

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Jalisa Broussard](#)
Subject: FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Private/Before Publication)
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 9:54:06 AM

From: sunset.website@brightleafgroup.com <sunset.website@brightleafgroup.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2026 9:50 AM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission <sunset@sunset.texas.gov>
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Private/Before Publication)

Submitted on Fri, 07/17/2026 - 08:47

Submitted by: Visitor

Submitted values are:

Choose the agency that you would like to provide input about
[Texas Workforce Commission](#)

Public Comments

1

First Name

Tiffany

Last Name

Cooper

Email

seren.kai25@gmail.com

State

Texas

Your Comments or Concerns

Subject

Systemic Failure of Agency Execution and Constituent Burden-Shifting — TWC, SNAP/HHSC, and WIOA

Statement

I am submitting this record to ask a direct governance question:

Who is responsible for requiring Texas agencies to identify and correct their own failures when internal complaints, appeals, executive escalations, legislative correspondence, and constituent follow-up still do not produce timely execution?

Since October 2025, I have experienced a continuing pattern involving the Texas Workforce Commission, SNAP administered through HHSC, and the workforce system administering WIOA services.

These programs operate separately when I need action, correction, documentation, or accountability. However, they are capable of exchanging and using information when that information supports withholding, reducing, or denying benefits.

The repeated pattern is:

The agency directs me to comply with a requirement.

I comply or attempt to comply.

The agency fails to process, provide, locate, reconcile, or timely act on the required information.

I identify the failure or contradiction.

Responsibility is shifted back to me through another call, complaint, appeal, document request, or escalation.

The matter remains idle until I escalate again.

The agency eventually takes limited action but does not identify how the failure occurred, who was responsible, or what internal correction will prevent recurrence.

This is not one isolated processing error.

Texas Workforce Commission

In October 2025, I was approved for unemployment benefits. The funds were then withheld or extracted before I received them. SNAP subsequently treated those benefits as income even though the money was not available to me and denied assistance based on that income.

For approximately seven months, I repeatedly asked TWC to provide the legal basis

authorizing it to continue withholding approximately \$2,880. That direct question was not answered.

I submitted an unemployment appeal. The agency allowed the appeal to remain unprocessed until the relevant period expired and then relied upon the expiration created during its own delay. When I identified the contradiction, I was instructed to file another appeal.

That second appeal also remained idle for approximately two months until I escalated again. Only after outside intervention was the matter expedited and assigned a projected review period.

Execution should not require repeated escalation by the person whose benefits remain withheld.

SNAP/HHSC

Earlier in 2026, HHSC could not locate a SNAP appeal that had remained idle for approximately four months. The document later appeared in the case record, but it was classified as evidence rather than processed as the appeal I had been instructed to file.

On July 9, 2026, I completed a SNAP interview and was instructed to return an employment-verification form to continue receiving benefits.

The agency did not make the required form available electronically. My online account displayed no pending tasks and no available recommended form.

On July 17, I received a written alert stating that the required information was due by July 20. During a telephone conversation that same day, an agent stated that the form was instead due August 5 and proposed mailing it to me—even though the agency had the ability to provide documents electronically and the written deadline was only three days away.

I was then instructed to search additional areas of the portal and contact an employer for a form that HHSC itself required but had not provided.

Again, the agency's failure became another assignment for the constituent.

I submitted an Ombudsman complaint on July 17, 2026, under tracking number

A07172026.0130024.

WIOA and workforce services

I have experienced the same underlying structure within workforce services: requirements are enforced against the participant, but execution, accountability, and corrective action within the administering system require repeated constituent intervention.

Legislative notice

Beginning in October 2025, I sent written correspondence to Texas legislative offices explaining that these systems operate in parallel until information can be used against a constituent, while corrections and responsibility remain fragmented when agency error causes harm.

I received no substantive response.

These are not minor customer-service complaints. These programs affect food, housing, transportation, employment stability, and the ability to remain financially sustainable after job loss.

I am attempting to use state resources for their intended purpose while pursuing a wrongful-termination matter. I have complied with directives, preserved records, filed appeals, contacted leadership, submitted complaints, and escalated unresolved matters.

I will not continue carrying responsibility for the agencies' internal execution in addition to my own obligations.

Questions requiring a written response

What internal control is responsible for identifying appeals, cases, required documents, or benefit decisions that remain idle beyond established processing periods?

Who is responsible for determining whether an agency-created delay affected a constituent's rights, deadline, eligibility, or access to benefits?

What mechanism requires an agency to correct its own error without forcing the constituent to file another appeal concerning the consequences of that error?

Who reviews repeated failures of execution across TWC, HHSC/SNAP, and WIOA when

internal escalation has already failed?

What accountability applies when an agency receives a direct question concerning its legal authority and leaves that question unanswered for months?

Why are agencies able to coordinate information used to deny or reduce benefits but unable to timely reconcile errors that prevent the constituent from receiving those benefits?

What entity has authority to require a systemic review rather than directing me back into the same internal processes that produced the failures?

Will your office review this record, refer it to an entity with actual oversight authority, or state plainly that no action will be taken?

Requested action

I am requesting:

a review of the documented pattern of delayed execution and burden-shifting;
identification of the office responsible for systemic oversight;
an examination of aging-case, appeal-processing, exception-handling, and document-delivery controls;
confirmation of whether these failures will be referred for audit, investigation, legislative review, or corrective action;
and a written response stating what action will or will not be taken.

Please do not contact me by telephone.

After repeated experiences in which direct statements were interrupted, redirected, or replaced with different questions, I require all communication regarding this submission to remain in writing.

The record is documented through emails, notices, portal screenshots, appeal submissions, complaint confirmations, benefit records, tracking numbers, and agency correspondence. Supporting material can be provided electronically.

I am not requesting another explanation of how to file an appeal or contact the same agencies. I have already used those channels.

I am asking who governs the system when the system repeatedly fails to govern itself.

Respectfully,

Tiffany Dene' Cooper

Your Proposed Solution

Requested action

I am requesting:

a review of the documented pattern of delayed execution and burden-shifting;
identification of the office responsible for systemic oversight;
an examination of aging-case, appeal-processing, exception-handling, and document-delivery controls;
confirmation of whether these failures will be referred for audit, investigation, legislative review, or corrective action;
and a written response stating what action will or will not be taken.

My Comments Will Be Made Public

Yes