

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

PAUL SHAFER and JOSHUA HARDER,	:	
Individually and on Behalf of All Other	:	CIVIL ACTION NO.
Persons Similarly Situated,	:	3:12CV-00039(AWT)
<i>Plaintiffs</i>	:	
v.	:	
	:	
RODERICK BREMBY, in his Official	:	
Capacity as Commissioner of the	:	
Connecticut Department of Social Services	:	
<i>Defendant</i>	:	JULY 9, 2018

**DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

I. INTRODUCTION

On June 25, 2018, the plaintiffs filed their Memorandum in Support of their Motion for Order to Show Cause why Roderick Bremby, in his official Capacity as Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Social Services ("DSS") should not be held in contempt for failing to meet certain timely processing benchmarks. [Dkt. # 257]. Plaintiffs' memorandum was filed both in support of their May 18, 2018 Motion for Order to Show Cause and in response to the Defendant's Opposition to the Plaintiffs' May 18, 2018 Motion for Order to Show Cause. [Dkt. # 247 and 254].¹

The plaintiffs failed to even address the third factor of contempt² in their May 18, 2018 Motion for Order to Show Cause. In contrast, DSS's Opposition to the Motion for Order to

¹ The defendant was only able to respond to the plaintiffs' Motion for Order to Show Cause as there was no accompanying memorandum as required by Local Rule 7(a)(1).

² As explained in the defendant's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Order to Show Cause to prove contempt, a moving party must prove, by clear and convincing evidence that: (1) the

Show Cause addressed the third prong of the contempt test, detailing the numerous efforts DSS has made and continues to make in order to achieve and maintain compliance with the Modified Settlement Agreement, including the timely processing benchmarks. [Dkt. # 243-1].

In their June 25, 2018 memorandum, the plaintiffs, for the first time, attempt to demonstrate why the defendant should be held in contempt. In the first instance, the plaintiffs baselessly assert that they do not have the burden in proving that contempt should enter. Next, the plaintiffs argue that even if they do have the burden in showing contempt should enter, DSS's additions to its eligibility service workforce as well as other efforts to work with existing staff to more effectively process Medicaid applications is essentially "too little too late." [Dkt. #257, p. 7]. This argument appears to be entirely predicated on plaintiffs' belief that the defendant's noncompliance with the timely processing benchmarks in the Original Settlement Agreement entered into in 2014 still provides plaintiffs with the basis for relief through a contempt motion, filed long after the expiration of the Original Settlement Agreement and adoption of the mutually agreed upon Modified Settlement Agreement in the summer of 2017.

Because the plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden in proving the third element of contempt, their Motion for Order to Show Cause should be denied. Not only have the plaintiffs failed to meet their burden, but the defendant's opposition to plaintiffs' motion clearly demonstrates that DSS is being reasonably diligent in its attempt to comply with the Modified Settlement Agreement. DSS's efforts more than meet the standard of "reasonable diligence."

underlying order was clear and unambiguous; (2) the defendant did not comply with the order; and (3) the defendant "did not diligently attempt to comply with the order in a reasonable manner." *Latino Officers Ass'n v. City of New York*, 558 F.3d 159, 164 (2d Cir. 2009).

II. ARGUMENT

A. It is the Plaintiffs' Burden to Prove by Clear and Convincing Evidence that Contempt Should Enter.

In their June 25, 2018 memorandum, the plaintiffs argue that it is not their burden to prove contempt should enter. [Dkt. #257, pp. 2-3]. The plaintiffs notably point to no legal authority to support their proposition that the burden here is shifted to the defendant. Nor do plaintiffs explain how the language in paragraph 22 of the Modified Settlement Agreement shifts this burden, either explicitly or implicitly. In their Motion for Order to Show Cause, the plaintiffs even went so far as to prove the first two elements of contempt – that the order was clear and unambiguous and that the defendant did not comply with the order. The only factor plaintiffs did not address in their Motion for Order to Show Cause was the third prong: whether DSS was reasonably diligent in its attempt to comply with the Modified Settlement Agreement.

Additionally, case law interpreting a district court's power to hold a party in contempt is very clear. "A contempt order is warranted only where the moving party establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the alleged contemnor violated the district court's edict." *Hart Schaffner & Marx v. Alexander's Department Store*, § 341 F.2d 101, 102 (2d Cir. 1965) (per curiam) (emphasis added.) Paragraph 22 of the Modified Settlement Agreement does not shift the burden to the Defendant to prove all elements by clear and convincing evidence.³

When the parties negotiated the extension and modification of the Original Settlement Agreement during the summer of 2017, the language in paragraph 22 of the Modified Settlement

³ Given the interpretation of the federal courts regarding a district court's "significantly circumscribed" power to enter an order of contempt, it is unclear to the defendant if even an agreement of the parties could confer upon the district court the power to enter a contempt order in the absence of the moving party proving all three elements of contempt by clear and convincing evidence. *U.S. v. Local 1804-1, Intern. Longshoremen's Ass'n, AFL-CIO*, 44 F.3d 1091, 1096 (2d Cir. 1995).

Agreement was adopted to allow the plaintiffs a quicker avenue to pursue contempt for the defendant's alleged violation of the timely processing benchmarks in paragraph 18(a). [Dkt. # 243-1 ¶ 22]. Pursuant to the original Settlement Agreement, the plaintiffs were required to give the defendant thirty days written notice that they intended to file a motion for contempt. [Dkt. # 196-1, ¶ 23]. The parties were then required to meet "to discuss and to attempt to resolve in good faith any claimed non-compliance no fewer than 20 days after the provision of the written notice." *Id.* Plaintiffs could only file for contempt after this meeting was held. *Id.* This meant that plaintiffs would have to wait a month or more after declaring their intention to request contempt to file the motion with the Court. *Id.*

While this provision remains in the Modified Settlement Agreement at paragraph 23, for alleged violations of paragraph 18(a) of the Modified Settlement Agreement, the plaintiffs can immediately file their request for contempt with the court without first requesting a meeting with the defendant to discuss the alleged noncompliance. [Dkt. # 243-1, ¶ 22]. This fast-track into court was the only stated purpose for the addition of paragraph 22 in the Modified Settlement Agreement. The plaintiffs' attempt to avoid having to put forth clear and convincing evidence that all three elements required for contempt to enter by shifting the burden to DSS must therefore be rejected.

B. Plaintiffs Are Seeking Redress of Noncompliance Under the Terms of the Original Settlement Agreement, Which is Not Permitted Under the Modified Settlement Agreement.

The plaintiffs agree "that the applicable standard for contempt" is set forth in *King v. Allied Vision*, 65 F.3d 1052, 1058 (2d.Cir 1995). [Dkt. # 257, p.7]. They argue that the Defendant has failed to show that it has made reasonably diligent attempts to "reach compliance with the Modified Stipulation". *Id.* at p. 13. In support of this position, the plaintiffs, in part,

improperly put forth facts that pre-date the entry of the Modified Stipulation by this Court on August 31, 2017.

The plaintiffs begin by identifying the basis for their contempt motion as the defendant's failure to comply with the benchmarks for the processing of HUSKY C non-long term care and Medicaid long term care applications set forth in paragraph 18(a) of the Modified Settlement Agreement. *Id.* at pp. 1-2, [Dkt. #243-1, ¶ 22]. The specific benchmarks which appear in paragraph 18(a) of the Modified Settlement Agreement replace the benchmarks contained in the Original Settlement Agreement. [Dkt. #243-1, ¶ 18(a)]. Yet, instead of focusing solely on the actual benchmarks set forth in paragraph 18(a) of the Modified Settlement Agreement, the plaintiffs expound upon the defendant's failure to reach compliance with the benchmarks set forth in the Original Settlement Agreement. [Dkt. #243-1, pp. 3-4, 7, 12]. The facts relating to the Original Settlement Agreement are improper to the Court's consideration of whether contempt for non-compliance with paragraph 18(a) of the Modified Stipulation should enter.

The impropriety of asking the court to consider these facts is made plain by the plaintiffs' own statement that they "did not file a motion for contempt with respect to Defendant's non-compliance with the 2014 Stipulation⁴" when they agreed to the Modified Settlement Agreement. [Dkt. # 257, p. 5]. The plaintiffs voluntarily waived their ability to file for contempt on the terms of the Original Settlement Agreement. They should not be permitted to revisit their decision to forego filing a motion for contempt or to reach back in time to assert non-compliance with paragraph 18(a) of the Modified Settlement Agreement based upon an agreement that is no longer in force. The defendant would clearly be prejudiced by having to defend against

⁴ This is the "Original Settlement Agreement."

allegations of non-compliance with the Original Settlement Agreement when the Modified Settlement Agreement is the basis of the motion for contempt presently before this court.

C. Plaintiffs' Argument that DSS's Increase in Staffing Does Not Demonstrate DSS is Being "Reasonably Diligent" in its Efforts to Comply with the Modified Settlement Agreement Because the Staffing Additions are "Too Little, Too Late" is Without Merit.

The plaintiffs argue that any increase in DSS staffing is "too little too late." [Dkt. # 257, p. 7]. This argument is again predicated on plaintiffs' belated attempt to seek redress for the defendant's noncompliance with the Original Settlement Agreement.

DSS started to routinely hire new staff beginning in October 2017, shortly after the Court's August 31, 2017 approval of the modified Settlement Agreement.[Dkt. #244]. DSS began hiring staff to bolster its performance and to attempt to comply with the terms of the Modified Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs' essentially argue that any noncompliance with the Modified Settlement Agreement should result in contempt because DSS was in noncompliance with the original Settlement Agreement. This means that nothing DSS did would be enough to avoid contempt if it ever failed to achieve or maintain compliance with the Modified Settlement Agreement. Not only does this argument defy logic, but it also undermines the parties' agreement to modify and extend the Settlement Agreement in exchange for plaintiffs not filing for contempt based on DSS's failure to comply with the original Settlement Agreement. [Dkt. #257, p. 5].

Plaintiffs also allege that DSS's additions to its eligibility staff within the last year only replaces staff DSS has lost through attrition over the years. [Dkt. # 257, p. 8]. This is simply not accurate. By plaintiffs' own calculations, DSS currently employs 27 more eligibility service workers than it did one year ago and 13 more than January 1, 2015. [Dkt. # 257, p. 8-9]. More importantly, the staffing levels in plaintiffs' exhibit were accurate as of June 1, 2018. [Dkt. #

257-1, p. 3]. As a result, the staffing levels provided by plaintiffs in support of the request for contempt does not include DSS's June 7, 2018 addition of 33 eligibility service workers or its coming July addition of 35 eligibility service workers. [Dkt. # 254-3, ¶ 32].

The plaintiffs provide no clear or convincing evidence that the current staffing levels are inadequate. In fact, the plaintiffs provide no evidence at all, simply their own unsupported opinion. Plaintiffs strongly suggest that DSS's failure to meet the timely processing benchmarks in January 2018 demonstrates that DSS's staffing level is inadequate. This explanation fails to consider that most of the additions of staff occurred after DSS would have processed the January 2018 applications.

The benefits of much of the additional staff would not be seen in the January 2018 report even though the report was issued on May 15, 2018 because DSS's Medicaid Application Timeliness Report reports on the dispositions of all applications that filed in a given month. Because some Medicaid applications have a 90 day⁵ standard of promptness, DSS cannot report on the dispositions of all applications filed in a month until 90 days after the end of the reported month. DSS then needs time to compile the data for the report. This means that for applications filed in January 2018, the report is not available until May 15, 2018, 3.5 months after the end of January. This reporting structure was agreed to by the parties before signing the Original Settlement Agreement in 2014.

Furthermore, while new staff will certainly help DSS to achieve the timely processing benchmarks in the future, staff must first be trained and then become comfortable processing applications. This is a process that takes time. Therefore, even for the new eligibility staff that

⁵ Most Medicaid applications have a shorter 45 day standard of promptness.

was hired prior to January 2018, their training and learning process had not completed by the end of the application processing period.

Prior to filing their Motion for Order to Show Cause, the defendant told the plaintiffs that DSS added staff. Ex. A, Email from AAG Callahan to Shelley White. DSS further explained that the benefits from the new staff would not be instantaneous due to the lengthy training process and the 3.5 month lag in reporting. *Id.* Notwithstanding this explanation, plaintiffs chose to file for contempt before there is even any concrete evidence that the current staffing levels, including the recent additions in staffing, are inadequate. Additionally, plaintiffs provide no evidence as to what they believe an adequate staffing level would be.

In fact, at the time plaintiffs filed their June 25, 2018 memorandum in support of their Motion for Order to Show Cause, the February 2018 Medicaid Timeliness Report was available.⁶ This report shows improved timely processing percentages for both HUSKY C and Medicaid long-term care. Ex. B, Medicaid Application Timeliness Summary. Based on the February 2018 report, DSS surpassed the full compliance benchmark for Medicaid long-term care applications and timely processed 95.35% of Medicaid long-term care application. *Id.* For HUSKY C applications, DSS improved its timely processing percentage by 2 percentage points, bringing its timely processing percentage up from 84.90% to 86.94%. *Id.* While this still does not meet the 90% timely processing percentage required for full compliance, DSS is only out of compliance by slightly more than 3%. *Id.*

This improvement strongly suggests that DSS's recent additions to staff, particularly the staff that was fully trained by February 2018, are helping it to reach full compliance. It also undermines plaintiffs' unsupported arguments that DSS's current staffing levels are inadequate.

⁶ This report was available on June 15, 2018, after the defendant filed his Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Order to Show Cause.

D. Plaintiffs' Argument that DSS's Efforts to Improve Medicaid Long-Term Care Timely Processing Using Existing Staff is Without Merit.

Plaintiffs go through great efforts to again minimize any effort DSS has made to improve timely processing and achieve full compliance by working with its existing staff to improve worker processes. DSS's opposition to contempt indicated that DSS instituted a Corrective Action Plan in April 2017 to address its failure to meet timely processing benchmarks for the Medicaid long-term care population. This was a typographical error. The Corrective Action Plan was instituted in April 2018. As a result, at the time of plaintiffs' Motion for Order to Show Cause, there was nothing to report regarding results as it had only been a month since DSS began its remediation plan. Additionally, though the defendant indicated the incorrect date for the start of the Corrective Action Plan, plaintiffs were aware of the actions DSS took to work to improve processing in the lagging Medicaid long-term care processing hubs. Ex. A, Email from AAG Callahan to Shelley White.

As with the additions in staffing, any benefit DSS would see from the actions it took to address issues with Medicaid long-term care processing would not have been reflected on the January 2018 timeliness report. Due to the 3.5 month lag in reporting, most of the Medicaid long-term care applications passed their standard of promptness long before DSS even produced the December 2018 report (available April 15, 2018). Any benefits from DSS's Corrective Action Plan would not be anticipated to be demonstrated until the reports for applications processed in April 2018 and May 2018 were available.⁷

⁷ These reports will be available August 15, 2018 and September 15, 2018 respectively.

E. Plaintiffs' Argument that DSS's Efforts to Improve HUSKY C Timely Processing are Inadequate Again Fail to Take into Account the 3.5 Month Delay in Reporting.

As with their arguments concerning staffing levels and DSS's Medicaid long-term care Corrective Action Plan, plaintiffs' argument that the staffing additions dedicated to HUSKY C is without merit because plaintiffs have not allowed enough time to pass since the staffing additions. Similarly, the recent management change described in Marva Perrin's affidavit was only effective beginning March 16, 2018. [Dkt. # 254-3, ¶ 28]. By March 16, 2018, most of the Medicaid applications filed in January 2018 would have passed the typical 45 day standard of promptness. As a result, this change would not have had much, if any, impact on the January 2018 applications.

F. The ImpaCT Transition Will Take Time for Full Benefits to Be Realized.

The plaintiffs are skeptical that the transition to ImpaCT should have any appreciable negative effect on DSS's ability to meet timely processing benchmarks. Nevertheless, plaintiffs produced old statements from DSS that predate the roll out of ImpaCT⁸ in which DSS explains the benefits of the transition to the ImpaCT system from its legacy EMS system. DSS still strongly believes that the implementation of ImpaCT will ultimately be beneficial to its timely processing efforts and will allow DSS to process applications and serve its clients more efficiently. In the short-term, DSS eligibility service workers need time to become fully acclimated to processing applications in a completely new computer system. Already, DSS sees improvement in its timely processing performance as compared to the beginning of the implementation of ImpaCT.

⁸ In fact one is an almost five year old quote from July 2013.

III. CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons explained in the Defendant's Opposition to Contempt and for all of the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny plaintiffs' Motion for Contempt.

RODERICK BREMBY, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY AS COMMISSIONER OF THE
CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES

GEORGE JEPSEN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

BY: /s/ Jennifer L. Callahan
Jennifer L. Callahan
Emily V. Melendez
Assistant Attorney General
Federal Bar No. ct 29033
Federal Bar No. ct 21411
55 Elm Street
P.O. Box 120
Hartford, CT 06141-0120
Tel: (860) 808-5210
Fax: (860) 808-5385
Jennifer.Callahan@ct.gov
Emily.Melendez@ct.gov

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on July 9, 2018, a copy of the foregoing Defendant's Response to Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Motion for Order to Show Cause was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent by e-mail to all parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's system.

/s/ Jennifer L. Callahan
(#ct 29033)
Assistant Attorney General
55 Elm Street, P.O. Box 120
Hartford, CT 06141-0120
Tel: (860) 808-5210
Fax: (860) 808-5385
Email: Jennifer.Callahan@ct.gov

From: Callahan, Jennifer
To: [Shelley White](#); [Sheldon Toubman](#)
Cc: [Melendez, Emily](#)
Subject: Shafer v. Bremby LTC Timely Processing
Date: Thursday, April 12, 2018 3:12:00 PM

Shelley and Sheldon,

I recently met with the Department of Social Services to discuss the concerns you raised with respect to the Department's processing of Medicaid LTC applications. Specifically, you asked what the Department was doing to bring up its LTC Medicaid application timely processing percentage and how the Department was working to improve the LTC timely processing percentages in the Hartford and New Haven offices. After meeting with staff from the Department I can report that the Department is addressing its LTC timely processing performance in several ways.

First, the Department has hired more staff to process LTC applications. In Hartford, nine new staff were added to the LTC application processing unit in the last six months. Three of the nine new staff are new DSS Connecticut Career Trainees and six are transfers from other areas into the Hartford LTC hub. Additionally, two new staff were added to the New Haven LTC application processing unit.

Second, the Department has worked diligently to address some management issues in the New Haven office. After talking to the managers and supervisors in the New Haven office, Marva Perrin observed the LTC application processing hubs in Waterbury and Bridgeport to determine if there was anything they did that could help New Haven improve its timely processing percentage for LTC applications. Marva found that there were certain things that Waterbury and Bridgeport did that made them more successful including holding all staff meetings on a near weekly basis and constantly reviewing reports of application processing.

As a result, the managers and supervisors from the New Haven office are set to observe the Waterbury and Bridgeport LTC processing hubs. In addition, the New Haven LTC processing hub is now required to report to Marva on a weekly basis the following items at the end of the week: all pending applications, all new applications, all processing applications, all overdue applications, and all delay codes associated for overdue applications. There will also be monthly meetings to discuss best practices as employed by the Waterbury and Bridgeport offices.

As a reminder, the Department has taken these actions, but we won't see the results from these improvements for up to 4 months due to the reporting lag associated with the Medicaid Timeliness report. Despite this lag, the Department will be monitoring the situation internally so that it can get a sense as to whether these efforts are successful or if further adjustments need to be made.

Finally, you requested that the Department re-run the Medicaid Timeliness Reports to January 1, 2017 so that it can capture any additional applications that were inadvertently left out of the ImpaCT query for the Timeliness Report. Unfortunately, re-running the reports will make the Timeliness Report less accurate because of challenges in retrieving certain reporting elements historically, notably the delay code field which can only reflect the most recent code associated with the case. Furthermore, any potential changes in volume of LTC applications would be minimal until July or

August because as of January 2017, Middletown was the only office that had rolled out ImpaCT. Other offices didn't begin rolling out into ImpaCT until March 2017, and ImpaCT was only fully rolled out in all offices by the end of the summer 2017. As a result, there were very few LTC applications in ImpaCT during the first half of 2017.

Also, even with the full roll out of ImpaCT the correction to the most recent report (November) shows that the issue with the ImpaCT query still only yields relatively few additional applications (86 for November), and including these applications had minimal effect (and in fact slightly improved) the Department's timely processing percentage this past month.

Let me know if you have any further questions at this time. Thanks.

Jennifer L. Callahan

Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
55 Elm Street
P.O. Box 120
Hartford, CT 06106

Phone: 860.808.5210

Fax: 860.808.5385

Email: jennifer.callahan@ct.gov

URL: <http://ct.gov/ag/>

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and protected from general disclosure. If the recipient or the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient, or person responsible to receive this e-mail, you are requested to delete this e-mail immediately and do not disseminate or distribute or copy. If you have received this e-mail by mistake, please notify us immediately by replying to the message so that we can take appropriate action immediately and see to it that this mistake is rectified.

Medicaid Application Timeliness Summary

	HUSKY A (w/o LTC)			HUSKY C (w/o LTC)			LONG TERM CARE			HUSKY D			TOTAL NON-LTC			TOTAL MEDICAID		
	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely
Aug-13	8,862	7,449	84.06%	5,403	4,408	81.58%	1,225	485	39.59%	7,651	5,991	78.30%	21,916	17,848	81.44%	23,141	18,333	79.22%
Sep-13	7,947	6,753	84.98%	5,135	4,201	81.81%	1,228	636	51.79%	8,050	6,441	80.01%	21,132	17,395	82.32%	22,360	18,031	80.64%
Oct-13	9,975	8,960	89.82%	6,533	5,161	79.00%	1,645	805	48.94%	8,659	7,087	81.85%	25,167	21,208	84.27%	26,812	22,013	82.10%
Nov-13	7,880	6,931	87.96%	5,722	4,106	71.76%	1,210	529	43.72%	7,037	5,846	83.08%	20,639	16,883	81.80%	21,849	17,412	79.69%
Dec-13	13,189	10,606	80.42%	6,335	4,576	72.23%	1,330	700	52.63%	20,037	15,781	78.76%	39,561	30,963	78.27%	40,891	31,663	77.43%
Jan-14	19,029	16,446	86.43%	6,376	4,374	68.60%	1,671	1,360	81.39%	21,679	18,780	86.63%	47,084	39,600	84.11%	48,755	40,960	84.01%
Feb-14	14,444	12,997	89.98%	5,767	4,533	78.60%	1,554	1,259	81.02%	15,405	13,961	90.63%	35,616	31,491	88.42%	37,170	32,750	88.11%
Mar-14	26,113	21,802	83.49%	6,743	5,127	76.03%	1,850	1,536	83.03%	35,271	31,936	90.54%	68,127	58,865	86.40%	69,977	60,401	86.32%
Apr-14	12,784	10,082	78.86%	6,565	5,269	80.26%	1,665	1,389	83.42%	11,283	8,989	79.67%	30,632	24,340	79.46%	32,297	25,729	79.66%
May-14	7,876	6,964	88.42%	6,269	4,696	74.91%	1,546	1,313	84.93%	6,486	5,634	86.86%	20,631	17,294	83.83%	22,177	18,607	83.90%
Jun-14	7,992	7,252	90.74%	6,143	4,527	73.69%	1,574	1,394	88.56%	6,361	5,637	88.62%	20,496	17,416	84.97%	22,070	18,810	85.23%
Jul-14	8,402	7,658	91.14%	5,909	4,609	78.00%	1,602	1,434	89.51%	6,572	5,969	90.82%	20,883	18,236	87.32%	22,485	19,670	87.48%
Aug-14	9,013	8,472	94.00%	5,472	4,630	84.61%	1,602	1,455	90.82%	6,166	5,712	92.64%	20,651	18,814	91.10%	22,253	20,269	91.08%
Sep-14	8,876	8,375	94.36%	6,001	5,251	87.50%	1,749	1,583	90.51%	6,196	5,777	93.24%	21,073	19,403	92.08%	22,822	20,986	91.96%
Oct-14	8,660	8,122	93.79%	6,373	5,689	89.27%	1,765	1,630	92.35%	6,274	5,836	93.02%	21,307	19,647	92.21%	23,072	21,277	92.22%
Nov-14	12,781	12,384	96.89%	6,506	5,271	81.02%	1,591	1,445	90.82%	10,687	10,371	97.04%	29,974	28,026	93.50%	31,565	29,471	93.37%
Dec-14	19,476	17,581	90.27%	6,301	5,280	83.80%	1,656	1,512	91.30%	19,816	17,429	87.95%	45,593	40,290	88.37%	47,249	41,802	88.47%
Jan-15	15,251	10,775	70.65%	5,547	4,844	87.33%	1,622	1,457	89.83%	14,753	8,193	55.53%	35,551	23,812	66.98%	37,173	25,269	67.98%
Feb-15	13,634	9,335	68.47%	5,829	5,343	91.66%	1,564	1,433	91.62%	15,046	8,005	53.20%	34,509	22,683	65.73%	36,073	24,116	66.85%
Mar-15	8,426	5,532	65.65%	7,218	6,568	90.99%	1,907	1,756	92.08%	4,819	2,641	54.80%	20,463	14,741	72.04%	22,370	16,497	73.75%
Apr-15	11,714	10,140	86.56%	6,342	5,709	90.02%	1,740	1,599	91.90%	8,336	7,327	87.90%	26,392	23,176	87.81%	28,132	24,775	88.07%
May-15	9,335	8,214	87.99%	5,731	5,297	92.43%	1,655	1,548	93.53%	5,910	5,291	89.53%	20,976	18,802	89.64%	22,631	20,350	89.92%
Jun-15	10,854	9,625	88.68%	6,438	5,915	91.88%	1,876	1,754	93.50%	6,975	6,351	91.05%	24,267	21,891	90.21%	26,143	23,645	90.44%
Jul-15	11,906	10,794	90.66%	6,691	5,976	89.31%	1,890	1,746	92.38%	7,018	6,550	93.33%	25,615	23,320	91.04%	27,505	25,066	91.13%
Aug-15	13,935	13,206	94.77%	5,921	5,438	91.84%	1,664	1,515	91.05%	7,367	7,009	95.14%	27,223	25,653	94.23%	28,887	27,168	94.05%
Sep-15	16,466	16,043	97.43%	5,753	5,313	92.35%	1,631	1,451	88.96%	9,081	8,822	97.15%	31,300	30,178	96.42%	32,931	31,629	96.05%
Oct-15	19,160	18,576	96.95%	6,956	6,230	89.56%	1,870	1,650	88.24%	9,474	9,208	97.19%	35,590	34,014	95.57%	37,460	35,664	95.21%
Nov-15	20,310	19,701	97.00%	9,497	8,498	89.48%	1,521	1,322	86.92%	11,757	11,381	96.80%	41,564	39,580	95.23%	43,085	40,902	94.93%
Dec-15	19,603	19,045	97.15%	7,331	6,556	89.43%	1,698	1,553	91.46%	14,535	14,225	97.87%	41,469	39,826	96.04%	43,167	41,379	95.86%
Jan-16	21,718	21,191	97.57%	6,876	6,401	93.09%	1,707	1,540	90.22%	15,021	14,755	98.23%	43,615	42,347	97.09%	45,322	43,887	96.83%
Feb-16	14,382	14,026	97.52%	5,932	5,397	90.98%	1,598	1,457	91.18%	7,739	7,517	97.13%	28,053	26,940	96.03%	29,651	28,397	95.77%
Mar-16	15,017	14,574	97.05%	6,850	6,408	93.55%	1,825	1,661	91.01%	7,974	7,728	96.91%	29,841	28,710	96.21%	31,666	30,371	95.91%
Apr-16	13,110	12,753	97.28%	6,624	5,920	89.37%	1,591	1,460	91.77%	8,222	7,938	96.55%	27,956	26,611	95.19%	29,547	28,071	95.00%
May-16	12,486	12,140	97.23%	7,468	6,755	90.45%	1,682	1,536	91.32%	8,342	8,028	96.24%	28,296	26,923	95.15%	29,978	28,459	94.93%
Jun-16	13,097	12,731	97.21%	6,970	5,937	85.18%	1,651	1,483	89.82%	7,942	7,649	96.31%	28,009	26,317	93.96%	29,660	27,800	93.73%
Jul-16	13,298	12,879	96.85%	6,497	5,609	86.33%	1,633	1,459	89.34%	7,470	7,182	96.14%	27,265	25,670	94.15%	28,898	27,129	93.88%
Aug-16	15,169	14,766	97.34%	7,208	5,677	78.76%	1,698	1,537	90.52%	8,230	7,912	96.14%	30,607	28,355	92.64%	32,305	29,892	92.53%
Sep-16	14,031	13,638	97.20%	6,811	5,644	82.87%	1,602	1,453	90.70%	8,339	8,018	96.15%	29,181	27,300	93.55%	30,783	28,753	93.41%
Oct-16	14,705	14,271	97.05%	7,073	5,606	79.26%	1,582	1,400	88.50%	8,381	8,032	95.84%	30,159	27,909	92.54%	31,741	29,309	92.34%
Nov-16	18,335	17,937	97.83%	8,740	7,004	80.14%	1,587	1,427	89.92%	12,167	11,893	97.75%	39,242	36,834	93.86%	40,829	38,261	93.71%
Dec-16	19,463	18,966	97.45%	8,118	6,469	79.69%	1,453	1,293	88.99%	14,812	14,521	98.04%	42,393	39,956	94.25%	43,846	41,249	94.08%
Jan-17	18,876	18,400	97.48%	7,065	5,473	77.47%	1,779	1,568	88.14%	15,189	14,914	98.19%	41,130	38,787	94.30%	42,909	40,355	94.05%
Feb-17	12,505	12,195	97.52%	6,127	5,074	82.81%	1,336	1,172	87.72%	7,715	7,496	97.16%	26,347	24,765	94.00%	27,683	25,937	93.69%
Mar-17	13,434	12,919	96.17%	6,759	5,320	78.71%	1,566	1,323	84.48%	8,452	8,165	96.60%	28,645	26,404	92.18%	30,211	27,727	91.78%
Apr-17	11,911	11,058	92.84%	5,634	4,428	78.59%	1,244	1,054	84.73%	7,629	7,266	95.24%	25,174	22,752	90.38%	26,418	23,806	90.11%
May-17	12,639	11,985	94.83%	5,955	4,546	76.34%	1,308	1,097	83.87%	7,489	7,122	95.10%	26,083	23,653	90.68%	27,391	24,750	90.36%
Jun-17	11,147	10,409	93.38%	5,460	4,090	74.91%	1,219	1,003	82.28%	7,270	6,886	94.72%	23,877	21,385	89.56%	25,096	22,388	89.21%
Jul-17	9,268	8,489	91.59%	5,121	4,179	81.61%	1,070	866	80.93%	6,539	6,156	94.14%	20,928	18,824	89.95%	21,998	19,690	89.51%
Aug-17	10,112	9,874	97.65%	4,958	4,231	85.34%	1,045	820	78.47%	6,201	6,066	97.82%	21,271	20,171	94.83%	22,316	20,991	94.06%
Sep-17	8,289	8,139	98.19%	4,735	4,248	89.71%	838	772	92.12%	5,291	5,215	98.56%	18,315	17,602	96.11%	19,153	18,374	95.93%
Oct-17	12,248	12,122	98.97%	5,744	5,227	91.00%	950	854	89.89%	7,446	7,395	99.32%	25,438	24,744	97.27%	26,388	25,598	97.01%
Nov-17	19,424	19,254	99.12%	6,279	5,653	90.03%	944	831	88.03%	15,441	15,346	99.38%	41,144	40,253	97.83%	42,088	41,084	97.61%
Dec-17	18,205	17,838	97.98%	4,352	3,709	85.23%	978	858	87.73%	19,516	19,330	99.05%	42,073	40,877	97.16%	43,051	41,735	96.94%
Jan-18	11,911	11,688	98.13%	4,383	3,721	84.90%	1,001	851	85.01%	8,314	8,212	98.77%	24,608	23,621	95.99%	25,609	24,472	95.56%
Feb-18	9,575	9,382	97.98%	4,121	3,583	86.94%	881	840	95.35%	6,882	6,824	99.16%	20,578	19,789	96.17%	21,459	20,629	96.13%

Re-runs

NOTES:

- (1) HUSKY C numbers include State Supplement applications
- (2) Beginning in January 2014, the number of timely Long Term Care (LTC) applications includes applications adjudicated within the SOP and those delayed beyond the SOP for excused reasons.
- (3) Beginning in January 2014, HUSKY A and D numbers include Medicaid denials processed through the DSS/Access Health CT shared system. For February 2018 there are 3625 HUSKY A and 2605 HUSKY D denials.
- (4) In December 2014, application data for all programs was updated for the months of January 2014 to July 2014. Previous versions of this report have different data for these months.

Medicaid Application Timeliness Summary

	STATE SUPPLEMENT			HUSKY A&C (w/o LTC)			HUSKY A (w/o LTC)			HUSKY C (w/o LTC)			LONG TERM CARE			HUSKY D			TOTAL with SSUP*			TOTAL W/O SSUP*		
	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely	Apps	# Timely	% Timely
Jul-11	896	764	85.27%	14,254	12,625	88.57%							1,164	448	38.49%	7,655	6,135	80.14%	22,805	19,524	85.61%	21,909	18,760	85.63%
Aug-11	931	786	84.43%	14,539	11,857	78.80%							1,357	536	39.50%	8,474	6,436	75.95%	23,944	18,679	78.01%	23,013	17,893	77.75%
Sep-11	875	737	84.23%	13,969	10,894	77.99%							1,323	523	39.46%	8,205	5,978	72.86%	23,049	17,609	76.40%	22,174	16,872	76.09%
Oct-11	898	740	82.41%	14,357	10,787	75.13%							1,282	503	39.24%	9,022	6,617	73.34%	24,277	18,144	74.74%	23,379	17,404	74.44%
Nov-11	840	687	81.79%	14,060	10,112	71.92%							1,190	471	39.58%	8,330	5,889	70.70%	23,230	16,688	71.84%	22,390	16,001	71.46%
Dec-11	887	726	81.85%	13,886	10,066	72.49%							1,249	488	39.07%	8,059	5,703	70.77%	22,832	16,495	72.25%	21,945	15,769	71.86%
Jan-12	812	620	76.35%	13,758	10,197	74.12%							1,256	477	37.98%	9,324	6,410	68.75%	23,894	17,227	72.10%	23,082	16,607	71.95%
Feb-12	813	604	74.29%	12,878	9,542	74.10%							1,299	507	39.03%	8,340	5,520	66.19%	22,031	15,666	71.11%	21,218	15,062	70.99%
Mar-12	891	681	76.43%	13,257	9,918	74.81%							1,392	535	38.43%	9,133	6,084	66.62%	23,281	16,683	71.66%	22,390	16,002	71.47%
Apr-12	755	598	77.88%	13,074	10,154	77.37%							1,290	509	39.46%	8,425	5,798	68.83%	22,254	16,488	74.09%	21,499	15,900	73.96%
May-12	887	675	76.10%	13,090	9,997	76.37%							1,176	462	39.29%	8,815	6,041	68.53%	22,792	16,713	73.33%	21,905	16,038	73.22%
Jun-12	875	684	78.17%	13,899	10,776	77.53%							1,312	512	39.02%	8,712	6,129	70.35%	23,486	17,589	74.89%	22,611	16,905	74.76%
Jul-12	877	685	78.11%	14,668	11,409	77.78%							1,336	542	40.57%	9,098	6,555	72.05%	24,643	18,649	75.68%	23,766	17,964	75.59%
Aug-12	940	743	79.04%	15,996	12,671	79.21%							1,290	503	38.99%	9,852	6,918	70.22%	26,788	20,332	75.90%	25,848	19,589	75.79%
Sep-12	825	691	83.76%	14,167	11,581	81.75%							1,129	454	40.21%	8,637	6,270	72.59%	23,629	18,542	78.47%	22,804	17,851	78.28%
Oct-12	837	745	89.01%	14,581	12,117	83.10%							1,258	535	42.53%	8,623	6,963	80.75%	24,041	19,825	82.46%	23,204	19,080	82.23%
Nov-12	851	704	82.73%	14,284	11,868	83.09%							1,220	518	42.46%	8,511	7,376	86.66%	23,746	20,028	84.34%	22,895	19,244	84.05%
Dec-12	865	752	86.94%	12,600	10,659	84.60%							1,250	508	40.64%	8,144	6,770	83.13%	21,609	18,181	84.14%	20,744	17,429	84.02%
Jan-13	1,039	882	84.89%	14,661	12,924	88.15%							1,442	634	43.97%	9,861	7,723	78.32%	25,561	21,529	84.23%	24,522	20,647	84.20%
Feb-13	887	774	87.26%	12,248	11,009	89.88%							1,256	601	47.85%	8,078	6,478	80.19%	21,213	18,261	86.08%	20,326	17,487	86.03%
Mar-13	1,049	924	88.08%	13,699	12,249	89.42%							1,383	669	48.37%	9,051	7,142	78.91%	23,799	20,315	85.36%	22,750	19,391	85.24%
Apr-13	1,111	1,003	90.28%	14,847	13,452	90.60%							1,339	629	46.98%	9,947	7,989	80.32%	25,905	22,444	86.64%	24,794	21,441	86.48%
May-13	1,011	915	90.50%	14,134	12,861	90.99%							1,414	605	42.79%	9,206	7,464	81.08%	24,351	21,240	87.22%	23,340	20,325	87.08%
Jun-13	1,020	918	90.00%	13,866	12,591	90.95%							1,386	606	43.79%	9,589	7,592	79.17%	23,598	20,598	87.30%	22,496	19,600	87.15%
Jul-13	813	654	80.44%	13,379	10,872	81.26%							1,145	487	42.53%	7,614	5,550	72.89%	21,806	17,076	78.31%	20,993	16,422	78.23%
Aug-13	826	698	84.50%	13,439	11,159	83.03%	8,862	7,449	84.06%	4,577	3,710	81.06%	1,225	485	39.59%	7,651	5,991	78.30%	21,916	17,848	81.44%	21,090	17,150	81.32%
Sep-13	684	577	84.36%	12,398	10,377	83.70%	7,947	6,753	84.98%	4,451	3,624	81.42%	1,228	636	51.79%	8,050	6,441	80.11%	21,132	17,395	82.32%	20,448	16,818	82.25%
Oct-13	912	764	83.77%	15,596	13,357	85.64%	9,975	8,960	89.82%	5,621	4,397	78.22%	1,645	805	48.94%	8,659	7,087	81.85%	25,167	21,208	84.27%	24,255	20,444	84.30%
Nov-13	646	518	80.19%	12,956	10,519	81.19%	7,880	6,931	87.96%	5,076	3,588	70.69%	1,210	529	43.72%	7,037	5,846	83.08%	20,639	16,883	81.80%	19,993	16,365	81.85%
Dec-13	765	630	82.35%	18,759	14,552	77.57%	13,189	10,606	80.42%	5,570	3,946	70.84%	1,330	700	52.63%	20,037	15,781	78.76%	38,796	30,363	78.27%	38,796	30,363	78.27%
Jan-14	830	628	75.66%	14,245	11,868	83.33%	10,929	10,466	95.78%	5,546	3,736	67.38%	1,220	518	42.46%	8,511	7,376	86.66%	23,746	20,028	84.34%	22,895	19,244	84.05%
Feb-14	805	620	77.02%	19,406	16,910	87.14%	14,444	12,997	89.98%	4,962	3,913	78.66%	1,554	1,259	81.02%	15,405	13,961	90.63%	35,616	31,491	88.42%	34,811	30,871	88.68%
Mar-14	853	627	73.49%	32,003	26,268	82.08%	26,113	21,802	83.49%	5,890	4,466	75.82%	1,850	1,536	83.03%	35,271	31,936	90.54%	68,127	60,544	88.87%	67,274	58,204	86.52%
Apr-14	868	670	77.19%	18,481	14,681	79.44%	12,784	10,082	78.86%	5,697	4,599	80.73%	1,665	1,389	83.42%	11,283	9,989	88.51%	30,632	24,340	79.46%	29,764	23,670	79.53%
May-14	901	689	76.47%	13,244	10,971	82.84%	7,876	6,964	88.42%	5,368	4,007	74.65%	1,546	1,313	84.93%	6,486	5,634	86.86%	20,631	17,294	83.83%	19,730	16,605	84.16%
Jun-14	893	676	75.81%	13,282	11,103	83.59%	7,972	7,252	90.74%	5,290	3,851	72.80%	1,574	1,394	88.56%	6,361	5,637	88.62%	20,496	17,416	84.77%	19,643	16,740	84.77%
Jul-14	853	721	84.52%	13,418	11,546	86.05%	8,402	7,658	91.14%	5,016	3,888	77.51%	1,602	1,434	89.51%	6,572	5,969	90.82%	20,883	18,236	87.32%	19,990	17,515	87.62%
Aug-14	697	486	69.73%	12,822	10,713	83.55%	9,013	8,472	94.00%	4,715	4,029	85.38%	1,715	1,568	91.43%	10,656	9,617	90.31%	20,611	18,104	87.81%	19,364	17,127	88.47%
Sep-14	741	635	85.70%	14,136	12,991	91.90%	8,876	8,375	94.36%	5,260	4,616	87.76%	1,749	1,583	90.51%	6,196	5,777	93.24%	21,073	19,403	92.08%	20,332	18,768	92.31%
Oct-14	711	603	84.81%	14,322	13,208	92.22%	8,660	8,122	93.79%	5,662	5,086	89.83%	1,765	1,630	92.35%	6,274	5,836	93.02%	21,307	19,647	92.21%	20,596	19,044	92.46%
Nov-14	653	569	87.14%	18,634	17,086	91.69%	12,781	12,384	96.89%	5,853	4,702	80.33%	1,591	1,445	90.82%	10,687	10,371	97.04%	29,974	28,026	93.50%	29,321	27,457	93.64%
Dec-14	648	549	84.72%	25,129	23,312	92.78%	19,476	17,581	90.27%	5,653	4,731	83.69%	1,656	1,512	91.30%	19,816	17,429	87.95%	45,593	40,290	88.37%	44,945	39,741	88.42%
Jan-15	628	582	92.68%	20,170	18,037	89.43%	15,251	14,075	92.35%	4,919	4,262	86.64%	1,622	1,457	90.43%	14,753	8,193	55.53%	35,551	23,812	66.98%	34,923	23,230	66.52%
Feb-15	596	551	92.45%	18,867	14,127	74.88%	13,634	9,335	68.47%	5,233	3,792	72.57%	1,564	1,433	91.62%	15,046	8,005	53.20%	34,509	22,683	65.73%	33,913	22,132	65.26%
Mar-15	821	752	91.60%	14,823	11,348	76.56%	8,426	5,532	65.65%	6,397	5,816	90.92%	1,907	1,756	92.08%	4,819	2,641	54.80%	20,463	14,741	72.04%	19,542	13,989	71.62%
Apr-15	846	695	82.03%	17,510	15,154	86.54%	11,714	10,340	88.26%	5,996	5,014	83.60%	1,740	1,599	92.00%	8,336	7,327	87.90%	26,392	23,176	87.81%	25,646	22,481	87.66%
May-15	673	595	88.41%	14,393	12,916	89.74%	9,335	8,214	87.99%	5,058	4,702	92.96%	1,655	1,548	93.53%	5,910	5,291	89.53%	20,976	18,802	89.64%	20,303	18,207	89.68%
Jun-15	686	641	93.44%	16,606	14,899	89.72%	10,854	9,625	88.68%	5,752	5,274	91.69%	1,876	1,754	93.50%	6,975	6,351	91.05%	24,267	21,891	90.21%	23,581	21,250	90.11%
Jul-15	763	697	91.35%	17,834	16,073	90.13%	11,906	10,794	90.66%	5,928	5,279	89.05%	1,890	1,746	92.38%	7,018	6,550	93.33%	25,615	23,320	91.04%	24,852	22,623	91.03%
Aug-15	692	646	93.35%	19,164	17,998	93.92%	13,935	13,206	94.77%	5,229	4,792	91.64%	1,664	1,515	90.50%	7,367	7,009	95.14%	27,223	25,653	94.23%			

	Hartford					Bridgeport				
	App#	Timely		Pending	% Timely	App#	Timely		Pending	% Timely
		Adjudicated	Excused				Adjudicated	Excused		
Jan-14	477	218	122	6	80.29%	340	190	36	1	84.41%
Feb-14	442	230	106	3	76.70%	291	144	90	0	80.41%
Mar-14	446	250	108	6	81.61%	370	212	94	0	82.70%
Apr-14	430	233	102	7	77.21%	367	234	89	1	88.28%
May-14	418	209	117	15	81.58%	304	193	62	4	85.20%
Jun-14	414	222	123	15	86.96%	291	185	66	4	87.63%
Jul-14	382	208	110	15	87.17%	348	211	66	1	89.94%
Aug-14	387	244	68	23	86.56%	305	196	64	24	93.11%
Sep-14	409	281	71	14	89.49%	380	241	82	16	89.21%
Oct-14	462	298	75	49	91.56%	377	260	78	31	93.10%
Nov-14	440	297	74	30	91.14%	305	219	44	18	92.13%
Dec-14	437	301	83	20	92.45%	340	226	66	19	91.47%
Jan-15	587	363	124	40	89.78%	485	285	201	17	89.82%
Feb-15	638	440	120	49	95.45%	214	141	38	23	94.39%
Mar-15	784	535	159	43	94.01%	224	138	49	24	94.20%
Apr-15	759	495	168	52	95.13%	214	143	29	27	92.98%
May-15	694	467	141	66	97.12%	205	131	42	20	94.15%
Jun-15	776	532	156	34	93.04%	261	181	39	20	91.55%
Jul-15	794	552	135	35	89.80%	237	165	35	28	93.52%
Aug-15	799	566	108	47	90.24%	199	135	30	21	93.47%
Sep-15	733	482	107	28	84.17%	200	127	37	21	92.50%
Oct-15	792	495	124	36	82.70%	223	146	35	21	91.93%
Nov-15	673	433	87	25	80.98%	206	129	40	21	92.23%
Dec-15	634	441	95	18	87.38%	242	159	40	25	92.56%
Jan-16	616	427	87	22	87.01%	253	178	46	10	92.89%
Feb-16	664	462	106	16	87.95%	195	125	39	18	93.33%
Mar-16	708	504	100	20	88.40%	222	149	39	15	91.44%
Apr-16	670	482	84	40	88.96%	194	125	39	17	93.30%
May-16	648	442	93	34	87.81%	228	166	40	12	95.61%
Jun-16	701	461	124	23	86.73%	208	118	54	19	90.88%
Jul-16	692	461	92	34	84.83%	218	147	35	21	92.66%
Aug-16	738	487	129	26	88.99%	189	126	29	19	92.06%
Sep-16	688	471	106	27	87.79%	227	142	41	26	92.07%
Oct-16	675	448	100	31	86.52%	201	134	38	17	94.03%
Nov-16	667	446	106	38	88.46%	200	128	30	22	90.00%
Dec-16	588	388	97	31	87.76%	182	91	49	24	92.80%
Jan-17	704	477	107	35	87.93%	253	154	58	23	92.89%
Feb-17	578	382	105	22	88.06%	166	102	27	24	92.17%
Mar-17	713	462	114	40	86.49%	187	96	35	31	86.63%
Apr-17	539	342	75	30	82.39%	144	74	30	23	88.19%
May-17	578	344	97	26	80.80%	180	98	37	28	90.56%
Jun-17	580	344	78	39	79.48%	159	78	24	28	88.05%
Jul-17	482	271	68	41	78.84%	114	55	28	34	87.31%
Aug-17	490	277	70	26	76.12%	107	41	28	25	87.85%
Sep-17	427	250	95	48	92.04%	79	24	22	27	92.41%
Oct-17	474	290	90	39	88.40%	90	34	24	26	93.33%
Nov-17	506	288	101	42	85.18%	79	33	19	24	96.20%
Dec-17	481	274	99	46	87.11%	100	36	32	28	96.00%
Jan-18	510	271	117	44	84.71%	114	30	43	22	83.33%
Feb-18	465	285	123	43	86.99%	91	30	29	28	95.60%
New Haven										
Waterbury										
	New Haven					Waterbury				
	App#	Timely		Pending	% Timely	App#	Timely		Pending	% Timely
		Adjudicated	Excused				Adjudicated	Excused		
Jan-14	514	274	123	0	78.40%	311	170	91	0	83.39%
Feb-14	464	238	137	0	80.82%	327	192	91	0	86.54%
Mar-14	622	376	133	0	81.83%	386	244	89	1	86.53%
Apr-14	523	337	98	3	83.75%	325	186	83	7	84.92%
May-14	490	320	89	0	83.47%	320	188	94	11	91.56%
Jun-14	538	353	114	4	87.55%	319	198	83	16	93.10%
Jul-14	547	375	102	1	89.40%	312	180	69	19	91.99%
Aug-14	578	409	110	19	93.08%	318	196	65	25	89.94%
Sep-14	571	417	93	12	91.42%	363	246	73	14	91.74%
Oct-14	563	397	119	14	94.14%	351	238	60	20	90.03%
Nov-14	501	352	80	16	89.42%	327	215	60	24	91.44%
Dec-14	537	385	86	17	90.88%	337	213	68	23	90.21%
Jan-15	458	318	95	13	89.52%	277	181	64	14	90.61%
Feb-15	437	280	89	21	89.24%	267	152	60	13	84.27%
Mar-15	518	357	93	15	89.77%	372	242	67	25	89.78%
Apr-15	453	310	110	13	89.40%	303	178	61	17	86.80%
May-15	406	266	84	13	89.41%	338	221	57	30	91.12%
Jun-15	488	350	87	25	94.67%	344	233	57	34	94.19%
Jul-15	499	356	84	24	94.99%	344	213	49	23	93.00%
Aug-15	355	246	62	14	90.70%	298	179	75	22	92.62%
Sep-15	409	267	97	17	93.15%	279	189	43	27	92.83%
Oct-15	481	327	94	24	91.89%	361	249	39	24	92.51%
Nov-15	396	245	92	24	91.16%	231	168	29	16	92.21%
Dec-15	463	329	93	22	95.90%	339	227	68	19	92.63%
Jan-16	478	333	109	15	91.42%	338	219	72	21	92.31%
Feb-16	417	275	86	30	93.76%	307	207	61	20	93.81%
Mar-16	567	398	104	22	92.42%	313	228	47	22	94.89%
Apr-16	409	283	84	20	94.62%	301	210	56	16	93.69%
May-16	466	318	99	22	94.21%	318	218	57	17	91.82%
Jun-16	417	277	86	21	92.09%	306	206	58	22	93.48%
Jul-16	590	358	74	32	93.38%	311	200	63	22	91.64%
Aug-16	431	273	92	38	93.50%	310	197	72	23	94.19%
Sep-16	385	252	69	35	92.47%	286	179	74	22	93.71%
Oct-16	510	360	68	31	87.56%	279	184	64	24	91.76%
Nov-16	381	255	59	30	90.29%	304	212	47	24	93.09%
Dec-16	370	238	71	39	88.66%	275	180	46	29	92.73%
Jan-17	444	284	72	29	86.71%	326	215	51	24	88.96%
Feb-17	330	200	61	23	86.06%	225	149	45	19	94.67%
Mar-17	386	238	76	46	88.08%	237	152	37	30	92.41%
Apr-17	335	188	64	31	84.48%	203	112	42	22	86.70%
May-17	311	150	72	45	85.85%	214	103	52	31	86.92%
Jun-17	298	134	65	53	83.89%	154	66	38	29	86.36%
Jul-17	269	131	55	35	82.16%	150	65	26	36	84.67%
Aug-17	272	108	66	33	76.10%	152	67	37	23	83.55%
Sep-17	180	87	47	30	91.11%	111	64	29	28	92.37%
Oct-17	234	113	57	39	89.32%	122	45	38	31	93.44%
Nov-17	201	79	64	31	86.57%	128	43	37	42	95.31%
Dec-17	246	84	70	48	82.11%	128	43	47	40	93.75%
Jan-18	207	82	55	30	80.68%	140	61	43	29	95.00%
Feb-18	191	76	63	36	90.58%	109	47	33	25	96.33%
Central Office										
Statewide										
	Central Office					Statewide				
	App#	Timely		Pending	% Timely	App#	Timely		Pending	% Timely
		Adjudicated	Excused				Adjudicated	Excused		
Jan-14	27	22	4	0	93.33%	1671	874	478	7	81.33%
Feb-14	30	24	4	0	93.33%	1554	828	428	3	81.02%
Mar-14	26	21	2	0	88.46%	1850	1,003	426	7	83.03%
Apr-14	20	15	4	0	95.00%	1665	995	376	18	82.42%
May-14	14	10	1	0	78.57%	1546	920	363	30	84.93%
Jun-14	12	7	4	0	91.67%	1574	965	390	39	88.56%
Jul-14	13	9	0	0	92.31%	1601	1053	368	63	89.57%
Aug-14	14	8	3	1	85.71%	1602	1053	310	92	90.82%
Sep-14	26	20	2	1	88.46%	1749	1205	321	57	90.51%
Oct-14	12	10	0	0	83.33%	1765	1204	330	96	92.35%
Nov-14	18	12	3	1	88.89%	1591	1095	261	89	90.82%
Dec-14	5	5	0	0	100.00%	1656	1130	303	79	91.30%
Jan-15	15	10	2	1	86.67%	1622	1074	288	95	89.83%
Feb-15	8	7	0	0	87.50%	1564	1020	307	106	91.62%
Mar-15	9	7	0	2	100.00%	1907	1279	368	109	92.08%
Apr-15	11	9	1	0	90.91%	1740	1135	354	110	91.90%
May-15	12	7	2	1	83.33%	1655	1092	326	130	93.53%
Jun-15	7	5	1	0	85.71%	1876	1301	340	113	93.50%
Jul-15	16	6	5	4	93.75%	1890	1332	313	101	92.38%
Aug-15	13	2	6	2	76.92%	1664	1128	281	106	91.05%
Sep-15	10	6	0	3	90.00%	1631	1071	284	96	88.96%
Oct-15	13	7	3	1	84.62%	1870	1224	312	114	88.24%
Nov-15	15	11	2	0	86.67%	1521	986	250	86	86.92%
Dec-15	20	14	1	2	85.00%	1698	1170	297	86	91.46%
Jan-16										