notice of missed interview (NOMI) explaining that they must call for their interview by the 30th day from the date of application or the application will be denied.</p>	91.62%	4.6	15	89.58%	6.3	36	2.0

Source: SNAP Certification Policy Waiver Database, <http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/waivers-rules>

¹ Food and Nutrition Service, Early Denial Waivers, memo to Regional Directors, March 31, 2014. Retrieved from <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/Memo%20Early%20Denial%20Waivers%20%283%29.pdf>.

² Food and Nutrition Service, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—Guidance for State Agencies on Novel Waivers, memo to Regional Directors, May 13, 2014. Retrieved from <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/SNAP%20-%20Guidance%20for%20States%20on%20Novel%20Waivers.pdf>. Note that the majority of e-notice waivers have since been converted to a State option. See memo, “Electronic Notice Waivers and Options,” published November 3, 2017.

³ *SNAP Workload Management Matrix*, January 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/snap-workload-management-matrix>.

⁴ Food and Nutrition Service, *Program Access Toolkit 2013—A Guide for State Agencies for Improving Access to SNAP*. Retrieved from <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/snap-program-improvement>. At the time of this study, SNAP regulations required that a household participate in a face-to-face interview with an eligibility worker at the time of initial certification and every 12 months thereafter. However, as of January 6, 2017, this regulation changed to allow States the option to use telephone interviews instead of a face-to-face interview.

Table E–5. State Operation of Demonstration Projects, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Demonstration Projects
Elderly Simplified Application Project (ESAP)		
Streamlines the application and certification process for elderly and/or disabled households with no earned income by waiving the recertification interview, using data matches, and extending certification periods to 36 months.		
2012	6	AL, FL, GA, MS, SC, TX
2013	7	AL, FL, GA, MS, SC, TX, WA
2014	7	AL, FL, GA, MS, SC, TX, WA
2015	8	AL, FL, GA, MO, MS, SC, TX, WA
Standard Medical Deductions (SMD) Project		
Allows States to streamline the certification process by applying a standardized medical deduction for elderly and disabled households claiming medical expenses in lieu of calculating actual expenses.		
2012	12	AR, DE, IA, MA, MO, NH, RI, SD, TX, VA, VT, WY
2013	14	AR, DE, IA, ID, MA, MO, ND, NH, RI, SD, TX, VA, VT, WY
2014	15	AL, AR, DE, IA, ID, MA, MO, ND, NH, RI, SD, TX, VA, VT, WY
2015	17	AL, AR, DE, GA, IA, ID, MA, MO, ND, NH, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, VT, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	IL, KS
Combined Application Project (CAP) (Standard)		
Allows shorter applications for seniors receiving Social Security Income.		
2012	6	MS, NJ, PA, SC, WA, WY
2013	6	MS, NJ, PA, SC, WA, WY
2014	6	MS, NJ, PA, SC, WA, WY
2015	6	MS, NJ, PA, SC, WA, WY
Combined Application Project (CAP) (Modified)		
Streamlines application procedures for individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. The modified model uses data from the Social Security Administration for targeted SNAP outreach to eligible SSI households who are then sent applications.		
2012	11	FL, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NC, NY, SD, TX, WY
2013	12	FL, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NC, NM, NY, SD, TX, WY
2014	12	FL, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NC, NM, NY, SD, TX, WY
2015	12	FL, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NC, NM, NY, SD, TX, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	DC, VA
Community Partner Interviewer Demonstration Project		
Allows nonprofit community-based organizations to conduct SNAP interviews on behalf of the State SNAP agency.		
2012	5	FL, MI, MN, NV, TX
2013	4	FL, MN, NV, TX
2014	5	FL, MN, NV, SC, TX
2015	5	FL, MN, NV, SC, TX
36-Month Certification Demonstration Project		
Extends certification period to 36 months for households with only elderly or disabled members.		
2012	8	AL, AR, AZ, LA, MD, MS, NC, TX
2013	8	AL, AR, AZ, LA, MD, MS, NC, TX
2014	8	AL, AR, AZ, LA, MD, MS, NC, TX
2015	8	AL, AR, AZ, LA, MD, MS, NC, TX

Table E-5. State Operation of Demonstration Projects, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Demonstration Projects
Novel Demonstration Projects¹		
2012	4	FL, MN, TX, WA
2013	5	AL, FL, MN, TX, WA
2014	6	AL, FL, LA, MN, TX, WA
2015	6	AL, FL, LA, MN, TX, WA
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

year unknown=State operated demonstration project, but years were unknown.

¹ Florida reported the Online Application Automatic Identity Pilot. Minnesota reported Minnesota's Group Residential Housing Project. Pennsylvania reported SNAP/Medicare Improvements to Patients and Providers Act (MIPPA) Demonstration Pilot Project. Washington reported Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribal Demonstration.

Note: Total States operating demonstration projects in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 35. States with no demonstration projects (not shown in table): AK, CA, CO, CT, HI, IN, ME, MT, OH, OK, OR, TN, UT, WI, WV. State that did not specify demonstration project status: NE.

Table E-6. State Operation of Demonstration Projects, by APT Status in FFY 2015

Demonstration Projects	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=21)		Very Untimely (n=19)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Elderly Simplified Application Project (ESAP) Streamlines the application and certification process for elderly and/or disabled households with no earned income by waiving the recertification interview, using data matches, and extending certification periods to 36 months.	1	10%	3	14%	4	21%
Standard Medical Deductions (SMD) Project Allows States to streamline the certification process by applying a standardized medical deduction for elderly and disabled households claiming medical expenses in lieu of calculating actual expenses.	5	50%	5	24%	9	47%
Combined Application Project (CAP) (Standard) Allows shorter applications for seniors receiving Social Security Income.	1	10%	3	14%	2	11%
Combined Application Project (CAP) (Modified) Streamlines application procedures for individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. The modified model uses data from the Social Security Administration for targeted SNAP outreach to eligible SSI households who are then sent applications.	3	30%	5	24%	6	32%
Community Partner Interviewer Demonstration Project Allows nonprofit community-based organizations to conduct SNAP interviews on behalf of the State SNAP agency.	0	0%	4	19%	3	16%
36-Month Certification Demonstration Project Extends certification period to 36 months for households with only elderly or disabled members.	1	10%	4	19%	3	16%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹ Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

Note: Total States operating demonstration projects in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 38. States with no demonstration projects (not shown in table): AK, CA, CT, HI, IN, ME, MT, OH, OK, TN, WI, WV. State that did not specify demonstration project status: NE. Percent of States in each APT status group are those that operated each demonstration project in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015. Not all States operated demonstration projects, so row totals may not add up to 51. States may have operated multiple demonstration projects, so column percentages may not add up to 100%.

Table E-7. State Operation of Demonstration Projects With Mean APT Rates

Demonstration Project	FFY 2015 APT Rates With Demonstration Project			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without Demonstration Project			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Elderly Simplified Application Project (ESAP) Streamlines the application and certification process for elderly and/or disabled households with no earned income by waiving the recertification interview, using data matches, and extending certification periods to 36 months.	89.10%	5.6	8	90.37%	6.0	42	1.3
Standard Medical Deductions (SMD) Project Allows States to streamline the certification process by applying a standardized medical deduction for elderly and disabled households claiming medical expenses in lieu of calculating actual expenses.	89.46%	6.9	19	90.60%	5.4	31	1.1
Combined Application Project (CAP) (Standard) Allows shorter applications for seniors receiving Social Security Income.	91.21%	3.9	6	90.03%	6.2	44	1.2
Combined Application Project (CAP) (Modified) Streamlines application procedures for individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. The modified model uses data from the Social Security Administration for targeted SNAP outreach to eligible SSI households who are then sent applications.	90.89%	4.9	14	89.89%	6.3	36	1.0
Community Partner Interviewer Demonstration Project Allows nonprofit community-based organizations to conduct SNAP interviews on behalf of the State SNAP agency.	91.51%	2.5	7	89.95%	6.3	43	1.6
36-Month Certification Project Extends certification period to 36 months for households with only elderly or disabled members.	90.27%	4.2	8	90.15%	6.2	42	0.1

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

Note: Total States operating demonstration projects in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 38. States with no demonstration projects (not shown in table): AK, CA, CT, HI, IN, ME, MT, OH, OK, TN, WI, WV. State that did not specify demonstration project status: NE.

Table E–8. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Policy Options
Simplified reporting—certification length		
States may set household certifications between 4 months and 24 months, requiring periodic reports between certification periods.		
2012	42	AK, AL, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
2013	43	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
2014	43	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
2015	43	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	IL, TN
Simplified reporting—action on changes		
States choose to act on all or only certain changes during the certification period.		
2012	41	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NV, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY
2013	40	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NV, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VT, WI, WV, WY
2014	41	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NV, OK, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WI, WV, WY
2015	41	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NV, OK, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WI, WV, WY
Change reporting		
A reporting system that requires households to report changes in income or employment within 10 days of the date the change is known to the household or within 10 days of the date that the first payment attributable to the change is received.		
2012	18	AZ, CA, HI, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, WI
2013	18	AZ, CA, HI, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, WI
2014	18	AZ, CA, HI, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, WI
2015	18	AZ, CA, HI, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OK, OR, RI, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	2	NY, TN
Simplified income and resources		
By aligning SNAP policies with TANF and/or Medicaid, States may exclude some types of income and resources.		
2012	32	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CT, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, TX, UT, WI, WY
2013	33	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, TX, UT, WI, WY
2014	32	AK, AL, AZ, CT, DC, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, TX, UT, WI, WY
2015	33	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, TX, UT, WI, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	VA
Treatment of self-employment income		
State adopts a simplified method for calculating business expenses when the client is self-employed.		
2012	15	AK, AL, AZ, CA, GA, IA, ID, MD, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, WA, WY
2013	18	AK, AL, AZ, CA, DE, GA, IA, ID, MD, ND, NJ, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, WA, WY
2014	18	AK, AL, AZ, CA, DE, GA, IA, ID, MD, ND, NJ, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, WA, WY
2015	18	AK, AL, AZ, CA, DE, GA, IA, ID, MD, ND, NJ, OK, OR, RI, SC, SD, WA, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MN

Table E–8. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Policy Options
Child support expense exclusion		
Child support may be counted as income exclusion when determining a household's gross income and not as a deduction used to calculate the household's net income.		
2012	11	AZ, CA, CO, DE, LA, ME, NH, NY, RI, SD, WA
2013	12	AZ, CA, CO, DE, LA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, RI, SD, WA
2014	12	AZ, CA, CO, DE, LA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, RI, SD, WA
2015	12	AZ, CA, CO, DE, LA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, RI, SD, WA
<i>year unknown</i>	1	NM
Ineligible noncitizens' income and deductions		
States may either count none, or all but a pro-rated share, of the individual's income and deductions. The chosen option must be implemented Statewide, and only applies to the income of the ineligible noncitizen.		
2012	35	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, KS, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, WA, WI
2013	35	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, KS, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, WA, WI
2014	35	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, KS, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, WA, WI
2015	35	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, KS, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, WA, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	2	TN, VA
Simplified homeless housing cost		
States may apply a \$143 deduction from net income for homeless households rather than take actual shelter costs in determining eligibility for the excess shelter deduction.		
2012	23	AK, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, ID, KY, MA, MD, ME, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, WV
2013	23	AK, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, ID, KY, MA, MD, ME, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, WV
2014	22	AK, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, ID, KY, MA, MD, ME, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, SC, TX, UT, WV
2015	22	AK, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, ID, KY, MA, MD, ME, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, SC, TX, UT, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	1	VA
Standard utility allowance		
States determine and apply standard utility allowances for all households that incur utility costs rather than using actual household amounts. States that have a mandatory standard utility allowance must also make available a standard utility allowance that does not include heating and cooling costs.		
2012	47	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2013	47	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2014	47	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2015	47	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	IL, TN

Table E–8. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Policy Options
Comparable disqualification		
If a household member is disqualified for “failure to perform an action” required by another Federal, State or local means-tested public assistance program, States may elect to impose the same disqualification on the member under SNAP.		
2012	17	AK, CA, FL, GA, ID, KS, KY, ME, MI, MT, NE, NJ, NY, SD, VA, WA, WY
2013	18	AK, CA, FL, GA, ID, KS, KY, ME, MI, MT, NE, NJ, NY, PA, SD, VA, WA, WY
2014	18	AK, CA, FL, GA, ID, KS, KY, ME, MI, MT, NE, NJ, NY, PA, SD, VA, WA, WY
2015	18	AK, CA, FL, GA, ID, KS, KY, ME, MI, MT, NE, NJ, NY, PA, SD, VA, WA, WY
Child support-related disqualification		
States have the option to disqualify individuals who fail to cooperate with child support enforcement agencies, who are in arrears in court-ordered child support payments, or both.		
2012	3	FL, MS, RI
2013	3	FL, MS, RI
2014	3	FL, MS, RI
2015	4	FL, KS, MS, RI
Broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE)		
Under BBCE, a State aligns its asset and income limits with the TANF non-cash benefit program that confers categorical eligibility. While certain eligibility criteria are deemed for BBCE households, as they are for other categorically eligible households, these households must provide documentation of income and certain expenses in order for benefits to be calculated. BBCE households must also meet all other SNAP rules and have net incomes low enough to qualify for a SNAP benefit.		
2012	39	AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TX, WA, WI, WV
2013	39	AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TX, WA, WI, WV
2014	39	AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TX, WA, WI, WV
2015	38	AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TX, WA, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	2	IL, VT
Narrow-categorical eligibility		
A household is SNAP eligible if it participates in one or more specific programs, e.g. employment assistance, transportation assistance, etc.		
2012	8	AK, AR, CA, MN, MS, NM, NV, VA
2013	8	AK, AR, CA, MN, MS, NM, NV, VA
2014	8	AK, AR, CA, MN, MS, NM, NV, VA
2015	8	AK, AR, CA, MN, MS, NM, NV, VA
Disqualification based on work requirements (for all non-exempt household members)		
States have the option to make disqualification based on failure to participate in SNAP Employment & Training longer than the periods currently mandated by statute.		
2012	17	AL, DE, HI, IA, ID, LA, MA, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, OH, RI, SC, SD, UT
2013	17	AL, DE, HI, IA, ID, LA, MA, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, OH, RI, SC, SD, UT
2014	16	AL, DE, HI, IA, ID, LA, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, OH, RI, SC, SD, UT
2015	16	AL, DE, HI, IA, ID, LA, MA, MD, MI, MN, MS, OH, RI, SC, SD, UT

Table E–8. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Policy Options
Transitional benefits alternative		
States have the option to offer transitional SNAP benefits to families leaving the TANF or State-funded cash assistance programs. Allows a household to receive SNAP benefits for up to 5 months as they transition from TANF to work without recertifying.		
2012	21	AZ, CA, GA, HI, KS, MA, MD, ME, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, TN, VA, WA, WI
2013	21	AZ, CA, GA, HI, KS, MA, MD, ME, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, TN, VA, WA, WI
2014	21	AZ, CA, GA, HI, KS, MA, MD, ME, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, TN, VA, WA, WI
2015	21	AZ, CA, GA, HI, KS, MA, MD, ME, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, TN, VA, WA, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	1	CT
Verification of change in deductible expenses		
Mandatory verification of expenses may include verification of child support, housing, or child care costs.		
2012	28	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, DC, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, VT, WY
2013	27	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, DC, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, SC, SD, VT, WY
2014	26	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, DC, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NY, RI, SC, SD, VT, WY
2015	28	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, DC, GA, HI, IA, ID, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MT, NC, NE, NH, NJ, NY, RI, SC, SD, UT, VT, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	DE
Photo EBT cards		
States may require that SNAP EBT cards have photographs of one or more household members.		
2012	0	
2013	0	
2014	2	MA, ME
2015	2	MA, ME
Other policy options¹		
2012	5	IN, NV, NY, OK, WY
2013	6	IN, NV, NY, OK, PA, WY
2014	6	IN, NV, NY, OK, PA, WY
2015	7	IN, MT, NV, NY, OK, PA, WY

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

year unknown=State implemented policy option but did not report the years.

¹ Other policies reported include exclusion of drug felons, casebanking, joint applications processed with TANF and Medicaid, averaging student work-hours, online applications, electronic notices, and program integration.

Note: Total number of States operating any policy option in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 51.

Table E–9. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by APT Status in FFY 2015

SNAP Policy Options	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=22)		Very Untimely (n=19)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Simplified reporting—certification length States may set household certifications between 4 months and 24 months, requiring periodic reports between certification periods.	7	70%	19	86%	19	100%
Simplified reporting —action on changes States choose to act on all or only certain changes during the certification period.	7	70%	20	91%	16	84%
Change reporting A reporting system that requires households to report changes in income or employment within 10 days of the date the change is known to the household or within 10 days of the date that the first payment attributable to the change is received.	4	40%	10	45%	6	32%
Simplified income and resources By aligning SNAP policies with TANF and/or Medicaid, States may exclude some types of income and resources.	9	90%	13	59%	12	63%
Treatment of self-employment income State adopts a simplified method for calculating business expenses when the client is self-employed.	6	60%	5	23%	8	42%
Child support expense exclusion Child support may be counted as income exclusion when determining a household's gross income and not as a deduction used to calculate the household's net income.	2	20%	6	27%	5	26%
Ineligible noncitizens' income and deductions States may either count none, or all but a pro-rated share, of the individual's income and deductions. The chosen option must be implemented Statewide, and only applies to the income of the ineligible noncitizen.	7	70%	17	77%	14	74%
Simplified homeless housing cost States may apply a \$143 deduction from net income for homeless households rather than take actual shelter costs in determining eligibility for the excess shelter deduction.	5	50%	8	36%	11	58%
Standard utility allowance States determine and apply standard utility allowances for all households that incur utility costs rather than using actual household amounts. States that have a mandatory standard utility allowance must also make available a standard utility allowance that does not include heating and cooling costs.	10	100%	21	95%	18	95%
Comparable disqualification If a household member is disqualified for "failure to perform an action" required by another Federal, State, or local means-tested public assistance program, the State may elect to impose the same disqualification on the member under SNAP.	2	20%	8	36%	9	47%

Table E–9. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options, by APT Status in FFY 2015 (Continued)

SNAP Policy Options	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=22)		Very Untimely (n=19)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Child support-related disqualification States have the option to disqualify individuals who fail to cooperate with child support enforcement agencies, who are in arrears in court-ordered child support payments, or both.	0	0%	3	14%	1	5%
Broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE) Under BBCE, a State aligns its asset and income limits with the TANF non-cash benefit program that confers categorical eligibility. While certain eligibility criteria are deemed for BBCE households, as they are for other categorically eligible households, these households must provide documentation of income and certain expenses in order for benefits to be calculated. BBCE households must also meet all other SNAP rules and have net incomes low enough to qualify for a SNAP benefit.	8	80%	17	77%	16	84%
Narrow-categorical eligibility A household is SNAP eligible if it participates in one or more specific programs, e.g. employment assistance, transportation assistance, etc.	1	10%	5	23%	2	11%
Disqualification based on work requirements (for all non-exempt household members) States have the option to make disqualification based on failure to participate in SNAP Employment & Training longer than the periods currently mandated by statute.	3	30%	6	27%	8	42%
Transitional benefits alternative States have the option to offer transitional SNAP benefits to families leaving the TANF or State-funded cash assistance programs. Allows a household to receive SNAP benefits for up to 5 months as they transition from TANF to work without recertifying.	4	40%	10	45%	8	42%
Verification of change in deductible expenses Mandatory verification of expenses may include verification of child support, housing, or child care costs.	7	70%	12	55%	12	63%
Photo EBT cards States may require that SNAP EBT cards have photographs of one or more household members.	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹ Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

Note: Total number of States operating any policy option in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 51. Percent of States in each APT status group are those that implemented policy options. Not all States operate policy options, so row totals may not add up to 51. States may implement multiple policy options, so column percentages may not add up to 100%.

Table E–10. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options With Mean APT Rates

SNAP Policy Options	FFY 2015 APT Rates With Policy Option			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without Policy Option			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Simplified reporting—certification length* States may set household certifications between 4 months and 24 months, requiring periodic reports between certification periods.	89.57%	5.9	45	94.72%	2.9	6	5.2
Simplified reporting—action on changes States choose to act on all or only certain changes during the certification period.	89.87%	6.0	43	91.82%	5.2	8	2.0
Change reporting A reporting system that requires households to report changes in income or employment within 10 days of the date the change is known to the household or within 10 days of the date that the first payment attributable to the change is received.	91.70%	4.0	20	89.19%	6.7	31	2.5
Simplified income and resources By aligning SNAP policies with TANF and/or Medicaid, States may exclude some types of income and resources.	90.49%	6.0	34	89.56%	5.8	17	0.9
Treatment of self-employment income State adopts a simplified method for calculating business expenses when the client is self-employed.	89.65%	7.5	19	90.49%	4.8	32	0.8
Child support expense exclusion Child support may be counted as income exclusion when determining a household's gross income and not as a deduction used to calculate the household's net income.	89.77%	6.8	13	90.32%	5.6	38	0.5
Ineligible noncitizens' income and deductions States may either count none, or all but a pro-rated share, of the individual's income and deductions. The chosen option must be implemented Statewide, and only applies to the income of the ineligible noncitizen.	89.86%	6.1	38	91.10%	5.1	13	1.2
Simplified homeless housing cost States may apply a \$143 deduction from net income for homeless households rather than take actual shelter costs in determining eligibility for the excess shelter deduction.	89.55%	6.9	24	90.73%	4.9	27	1.2
Standard utility allowance States determine and apply standard utility allowances for all households that incur utility costs rather than using actual household amounts. States that have a mandatory standard utility allowance must also make available a standard utility allowance that does not include heating and cooling costs.	90.21%	5.9	49	89.49%	7.0	2	0.7

Table E-10. State Operation of SNAP Policy Options With Mean APT Rates (Continued)

SNAP Policy Options	FFY 2015 APT Rates With Policy Option			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without Policy Option			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Comparable disqualification If a household member is disqualified for "failure to perform an action" required by another Federal, State, or local means-tested public assistance program, the State may elect to impose the same disqualification on the member under SNAP.	89.37%	6.4	19	90.66%	5.6	32	1.3
Child support-related disqualification States have the option to disqualify individuals who fail to cooperate with child support enforcement agencies, who are in arrears in court-ordered child support payments, or both.	92.18%	2.7	4	90.01%	6.1	47	2.2
Broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE) Under BBCE, a State aligns its asset and income limits with the TANF non-cash benefit program that confers categorical eligibility. While certain eligibility criteria are deemed for BBCE households, as they are for other categorically eligible households, these households must provide documentation of income and certain expenses in order for benefits to be calculated. BBCE households must also meet all other SNAP rules and have net incomes low enough to qualify for a SNAP benefit.	90.33%	5.6	41	89.54%	7.1	10	0.8
Narrow-categorical eligibility A household is SNAP eligible if it participates in one or more specific programs, e.g. employment assistance, transportation assistance, etc.	90.52%	7.4	8	90.11%	5.7	43	0.4
Disqualification based on work requirements States have the option to make disqualification based on failure to participate in SNAP Employment & Training longer than the periods currently mandated by statute.	89.47%	6.5	17	90.53%	5.6	34	1.1
Transitional benefits alternative States have the option to offer transitional SNAP benefits to families leaving the TANF or State-funded cash assistance programs. Allows a household to receive SNAP benefits for up to 5 months as they transition from TANF to work without recertifying.	90.35%	5.3	22	90.05%	6.4	29	0.3
Verification of change in deductible expenses Mandatory verification of expenses may include verification of child support, housing, or child care costs.	89.76%	6.7	31	90.83%	4.3	20	1.1
Photo EBT cards* States may require that SNAP EBT cards have photographs of one or more household members.	81.07%	3.0	2	90.55%	5.7	49	9.5

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

*Difference in Mean APT is statistically significant, $p < .05$.

Note: Total number of States operating any policy option in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 51.

Table E–11. State Activities Resulting from Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Initiatives, by APT Status in FFY 2015

Activities Resulting from BPR Initiatives	APT Status ³ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (N=6)		Untimely (N=16)		Very Untimely (N=12)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Created new position(s) to handle new duties/responsibilities	2	33%	8	50%	8	67%
Integrated workflow improvements into existing SNAP certification processing procedures	5	83%	16	100%	11	92%
Implemented new certification processing model ¹	3	50%	11	69%	10	83%
Enhanced automation or modernization features	3	50%	6	38%	6	50%
Established call centers	1	17%	4	25%	3	25%
Took other action ²	0	0%	1	6%	2	17%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹ New processing models reported include task-based processing, casebanking, shared caseload, first-available worker, virtual caseload, statewide business model, universal caseload, geographical caseload, specialized work units, one-touch processing, first contact resolution, and same-day/next-day service.

² Other actions reported include implementing the Unscheduled/On-Demand Telephone Interview Waiver.

³ Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

Note: Total States with BPR in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 34. States that did not report BPR between 2012 and 2015: DC, DE, ID, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, ND, NH, SD, VA, WV. States not identifying BPR status: AR, IL, MI, OH. Percent of States in each APT status group are those that implemented action to support BPR. Not all States implemented activities resulting from BPR, so row totals may not add up to 51. States may implement multiple actions, so column percentages do not add up to 100%.

Table E–12. State Activities Resulting from Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Initiatives With Mean APT Rates

Activities Resulting from BPR Initiatives	FFY 2015 APT Rates With Activities Resulting from BPR Initiatives			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without Activities Resulting from BPR Initiatives			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Created new position(s) to handle new duties/responsibilities	89.23%	5.3	18	91.56%	6.0	16	2.3%
Integrated workflow improvements into existing SNAP certification processing procedures	90.30%	5.6	32	90.79%	7.8	2	0.5%
Implemented new certification processing model ¹	89.56%	5.7	24	92.17%	5.2	10	2.6%
Enhanced automation or modernization features	89.52%	7.2	15	90.96%	4.2	19	1.4%
Established call centers	87.78%	8.7	8	91.11%	4.2	26	3.3%
Took other action ²	89.39%	4.6	3	90.42%	5.8	31	1.0%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹ New processing models reported include task-based processing, casebanking, shared caseload, first-available worker, virtual caseload, statewide business model, universal caseload, geographical caseload, specialized work units, one-touch processing, first contact resolution, and same-day/next-day service.

² Other actions reported include implementing the Unscheduled/On-Demand Telephone Interview Waiver.

Note: Total States with BPR in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 34. States that did not report BPR between 2012 and 2015: DC, DE, ID, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, ND, NH, SD, VA, WV. States not identifying BPR status: AR, IL, MI, OH.

Table E–13. State Implementation of Workflow Analyses or Process Management Strategies, by APT Status in FFY 2015

Implemented Analyses or Strategies	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=19)		Very Untimely (n=16)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Workflow analyses or process management strategies	6	60%	17	89%	14	88%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹ Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

Note: Total States implementing workflow analyses or process management strategies in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 37. States not reporting strategy status: AR, MS, PA, MA, MO. Percent of States in each APT status group are those that implemented workflow analyses or process management strategies. Not all States implemented workflow analyses or process management strategies, so row totals may not add up to 51.

Table E–14. State Implementation of Workflow Analyses or Process Management Strategies With Mean APT Rates

Implemented Analyses or Strategies	FFY 2015 APT Rates With Workflow Analyses or Process Management Strategies			FFY 2015 APT Rates Without Workflow Analyses or Process Management Strategies			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Workflow analyses or process management strategies	90.11%	6.0	37	91.82%	5.9	8	1.7

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

Note: Total States implementing workflow analyses or process management strategies in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 37. States not reporting strategy status: AR, MS, PA, MA, MO.

Table E-15. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Modernization Features
Call center(s) that handled general inquiries and requests		
2012	28	AR, AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, LA, MD, MN, MO, MS, NE, ND, NH, NJ, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, VT, WI, WV
2013	32	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, VT, WI, WV
2014	34	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, VT, WI, WV
2015	34	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, VT,
<i>year unknown</i>	2	DE, TN
Call center(s) that scheduled appointments, processed complaints, entered changes, and set task alerts		
2012	17	AZ, CA, FL, IA, ID, IN, MS, NE, NH, OK, PA, SC, TX, VT, WA, WI, WV
2013	20	AZ, CA, FL, IA, ID, IN, KY, ME, MS, NE, NH, NM, OK, PA, SC, TX, VT, WA, WI, WV
2014	20	AZ, CA, FL, IA, ID, IN, KY, MA, ME, MS, NE, NH, NM, OK, PA, SC, TX, VT, WI, WV
2015	20	AZ, CA, FL, IA, ID, IN, KY, MA, ME, MS, NE, NH, NM, OK, PA, SC, TX, VT, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	2	MN, TN
Call center(s) that processed changes, conducted interviews, and made eligibility determinations		
2012	15	AZ, CA, DC, FL, ID, NE, NH, NY, OK, OR, PA, UT, VT, WI, WV
2013	20	AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, ID, KY, ME, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, UT, VT, WI, WV
2014	21	AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, ID, KY, MA, ME, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
2015	21	AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, ID, KY, MA, ME, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	3	DE, SC, TN
Contact center(s) that communicated with clients through email, web chat/instant messaging, or shared web pages, in addition to phone calls		
2012	2	NY, UT
2013	4	AZ, ME, NY, UT
2014	4	AZ, ME, NY, UT
2015	4	AZ, ME, NY, UT
Online eligibility screening tool		
2012	35	AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV
2013	36	AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV
2014	36	AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV
2015	36	AK, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	2	DE, KS
Applications in PDF format that the client could download, complete, and submit online or via email or mail		
2012	17	CA, FL, HI, ID, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, NC, ND, NE, NM, OR, SC, WA, WI
2013	16	CA, FL, HI, ID, KY, MI, MN, MS, NC, ND, NE, NM, OR, SC, WA, WI
2014	16	CA, FL, HI, ID, KY, MI, MN, MS, NC, ND, NE, NM, OR, SC, WA, WI
2015	16	CA, FL, HI, ID, KY, MI, MN, MS, NC, ND, NE, NM, OR, SC, WA, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	3	AR, AZ, IA

Table E–15. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Modernization Initiatives
Online application system that allowed clients to apply online and was integrated with the eligibility system		
2012	15	CA, CO, IN, LA, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NV, NY, OK, RI, TX, WI
2013	20	AZ, CA, CO, IN, LA, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, WI
2014	21	AZ, CA, CO, FL, IN, LA, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, WI
2015	22	AZ, CA, CO, FL, IN, LA, MA, MD, ME, MT, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	1	DE
Online application system that allowed clients to apply online and staff to input information into eligibility system		
2012	24	AL, AZ, FL, GA, IA, KS, KY, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, ND, NE, OH, OR, PA, RI, SC, UT, VA, VT, WA, WV
2013	24	AL, AZ, FL, GA, IA, KS, KY, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, OH, OR, PA, RI, SC, VA, VT, WA, WV
2014	24	AL, AZ, CT, FL, GA, IA, KS, KY, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, OH, OR, RI, SC, VA, VT, WA, WV
2015	24	AL, AZ, CT, FL, GA, IA, KS, KY, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, OH, OR, RI, SC, VA, VT, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	2	AR, NM
Online account management that allowed client to check benefit information, report changes, and upload documents		
2012	19	AZ, CA, CO, FL, GA, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, NE, NH, NY, OK, PA, TX, VT, WA, WI
2013	24	AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, PA, SD, TX, VT, WA, WI
2014	25	AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, PA, SD, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI
2015	27	AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, PA, SD, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	1	DE
Online case management for workers that organized caseloads by queue, tracked application routing, and alerted workers when case actions were due		
2012	16	AR, AZ, CA, FL, ID, IN, LA, ME, NE, NH, NM, NY, PA, TX, UT, WI
2013	20	AR, AZ, CA, CT, FL, ID, IN, LA, ME, MN, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, PA, TX, UT, WA, WI
2014	22	AR, AZ, CA, CT, FL, ID, IN, LA, MA, ME, MN, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, TX, UT, WA, WI
2015	23	AR, AZ, CA, CT, FL, ID, IN, LA, MA, ME, MN, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, TX, UT, WA, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	1	DE
Integrated systems that handled online applications, eligibility system, and data verification		
2012	14	CO, FL, ID, IN, MA, ME, MI, NC, NH, PA, TX, UT, WI, WV
2013	15	AZ, CO, FL, ID, IN, MA, ME, MI, NC, NH, PA, TX, UT, WI, WV
2014	15	AZ, CO, FL, ID, IN, MA, ME, MI, NC, NH, PA, TX, UT, WI, WV
2015	16	AZ, CO, FL, ID, IN, MA, ME, MI, NC, NH, NV, PA, TX, UT, WI, WV
Electronic messages to notify clients of appointments or for client-caseworker communication		
2012	7	CA, FL, IN, KY, LA, ME, NC
2013	10	CA, FL, IN, KY, LA, ME, MS, NC, PA, TX
2014	15	CA, CO, FL, GA, IN, KY, LA, ME, MS, MT, NC, PA, TX, UT, WI
2015	15	CA, CO, FL, GA, IN, KY, LA, ME, MS, MT, NC, PA, TX, UT, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	1	DE

Table E–15. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Modernization Initiatives
Mobile applications for clients to apply, submit verification, or report changes		
2012	2	CA, IN
2013	2	CA, IN
2014	3	CA, IN, TX
2015	3	CA, IN, TX
<i>year unknown</i>	1	UT
Video interviews		
2012	1	WY
2013	1	WY
2014	1	WY
2015	2	MN, WY
Online e-authentication procedures (access to electronic data to verify client income and other eligibility requirements)		
2012	24	CA, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MN, MO, NC, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, WA, WY
2013	25	AZ, CA, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, MD, ME, MN, MO, NC, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, WA, WY
2014	25	AZ, CA, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, MD, ME, MN, MO, NC, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, WA, WY
2015	25	AZ, CA, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, MD, ME, MN, MO, NC, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, UT, WA, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	4	MA, SD, TN, VT
Document imaging		
2012	28	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, UT, VT, WA, WI
2013	31	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, UT, VT, WA, WI
2014	33	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, UT, VT, WA, WI
2015	33	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, UT, VT, WA, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	4	DE, HI, NC, TN
Electronic or telephonic signatures		
2012	29	AL, AR, CA, CO, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV
2013	31	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV
2014	32	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV
2015	32	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	1	DE

Table E-15. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Operating Modernization Initiatives
Electronic case files		
2012	30	AR, AZ, CA, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MD, ME, MN, MS, NC, NE, NH, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
2013	32	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MD, ME, MN, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
2014	35	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
2015	36	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CT, DC, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV
<i>year unknown</i>	1	ND
Other modernization initiatives¹		
2012	3	NE, WA, WY
2013	5	CA, NE, NH, WA, WY
2014	5	CA, NE, NH, WA, WY
2015	5	CA, NE, NH, WA, WY

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

year unknown=State operated modernization initiative, but years were not reported.

¹Other modernization features reported include a self-service kiosk that clients can use to access the system through a screen; a workflow tool to manage task-based work; a statewide new hire reporting web site; an EBT Data Warehouse that assists in fraud management, account activity, and customer care; a workload management and distribution system; and a database which serves as a one-stop shop for interface viewing.

Note: Total States with modernization initiatives in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 50. State that did not identify modernization initiative status: IL.

Table E-16. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives, by APT Status in FFY 2015

Modernization Features	APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
	Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=22)		Very Untimely (n=18)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Call center(s) that handled general inquiries and requests	7	70%	16	73%	14	78%
Call center(s) that scheduled appointments, processed complaints, entered changes, and set task alerts	4	40%	12	55%	7	39%
Call center(s) that processed changes, conducted interviews, and made eligibility determinations	7	70%	11	50%	7	39%
Contact center(s) that communicated with clients through email, web chat/instant messaging, or shared web pages, in addition to phone calls	1	10%	1	5%	2	11%
Online eligibility screening tool	5	50%	18	82%	15	83%
Application in PDF format that the client could download, complete, and submit online, by email, or by mail	4	40%	11	50%	5	28%
Online application system that allowed clients to apply online, integrated with the eligibility system	4	40%	11	50%	7	39%
Online application system that allowed clients to apply online, and staff to input information into eligibility system	5	50%	14	64%	11	61%
Online account management that allowed clients to check benefit information, report changes, and upload documents	6	60%	13	59%	9	50%
Online case management for workers that organized caseloads by queue, tracked application routing, and alerted workers when case actions were due	4	40%	13	59%	7	39%
Integrated systems that handled online applications, eligibility system, and data verification	3	30%	7	32%	6	33%
Electronic messages to notify clients of appointments or for client-caseworker communication	1	10%	9	41%	6	33%
Mobile applications for clients to apply, submit verification, or report changes	1	10%	1	5%	2	11%
Video interviews	1	10%	1	5%	0	0%
Online e-authentication procedures (access to electronic data to verify client income and other eligibility requirements)	5	50%	13	59%	11	61%
Document imaging	7	70%	19	86%	12	67%
Electronic or telephonic signatures	7	70%	16	73%	10	56%
Electronic case files	8	80%	17	77%	13	72%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

Note: Total States with modernization initiatives in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 50. State not reporting modernization initiative status: IL. Percent of States in each APT status group are those that implemented the modernization feature. Not all States implemented modernization features, so row totals may not add up to 51. States may implement multiple modernization features, so column percentages may not add up to 100%.

Table E-17. State Operation of Modernization Initiatives and Mean APT Rates

Modernization Features	FFY 2015 APT Rates of States That Operated Modernization Feature			FFY 2015 APT Rates of States That Did Not Operate Modernization Feature			Difference Between Means
	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Call center(s) that handled general inquiries and requests	90.02%	5.9	37	91.03%	6.1	13	1.0
Call center(s) that scheduled appointments, processed complaints, entered changes, and set task alerts	90.99%	5.2	23	89.68%	6.5	27	1.3
Call centers(s) that processed changes, conducted interviews, and made eligibility determinations	91.23%	5.8	25	89.34%	5.9	25	1.9
Contact center(s) that communicated with clients through email, web chat/instant messaging, or shared web pages, in addition to phone calls	88.68%	7.4	4	90.42%	5.8	46	1.7
Online eligibility screening tool	89.83%	6.0	38	91.72%	5.6	12	1.9
Application in PDF format that the client downloads, completes, and submits online or via email or mail	92.10%	4.5	20	89.07%	6.4	30	3.0
Online application system that allowed clients to apply online and was integrated with the eligibility system	90.61%	5.9	22	90.03%	6.0	28	0.6
Online application system that allowed clients to apply online and staff to input the information in the eligibility system	90.63%	5.1	30	89.76%	7.0	20	0.9
Online account management that allowed clients to check benefit information, report changes, and upload documents	91.08%	5.5	28	89.27%	6.4	22	1.8
Online case management for workers that organized caseloads by queue, tracked application routing, and alerted workers when case actions were due	90.84%	5.7	24	89.77%	6.1	26	1.1
Integrated systems that handled online applications, eligibility system, and data verification	90.60%	5.7	16	90.14%	6.1	34	0.5
Electronic messages to notify clients of appointments or for client-caseworker communication	89.21%	6.4	16	90.79%	5.7	34	1.6
Mobile applications for clients to apply, submit verification, or report changes	91.05%	3.2	4	90.22%	6.1	46	0.8
Video interviews	95.13%	1.7	2	90.08%	5.9	48	5.0
Online e-authentication procedures (access to electronic data to verify client income and other eligibility requirements)	90.46%	5.3	29	90.05%	6.8	21	0.4
Document imaging	90.68%	5.6	38	89.03%	6.8	12	1.7
Electronic or telephonic signatures	90.97%	5.6	33	88.95%	6.4	17	2.0
Electronic case files	90.67%	5.2	38	89.06%	7.7	12	1.6

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

Note: Total States with modernization initiatives in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 50. State not reporting modernization initiative status: IL.

Table E-18. State Actions to Make APT a Priority, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	# States	States Taking Action to Make APT a Priority
Established clear performance targets or goals for improving the State's APT rate		
2012	31	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, MN, MS, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
2013	33	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, MN, MS, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
2014	35	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, MN, MS, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
2015	36	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, MN, MS, NC, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI, WV, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI
Monitored State APT rates annually		
2012	29	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, MA, MD, MN, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY
2013	29	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, MA, MD, MN, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY
2014	31	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, MA, MD, MN, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY
2015	31	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, MA, MD, MN, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI
Monitored State APT rates quarterly		
2012	27	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, LA, MD, ME, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2013	27	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, LA, MD, ME, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2014	30	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2015	30	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, LA, MD, ME, MN, MO, NE, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI
Monitored State APT rates monthly or weekly		
2012	36	AK, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, MD, MS, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2013	37	AK, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, MD, MS, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2014	38	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, MD, MS, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2015	40	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, MD, MO, MS, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	MI, OH
Monitored local APT rates annually		
2012	22	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NV, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2013	22	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NV, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2014	24	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NV, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2015	24	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NV, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI

Table E-18. State Actions to Make APT a Priority, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Taking Action to Make APT a Priority
Monitored local APT rates quarterly		
2012	23	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NJ, NV, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2013	23	AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NJ, NV, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2014	24	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NE, NV, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
2015	25	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, MD, MO, NC, NE, NV, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WY
Monitored local APT rates monthly or weekly		
2012	28	AR, AZ, CO, DC, DE, GA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WA, WI, WY
2013	29	AR, AZ, CO, DC, DE, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, TX, VA, WA, WI, WY
2014	32	AL, AR, AZ, CO, DC, DE, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WA, WI, WY
2015	33	AL, AR, AZ, CO, DC, DE, GA, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, WA, WI, WY
Held workers accountable for overdue cases in performance reviews or in decisions about employment status		
2012	29	AR, AZ, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, MA, ME, MS, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WY
2013	28	AR, AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, MA, ME, MS, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WY
2014	29	AL, AR, AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MS, NE, NH, NM, NV, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WY
2015	29	AL, AR, AZ, CO, DE, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MS, NC, NE, NH, NM, NV, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI
Supported business process reengineering initiative(s)		
2012	23	AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, HI, ID, KS, MD, MN, NE, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, TN, UT, VT, WA, WI, WY
2013	29	AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, HI, ID, KS, KY, MD, ME, MN, MT, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TN, UT, VT, WA, WI, WY
2014	33	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, HI, ID, KS, KY, MA, MD, ME, MN, MT, NE, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WY
2015	35	AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, KS, KY, MA, ME, MN, MT, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI
Provided staff training in new application processing procedures		
2012	33	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, MN, MS, ND, NE, NH, NM, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, TN, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2013	36	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MD, ME, MN, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, TN, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2014	40	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
2015	41	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MS, NC, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	MI, SD

Table E–18. State Actions to Make APT a Priority, by Calendar Year (Continued)

Calendar Year	# States	States Taking Action to Make APT a Priority
Allocated resources for new technology designed to improve application processing		
2012	25	AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, KS, LA, MD, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, VT, WA, WI, WY
2013	27	AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, KS, LA, MD, ME, MT, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, VT, WA, WI, WY
2014	30	AL, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, HI, ID, IL, KS, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TX, VT, WA, WI, WY
2015	32	AL, AZ, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, KS, LA, MD, ME, MN, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, SC, TX, VT, WA, WI, WY
<i>year unknown</i>	2	AR, MI
Allocated resources for technical assistance to help workers use new technology		
2012	21	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, KS, MD, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, PA, SC, VT, WI
2013	22	AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, KS, MD, ME, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, PA, SC, VT, WI
2014	27	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, HI, ID, IL, KS, MA, MD, ME, MN, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, SC, TX, VT, WI
2015	29	AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DC, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, KS, MD, ME, MN, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, SC, TX, VT, WI
<i>year unknown</i>	1	MI
Other actions¹		
2012	6	AK, CA, CT, ID, NV, VA
2013	6	AK, CA, CT, ID, NV, VA
2014	8	AK, AL, CA, CT, ID, NH, NV, VA
2015	8	AK, AL, CA, CT, ID, NH, NV, VA

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

year unknown=State took action but did not report the years.

¹Other actions reported include adding APT to staff evaluations, developing crisis response team for counties not meeting APT goals, using monthly timeliness reports, collaborative problem solving with local offices, issuing APT guidance, establishing corrective action plans, developing new reporting tools to track APT, implementing a one-worker-one-family model, establishing a statewide universal workforce with first-point-of-contact model, developing web reports, and providing timeliness training.

Note: Total States taking actions to make APT a priority in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 51.

Table E–19. State Actions to Make APT a Priority, by APT Status in FFY 2015

Actions to Make APT a Priority		APT Status ¹ in FFY 2015					
		Timely (n=10)		Untimely (n=22)		Very Untimely (n=19)	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Provided Additional Support, Training, or Resources	Supported business process reengineering initiative(s)	8	80%	16	73%	13	68%
	Provided staff training in new application processing procedures	9	90%	21	95%	14	74%
	Allocated resources for new technology designed to improve application processing	8	80%	15	68%	12	63%
	Allocated resources for technical assistance to help workers use new technology	5	50%	13	59%	13	68%
Established Performance Goals and Accountability	Established clear performance targets or goals for improving the State's APT rate	7	70%	17	77%	13	68%
	Held workers accountable for overdue cases in performance reviews or in decisions about employment status	8	80%	16	73%	9	47%
Monitored State APT Rates	Annually	6	60%	14	64%	12	63%
	Quarterly	6	60%	15	68%	11	58%
	Monthly or weekly	10	100%	18	82%	14	74%
Monitored Local APT Rates	Annually	6	60%	10	45%	9	47%
	Quarterly	6	60%	10	45%	10	53%
	Monthly or weekly	9	90%	13	59%	11	58%

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

¹Timely (APT rates ≥95.00), Untimely (APT rates 90.00–94.99), Very Untimely (APT rates <90.00).

Note: Total States taking actions to make APT a priority in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 51. Percent of States in each APT status group are those that took each action. Not all States implemented actions, so row totals may not add up to 51. States may have taken multiple actions, so column percentages may not add up to 100%.

Table E-20. State Actions to Make APT a Priority and Mean APT Rates

Actions to Make APT a Priority		FFY 2015 APT Rates Among States That Implemented Activity			FFY 2015 APT Rates Among States That Did Not Implement Activity			Difference between Means
		Mean	Standard Deviation	n	Mean	Standard Deviation	n	
Provided Additional Support, Training, or Resources	Supported business process reengineering initiative(s)	90.55%	6.2	37	89.18%	4.9	14	1.4
	Provided staff training in new application processing procedures	90.63%	5.8	44	87.35%	5.9	7	3.3
	Allocated resources for new technology designed to improve application processing	90.90%	5.5	35	88.59%	6.4	16	2.3
	Allocated resources for technical assistance to help workers use new technology	90.42%	5.7	31	89.81%	6.3	20	0.6
Established Performance Goals and Accountability	Established clear performance targets or goals for improving the State's APT rate	90.77%	5.2	37	88.62%	7.3	14	2.1
	Held workers accountable for overdue cases in performance reviews or in decisions about employment status	91.24%	5.6	33	88.23%	6.0	18	3.0
Monitored State APT Rates	Annually	90.48%	5.3	32	89.67%	6.8	19	0.8
	Quarterly	90.52%	5.5	32	89.60%	6.6	19	0.9
	Monthly or weekly	90.61%	5.9	42	88.15%	5.5	9	2.5
Monitored Local APT Rates	Annually	90.53%	5.5	25	89.84%	6.3	26	0.7
	Quarterly	90.05%	5.7	26	90.31%	6.2	25	0.3
	Monthly or weekly	90.69%	5.6	33	89.24%	6.5	18	1.4

Source: SNAP Timeliness Study State Agency Survey, 2017.

Note: Total States taking actions to make APT a priority in any year between CY 2012 and CY 2015: 51.