

**CCWRO Weekly New Welfare News Bulletin
#2003-11- April 7, 2003**

IN THIS ISSUE

IN MEMORIAL - ELISA JAMES 1950-2003- President of CCWRO

•• NEW FEDERAL REGULATION PROPOSED

•• DSS NEWS

•• COUNTY WELFARE DEPARTMENT VICTIM REPORT

NEW Public Assistance Tables Effective 4/1/03 attached in adobe acrobat format.

IN MEMORIAL - ELISA JAMES, President of CCWRO - 1950-2003

On Saturday, April 5, 2003, Elisa James, the President of CCWRO's Board of Directors, passed away unexpectedly. Elisa first joined the welfare rights movement in the 70s, when she and I worked together with the Welfare Recipients League in San Jose, California. She then moved to Modesto and started the Stanislaus County Welfare Rights Organization. There, again she provided tireless, passionate advocacy, representing recipients at fair hearings and advocating on their behalf on many issues. She was also a member of the National Welfare Rights and Reform Organization.

Elisa was a passionate, volatile fighter for the rights of the poor and disabled in Stanislaus County. As years went on, she worked as a rural postal carrier in Modesto and continued to advocate against injustice in the postal system. Being an advocate assures that controversy follows you wherever you go. It is a way of life for advocates of the poor and advocates for justice. Elisa was strong enough to handle anything that came her way.

Elisa will be sorely missed by me, her community and by CCWRO. Elisa is survived by her husband Rusty, son Damascus and three grandchildren, Rimy, Tanesia, Nevin. She really enjoyed being a grandma.

-Kevin Aslanian-

NEW FEDERAL REGULATION PROPOSED

On March 26, 2003, a new proposed rule was published in the federal register (see: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fedreg/a030326c.html) regarding social security numbers.

Under this new policy, persons who apply for a social security number (SSN) will have to provide evidence of identity. Yes, the Bush Administration states “Evidence of identity is required for all SSN applicant, regardless of age. A birth record is not sufficient evidence to establish identity.”

Why the need for this new rule? The notice of proposed rule explains the rationale. The NPR explains, “In a 2000 audit, SSA’s Inspector General indicated that SSA assigned SSNs to individuals whose U.S. birth certificates were counterfeit. Individuals typically posed as the mothers of nonexistent children and presented counterfeit birth certificates as evidence. Requiring an identity document other than a birth certificate will make it harder for fraudulent applicants to obtain SSNs under a fictitious identity because they must obtain additional evidence. This requirement should not unduly burden legitimate applicants because sufficient proof of identity, such as a medical record or school record, will normally exist, even for the very young.”

Now that Bush Administration really knows what’s happening in the real world. How can a newborn baby provide a school record or a doctor record?

The proposed regulation would read:

“(c) Evidence of identity. An applicant for an original social security number or a duplicate or corrected social security number card is required to submit convincing documentary evidence of identity. Documentary evidence of identity may consist of a driver’s license, identity card, school record, medical record, marriage record, passport, Immigration and Naturalization Service document, or other similar document serving to identify the individual. The document must contain sufficient information to identify the applicant, including the applicant’s name and the applicant’s age, date of birth, or parents’ names; and/or a photograph or physical description of the individual. A birth record is not sufficient evidence to establish identity for these purposes.”

We urge you to comment on these proposed regulations no later than May 27, 2003. You can transmit you comments to:

1. SSA’s Internet facility (i.e., Social Security Online) at <http://www.socialsecurity.gov/regulations>; or
2. email to regulations@ssa.gov; telefax to (410) 966–2830; or
3. letter to the Commissioner of Social Security, PO Box 17703, Baltimore, MD 21235–7703.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Arthur La Veck or Karen Cool, Social Insurance Specialists, Office of Income Security Programs, 3–R–1 Operations Building, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21235–6401, ((410) 966–5665, arthur.laveck@ssa.gov or (410) 966–7094, karen.r.cool@ssa.gov). They would love to hear from you and explain how they came up with these crazy ideas.

- There are a lot of welfare recipients who can’t even find a doctor who will take medicaid.

- And even if they are lucky enough to have a doctor, then the doctors will charge for completing an identification document. There is nothing in this NPR that prohibits doctors from charging welfare recipients to complete forms.
- The SSA should have a form that can be completed by the school or any other third party to identify the new born baby.
- Neighbors and landlords should be allowed to complete identification verification forms.

DSS NEWS

-- The Governor's 2003-2004 budget proposed 6.2% reduction in CalWORKs benefits will mean 7,500 working poor will be denied supplemental income.

-- ACIN I - March 28, 2003- This is a question and answer regarding face-to-face interviews. This ACIN makes it clear that the county cannot require the parents to bring their kids to the welfare office at application or to add the child to the assistance unit. This was a practice in Los Angeles County. They even forced parents to bring their Maximum Family Grant children to the welfare office who would get no cash aid. Failure to bring your child often meant termination of aid for the entire family.

ACIN I-15-03 Question # 3 states:

“Question: Can a county require a family to bring their children to the interview?”

Response: No. Children, who are not caretakers or heads of households, are not required to attend a face-to-face interview. ..”

MAXIMUM FAMILY GRANT (MFG)

In 1998, a bill by State Senator James Brulte, a southern California Republican, enacted the most anti-child legislation ever. The idiots supporting this mean spirited legislation believed that women would not have babies if they knew they would not get cash aid for them.

As a result, there are families with more than one child who receive aid for only one child. Their mommies decided to have the babies rather than have abortions.

States like Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Main, Michigan, New York, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, ,New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia do not deny cash aid to MFG kids. They have more compassion for kids than California.

WELFARE STATISTIC OF THE WEEK

State law and regulations require that food stamps be issued to households whose monthly gross income is less than \$150, have less than \$100 in liquid resources or their rent and utilities are more than their gross income. These households are called expedited service (ES) households (HH). Under MPP 63-301.531 ES HH shall be issued benefits “..no later than the third calendar day following the date the application was filed. For purposes of this section, a weekend (Saturday and Sunday) shall be considered one calendar day. However, if the third calendar day is a nonworking day when coupons cannot be issued, the CWD shall make coupons available on or before the

working day immediately preceding the nonworking day.” During the months of January, February and March of 2002, 52,195 HH were found eligible for ES. Of those 12,920 HH were not issued ES benefits during the three days as required by state law. That means thousands of babies and children went hungry because the county welfare departments failed to do their job. Did the fact that babies and children went hungry due to the unlawful actions of the county have any consequences to the county welfare department? No. It is business as usual. Abusing children is what some counties do without consequences. Below are the rankings of the most punitive counties who forced many children and babies to go hungry.

#1.	Humboldt	44.22%	#7.	Nevada	27.50%
#2.	Tehama	42.48%	#8.	Mono	25.00%
#3.	Los Angeles	40.02%	#9.	Sutter	23.40%
#4.	Stanislaus	34.44%	#10.	Merced	22.64%
#5.	San Joaquin	32.61%	#11.	Fresno	21.16%
#6.	Ventura	31.44%	#12.	Santa Clara	20.54%

COUNTY WELFARE DEPARTMENT VICTIM REPORT

SANTA CLARA COUNTY VICTIM - Ms. S.D. is a resident of Santa Clara County. She is “totally disabled” according to doctor Jean Luong. She is suffering from autoimmune thyroiditis, severe anxiety and DJD spine. She also has depression and is taking Paxil. The doctor prohibits any additional stress.

The verification of her disability was submitted to Santa Clara County and she was exempted from the WtW program due to disability. The disability verification did not impose any time limits on how long she would be totally disabled. The same doctor completed the CW 61 on 10/11/02 stating that the victim was unable to work.

This must have angered Santa Clara County. Here is a person who is disabled and they cannot sanction her. What to do?

Well, the law is clear. 42-212.44 states: