DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

CHECKLIST FOR IFG/IHP-ONP PROGRAM REVIEW

O.M.B. No. 1660-0018
Expires September 30, 2009

PAPERWORK BURDEN DISCLOSURE NOTICE

Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 240 minutes per response. The burden estimate includes the time for reviewing instructions, searchingexisting data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing, reviewing, and submitting the form. You are not required to respond to this collection of information unless a valid OMB control number appears in the upper right corner of this form. Send comments regarding the accuracy of the burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing this burden to: Information Collections Management, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Washington, DC 20472, Paperwork Reduction Project (1660-0018). **Please do not send our completed form to the above address.**

STATE	DR NO.	DATE OF REVIEW

I. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

DATE	EVENT
_____	Govenor's expressed intent to implement an IFG program
_____	Presidential Declaration
_____	Disaster Assitance Center (DAC) opened
_____	IFG Administrative Plan submitted for review
_____	Approval of Plan
_____	Initial advance of funds
_____	DAC closed
_____	First IFG Panel meeting
_____	First grant check issued

Agency(s) Administration Program:

Statistics at time of Review:

Estimated Applications	_____
Applications Received	_____
Pending	_____
Approved	_____
Disapproved	_____
Withdrawn	_____
Appeals Received	_____
Processed	_____
Pending	_____
Approved in Full	_____
Approved in Part	_____
Denied	_____

II. GENERAL - MANAGEMENT/STAFFING

Was the staffing level adequate to support the IFG functions? If not, in what area? why not?

Who trained the State portion of th verifiers, panel, and other staff? Was the training adequate?

Was the level of program guidance given to IFG staff adequate? If not, what corrections need to be made?

Did any level of State government fail to support the FG program as required of it in the administrative plan? Which one(s) and why?

Conclusion: Complies with State plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations:

III. APPLICATION PROCESSING

Did any problems result from the "packages" prepared for the State by FEMA (housing, personal property, transportation)? What were they?

Were any problems identified as a result of FEMA's application-taking that impacted the IFG program? What were they?

Was the floodplain map reading function adequate? If not, what happened?

Conclusion: Complies with State plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations:

IV. VERIFICATION FUNCTIONS

Was the timeliness and quality of the real and personal property verification adequate for State processing? If not, why not?

Is the State's verification function (medical, dental, funeral, other) adequately documenting these categories: Is it timely? If not, why not?

Is the information management system providing accurate and detailed enough information to enable avoidance of duplication of benefits? If not, what is the problem?

Are there any "ownership" or "primary residence" problems that need to be addressed? What are the problems and proposed solutions?

Are applicants providing documents to the State in a timely way (receipts, doctor's bills, flood insurance proof of purchase, etc.)? If not, what action has the State taken to eliminate the problem?

How many FEMA reverifications (____) and State reverifications (____) were necessary? Why?

Conclusion: Complies with State plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations:

V. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION FUNCTION

Is the function co-located with the other processing functions? If not, where is it in relation to the other functions?

Are cases being reviewed before being forwarded for eligibility determination?

How are cases being reviewed? ☐ Panel ☐ One Person ☐ Other (Explain: State level/county level)

How often? ☐ Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly (Explain if more that one)

Is there a priority system? If so, what is it?

What is the attitude of the reviewers? Are they aware of the time limitations or is it business as usual?

Do the case files contain all the necessary paperwork needed to make a determination? If not, what type of information is missing?

Are files being returned for verification? Why and approximately what percentage?

How long do reverifications take?

If floodplain management is involved, how is the process handled?

Are determinations clearly documented?

Are there any appeals to date?

Are there any identified by the State in the "other" category? If yes, what are they and are they documented?

V. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION FUNCTION (Cont.)

Is insurance data available such as proof of loss settlement?

Have there been any reconsiderations? Why were they necessary?

Conclusion: Complies with State plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations:

VI. QUALITY CONTROL FUNCTIONS

Is there a quality control system? Briefly explain.

As a result of quality control, have there been any changes to the original determination?

If there are denials what are the most common reason?

Conclusion: Complies with State plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations:

VI. QUALITY CONTROL FUNCTIONS

Which agency has the responsibility for resolution of appeals? Is it separate from the authority of the eligibility determination?

Are the appeals being reviewed by a board or by a single individual? Is this in compliance with the State Administrative Plan?

Is there an established timeframe for processing and resolving each appeal? What is it?

Are the case files available to the appeals officer? Do they contain all the documentation needed or must the officer seek information or clarification from the staff who made the eligibility determination?

Of the cases approved, in part or in full, did any of these involve misinterpretation of the regulations and/or policy? If yes, explain.

Did the appeals officer follow-up on any of these issues? Did this result in changes in the State's policy and therefore affect the eligibility determination of other applicants?

Conclusion: Complies with State plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations: