

Colorado State Department of Human Services Office of Performance and Strategic Outcomes SNAP Quality Assurance



COLORADO SNAP QUALITY CONTROL POINT-IN-TIME SUMMARY REPORT FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2012

(April 20, 2012)

NATIONAL:

National Average Active = 3.42% National Colorado Ranking = 33 out of 53 Mountain Plains Region Ranking = 7 out of 10

National Average Negative = 21.06 National Colorado Ranking = 53 out of 53 Mountain Plains Region Ranking = 10

STATE:

Active Case Error Rate = **7.92%**Active Error Rate = **3.57%**Target Goal = 3%

- Total Cases Reviewed = 341
- Total Cases with Errors = 27
- Total Issuance = \$95.846
- Total Misspent = \$3,425

Negative Error Rate = **68.30%** Target Goal = 25%

- Total Cases Reviewed = 530
- Total Invalid = 362

Negative Error Rate without CBMS or NOAA Errors = 42.76%

FEDERAL TIMELINESS:

State = 90.48%(Regular and EXP only)

NOTE: Federal Office has not provided new statistics since 3/9/12. Thus, the National numbers have not changed from the last PIT.

FFY 2012 SNAP Active Case Review as of April 20, 2012

County	Complete	Errors	Case Error Rate	COUPON ALLOTMENT	DOLLARS IN ERROR	ERROR RATE	CBMS Errors	\$ in Error	County Error Rate
Adams	36	1	2.78%	\$10,013	\$120	1.20%			
Alamosa	2	0	0.00%	\$713	0	0.00%			
Arapahoe	36	4	11.11%	\$9,479	\$722	7.62%	1	\$177	5.75%
Archuleta	2	0	0.00%	\$891	0	0.00%			
Baca	1			\$16					
Bent									
Boulder	14	2	14.29%	\$2,856	\$302	10.57%			
Broomfield	5	0	0.00%	\$1,472	0	0.00%			
Chaffee	1	0	0.00%	\$135	\$0	0.00%			
Cheyenne									
Clear Creek	1	0	0.00%	\$16	0	0.00%			
Conejos	3	0	0.00%	\$412		0.00%			
Costilla	2	0	0.00%	\$97	\$0	0.00%			
Crowley									
Custer	1			\$526	u.				
Delta	8	0	0.00%	\$2,437	\$0	0.00%			
Denver	59	4	6.78%	\$16,793	\$442	2.63%			
Dolores									
Douglas	3	0	0.00%	\$762	0	0.00%			
Eagle						#DIV/0!			
Elbert	2		0.00%	\$691		0.00%			
El Paso	32	5	15.63%	\$11,446	\$407	3.56%			
Fremont			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			
Garfield	4	0	0.00%	\$801	\$0	0.00%			
Gilpin									
Grand	1	1	100.00%	\$614	\$120	19.54%			
Gunnison			#DIV/0!	,		#DIV/0!			
Hinsdale									
Huerfano	1	0	0.00%	\$50	0	0.00%			
Jackson	1		0.00%	\$126		0.00%			
Jefferson	25	1	4.00%	\$6,773	\$99	1.46%			
Kiowa									
Kit Carson			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			
Lake						#DIV/0!			
La Plata	4	0	0.00%	\$1,583	0	0.00%			
Larimer	15	3	20.00%	\$4,810	\$350	7.28%			
Las Animas	3	0	0.00%	\$878	0	0.00%			
Lincoln									
Logan	1	0	0.00%	\$358	0	0.00%			
Mesa	15	0	0.00%	\$3,531	\$0	0.00%			
Mineral									
Moffat	1		0.00%	\$668		0.00%			
Montezuma	4	0	0.00%	\$1,039	\$0	0.00%			
Montrose	4	0	0.00%	\$560	\$0	0.00%			
Morgan			100 mm			(2. 2. (Exec) (1.0)			
Otero	2	0	0.00%	\$566	0	0.00%			

County	Complete	Errors	Case Error Rate	COUPON ALLOTMENT	DOLLARS IN ERROR	ERROR RATE	CBMS Errors	\$ in Error	County Error Rate
Ouray									
Park									
Phillips									
Pitkin	1	0	0.00%	\$367	0	0.00%			
Prowers	2	0	0.00%	\$369	\$0	0.00%			
Pueblo	22	2	9.09%	\$6,573	\$243	3.70%			
Rio Blanco									
Rio Grande									
Routt	1	0	0.00%	\$322	0	0.00%			
Saguache	2	0	0.00%	\$400	\$0	0.00%			
San Juan	1		0.00%	\$367		0.00%			
San Miguel	×		#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!			
Sedgwick									
Summit	1	1	100.00%	\$273	\$94	34.43%			
Teller	1		0.00%	\$172		0.00%			
Washington	1	0	0.00%	\$367	0	0.00%			
Weld	19	3	15.79%	\$5,288	\$526	9.95%			
Yuma	1	0	0.00%	\$236	0	0.00%			
TOTAL	341	27	7.92%	\$95,846	\$3,425	3.57%	1	\$177	3.39%

It is critical that counties with a payment error rate in excess of 4% take measures to reduce the payment error rate in the county in order to ensure payment accuracy and that the state as a whole meets of exceeds a Payment Error Rate of less than the National Average.

FY 2012 SNAP Negative Case Review as of April 20, 2012

County	Complete	Errors	Neg Case Error Rate	CBMS/ NOAA Errors	County Error Rate
Adams	42	29	69.05%	9	47.62%
Alamosa	4	2	50.00%	2	0.00%
Arapahoe	89	65	73.03%	21	49.44%
Archuleta			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Baca			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Bent	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Boulder	20	12	60.00%	3	45.00%
Broomfield	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%
Chaffee	4	4	100.00%		100.00%
Cheyenne			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Clear Creek			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Conejos	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Costilla			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Crowley	1	0	0.00%		0.00%
Custer			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Delta	3	3	100.00%	1	66.67%
Denver	84	56	66.67%	17	46.43%
Dolores			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Douglas	7	5	71.43%	1	57.14%
Eagle	2	2	100.00%	1	50.00%
Elbert	1	1	100.00%	1	0.00%
El Paso	84	61	72.62%	20	48.81%
Fremont	4	3	75.00%		75.00%
Garfield	6	5	83.33%	3	33.33%
Grand	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Gilpin			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Gunnison			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Hinsdale			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Huerfano	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Jackson			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Jefferson	28	21	75.00%	8	46.43%
Kiowa		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Kit Carson			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Lake	1		0.00%		0.00%
La Plata	7	3	42.86%	1	28.57%
Larimer	17	9	52.94%	7	11.76%
Las Animas	5	3	60.00%	1	40.00%
Lincoln			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Logan	4	3	75.00%	2	25.00%
Mesa	17	11	64.71%	5	35.29%
Mineral			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Moffat	3	3	100.00%	3	0.00%
Montezuma	3	1	33.33%		33.33%
Montrose	6	3	50.00%	2	16.67%
Morgan	6	4	66.67%	2	33.33%
Otero	4	3	75.00%	1	50.00%

County	Complete	Errors	Neg Case Error Rate	CBMS/ NOAA Errors	County Error Rate
Ouray			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Park			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Phillips			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Pitkin	2	2	100.00%		100.00%
Prowers	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Pueblo	24	14	58.33%	5	37.50%
Rio Blanco			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Rio Grande	4	3	75.00%	1	50.00%
Routt	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Saguache	1	1	100.00%	1	0.00%
San Juan			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
San Miguel	2	2	100.00%		100.00%
Sedgwick	1	1	100.00%		100.00%
Summit			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Teller	4	3	75.00%	1	50.00%
Washington			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
Weld	30	16	53.33%	10	20.00%
Yuma			#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
TOTAL	530	362	68.30%	130	43.77%

NOTE: The County Error Rate determination is based on a manual process and displays approximately a 2-month delay. The blue columns reflect the data transmitted to the Federal Office and it takes up to 2 additional months after the Federal data is posted to fully review each file for responsible party for the error (i.e., state or county). This means the county error rate is accurate only for the point in time and does not reflect any of the outstanding reviews. Based on the reviews to date, approximately 60% of the errors are the responsibility of the State.

FY 2012 SNAP Federal Timeliness of April 20, 2012

County	TIMELY (Reg and EXP)		NOT TIMELY (Reg and EXP)		OTHER (Prior to FFY)		TIMELINESS TOTAL		% OF STATE TOTAL CASES REVIEWED	% OF STATE TIMELINESS RATE
	#	% of Sample	#	% of Sample	#	% of Sample	TOTAL CASES	TIMELINESS RATE	%	%
Adams	7	16.67%	2	4.76%	33	78.57%	42	77.78%	10.58%	9.21%
Alamosa	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	3	77.7070	0.76%	0.00%
Arapahoe	8	20.00%	1	2.50%	31	77.50%	40	88.89%	10.08%	10.53%
Archuleta	2	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	0.50%	2.63%
Baca	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.25%	1.32%
Boulder	6	40.00%	0	0.00%	9	60.00%	15	100.00%	3.78%	7.89%
	2		0	-	3	60.00%	5			
Broomfield	-	40.00%		0.00%				100.00%	1.26%	2.63%
Chaffee	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Clear Creek	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Conejos	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	3		0.76%	0.00%
Costilla	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2		0.50%	0.00%
Custer	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100 000/	0.25%	0.00%
Delta	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	7	87.50%	8	100.00%	2.02%	1.32%
Denver	7	10.61%	4	6.06%	55	83.33%	66	63.64%	16.62%	9.21%
Douglas	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	4	100.00%	1.01%	2.63%
Elbert	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2		0.50%	0.00%
El Paso	9	20.93%	0	0.00%	34	79.07%	43	100.00%	10.83%	11.84%
Garfield	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	100.00%	6		1.51%	0.00%
Grand	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Huerfano	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.25%	1.32%
Jackson	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Jefferson	6	20.69%	0	0.00%	23	79.31%	29	100.00%	7.30%	7.89%
La Plata	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	4	80.00%	5	100.00%	1.26%	1.32%
Larimer	3	17.65%	0	0.00%	14	82.35%	17	100.00%	4.28%	3.95%
Las Animas	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	3	50.00%	0.76%	1.32%
Logan	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Mesa	1	6.25%	0	0.00%	15	93.75%	16	100.00%	4.03%	1.32%
Moffat	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Montezuma	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	100.00%	4		1.01%	0.00%
Montrose	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	5	83.33%	6	100.00%	1.51%	1.32%
Otero	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	50.00%	2	100.00%	0.50%	1.32%
Park	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	200.0070	0.25%	0.00%
Pitkin	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1		0.25%	0.00%
Prowers	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2		0.50%	0.00%
Pueblo	9	29.03%	0	0.00%	22	70.97%	31	100.00%	7.81%	11.84%
Routt	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.0070	0.25%	0.00%
Saguache	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	2	66.67%	3	100.00%	0.76%	1.32%
Saguache San Juan	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.0070	0.75%	0.00%
Summit	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2		0.50%	0.00%
Teller		100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.25%	1.32%
	1							100.00%		
Washington	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1 1 5	100.00%	1	100.000/	0.25%	0.00%
Weld	5	25.00%	0	0.00%	15	75.00%	20	100.00%	5.04%	6.58%
Yuma	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	00.400/	0.25%	0.00%
TOTAL	76	19.14%	8	2.02%	313	78.84%	397	90.48%	100%	100%

Negative Errors – Analysis

Background:

Prior to the current Federal Fiscal Year (FFY), the Negative Error Rate measured:

- 1. The accuracy of the eligibility determination (denied or terminated); and
- 2. Timeliness.

As of the current FFY (October 1, 2011) new federal rules became effective that impacted the Negative Error Rate in Colorado and changed the measurement better reflect actual circumstance to include the client's right to receive proper notices. The Negative Error Rate now reflects:

- 1. The accuracy of the eligibility determination (denied or terminated);
- 2. Timeliness; and
- 3. Proper noticing including timeliness, accurate reason, effective date, and understandability.

In addition to the measurement, the new rules require that all negative actions be sampled even if the household has received a payment in, and for, the sample month and does not allow cases to be dropped from the sample if the negative action was included in a prior sample frame. This means that most of the cases in the sample that were dropped (not reflected in the error rate) due to receiving payment or inclusion in a prior frame must now be reviewed resulting in a significant increase in inaccurate and untimely processing. Note: Although Colorado had a legitimate drop record (i.e., 100% of cases dropped met federal requirements), Colorado is on a Corrective Action Plan to reduce the drop rate to 5% or less.

Categories highlighted in green would have been included in the previous review methodology and would have been reflected in the Negative Error Rate. Categories with an * may have had some cases included depending on the date benefits were issued to the household.

Negative Error Rate (Oct through Dec 2011): 70.72%

- 304 Sampled Actions
- 215 Errors
 - State Responsible = 54.23% (of errors not total error rate)
 - County Responsible = 45.77% (of errors not total error rate)

Breakdown of Causes (201 errors reviewed: percentage based on errors):

- Notice of Adverse Action = 29.85%
 - o Top Reasons:
 - 6.47% NOAA is missing an Effective Date
 - 5.47% NOAA lists an incorrect future Effective Date
 - 2.99% NOAA has approval and denial language
 - 2.99% NOAA reason is "unable to determine eligibility. If you refused..." from the Non-compliance window
- CBMS Programming = 23.38%
 - o Top Reasons:
 - 14.93% CBMS Ran Back
 - 4.98% QA cannot determine the trigger for running back

- 3.48% Mass Update/Batch runs back and authorizes a negative action
- 1.49% CBPatch posted a change w/o change to Effective Begin Date (EBD), but authorization is not run (this causes the run back at next authorization)
- 1.49% HelpDesk Ticket posted a change w/o change to Effective Begin Date (EBD), but authorization is not run (this causes the run back at next authorization)
- 1.49% Interface posted a change w/o change to Effective Begin Date (EBD)
- 1.49% SOLQ posted a change w/o change to Effective Begin Date (EBD), but authorization is not run (this causes a run back at next authorization)
- 1.49% SSA on exception report and manually updated, but Deloitte ran a 2nd interface that doubled the income.
- Data Entry = 19.90%
 - o Top Reasons:
 - 7.46% fail to update an Effective Begin Date (EBD) with a change
 triggers run back
 - 2.99% fail to enter required data (notice picks up incorrect reason)
 - 1.99% Save data w/o change creating a new record with incorrect Effective Begin Date (EBD)
- Misapplication of Policy = 9.95%
 - o Top Reasons:
 - 1.98% Rescinded in error
 - 1% Incorrect calculation of income
 - 1% Verification received prior to negative action*
- Untimely Action = 5.47%
 - o Top Reasons:
 - 3.48% Periodic Report (mid cert) not entered into CBMS or processed timely*
 - 1.49% Recertification not entered into CBMS or processed timely*
- Misuse of CBMS = 3.98%
 - o Top Reasons:
 - 1.49% Worker used the Non-compliance action in error
 - 1% Program Action used in error
- Misapplication of Policy Application = 3.98%
- Failed to Act on Information = 1%
- Unearned Income Incorrect = 1%
- Wages incorrect = .50%