

Center
Washington
Alabama
Alabama
Alabama
Alabama
Alabama

utilizes the same techniques described in my original report, but which also excludes any appeal records that have a value in any of these four columns.

I attach to this letter an updated chart showing these numbers, which is labeled Exhibit C. The columns in this chart have the same name as those appearing in Exhibit B by original H[SHUW UHSRUW H[FHSW WKDW WKH FROXPQ KHDGLQJV VVW the calculation as described in the original expert report and first supplement, and the columns ZLWK KHDGLQJV ODEH ORIG DURG H[IFOG & DOUF XDO WHLV LQ WKH described in the previous paragraph, also sending contemporaneously with this the electronic excel spreadsheet I used to make these calculations. This is LFK LTCWLD0000530G 3 Daily ELG AIR-CIR 03.152017- edited by MWarner.xlsx

The attached excel file is functionally identical to the file previously produced and described in my first supplemental report, with differences. First, it contains updated data (i.e., updated rows in the excel file) provided by Defense Counsel. Second, I created new columns, appearing at columns AC, AE, AG, and AI. These columns are identical to the columns that precede them, except that the formula excludes any row that has a value in the four aforementioned FROXPQ V)RU H[DP SOH Conditional Approval Columns H G 3 Merits Denial Columns and AP Denial Fail to Provide LV WKH VDPH DV LQ P\ RULJ & R O X P Q \$ & Conditional Approval Columns Merits Denial Columns and AP Denial Fail to Provide-- AND EXCLUDE rows with value in columns AIR Already Eligible (Z), AIR Appeal Created in Error (AA), AP Resolution Application (BP) and Interchange Resolution % 4 ` LV WKH VDPH DV & R O X P Q \$ % H [F H S W U H S R U W O n l y Q W K H if the four columns referenced above are all empty.

As before, to calculate the values appearing in Exhibit C, one must filter the data by month using the Issue Received Date column (column W).

Based on the foregoing, I update my opinion as follows:

- A. Opinion on the Number of Delay Appeals that Involved Underlying Delayed Applications that Were Approved, Denied on the Merits After Being Fully Processed, or Denied for Failure to Respond to a Verification Request from May 2015 to February 2017.

From May 1, 2015 to February 28, 2017, the State received a total of at least 15,717 delay appeals that involved a delayed application.

the appellant was found to not be eligible on substantive grounds, or denied because the applicant did not timely respond to verification request. During this period, the State received a monthly average of 14 of these delay appeals related to underlying delayed applications, and in the last three months for which complete data was available December 2016 and January

EXHIBIT C

Delay Appeals
that Involved Delayed Applications
that Were Approved, Denied on the Merits,
or Denied for Failure to Verify Eligibility

EXHIBIT


DelayAppealsthat InvolvedDelayedApplicationsthat WereApproved,Deniedon the Merits, or Deniedfor Failureto

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the Second Supplement to Expert Report by Mr. Warner was sent via email to the following counsel of record this April 20, 2017:

Michael W. Kirk
Nicole J. Moss
Brian W. Barnes
COOPER & KIRK, PLLC
e: mkirk@cooperkirk.com
e: nmoss@cooperkirk.com
e: bbarnes@cooperkirk.com

Linda A. Ross
Carolyn E. Reed
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
e: linda.ross@ag.tn.gov
e: carolynreed@ag.tn.gov



Rachel Grossman