

Nutrition Assistance Program Report Series
Office of Research and Analysis

Family Nutrition Programs

*Enhancing Supplemental Nutrition Assistance
Program (SNAP) Certification:
SNAP Modernization Efforts*

Interim Report

Volume 2



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

April 2010

Non-Discrimination Policy

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of a person's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Food and
Nutrition
Service

Family Programs
Report
April 2010

*Enhancing Supplemental Nutrition
Assistance Program (SNAP) Certification:
SNAP Modernization Efforts*

Interim Report

Volume 2

Authors:

Gretchen Rowe
Sam Hall
Carolyn O'Brien
Nancy Pindus
Robin Koralek

Submitted by:

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Submitted to:

Office of Research and Analysis
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302-1500

Project Director:

Carolyn O'Brien

Project Officer:

Rosemarie Downer

This study was conducted under Contract number GS23F8198H with the Food and Nutrition Service.

This report is available on the Food and Nutrition Service website: <http://www.fns.usda.gov>

Suggested Citation:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis, *Enhancing Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Certification: SNAP Modernization Efforts: Interim Report - Volume 2*, by Gretchen Rowe, Sam Hall, Carolyn O'Brien, Nancy Pindus, and Robin Koralek. Project officer: Rosemarie Downer, Alexandria, VA: April 2010.

CONTENTS

STATE PROFILES.....	1
STATE PROFILE: ALABAMA.....	2
STATE PROFILE: ALASKA.....	3
STATE PROFILE: ARIZONA.....	4
STATE PROFILE: ARKANSAS.....	5
STATE PROFILE: CALIFORNIA.....	6
STATE PROFILE: COLORADO.....	7
STATE PROFILE: CONNECTICUT.....	8
STATE PROFILE: DELAWARE.....	9
STATE PROFILE: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.....	10
STATE PROFILE: FLORIDA.....	11
STATE PROFILE: GEORGIA.....	12
STATE PROFILE: HAWAII.....	13
STATE PROFILE: IDAHO.....	14
STATE PROFILE: ILLINOIS.....	15
STATE PROFILE: INDIANA.....	16
STATE PROFILE: IOWA.....	17
STATE PROFILE: KANSAS.....	18
STATE PROFILE: KENTUCKY.....	19
STATE PROFILE: LOUISIANA.....	20
STATE PROFILE: MAINE.....	21
STATE PROFILE: MARYLAND.....	22
STATE PROFILE: MASSACHUSETTS.....	23
STATE PROFILE: MICHIGAN.....	24
STATE PROFILE: MINNESOTA.....	25
STATE PROFILE: MISSISSIPPI.....	26
STATE PROFILE: MISSOURI.....	27
STATE PROFILE: MISSOURI.....	27
STATE PROFILE: MONTANA.....	28
STATE PROFILE: NEBRASKA.....	29
STATE PROFILE: NEVADA.....	30
STATE PROFILE: NEW HAMPSHIRE.....	31
STATE PROFILE: NEW JERSEY.....	32
STATE PROFILE: NEW MEXICO.....	33
STATE PROFILE: NEW YORK.....	34
STATE PROFILE: NORTH CAROLINA.....	35
STATE PROFILE: NORTH CAROLINA.....	35
STATE PROFILE: NORTH DAKOTA.....	36
STATE PROFILE: OHIO.....	37
STATE PROFILE: OKLAHOMA.....	38
STATE PROFILE: OREGON.....	39
STATE PROFILE: PENNSYLVANIA.....	40
STATE PROFILE: RHODE ISLAND.....	41
STATE PROFILE: SOUTH CAROLINA.....	42
STATE PROFILE: SOUTH DAKOTA.....	43
STATE PROFILE: TENNESSEE.....	44
STATE PROFILE: TEXAS.....	45
STATE PROFILE: UTAH.....	46
STATE PROFILE: VERMONT.....	47
STATE PROFILE: VIRGINIA.....	48
STATE PROFILE: WASHINGTON.....	49
STATE PROFILE: WEST VIRGINIA.....	50
STATE PROFILE: WISCONSIN.....	51
STATE PROFILE: WYOMING.....	52

ADDITIONAL DATA TABLES.....	53
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT	54
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	55
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	56
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	57
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	58
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	59
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	60
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	61
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	62
TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED).....	63
TABLE 2: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING CUSTOMER ACCESS INITIATIVES.....	64
TABLE 3: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING CAP INITIATIVES	65
TABLE 4: REASON PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES	66
TABLE 5: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING CALL CENTER INITIATIVES	67
TABLE 6: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC APPLICATION INITIATIVES	67
TABLE 7: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS	68
TABLE 7: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS (CONTINUED).....	69
TABLE 8: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING INFORMATION SHARING INITIATIVES	70
TABLE 9: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR CONTRACTING WITH OUTSIDE ENTITIES	70
TABLE 10: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTRACTED ACTIVITIES	71
TABLE 10: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTRACTED ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED).....	72

STATE PROFILES

State profiles highlighting findings for each state are included in this section. These profiles summarize the types and status of modernization efforts undertaken by each state, motivations for selection of specific efforts, perceptions of barriers to access, challenges to implementation, and the successes of modernization realized thus far.

STATE PROFILE: ALABAMA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Planned
Customer Access	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Planned
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Planned
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Planned

Both economic growth and economic downturn, along with a decrease in the budget for SNAP administration, led Alabama to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Alabama found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, language barriers, distrust of SNAP offices/government programs, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices, local SNAP office hours of operation, transportation to local SNAP offices, and stigma all to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Alabama	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Neutral
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Neutral

Overall, Alabama found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, and competing priorities to be the most

challenging aspects of modernizing their SNAP. State administrators thought that it was too early to report on their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: ALASKA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Pre-2000
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, resources in general, and information technology hurdles led Alaska to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Alaska found language barriers and the amount of documentation or verification required to be weak barriers to SNAP access in the state. No other barriers were noted.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Alaska	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Alaska found hiring staff, upgrading legacy/existing computer systems, and controlling error rates to be the most challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased participation of other special populations, decreased error rates, increased customer satisfaction, and increased staff satisfaction were listed as their successes, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: ARIZONA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Planned
	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Planned
	Transferring of functions or organizational units to the state SNAP agency from another governmental entity	Planned
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Telecommute	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Planned	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
Biometric Identification	Fingerprint Imaging	Implemented

Economic downturn, a new governor, new state SNAP administrators, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Arizona to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Arizona found long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices, and stigma all to be strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Arizona	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Somewhat positive
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat negative
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Arizona found limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, hiring staff, upgrading legacy/existing computer systems, and obtaining waiver approval to be the most challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, decreased error rates, increased administrative savings, decreased staff workload, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction, and decreased application processing time were all deemed somewhat successful.

STATE PROFILE: ARKANSAS

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented as a pilot
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Planned
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Planned
Call Centers	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Planned
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Planned
	Web sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Not Authorized

Economic downturn, a new governor, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Arkansas to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Arkansas found language to be a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Arkansas	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Arkansas found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, and limited or decreased staff resources to be the most challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of immigrants, increased customer satisfaction, and decreased application processing time were all deemed somewhat successful.

STATE PROFILE: CALIFORNIA

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Planned
	Multiple Programs On Site	Planned
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Planned
Technological Innovations	Check Status	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Implemented
	Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Implemented
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Call Centers	Call Centers
Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials		Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
	Biometric Identification	Fingerprint Imaging
Facial Recognition		Implemented

limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, and limited or decreased staff resources to be the most challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. State administrators reported that it was too early to report on their greatest successes.

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, a new governor, a change in the state legislative body, new state SNAP administrators, new local SNAP office administrators, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and advocates led California to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

California found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, distrust of SNAP offices/ government programs, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices, transportation to local SNAP offices, and stigma all to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Overall, California found

California	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Don't know
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Don't know

STATE PROFILE: COLORADO

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Web sites	Planned
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

“High priority issues” (which were not specified) led Colorado to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Colorado found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, distrust of SNAP offices/government programs, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices, transportation to local SNAP offices, and stigma all to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Colorado	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Strongly positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Colorado found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, hiring staff, training staff, staff resistance, limited project/contract oversight, working with vendors/contractors and maintaining client access to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation and decreased error rates were listed as their successes, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: CONNECTICUT

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Pre-2000
	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Implemented
	Develop online grocery ordering	Pre-2000
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Door-to-door outreach campaigns	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Increases in budget for SNAP, administration, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, union rules and civil service regulations, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and regional organizational structure led Connecticut to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Connecticut found long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, and perceived poor treatment at local offices all to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

Connecticut	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

The table above right provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Overall, Connecticut found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, competing priorities reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, hiring staff, staff resistance, and limited support from administrators/lack of leadership to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased customer satisfaction and decreased application processing time were listed as their successes, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: DELAWARE

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Planned
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented as a Pilot
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs On Site	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Telecommute	Implemented as a pilot
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Planned
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
Call Centers	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented

Economic downturn, state legislation, and decreases in budget for SNAP administration led Delaware to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Delaware found transportation to local SNAP offices to be a somewhat strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Delaware	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Delaware found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, training staff, and controlling error rates to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation and increased participation of working families were considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Transferring of functions or organizational units to the state SNAP agency from another governmental entity	Planned
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Pre-2000
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to private-sector business	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Planned
	Recertifications by Fax	Planned
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Telecommute	Planned
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Planned
Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and available staff to complete modernization activities led the District of Columbia to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

The District of Columbia found language barriers, waiting times at local SNAP offices, and perceived poor treatment at local offices all to be weak barriers to SNAP access in the state. No other barriers were given.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

District of Columbia	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, the District of Columbia found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, training staff, controlling error rates, and controlling fraud to be very

challenging aspects of modernizing its SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of immigrants, and increased customer satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: FLORIDA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Implemented
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Implemented
Customer Access	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Telecommute	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Implemented
	Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, local labor market conditions, a change in the state legislative body, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Florida to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Florida found distrust of SNAP offices/government programs to be a somewhat strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Florida	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Strongly positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Florida found limited financial resources/cost, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, competing priorities, and limited or decreased staff resources to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased administrative savings and increased customer satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: GEORGIA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Pre-2000
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Pre-2000
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Not Authorized

Economic downturn, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Georgia to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Georgia found waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices and stigma all to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Georgia	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Georgia found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, technical problems, and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, decreased error rates, and increased customer satisfaction were listed as somewhat successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: HAWAII

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, union rules and civil service regulations, and a new governor led Hawaii to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Hawaii found long/confusing applications and the amount of documentation or verification required to be a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

Hawaii	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly negative
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Strongly negative
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly negative

The table above provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Overall, Hawaii found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, limited support from administrators/lack of leadership, and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Decreased staff workload was listed as somewhat successful and decreased error rates was

considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: IDAHO

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Planned
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Planned
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Planned
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented as a pilot
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Planned
Call Centers	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Planned
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Decreased staff workload, increased staff satisfaction, and decreased application processing time were listed as very successful, thus far.

Economic downturn, state legislation, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, a new governor, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and advocates led Idaho to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Idaho found transportation to local SNAP offices to be a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Idaho	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Strongly positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Idaho found limited time for roll-out (planning,

STATE PROFILE: ILLINOIS

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort ¹	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Pre-2000
	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
Customer Access	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Implemented as a pilot
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	I - Pilot
	Apply Online/Send Copy	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented as a pilot
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Pre-2000
	Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Call Centers	Call Centers	Pre-2000
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Pre-2000
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Retinal Scanning	Pre-2000

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, increases in budget for SNAP administration, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, local labor market conditions, union rules and civil service regulations, a new governor, a change in the state legislative body, new state SNAP administrators, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and advocates led Illinois to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Illinois found waiting times at local SNAP offices to be a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Illinois	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Don't know

Overall, Illinois found limited financial resources/cost, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, and limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased

participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, decreased error rates, increased administrative savings, decreased staff workload, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction, and decreased application processing time were listed as somewhat successful, thus far.

¹ Illinois did implement biometric identification but later discontinued the policy.

STATE PROFILE: INDIANA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to private-sector business	Implemented
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented as a pilot
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Planned
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented as a pilot
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Telecommute	Planned
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Implemented
	Recertify clients at call centers	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

State legislation, a new governor, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and advocates led Indiana to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Indiana found stigma to be a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Indiana	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Strongly positive
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Strongly positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Indiana found, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, competing priorities, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, not enough buy-in from community-based organizations, and obtaining waiver approval to be somewhat challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. State administrators reported that it was too early to comment on their successes.

STATE PROFILE: IOWA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Pre-2000
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Planned
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Planned
	Door-to-door outreach campaigns	Planned
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented as a pilot

Economic downturn, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, high caseloads and program error rates led Iowa to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Iowa found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules and the amount of documentation or verification required to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Iowa	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat negative
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Iowa found limited financial resources/cost, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation was considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: KANSAS

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Planned
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Economic downturn, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Kansas to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Kansas found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, the amount of documentation or verification required, a amount of time required for the application process, and transportation to local SNAP offices to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Kansas	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Kansas found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, training staff, staff resistance, and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, decreased error rates, increased administrative savings, increased customer satisfaction, and increased staff satisfaction were considered somewhat successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: KENTUCKY

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Pre-2000
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Pre-2000
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes
	Couples	Yes

State legislation, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, new state SNAP administrators, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and advocates led Kentucky to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Kentucky found distrust of the SNAP office/government programs to be a somewhat strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Kentucky	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat negative
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Kentucky found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, competing priorities, and limited or decreased staff resources to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, decreased staff workload, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction, and decreased application processing time were considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: LOUISIANA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Call Centers	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Door-to-door outreach campaigns	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

State programs, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and department level priorities led Louisiana to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Louisiana did not list any strong or somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Louisiana	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Louisiana found competing priorities to be a very challenging aspect of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, decreased staff workload, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction, and decreased application processing time were considered somewhat successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: MAINE

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Economic downturn, state legislation, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Maine to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Maine found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, transportation to local SNAP offices, and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Maine	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Somewhat positive
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Maine found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, training staff, union rules and civil service regulations, and upgrading

legacy/existing computer systems be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, and increased participation of immigrants were considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: MARYLAND

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply Online/Send Copy	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Planned
	Multiple Programs, One	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Check Status	Planned
	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Planned
Accept changes through online tool	Implemented	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

Economic downturn, state legislation, increases in budget for SNAP administration, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Maryland to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Maryland found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, distrust of the SNAP office/government programs, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, and perceived poor treatment at local offices to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Maryland	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat negative
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Maryland found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation was considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: MASSACHUSETTS

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Process applications at call center	Implemented as a pilot
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented	
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

State legislation, state programs, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, advocates, and demand to improve/enhance the SNAP led Massachusetts to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Massachusetts found language barriers, distrust of SNAP offices/government programs, the amount of documentation or verification required, and perceived poor treatment at local offices to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Massachusetts	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Somewhat positive
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Massachusetts found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, competing priorities, and limited or decreased staff resources to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of

working families, increased participation of the elderly, and increased customer satisfaction were considered very successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: MICHIGAN

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Planned
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Planned
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Telecommute	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, a change in the state legislative body, and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Michigan to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Michigan found language barriers, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices, transportation to local SNAP offices, and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Michigan	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Somewhat positive
Error rates?	Somewhat negative
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Neutral

Overall, limited financial resources/cost, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, hiring staff, training staff, union rules and civil service regulations, technical problems, and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, and increased participation of the disabled were considered somewhat successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: MINNESOTA

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Economic downturn and state legislation led Minnesota to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Minnesota found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, transportation to local SNAP offices, and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Minnesota	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Minnesota found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources to be very challenging aspects of modernizing its state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of

immigrants, and increased customer satisfaction were considered somewhat successful, thus far.

STATE PROFILE: MISSISSIPPI

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Planned
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Planned
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

Economic downturn and the process of securing vendors for modernization activities led Mississippi to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Mississippi listed stigma as a somewhat strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Mississippi	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Mississippi found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, working with vendors/contractors and technical problems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, decreased error rates, increased administrative savings, decreased staff workload, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction, decreased application processing time and reduced staff turnover were their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: MISSOURI

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Planned
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented

Economic downturn and state legislation led Missouri to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Missouri listed no strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Missouri	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Missouri found competing priorities and limited or decreased staff resources to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation was their greatest success.

STATE PROFILE: MONTANA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Planned
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Planned
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Overall, Montana found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation was listed as somewhat successful for the state

Economic downturn, state legislation, increases in budget for SNAP administration, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Montana to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Montana listed long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process and stigma as somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Montana	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

STATE PROFILE: NEBRASKA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Pre-2000
	Web sites	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Pre-2000
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Pre-2000

Economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, local labor market conditions, union rules and civil service regulations, a new governor, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and advocates led Nebraska to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Nebraska listed language barriers, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, transportation to local SNAP offices and stigma as somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a

scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Overall, Nebraska found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, hiring staff, training staff, union rules and civil service regulations and technical problems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Nebraska considered it too soon to tell if some planned and implemented modernization efforts were successful.

Nebraska	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat negative
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

STATE PROFILE: NEVADA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented as a pilot
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented

Economic downturn, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Nevada to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Nevada listed long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, waiting times at local SNAP offices and transportation to local SNAP offices as strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Overall, Nevada found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, training staff, working with vendors/contractors, technical problems, controlling error rates and maintaining client access to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation and increased participation of other special populations were their greatest successes.

Nevada	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

STATE PROFILE: NEW HAMPSHIRE

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented as a pilot
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented as a pilot
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Telecommute	Pre-2000
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Pre-2000
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	Media campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Economic downturn, state programs, decreases in budget for SNAP administration and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led New Hampshire to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

New Hampshire listed lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, the amount of documentation or verification required and stigma as somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

New Hampshire	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, New Hampshire found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline and competing priorities to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, decreased error rates, decreased staff workload and increased customer satisfaction were listed as somewhat successful for the state.

STATE PROFILE: NEW JERSEY

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Planned
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Planned
	Check Status	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

Economic downturn led New Jersey to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

New Jersey listed lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, language barriers, trust of SNAP offices/government programs, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices and perceived poor treatment at local offices as somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

New Jersey	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, New Jersey found limited financial resources/cost, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, union rules and civil service regulations and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation and increased participation of working families were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: NEW MEXICO

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Planned
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Planned
	Develop online grocery ordering	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
CAP Programs	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	CAP Policy	Planned

Economic growth, state legislation, union rules and civil service regulations, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led New Mexico to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

New Mexico listed waiting times at local SNAP offices as a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

New Mexico	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, New Mexico found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants and decreased application processing time were listed as somewhat successful for the state.

STATE PROFILE: NEW YORK

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Planned
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented as a pilot
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Planned
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	Media campaign	Pre-2000
CAP Programs	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
	CAP Policy	Implemented
Biometric Identification	Single SSI Only	Yes
	Fingerprint Imaging	Pre-2000

State programs, a new governor, new local SNAP office, administrators, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and advocates led New York to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

New York listed no strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

New York	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, New York found limited time for roll-out

(planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline to be a very challenging aspect of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, increased customer satisfaction and increased staff satisfaction were listed as somewhat successful for the state.

STATE PROFILE: NORTH CAROLINA

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Planned
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes
	Elderly Only	Yes

State legislation led North Carolina to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

North Carolina listed waiting times at local SNAP offices and transportation to local SNAP offices as strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

North Carolina	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, North Carolina found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Decreased error rates were listed as their greatest success.

STATE PROFILE: NORTH DAKOTA

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Implemented
	Application by Mail	Implemented
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

State legislation and increases in budget for SNAP administration led North Dakota to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

North Dakota listed long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required and stigma as somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

North Dakota	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, North Dakota found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, decreased error rates and increased customer satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: OHIO

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Implemented
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Telecommute	Pre-2000
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Pre-2000
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, local labor market conditions, a new governor, a change in the state legislative body, new state SNAP administrators, new local SNAP office, administrators, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and advocates led Ohio to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Ohio listed distrust of SNAP offices/government programs, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices and stigma as somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the

state.

The table to the right provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Overall, Ohio found competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, training staff, upgrading legacy/existing computer systems, controlling error rates and controlling fraud to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation was listed as somewhat successful.

Ohio	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Don't know

STATE PROFILE: OKLAHOMA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Pre-2000
	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Pre-2000
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Planned
	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Media campaign	Implemented

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, increases in budget for SNAP administration, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and advocates led Oklahoma to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Oklahoma listed no strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Oklahoma	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Somewhat positive
Error rates?	Strongly positive
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Oklahoma found limited or decreased staff resources to be a very challenging aspect of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, decreased error rates and decreased application processing time were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: OREGON

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Economic downturn and state legislation led Oregon to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Oregon found local SNAP office hours of operation and transportation to local SNAP offices somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Oregon	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Oregon found limited financial resources/cost to be a very challenging aspect of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants and increased customer satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: PENNSYLVANIA

State or County Administered?	State	
		Implementation Status
	Modernization Effort	
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Implemented
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Call Centers	Call Centers
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	Door-to-door outreach campaigns	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

Union rules and civil service regulations, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and advocates led Pennsylvania to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Pennsylvania found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, distrust of SNAP offices/government programs, long/ confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Pennsylvania	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Strongly positive
Error rates?	Strongly positive
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Pennsylvania found limited financial resources/ cost, unanticipated costs/ controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline,

competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, upgrading legacy/existing computer systems and obtaining waiver approval to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, decreased error rates and increased customer satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: RHODE ISLAND

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Implementation Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented as a pilot
	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs On Site	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Planned
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	Media campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented

Economic downturn, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, union rules and civil service regulations, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices, and a current state budget crisis led Rhode Island to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Rhode Island found language barriers, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, language barriers, waiting times at local SNAP offices and transportation to local SNAP offices to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Rhode Island	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Rhode Island found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/restructuring local office staff, hiring staff, training staff, limited support from administrators/lack of leadership and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, increased participation of other special populations and increased customer satisfaction were somewhat successful for the state.

STATE PROFILE: SOUTH CAROLINA

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented as a pilot
	Document Imaging	Implemented as a pilot
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented as a pilot
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	Media campaign	Planned
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Planned
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

Decreases in budget for SNAP administration, new state SNAP administrators, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led South Carolina to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

South Carolina found language to be a somewhat strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

South Carolina	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Strongly positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, South Carolina found limited or decreased staff resources to be a very challenging aspect of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation,

increased participation of the elderly and increased customer satisfaction were all considered very successful for the state.

STATE PROFILE: SOUTH DAKOTA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply Online/Send Copy	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Pre-2000
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Pre-2000
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Pre-2000
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Pre-2000
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

Staff turnover in local SNAP offices and turnover in state office staff led South Dakota to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

South Dakota found the amount of documentation or verification required, transportation to local SNAP offices and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

South Dakota	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, South Dakota found competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, hiring staff, training staff, obtaining waiver approval, controlling error rates and controlling fraud to be somewhat challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased administrative savings, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction and decreased application processing time were listed as somewhat successful.

STATE PROFILE: TENNESSEE

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Document Imaging	Pre-2000
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Implemented
	Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Pre-2000
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Pre-2000
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	Door-to-door outreach campaigns	Planned
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Pre-2000
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Pre-2000

Local labor market conditions, a new governor, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP office led Tennessee to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Tennessee found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, distrust of SNAP, office/government programs, the amount of time required for the application process, perceived poor treatment at local offices and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Tennessee	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Don't know
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Tennessee found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of

modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, increased customer satisfaction and increased staff satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: TEXAS

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Implemented
	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to private-sector business	Implemented
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Pre-2000
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Couples	Yes
	Elderly Only	Yes
Biometric Identification	Fingerprint Imaging	Pre-2000

State legislation, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, advocates and governor directives led Texas to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Texas found waiting times at local SNAP offices to be a strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Texas	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Texas found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, limited time for rollout (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, hiring staff, training staff and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Texas did not list any successes of planned and implemented modernization efforts.

STATE PROFILE: UTAH

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Pre-2000
	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Pre-2000
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Telecommute	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Implemented
Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

State legislation, state programs, local labor market conditions, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and advocates led Utah to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Utah found distrust of SNAP offices/government programs, transportation to local SNAP offices and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Utah	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Utah found limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline and competing priorities to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Utah considered it too soon to tell if planned and implemented modernization efforts were successful.

STATE PROFILE: VERMONT

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Implemented
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Planned
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Implemented
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Planned
	Electronic Case Files	Planned
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Planned
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Planned
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Planned
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Accept changes through online tool	Planned
	Recertify clients at call centers	Planned
	Recertify by telephone using automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Planned
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Implemented as a pilot
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented as a pilot
	Call Centers	Call Centers
Information Sharing/Applications on Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Planned
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Planned
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Planned
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Planned

Economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, local labor market conditions, new state SNAP administrators, staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led Vermont to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, long/confusing applications and stigma were considered strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Vermont	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Strongly positive
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Vermont found limited financial resources/cost, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources and hiring staff to be very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, increased

participation of the elderly, increased participation of the disabled, increased participation of immigrants, decreased error rates, decreased staff workload, increased customer satisfaction, increased staff satisfaction and decreased application processing time were listed as somewhat successful.

STATE PROFILE: VIRGINIA

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Flexible Hours	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Pre-2000
	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Planned
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Establish wireless point of service systems	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Web sites	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes
	Elderly Only	Yes

Economic downturn, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and conformity with TANF and Medicaid Program rules led Virginia to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Virginia found language barriers, long/confusing applications, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices, transportation to local SNAP offices and stigma to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Virginia	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Somewhat positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Don't know
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Virginia found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, technical problems, upgrading legacy/existing computer systems and controlling error rates to be the very challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation was listed as their greatest success.

STATE PROFILE: WASHINGTON

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Closing or consolidation of local offices	Implemented
	Transferring of functions from the state SNAP agency to CBOs	Implemented
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Door-to-door outreach campaigns	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Implemented
	Single SSI Only	Yes

Economic growth, economic downturn, state legislation, state programs, increases in budget for SNAP administration, decreases in budget for SNAP administration, election of new governor, a change in the state legislative body, staff turnover in local SNAP offices, staff caseloads in local SNAP offices and advocate involvement led Washington to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Washington found the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process and transportation to local SNAP offices all to be somewhat strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Washington	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Somewhat positive
Administrative cost savings?	Somewhat positive
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, Washington found limited financial resources/cost, unanticipated costs/controlling costs, maintaining schedule/meeting deadlines, limited time for roll-out (planning, testing, and training staff)/unrealistic timeline, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources, reorganizing/re-structuring local office staff, hiring staff, training staff, technical problems and upgrading legacy/existing computer systems to be somewhat challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Decreased error rates and increased customer satisfaction were listed as their greatest successes.

STATE PROFILE: WEST VIRGINIA

State or County Administered?	State	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Pre-2000
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Implemented
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online No E-Signature	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Planned
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Pre-2000
	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Implemented
	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented
	Call Centers	Call Centers
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

Staff turnover in local SNAP offices and staff caseloads in local SNAP offices led West Virginia to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

West Virginia found transportation to local SNAP offices to be a somewhat strong barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

West Virginia	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Somewhat positive

Overall, West Virginia found limited financial resources/cost, competing priorities, limited or decreased staff resources and staff resistance to be the most challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. West Virginia considered it too soon to tell if some planned and implemented modernization efforts were successful.

STATE PROFILE: WISCONSIN

State or County Administered?	County	
	Modernization Effort	Status
Organizational Changes	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies	Implemented
	Transferring of functions or organizational units from the state SNAP agency to another governmental entity	Pre-2000
	Transferring of functions or organizational units to the state SNAP agency from another governmental entity	Planned
	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Planned
	Increasing job specialization of the local SNAP staff	Implemented as a pilot
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Implemented
	Recertifications by Fax	Implemented
	Flexible Hours	Implemented
	Outstationed SNAP Worker	Implemented
	Track and Follow Up	Pre-2000
Electronic Applications	Online Tool	Implemented
	Apply/Submit Online with E-Signature	Implemented
	Multiple Programs, One Application	Implemented
	Check Status	Implemented
Technological Innovations	Integrated MIS	Implemented
	Online Policy Manual	Implemented
	Electronic Case Files	Implemented
	Document Imaging	Implemented
	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Implemented
	Process applications at call center	Implemented
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Implemented
	Accept faxed changes	Implemented
	Accept changes at call center	Implemented
	Accept changes through online tool	Implemented
	Recertify clients at call centers	Implemented
Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Implemented	
Call Centers	Call Centers	Implemented
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Implemented
	Development of toll-free informational hotlines	Implemented
	Media campaign	Implemented
	Direct mail campaign	Implemented
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented
	Off-site application assistance or prescreening	Implemented
CAP Programs	CAP Policy	Planned

Decreases in budget for SNAP administration and current county administrative structure led Wisconsin to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Wisconsin found lack of knowledge or misinformation about eligibility rules, the amount of documentation or verification required, the amount of time required for the application process, waiting times at local SNAP offices, perceived poor treatment at local offices and stigma all to be strong barriers to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Wisconsin	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Strongly positive
Fraud?	Don't know
Error rates?	Strongly positive
Administrative cost savings?	Strongly positive
Customer satisfaction?	Strongly positive

Overall, Wisconsin listed limited financial resources/cost and competing priorities to be the most challenging aspects of modernizing their state SNAP. Increased overall participation, increased participation of working families, decreased error rates, increased customer satisfaction and decreased application processing time were listed as their greatest

successes.

STATE PROFILE: WYOMING

State or County Administered?	State	
Customer Access	Combined Application	Pre-2000
	Application by Mail	Pre-2000
	Application by Fax	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Mail	Pre-2000
	Recertifications by Fax	Pre-2000
Technological Innovations	Online Policy Manual	Pre-2000
	Electronic Case Files	Pre-2000
	Document Imaging	Planned
	Data Brokering/Sharing	Pre-2000
	Process applications at call center	Planned
	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Pre-2000
	Accept faxed changes	Pre-2000
Call Centers	Accept EBT at Farmers' Markets	Pre-2000
	Call Centers	Planned
Information Sharing/Application Assistance	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Implemented
	Distribution of flyers, etc.	Implemented
	Web sites	Pre-2000
	In-person outreach presentations at community sites	Implemented

A modernized EBT system and updated eligibility system led Wyoming to modernize its SNAP using the initiatives displayed in the table to the left.

Wyoming found stigma to be the strongest barrier to SNAP access in the state.

The table below provides an overview of the overall effects of those modernization efforts on five possible outcomes. States were asked to rate the effects of their modernization efforts on a scale from 1 (strongly negative) to 5 (strongly positive).

Wyoming	
Clients' access to the SNAP Program?	Neutral
Fraud?	Neutral
Error rates?	Neutral
Administrative cost savings?	Neutral
Customer satisfaction?	Neutral

Overall, Wyoming did not list any challenges. Increased customer satisfaction and increased staff satisfaction were listed as somewhat successful.

ADDITIONAL DATA TABLES

This section provides additional detailed information on modernization activities for each state and the District of Columbia. The initial tables provide an overview of the status of modernization activities in each state, for each of 10 modernization efforts: customer access, CAP programs, organizational and operational changes, call centers, electronic applications, paperless systems, data brokering/sharing, other technological innovations, biometric identification, and information sharing/application assistance. In addition, individual tables on state reasons for implementation are included for each modernization effort as well as additional details on contracted activities for each state and the District of Columbia.

Key:

I = Implemented after January 1, 2000.

P = Planned

I-Pilot = Implemented as a pilot program after January 1, 2000.

Pre-2000 = Implemented before January 1, 2000.

Not authorized = Request to undergo modernization efforts were denied by the Food and Nutrition Service.

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT

State	Customer Access Activities							Track and follow up
	Combined application	Application by mail	Application by fax	Recertification by mail	Recertification by fax	Flexible hours	Outstationed SNAP worker	
Alabama		I	I	I	I		I	
Alaska	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	
Arizona	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Arkansas	I	I	I	I	I	I		I
California	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Colorado	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	
Connecticut	Pre-2000	I	I	I	I			
Delaware	I	I	I	I	I	P		I - Pilot
DC	I	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	P	P	Pre-2000	I	
Florida		Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000		Pre-2000
Georgia	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			Pre-2000		I
Hawaii		Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I			
Idaho	I	I	I	I	I	P		I
Illinois		Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I - Pilot	I	
Indiana	I	I	I	I		I		I
Iowa	I	I	I	I	I	I		I
Kansas	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Kentucky	Pre-2000	I	I			Pre-2000		
Louisiana	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I		
Maine	I	I		I				I
Maryland	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I		Pre-2000	Pre-2000	
Massachusetts	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Michigan	I	I				I	I	I
Minnesota	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		Pre-2000		Pre-2000	Pre-2000	
Mississippi	I	I	I	I	I	P		I
Missouri	I	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I	I	Pre-2000	
Montana	Pre-2000	I	I	I	I	I		
Nebraska	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		Pre-2000	
Nevada	I	I	I	I	I	I		
New Hampshire	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			I - Pilot	
New Jersey	P	I	I	I	I	I	I	
New Mexico	P	I	I	I	I		I	I
New York	P	Pre-2000	I	I	I			
North Carolina		I	I	I	I			
North Dakota	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	
Ohio	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	I	
Oklahoma	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Oregon	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	
Pennsylvania	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I	I	Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Rhode Island	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		Pre-2000			I - Pilot	Pre-2000
South Carolina	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			
South Dakota	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	
Tennessee	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Texas	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I		
Utah	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			
Vermont	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000	I	I	I	I
Virginia	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Washington	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		I	
West Virginia	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	I		I	I
Wisconsin	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	I	I	I	Pre-2000
Wyoming	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	CAP Programs and Eligibility Criteria			
	CAP policy	Single SSI only	Couples	Elderly only
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas	Not Authorized			
California				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
DC				
Florida	I	Yes		
Georgia	Not Authorized			
Hawaii				
Idaho	P			
Illinois				
Indiana				
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky	I	Yes	Yes	
Louisiana	I	Yes		
Maine				
Maryland	P			
Massachusetts	I	Yes		
Michigan	P			
Minnesota				
Mississippi	I	Yes		
Missouri				
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	P			
New Mexico	P			
New York	I	Yes		
North Carolina	I	Yes		Yes
North Dakota				
Ohio				
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania	I	Yes		
Rhode Island				
South Carolina	I	Yes		
South Dakota	P			
Tennessee				
Texas	I		Yes	Yes
Utah	P			
Vermont				
Virginia	I	Yes		Yes
Washington	I	Yes		
West Virginia	P			
Wisconsin	P			
Wyoming				

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Organizational and Operational Changes Activities								
	Program administration	Merge or consolidate state-level agencies	Close or consolidate local offices	Transferring of functions:					
				From the state SNAP agency to governmental entity	To the state SNAP agency from another governmental entity	From the state SNAP agency to CBOs	From the state SNAP agency to the private-sector	Greater sharing of functions with CBOs	Increase job specialization of the local SNAP staff
Alabama	State					P			
Alaska	State								
Arizona	State	P	P		P	I - Pilot		I - Pilot	
Arkansas	State								
California	County								
Colorado	County								
Connecticut	State	Pre-2000	I					I	
Delaware	State								
DC	State				P		P	Pre-2000	
Florida	State		I			I		I	I
Georgia	State							I	I - Pilot
Hawaii	State								
Idaho	State					P		P	I - Pilot
Illinois	State	Pre-2000	I			I - Pilot		I	
Indiana	State						I	I - Pilot	P
Iowa	State		Pre-2000						
Kansas	State		I					I	
Kentucky	State								
Louisiana	State		I						
Maine	State								
Maryland	State		I						
Massachusetts	State								P
Michigan	State		P					P	P
Minnesota	County								
Mississippi	State								
Missouri	State								
Montana	State		I						
Nebraska	State								
Nevada	State							I - Pilot	
New Hampshire	State								
New Jersey	County								
New Mexico	County								
New York	County					I - Pilot		I - Pilot	
North Carolina	County								
North Dakota	County								
Ohio	County	I						I	
Oklahoma	State	Pre-2000	Pre-2000					P	
Oregon	State								
Pennsylvania	State		I			I - Pilot		I - Pilot	
Rhode Island	State		I					P	
South Carolina	County					P			
South Dakota	State								
Tennessee	State								
Texas	State	I	I				I	I	I
Utah	State	Pre-2000	Pre-2000					I - Pilot	
Vermont	State	I							P
Virginia	County								
Washington	State		I			I			
West Virginia	State	Pre-2000							
Wisconsin	County	I		Pre-2000	P			P	I - Pilot
Wyoming	State								

All data presented obtained from Urban Institute analysis of the 2008 State Food Stamp Agency Survey conducted for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Call centers
Alabama	
Alaska	
Arizona	I
Arkansas	P
California	I - Pilot
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	P
DC	I
Florida	I
Georgia	Pre-2000
Hawaii	
Idaho	P
Illinois	Pre-2000
Indiana	I - Pilot
Iowa	I
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	P
Maine	
Maryland	P
Massachusetts	I - Pilot
Michigan	I - Pilot
Minnesota	
Mississippi	
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	I
New Hampshire	Pre-2000
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	I
Oklahoma	P
Oregon	
Pennsylvania	I
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	I - Pilot
South Dakota	
Tennessee	I
Texas	I
Utah	I
Vermont	P
Virginia	
Washington	I
West Virginia	I
Wisconsin	I
Wyoming	P

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Electronic Application Activities						
	Online tool	Apply online and send copy	Apply and submit online, no e-signature	Apply and submit online with e-signature	Apply for multiple programs on site	Apply for multiple programs with one application	Check status
Alabama	P						
Alaska							
Arizona	P						
Arkansas	P						
California	I		I	P	P	P	P
Colorado							
Connecticut	P						
Delaware	I			I	I	I	I
DC	P						
Florida	I			I		I	I
Georgia	P						
Hawaii							
Idaho	P						
Illinois	I - Pilot	I		I - Pilot		I	I
Indiana	I - Pilot		I	P		I	I - Pilot
Iowa	I			I		P	
Kansas	I		I	P		I	
Kentucky	P						
Louisiana	P						
Maine							
Maryland	I		I	P		I	P
Massachusetts	I			I		I	P
Michigan	P						
Minnesota							
Mississippi	P						
Missouri	P						
Montana	P						
Nebraska	P						
Nevada	P						
New Hampshire	I - Pilot		I			I	
New Jersey	I			I		P	P
New Mexico	P						
New York	I - Pilot			I		P	I
North Carolina							
North Dakota							
Ohio	P						
Oklahoma	P						
Oregon	P						
Pennsylvania	I			I		I	I
Rhode Island	I			I	P		
South Carolina	P						
South Dakota	I	I					
Tennessee	I			I		I	P
Texas	I			I		I	I
Utah	I			I		I	I
Vermont	P						
Virginia	I			I		P	
Washington	I			I		I	I
West Virginia	I		I	P		I	I
Wisconsin	I			I		I	I
Wyoming							

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Paperless Systems and Data Brokering/Sharing Activities		
	Electronic case files	Document imaging	Data Brokering/Sharing
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona	I	I	
Arkansas	P	P	I
California	I		
Colorado	Pre-2000		
Connecticut		P	I
Delaware		P	
DC	P	P	P
Florida	I	I	Pre-2000
Georgia	P		P
Hawaii			
Idaho	I - Pilot	I - Pilot	
Illinois	I	P	
Indiana	I	I	P
Iowa	P		P
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana		I - Pilot	Pre-2000
Maine	I	P	P
Maryland	P	P	
Massachusetts	I	I - Pilot	P
Michigan	I	P	I
Minnesota			
Mississippi	P	I - Pilot	
Missouri	I	P	
Montana	P	P	Pre-2000
Nebraska			I
Nevada	P	P	P
New Hampshire		I - Pilot	
New Jersey	P	P	P
New Mexico		P	P
New York		I	
North Carolina	P		
North Dakota			P
Ohio			
Oklahoma	I	I	Pre-2000
Oregon	Pre-2000		Pre-2000
Pennsylvania	I	I	
Rhode Island	Pre-2000	I - Pilot	P
South Carolina	I - Pilot	I - Pilot	
South Dakota		I	
Tennessee	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Texas	Pre-2000	I	Pre-2000
Utah	I	I	I
Vermont	P	P	P
Virginia			P
Washington	I	I	
West Virginia	Pre-2000		Pre-2000
Wisconsin	I	I	
Wyoming	Pre-2000	P	Pre-2000

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Technological Innovation Activities					
	Integrated MIS	Online policy manual	Telecommute	Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community	Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online	Accept faxed changes
Alabama					I	I
Alaska		I				Pre-2000
Arizona	I	I	I	P	P	I
Arkansas	I	I		I - Pilot	P	I
California		I			I	
Colorado	I	Pre-2000				Pre-2000
Connecticut	P	I				I
Delaware	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I - Pilot			I
DC	Pre-2000	I	P	I	P	I
Florida	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I		I	I
Georgia	Pre-2000	I		P	P	Pre-2000
Hawaii		P			P	I
Idaho	Pre-2000	I		I - Pilot		Pre-2000
Illinois	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		P	P	Pre-2000
Indiana	P	I	P	I	I	I
Iowa		I				
Kansas	Pre-2000	I				Pre-2000
Kentucky		I		P	P	I
Louisiana	P	I		P	P	Pre-2000
Maine	I					I
Maryland	Pre-2000	I				Pre-2000
Massachusetts	I	I			P	I
Michigan		I	I	P		I
Minnesota	Pre-2000	Pre-2000				
Mississippi	I	I		P		I
Missouri	I	I			P	I
Montana	P	I		I		
Nebraska	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		P		Pre-2000
Nevada	I	I		I - Pilot	P	I
New Hampshire	P	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		I	Pre-2000
New Jersey	Pre-2000	I			P	I
New Mexico		I			P	I
New York					I	I
North Carolina	P	I				I
North Dakota		I			I	I
Ohio	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			Pre-2000
Oklahoma	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		P		Pre-2000
Oregon		Pre-2000				Pre-2000
Pennsylvania		I		I	I	I
Rhode Island	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			I	Pre-2000
South Carolina	Pre-2000	I		P		Pre-2000
South Dakota	Pre-2000	Pre-2000				Pre-2000
Tennessee	Pre-2000	I		I	P	I
Texas	Pre-2000	I			I	I
Utah	Pre-2000	I	I		I	I
Vermont	Pre-2000	P		P	P	I
Virginia	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			I	Pre-2000
Washington		Pre-2000				Pre-2000
West Virginia	Pre-2000	Pre-2000			I	I
Wisconsin	I	I		I	I	I
Wyoming		Pre-2000			Pre-2000	Pre-2000

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Technological Innovation Activities (cont'd)					
	Accept changes by Automated Speech Recognition Systems or Automated Response Units	Accept changes through online tool	Recertify by automated speech recognition system or Automated Response Units	Establish wireless point of service systems	Develop online grocery ordering	Accept EBT at farmers' markets
Alabama						I - Pilot
Alaska						
Arizona	P	P	P			
Arkansas		P				P
California	I	P	I	I		I
Colorado						I
Connecticut				I	Pre-2000	I
Delaware		P				
DC	P	P	P			I
Florida		I	P	Pre-2000		I - Pilot
Georgia		P				I - Pilot
Hawaii						I - Pilot
Idaho						P
Illinois			I			I
Indiana		I				I - Pilot
Iowa						I - Pilot
Kansas						I - Pilot
Kentucky						I
Louisiana						I
Maine						I
Maryland		I				
Massachusetts		P				I - Pilot
Michigan	I	P				I - Pilot
Minnesota						I
Mississippi						P
Missouri		P				I
Montana						I
Nebraska				P		I
Nevada						I
New Hampshire						I - Pilot
New Jersey				I - Pilot		I - Pilot
New Mexico		P		P	P	I
New York		P				I
North Carolina				P		I - Pilot
North Dakota		I				I
Ohio						I - Pilot
Oklahoma						P
Oregon						I
Pennsylvania	I	I		I		I
Rhode Island						I
South Carolina						I - Pilot
South Dakota						Pre-2000
Tennessee	P		P			Pre-2000
Texas		P				I - Pilot
Utah		P				I
Vermont	P	P	P	I - Pilot		I - Pilot
Virginia				P		
Washington						I
West Virginia		I				I
Wisconsin		I				I
Wyoming						Pre-2000

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Biometric Identification Activities		
	Fingerprint imaging	Facial recognition	Retinal scanning
Alabama			
Alaska			
Arizona	I		
Arkansas			
California	I	I	
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
DC			
Florida			
Georgia			
Hawaii			
Idaho			
Illinois ²			
Indiana			
Iowa			
Kansas			
Kentucky			
Louisiana			
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi			
Missouri			
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico			
New York	Pre-2000		
North Carolina			
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma			
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota			
Tennessee			
Texas	Pre-2000		
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia			
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			

² Illinois did implement biometric identification but later discontinued the policy.

All data presented obtained from Urban Institute analysis of the 2008 State Food Stamp Agency Survey conducted for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

TABLE 1: IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES BY EFFORT (CONTINUED)

State	Information Sharing/Application Assistance Activities								
	Development of flyers, posters or other educational/informational materials	Distribution of flyers, and other materials	Informational web sites	Toll-free info hotlines	Media campaign	Direct mail campaign	Door-to-door outreach campaign	In-person outreach presentations in community	Off-site application assistance or prescreening
Alabama	P	P						P	
Alaska	I	I	Pre-2000	Pre-2000				Pre-2000	I
Arizona									I
Arkansas	P	P	I						I
California	I	I	I	I	I			I	I
Colorado			P		I				I
Connecticut	I				I		I	I	I
Delaware			I	I					
DC	I	I			I			I	I
Florida	I	I	I	I	I	I		I	I
Georgia		I		I				I	
Hawaii								I	
Idaho	I		I	I					P
Illinois	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000		I		I	
Indiana	I	I	I	I	I	I		I	I
Iowa	I	I	I	I	P		P	I - Pilot	
Kansas	I	I		I				I	I
Kentucky								Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Louisiana	Pre-2000		Pre-2000				I		
Maine	I	I	I	I				I	I
Maryland	I	I	I					I	I
Massachusetts	I	I	I	I	I	I		I	I
Michigan	I	I	I					I	I
Minnesota	I	I	I	I				I	I
Mississippi									
Missouri									
Montana	P	I	P					I	I
Nebraska	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I					Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Nevada									
New Hampshire	I	I	I	Pre-2000	I			I	I
New Jersey	I	I	I	I	I			I	I
New Mexico	I	I	I	I	I	I		I	
New York	I	I	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000				I
North Carolina	I	I	I						
North Dakota	I	I	I	I				I	I
Ohio	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000					
Oklahoma	I	I	Pre-2000		I				
Oregon	I	I	I	I	I			I	I
Pennsylvania	I	I	I		I	I	I	I	I
Rhode Island	I	I	P	Pre-2000	I			I	I
South Carolina	I	I	I	Pre-2000	P	I		I	P
South Dakota	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	Pre-2000				Pre-2000	
Tennessee	Pre-2000	Pre-2000	I	I	I	I	P	Pre-2000	Pre-2000
Texas	Pre-2000	I	I	I				I	I
Utah									
Vermont	P	P	I	I	P				P
Virginia			I					I	I
Washington		I					I	I	I
West Virginia								I	I
Wisconsin	I	I	I	I	I	I		I	I
Wyoming	I	I	Pre-2000					I	

All data presented obtained from Urban Institute analysis of the 2008 State Food Stamp Agency Survey conducted for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

TABLE 2: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING CUSTOMER ACCESS INITIATIVES

	Create a combined application for various social service programs (N = 19)	Accept Applications by:		Recertify Cases by:		Accept changes by Fax (N = 23)	Provide flexible office hours (N = 19)	Provide outstationed SNAP worker (N = 14)
		Mail (N = 21)	Fax (N = 26)	Mail (N = 25)	Fax (N = 27)			
Decrease staff workload	37	19	15	32	22	8	16	7
Simplify process for workers	63	38	35	44	41	13	32	14
Simplify process for clients	87	81	77	88	78	65	68	36
Improve program access	87	81	85	84	88	82	79	36
Increase overall program participation	74	76	73	80	74	74	79	57
Increase participation of working families	63	67	69	72	70	74	58	21
Increase participation of elderly and/or disabled	63	62	65	68	70	49	53	21
Increase participation of immigrants	42	43	50	44	52	35	37	21
Improve application processing time for client	63	57	54	64	52	35	37	36
Reduce fraud	26	5	4	4	4	4	5	7
Reduce error rates	26	9	8	8	11	4	11	14
Align with other public benefits programs	53	28	27	28	26	17	32	7
Reduce administrative costs	47	19	15	16	15	9	10	0

TABLE 3: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING CAP INITIATIVES

	Large Role	Somewhat Large Role	Small Role	No Role At All	Do Not Know
Decrease staff workload	40	25	15	20	0
Simplify process for workers	45	30	15	10	0
Improve customer service	80	15	5	0	0
Improve program access	90	10	0	0	0
Increase overall program participation	80	15	5	0	0
Increase participation of working families	10	0	10	65	15
Increase participation of the disabled	80	5	0	10	5
Increase participation of the elderly	95	5	0	0	0
Increase participation of immigrants	10	15	5	45	25
Improve application processing time	45	20	10	20	5
Align with other public benefits programs	20	0	5	55	20
Reduce administrative costs	40	10	10	35	5
Decrease fraud	15	0	0	70	15
Decrease error rates	25	10	5	40	20

Note: N = 20

TABLE 4: REASON PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES

	Merging or consolidation of state-level agencies (N = 5)	Closing or consolidation of local offices (N = 13)	Transferring functions of organizational units:			Greater sharing of functions with CBOs (N = 18)	Increasing job specialization of local SNAP staff (N = 9)
			to the state SNAP agency from another governmental entity (N = 3)	from the state SNAP agency to CBOs (N = 9)	from the state SNAP agency to private-sector business (N = 3)		
Decrease staff workload	20	8	33	11	33	33	66
Simplify process for workers	20	0	0	22	0	22	66
Improve program access	60	0	67	55	67	78	44
Increase overall program participation	40	8	33	77	67	83	33
Increase participation of working families	40	0	33	66	67	85	33
Increase participation of elderly and/or disabled	40	0	67	77	33	89	33
Increase participation of immigrants	40	0	33	44	33	61	22
Improve application processing time for client	40	8	67	44	33	61	44
Reduce fraud	20	8	33	0	33	5	22
Reduce error rates	40	0	33	11	33	17	44
Align with other public benefits programs	40	8	67	11	33	22	22
Reduce administrative costs	80	76	33	11	67	38	33

TABLE 5: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING CALL CENTER INITIATIVES

Reasons for Implementation	Large Role	Somewhat Large Role	Small Role	No Role At All	Do Not Know
Decrease staff workload	54	23	4	8	11
Simplify process for workers	58	31	0	4	7
Improve customer service	85	4	0	4	7
Improve program access	69	8	0	12	11
Increase overall program participation	39	12	27	12	10
Increase participation of working families	35	23	19	12	11
Increase participation of the disabled	27	23	27	12	11
Increase participation of the elderly	27	23	27	12	11
Increase participation of immigrants	19	19	35	15	12
Improve application processing time	27	31	19	4	19
Align with other public benefits programs	12	12	23	23	30
Reduce administrative costs	42	4	4	23	27
Decrease fraud	8	8	23	39	22
Decrease error rates	35	23	8	19	15

Note: N = 26

TABLE 6: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC APPLICATION INITIATIVES

	Large Role	Somewhat Large Role	Small Role	No Role At All	Do Not Know
Decrease staff workload	23	16	28	23	9
Simplify process for workers	23	26	23	16	12
Improve customer service	79	14	5	0	2
Improve program access	79	16	2	0	2
Increase overall program	79	14	5	0	2
Increase participation of working families	70	19	5	2	5
Increase participation of the disabled	58	23	9	5	5
Increase participation of the elderly	54	21	16	5	5
Increase participation of immigrants	44	30	14	2	9
Improve application processing time	40	16	26	14	5
Align with other public benefits programs	14	9	14	28	35
Reduce administrative costs	16	14	19	33	19
Decrease fraud	9	5	7	51	28
Decrease error rates	19	2	14	42	23

Note: N = 43

TABLE 7: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS

	Decrease staff workload	Simplify process for workers	Simplify process for clients	Improve program access	Increase overall program participation	Increase participation of working families	Increase participation of elderly and/or disabled	Increase participation of immigrants	Improve application processing time for client	Reduce fraud	Reduce error rates	Align with other public benefits programs	Reduce administrative costs
Integrate the SNAP MIS with other program systems (N = 15)	40	80	40	27	27	27	33	27	53	26	53	40	47
Create online policy manuals (N = 32)	31	81	9	6	0	0	0	0	12	6	34	16	37
Make modifications to enable workers to telecommute (N = 7)	29	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	42
Create electronic case files (N = 27)	52	74	30	18	15	15	11	11	41	22	52	18	37
Implement document imaging/paperless systems (N = 33)	64	72	36	24	21	12	9	9	42	21	51	15	45
Implement data brokering/sharing / sharing with other benefits systems (N = 18)	39	55	33	17	17	5	5	5	11	27	33	39	22
Establish kiosks for prescreening or application tools in local offices and/or in the community (N = 20)	35	25	60	70	60	50	50	45	50	10	20	15	25
Allow clients to check account history or benefit status online (N = 29)	45	24	72	31	24	14	10	10	7	14	14	7	24

**TABLE 7: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS
(CONTINUED)**

	Decrease staff workload	Simplify process for workers	Simplify process for clients	Improve program access	Increase overall program participation	Increase participation of working families	Increase participation of elderly and/or disabled	Increase participation of immigrants	Improve application processing time for client	Reduce fraud	Reduce error rates	Align with other public benefits programs	Reduce administrative costs
Accept changes by Automated Response Units (N = 7)	28	28	57	57	28	28	28	28	14	28	43	28	28
Recertify clients by telephone using Automated Response Units (N = 7)	30	43	43	43	30	30	14	14	0	0	0	0	14
Establish wireless point of service systems (N = 9)	0	11	33	44	11	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	11
Develop online grocery ordering (N = 1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accept EBT at farmers' markets (N = 43)	7	2	40	67	42	19	26	14	2	2	2	2	5

TABLE 8: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING INFORMATION SHARING INITIATIVES

Reasons for Implementation	Large Role	Somewhat Large Role	Small Role	No Role At All	Do Not Know
Simplify process for workers	2	19	21	44	14
Simplify process for clients	42	30	16	7	5
Improve customer service	74	19	2	2	3
Improve program access	84	16	0	0	0
Increase overall program participation	84	16	0	0	0
Increase participation of working families	65	26	2	2	5
Increase participation of the disabled	65	26	2	2	5
Increase participation of the elderly	70	23	2	2	3
Increase participation of immigrants	58	28	7	2	5
Improve application processing time	12	12	0	12	64

Note: N = 43

TABLE 9: PERCENT OF STATES PROVIDING REASONS FOR CONTRACTING WITH OUTSIDE ENTITIES

Reasons for Implementation	Large Role	Somewhat Large Role	Small Role	No Role At All	Do Not Know
Decrease staff workload	8	19	14	22	37
Improve customer satisfaction	36	25	11	8	20
Improve program access	61	17	6	8	8
Improve application processing time for client	39	14	11	11	25
Reduce expenses	6	8	19	25	42
Contractor has more appropriate/up-to-date skills than in house staff	28	17	3	22	30
Contractor has familiarity/better rapport with population to be served	17	14	22	11	36
Contractor works at more convenient locations	17	25	14	11	33
Contractor has the necessary (or better, or more modern) equipment/technology	11	19	6	22	42
Reduce fraud	3	6	6	31	54
Reduce error rates	3	8	8	25	56

Note: N = 35

TABLE 10: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTRACTED ACTIVITIES

State	Contracted Activities					
	Outreach and education about SNAP	Prescreening activities	Application assistance	Submitting application/documents	Tracking and follow-up of applications	Interpretation/translation
Alabama	I					
Alaska	I		Pre-2000			Pre-2000
Arkansas						I
Colorado						Pre-2000
Connecticut	I	I	I			
Delaware						I
DC	Pre-2000					
Florida						Pre-2000
Georgia	I	I	I	I	I	I
Hawaii						Pre-2000
Idaho						I
Illinois	I					
Indiana	I	I	I	I	I	I
Iowa	I					
Kansas	I	I	I			I
Maryland						I
Massachusetts						I
Michigan	I					I
Minnesota						
Mississippi						I
Montana	I	I	I			
Nebraska						I
Nevada	I		I	I		
New Hampshire	Pilot		Pilot	Pilot		
New Mexico						
New York	I	I	I	I		I
North Carolina	I					I
Ohio	I	I	I	I	I	I
Pennsylvania	I	I	I	I		I
South Carolina						Pre-2000
Tennessee	Pre-2000				I	I
Texas	I	I	I	I		
Washington	Pre-2000		Pre-2000			
West Virginia	I					
Wisconsin	I	I	I	I		I

TABLE 10: IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTRACTED ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

State	Contracted Activities					
	Out-stationed workers	Operating call centers	Providing document imaging services	Technological support	Systems design	Case management
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arkansas			I			
Colorado						
Connecticut						
Delaware						
DC				Pre-2000		
Florida	I					
Georgia						
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois	I	I	I	I	I	I
Indiana						
Iowa						
Kansas					I	
Maryland			Pilot		I	
Massachusetts	I	I				
Michigan					Pilot	
Minnesota				I	I	
Mississippi						
Montana						
Nebraska				I	I	
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Mexico						
New York						
North Carolina						P
Ohio				Pre-2000	Pre-2000	
Pennsylvania				I		
South Carolina						
Tennessee					I	
Texas	I	I	I	I	I	
Washington						
West Virginia						
Wisconsin	I					