

**CCWRO Weekly New Welfare News Bulletin**  
**#2003-10- March 23, 2003**

**IN THIS ISSUE**

•• **IN BRIEF**

•• **DSS NEWS**

•• **TANF UPDATE by Evelyn Dortch - Direct Action Welfare Group (DAWG)**

•• **COUNTY WELFARE DEPARTMENT VICTIM REPORT**

•• **CCWRO Analysis of the CalWORKs 2003-2004 Proposed State Budget-  
See attached Adobe Acrobat Document**

---

**IN BRIEF- Food Stamp Policy Issues**

DSS recently released the following Question and Answer: QUESTION: "Can the CWD allow an homeless household the standard telephone allowance? ANSWER: If a household is entitled to the Standard Utility Allowance (SUA), the standard telephone allowance would not be allowed because the telephone is considered a component of the SUA. However, if the household had a telephone but was not entitled to the SUA, the household would be allowed the standard telephone allowance in accordance with Section 63-502.363(b). In an instance where a homeless household elects to use the homeless shelter deduction, as specified Section 63-502.371(d)(8)-utility allowance decision chart, the household is not entitled to the SUA. Therefore, since the homeless households are not entitled to the SUA when it elects to the homeless shelter deduction, the household would be allowed the standard telephone allowance." This is also identified as the October 2002 Consultation Question that was CDSS initiated.

---

**DSS NEWS**

**Emergency Regulations Regarding Senior Parent Deeming -**

The 2002-2003 state budget trailer bill imposed an anti-family provision. Under this provision, known as the "senior parent deeming", senior parents income will be deemed to be available to the minor parent, if the minor parent is unfortunate enough to live with his or her parents. Off course the child should be supported by the absent parent, but given the inept child support system, the government, rather than doing their job and going after the absent parent, deems the senior parents income available to the minor parent, thus making them ineligible for CalWORKs. It is just another compassionate policy that got through the California State Legislature last year. And now, rather than going through the regular process to promulgate regulations, DSS is

proposing emergency regulations, because the law passed last year authorized the department to subvert the California Administrative Procedures Act in implementing this provision.

**“EMERGENCY REGULATION ACTION SUBMITTED TO OAL ON: 3/20/03**

**OAL FILE NO. 03-0320-01E**

**AGENCY: DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

**TOPIC: CalWORKs Senior Parent /Minor Parent Cases- Income Availability Change**

**SECTIONS AFFECTED: Manual of Policies & Procedures MPP, SECTIONS: 44-315 & 89-201**

Unless OAL approves or disapproves the Regulations sooner, the last day for public comment is : 03/25/03

**OAL DECISION DUE: 03/31/03**

**AGENCY CONTACT: Anthony J. Velasquez @ (916) 654-3286”**

Source: [http://www.oal.ca.gov/emergency\\_now.htm](http://www.oal.ca.gov/emergency_now.htm)

---

### **TANF UPDATE by Evelyn Dortch Direct Action Welfare Group (DAWG)**

From the Center for Community Change:

**WELFARE REAUTHORIZATION HEARING HELD; OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT TESTIMONY**

**BACKGROUND:** The Senate Finance Committee held a hearing on TANF reauthorization on Wednesday, March 12th. Although the witnesses were clearly there to promote the President's proposal, the Committee made clear that there is no support -- from either side of the aisle -- for the proposal.

The Bush plan would require states to put more welfare recipients to work, and it require that each person work more hours. It would tighten the definition of what counts as work; for instance, it would be harder to enroll in vocational education, and job search would not count at all. The president's proposal would also provide hundreds of millions of dollars to promote marriage and sexual abstinence. It did not offer any new child care money, though the administration now supports a modest increase in spending provided by the House.

Because the Senate failed to renew the program last year, and the 1996 law has been extended several times to keep the program operating, and is currently extended through June 30, 2003.

Even though Democrats no longer control the Senate, the makeup of the Finance Committee has not changed much since last year, and moderates in both parties are again voicing concerns.

Senator Olympia Snowe, (R-ME), argued at the hearing that her state's program allowing welfare recipients to go to college has produced results that are "beyond astonishing" and said that everyone on welfare should be given the same opportunity. Education, she said, is the only way to break the multigeneration cycle of poverty. Snowe said it would be "impossible" for states to put 70 percent of their welfare recipients into "work" for 40 hours per week, as the Bush plan directs, without "tremendous cost."

Senator John Breaux (D-LA) expressed opposition to the increase hours, saying that there is no reason to increase the work requirements now in law, arguing that the overall welfare program is not broken and does not need fixing. Current law requires each person to work 30 hours.

The committee chairman, Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA) expressed reservations about significant new requirements on the states, which have quietly complained about the stricter requirements.

**ACTION NEEDED:** The Senate Finance committee is accepting public comment on TANF reauthorization. Individuals and groups are encouraged to submit written statements on TANF reauthorization. Statements must be received by March 26th (two weeks after the hearing).

**Written Statements for the Record:** Any individuals or organizations wanting to present their views on these hearings to the Committee are urged to submit a single-spaced statement, not exceeding 10 pages in length, for inclusion in the hearing record.

The date and subject of the hearing must appear on the first page of the statement. Statements must be received no later than two weeks following the conclusion of the hearing.

Written statement must be submitted in a format that can be read by personal computers (Word Perfect text is preferred. PDF Files are not acceptable.) Submit statements for the record to [Editorial@finance-rep.senate.gov](mailto:Editorial@finance-rep.senate.gov).

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:** Rachel Gragg, CCC, 202-339-9332 or [rgragg@communitychange.org](mailto:rgragg@communitychange.org).

---

## **WELFARE STATISTIC OF THE WEEK**

This week we look at sanctions again. Sanctions means that the family loses 25% to 35% of their fixed income. That is traumatic for families. Most of these sanctions are unlawfully imposed upon the victims of the county welfare department, but they get away with their unlawful behavior, because our system of checks and balances are out of whack.

We again look at the data published by the State Department of Social Services based on the WtW 25 and 25A reports theta DSS receives from counties. They can be located on the DSS web page.

Statewide 36% of the welfare to work participants were sanctioned in December of 2002. This was a Christmas Present for the children of these families from the compassionate county welfare department of California.

Given the fact that we are located in Sacramento, we would like to proudly announce that Sacramento County only sanctioned 4.72% of its participants. Santa Cruz, who used to have zero sanctions, are at 15%. San Francisco, a city that works very hard not to sanction, was 13%.

And now the Top 26 Counties who sanctioned over the state average:

1	<b>Merced</b>	<b>98.83%</b>
2	<b>Plumas</b>	<b>96.15%</b>
3	<b>Fresno</b>	<b>94.36%</b>
4	<b>Calaveras</b>	<b>89.42%</b>
5	<b>Trinity</b>	<b>70.00%</b>
6	<b>Napa</b>	<b>58.88%</b>
7	<b>Siskiyou</b>	<b>56.99%</b>
8	<b>Amador</b>	<b>52.63%</b>
9	<b>San Joaquin</b>	<b>52.13%</b>
10	<b>Colusa</b>	<b>51.02%</b>
11	<b>Alameda a/</b>	<b>51.00%</b>
12	<b>Tehama</b>	<b>50.81%</b>
13	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>49.89%</b>
14	<b>Imperial</b>	<b>49.49%</b>
15	<b>Contra Costa</b>	<b>48.09%</b>
16	<b>Tulare</b>	<b>48.04%</b>
17	<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	<b>46.46%</b>
18	<b>Monterey</b>	<b>45.71%</b>
19	<b>Mendocino</b>	<b>45.45%</b>
20	<b>Sutter</b>	<b>38.84%</b>
21	<b>Lake</b>	<b>38.70%</b>
22	<b>San Diego b/</b>	<b>38.27%</b>
23	<b>Shasta</b>	<b>38.21%</b>
24	<b>Humboldt</b>	<b>38.14%</b>
25	<b>Sonoma</b>	<b>36.56%</b>
26	<b>Mariposa</b>	<b>36.49%</b>

---

## COUNTY WELFARE DEPARTMENT VICTIM REPORT

-- San Diego County attempted to sanction Ms. 2002120165 for allegedly failing to participate in the California Workfare program. She is taking care of her grandchildren. San Diego County is after grandma - they want to ratchet up another sanction in their trophy display. Ms. 2002120165

is taking care of a disabled grandchild and should be exempt, but the county would have nothing to do with it. Sanction is the primary goal. Ms. 2002120165 filed for a fair hearing. She presented medical evidence of her grandchild's disability and the sanction was reversed. She is now exempt.

-- Ms. 200136039, of Santa Clara County, was sent a notice on December 21 proposing to impose a sanction on January 1. - It was Santa Clara County's way of saying Merry Christmas - an illegal sanction, because the notice was not a 30 day notice as required by law - see Section §42-721.23. She was also a victim of domestic abuse. She was attending therapeutic services, thus she had good cause for not participating. She had Judge Betty Bubcat, who rarely grants a claim. In this case the claim was granted. Not because the county violated Section §42-721.23, but because she had a good reason for not participating.

---

CCWRO SERVICES AVAILABLE TO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS & WELFARE  
RECIPIENTS REFERRED TO US BY LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Types of Services Offered: Litigation, Fair Hearing Representation, Fair Hearing Consultation, Informational Services, and Research Services, In depth Consultation.

Programs Covered: CalWORKs, Welfare to Work (WtW), Food Stamps, Medi-Cal. General Assistance and Refugee Immigration Problems

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc.  
1901 Alhambra Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95816  
Tel. 916-736-0616  
After 6 PM - 916-387-8341  
Message/cell number 916-712-0071  
FAX 916-736-2645  
e-mail address: ccwro@aol.com