

**In This  
Issue**

- State Budget Update
- Bush Ignores Poor Children and Gives to the Rich
- TANF Update
- CWDA Targets IHSS Providers
- ABAWDS Unlawfully Denied Food Stamps

- Statistic of the Week -  
(1) 37% WtW Sanction Rate in California ;  
(2) Food Stamp Withdrawals Gone Array in California

## State Budget Update

The State budget has yet to be adopted. There are two budget bills: (1) the Assembly bill, which suspends CalWORKs and SSI COLAs to make more money available for the bureaucracy, and the Senate Bill, which provides full COLA for CalWORKs and SSI.

There is also a so-called bipartisan budget proposed by Democrat Joe Canciamilla and Republican Keith RIchman. This proposed budget is another severe and needless attack on the poor of California who are living on 1989 fixed income levels. The proposal would change the sanction process so as to increase the number of sanctions which will save \$10 million dollars annually. The proposal would also suspend the CalWORKs COLA for three years; reduce SSI benefits to the MOE floor and eliminate the CAPI and CFAP programs. Many of these changes do not save any general fund monies. California legislators have proven their cowardice. When given the choice to support or hurt poor the poor families California they chose to hurt them.

## Bush Ignores Poor Children and Gives to the Rich

On May 28th the President signed a massive tax-cut bill that gave millionaires an average of \$93,500 in tax cuts this year. The children of hard working families, one million of which are mili-

tary families, received nothing from the tax bill. That is because they did not contribute to the Bush campaign for President. The other rationale touted by Republicans is the LIE that poor families do not pay taxes.

After this shameful act of excluding working and military families, the Senate and House passed new tax bills that included some of these families.

According to the Children's Defense Fund, the House plan departs from the Senate plan in three key ways, all of them bad for families: FIRST, the House attached its help for low-income families to an 82 billion dollar package of unnecessary new tax cuts, providing six times as much help for families making over \$110,000 compared to low-income families. Unlike the Senate bill, about 200,000 military families will not qualify for the full child tax credit in the House version, since combat pay will not count as income for tax purposes. SECOND, the House version delays its help for lower-income families until next year, while providing tax rebate checks for upper-income families right away. THIRD, because the House bill fails to find offsets to pay for its massive new tax cuts, it represents yet another cynical attempt to saddle the government with billions in added debt and drain resources away from badly needed public services.

## **TANF UPDATE**

**The Children's Defense Fund reports that** the Senate Finance Committee still hopes to take up TANF (welfare) reauthorization legislation when they return from the July recess, with markup in the committee perhaps as early as the week of July 14th. The House-passed bill (H.R. 2350) to extend the TANF block grant funds through September 30th (pending reauthorization) is now before the Senate, which should pass the extension by the end of June until September 30, 2003 to keep program money flowing to the states.

Many issues in the bill still have not been resolved - such as whether the work requirements will be intensified as they are in H.R. 4, the House-passed welfare bill (requiring parents to work even more hours per week but limiting what activities can count as work) and how much child care funding states should receive. We will keep you posted on important developments, including opportunities to contact your members of Congress to make sure they support key provisions.

In addition, there's a proposal afoot to toughen the existing TANF work requirements for single parents with young children under age 6. Under current law, these parents (most often mothers) are only required to work 20 hours per week instead of 30, so they can spend more time with their infants and toddlers. The proposal would increase their hours to equal those of other families. It is based upon flawed TANF statistics showing that in states' TANF records, moms with younger children work just as many hours as other parents. However a recent CDF report finds that mothers DO work less when they have young children. Imposing more stringent work requirements on these parents would create hardships for these families, including making it even more difficult to find appropriate child care to cover additional hours of required work.

The Senate Finance Committee still hopes to take up TANF (welfare) reauthorization legislation when they return from the July recess, with markup in the committee perhaps as early as the week of July 14th. The House-passed bill (H.R. 2350) to

extend the TANF block grant funds through September 30th (pending reauthorization) is now before the Senate, which should pass the extension by the end of June to keep program money flowing to the states.

## **CWDA Targets IHSS Providers**

**A California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) committee**, has decided to investigate welfare fraud in the IHSS program.

At a May CWDA FAADS Committee meeting Santa Clara County stated that they can produce a report that reveals some providers are claiming too many service hours per month. Sacramento County's policy of unlawfully denying service hours to eligible clients, is hiring more fraud investigators to terrorize the providers while the county crimes against the IHSS recipients goes unchecked.

"It is the counties that are intentionally and unlawfully denying IHSS hours to which IHSS applicants and recipients are eligible for because the county has a closed end allocation of IHSS dollars" said a representative of the IHSS providers union.

At this May meeting San Francisco County proposed to have a workshop on techniques for successful fraud prevention, which really means a workshop to terrorize IHSS recipients and their low paid providers.

## **ABAWDS Denied Food Stamps Unlawfully**

After our last article about ABAWDS waivers, DSS was kind enough to fax us some information about the current status of waivers.

There are nine counties who have [10% unemployment waivers](#). They are Fresno, Glenn, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, Sierra and Tulare.

Eight counties have a [Labor Surplus Area Waivers](#). They are Alpine, Calaveras, Del Norte, Mendocino, Modoc, San Joaquin, Siskiyou and Trinity counties.

Two (2) counties have received a so-called 20% waivers. They are Mono and Tuolumne.

As we have said before, there are many counties and areas of California where the ABAWDS rules should be waived to maximize participation in the food stamp program. CCWRO is working to maximize the participation in the Food Stamp program.

### **A New USDA Food Stamp Prescreening Tool**

On June 5, USDA released a Food Stamp Program (FSP) prescreening tool that is designed to determine if a household is potentially eligible for Food Stamp benefits. The tool, called "Step 1," is available via the internet to help individuals, or assistance organizations working with clients, determine their FSP eligibility and get an estimate of monthly benefits in as little as 15 minutes. The tool can be found on the internet at [www.FoodStamps-Step1.usda.gov](http://www.FoodStamps-Step1.usda.gov) or [www.govbenefits.gov](http://www.govbenefits.gov). According to USDA, the number one reason eligible people do not participate [in FSP] is that they do not know they are eligible. This is an easy way to determine if a household is eligible for food stamp benefits.

### **Statistic of the Week 37% Sanction Rate in California**

This week DSS finally released the Welfare to Work sanction data for March of 2003. It is bad. Statewide there is a 38% sanction rate of unduplicated participants. This means that one out of three participants are sanctioned. Some of the leading counties with sanctions are Fresno at 95%; San Joaquin at 64%, Los Angeles at 55%, Tulare at

54%, Alameda at 51%, San Diego at 48%.

The sanction propagandists claim that vigorous sanctions means better participation and better results from the WtW program. This not untrue. It is old Soviet-Nazi propaganda.

The truth is while 55% of the Los Angeles County participations were sanctioned, only 3.68% of the participants found employment that resulted in termination of benefits.

Alameda County sanctioned 51% and less than 3% of the participants found employment that resulted in termination of benefits.

San Joaquin County sanctioned 64% of the unduplicated participants and only 2% of the participants found employment that resulted in termination of benefits.

And who said that WtW does not work. It works insofar as "sanctions" are concerned, but it is dismal failure what it comes to self-sufficiency, which was never the purpose of WtW anyhow.

### **Food Stamp Withdrawals Gone Array in California**

Statewide over 7% of the Food Stamp applications are withdrawn by Food Stamp applicants. The 7% average reflects Napa County, the highest at 29% to Yolo County's low at 0.29%. Why would so many people withdraw their applications in Napa County and so few in Yolo County? Could it be that Napa County tells applicants that they are not eligible, thus they should withdraw their application in blatant violation of the Food Stamp laws? And what is DSS doing about this obvious law breaking that is going on Napa County and other counties, such as Santa Clara County at 20%; El Dorado County at 17%; Nevada County at 16%; Yuba County at 16%. Any investigations being conducted by the so-called "program integrity" folks. Nay. Who cares that the county breaks the law. So what? No big deal. That's what counties do. Integrity refers to "recipient integrity" not "County In-

tegrity”. As far as counties are concerned, the ends justify the means.

Below are the percentages of applicants who withdrew their applications during April of 2003, according to the DSS Food Stamp application monthly report.

	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>7.44%</b>
<b>1</b>	Napa	28.88%
<b>2</b>	Santa Clara	20.69%
<b>3</b>	Plumas	20.00%
<b>4</b>	San Benito	18.38%
<b>5</b>	El Dorado	17.03%
<b>6</b>	Nevada	16.25%
<b>7</b>	Yuba	16.12%
<b>8</b>	Mariposa	15.38%
<b>9</b>	Lassen	13.86%
<b>10</b>	Calaveras	13.64%
<b>11</b>	Modoc	13.16%
<b>12</b>	Monterey	12.95%
<b>13</b>	Mendocino	12.07%
<b>14</b>	Amador	11.96%
<b>15</b>	Sutter	11.96%
<b>16</b>	Madera	11.64%
<b>17</b>	Placer	11.32%
<b>18</b>	Butte	11.30%
<b>19</b>	Glenn	11.21%
<b>20</b>	Mono	11.11%
<b>21</b>	Tulare	10.88%
<b>22</b>	Humboldt	10.19%
<b>23</b>	San Joaquin	10.02%
<b>24</b>	Imperial	9.15%
<b>25</b>	Orange	9.05%

<b>26</b>	Shasta	8.83%
<b>27</b>	Del Norte	8.60%
<b>28</b>	Los Angeles	8.52%
<b>29</b>	Trinity	8.33%
<b>30</b>	Tehama	8.10%
<b>31</b>	San Luis Obispo	7.89%
<b>32</b>	Siskiyou	7.85%
<b>33</b>	Tuolumne	7.74%
<b>34</b>	Kern	7.17%
<b>35</b>	Alameda	6.93%
<b>36</b>	Inyo	6.67%
<b>37</b>	San Bernardino	6.14%
<b>38</b>	Contra Costa	5.13%
<b>39</b>	San Diego	4.92%
<b>40</b>	Stanislaus	4.83%
<b>41</b>	Lake	4.65%
<b>42</b>	Kings	4.19%
<b>43</b>	Ventura	4.11%
<b>44</b>	Merced	4.05%
<b>45</b>	Marin	3.62%
<b>46</b>	Santa Cruz	3.50%
<b>47</b>	Colusa	3.17%
<b>48</b>	Solano	3.07%
<b>49</b>	Sacramento	2.95%
<b>50</b>	San Francisco	2.86%
<b>51</b>	Riverside	2.42%
<b>52</b>	Santa Barbara	2.12%
<b>53</b>	Sonoma	1.01%
<b>54</b>	Fresno	0.40%
<b>55</b>	Yolo	0.29%
<b>56</b>	Alpine	0.00%
<b>57</b>	Sierra	0.00%
<b>58</b>	San Mateo a/	no report

**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, Media Cal, General Assistance and Refugee Immigration