



IN BRIEF

✓ **Budget** - The County Supervisors Association of California (CSAC) has established a Budget Task Force to look at ways of making budget cuts in lieu of property tax shifts proposed by the Administration. A similar task force was set up by CSAC in 1992 and it recommended numerous cuts in programs favored by State legislators. This irritated many state Legislators. The outcome was that property taxes were shifted and many programs were cut.

✓ **Reauthorization News** - Congressman Herger of California has introduced a bill that contains a change in caseload reduction credit that would hurt California. This is designed to push the Senate into enacting the much opposed House TANF reauthorization legislation. Many TANF reauthorization watchers believe that the Senate will not act on TANF until next year.

✓ **Open CPS Court Legislation** - Darrel Steinberg of Sacramento, Chair of the Assembly Budget Committee, has proposed AB 2627 which would open dependency court proceedings which are now closed to the public. Social workers, in opposition to this bill, assert that closed hearings are in the best interest of the child. Proponents of the bill assert it will expose the shortcomings of the child welfare system and shed light on the blatant violations that are committed daily in the child welfare system such as not making reports available on time, not proving that

reasonable efforts have been taken before removing the child from the home, etc.

✓ **Medi-Cal Rapid Response Team - Quarterly Reporting (QR)** - DHS has established a Medi-Cal Rapid Response Team which is a new way of making policy.

Counties have raised the issue of families who are ineligible for CalWORKs during the QR period are still getting Medi-Cal. If a person becomes ineligible for CalWORKs during the second month of the QR period, but they still get CalWORKs until the end of the QR period, are they eligible for Medi-Cal during the third months of the QR period?

✓ **Turner Handbook** - DSS has a Turner Handbook which is supposed to contain all DSS Notices of Action (NOA). However, DSS has been informed by several counties that not all NOAs in the handbook are on the DSS web page.

✓ **Child Care and QR problems** - Under Quarterly Reporting (QR) if the second parent returns home or income has increased, this could effect eligibility for child care. Child Care eligibility, like Medi-Cal, is determined monthly. Thus, many child care recipients will have overpayments. **This can be resolved by making everything QR.** Of course, QR was imple-

In This Issue

- IN BRIEF
- State Required Reports Not Submitted for Years by Los Angeles County
- Statistical Report - 12/03 WtW Sanctions

mented to reduce the Food Stamp error rate by 75% and not to make the system more efficient.

✓ **DSS has a Child Care Change Form -**

DSS has developed a child care change report that is being shared with counties. A draft ACL and draft forms are being mailed to Carol Spooner of CWDA to get their input. No similar input has been solicited from the representatives of the child care recipients.

✓ **DSS is preparing a NOA for denying and time limit extenders -**

DSS is preparing a NOA language for denial and discontinuance of time limit extenders.

✓ **Getting Monthly Information in the QR system for WtW monthly participation -**

Counties need monthly data to report how many hours a participant participated so they can make reports to the State. The QR-7 has a space to report hours of work, but some counties want that information on a monthly basis. One county is forcing WtW participants to make monthly reports as a part of their WtW plan and they sanction the participant for failure to make the report. In Tulare County staff makes monthly contacts with WtW participants to find out how many hours they participated. Another county is using the child care monthly

reimbursement information to determine number of participation hours. This county said that it would be confusing to client to have a monthly report for one program when CalWORKs reports are done quarterly.

State Required Reports Not Submitted For Years by L.A. County

At <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research> you will find various statistical reports posted by the Department of Social Services (DSS) - reports required by state regulations

Los Angeles County, has a history of ignoring state regulations without consequences. For the past three years Los Angeles County has refused to submit certain required reports. **DSS is aware of this behavior, but has failed to take any action to assure that Los Angeles County Welfare Department show the same respect for the welfare regulations that they expect CalWORKs recipients to show.**

For example, since June of 2002, Los Angeles County has refused to submit Homeless Assistance Monthly reports required by state regulations.

State regulations also require counties to report how many people have applied for and received expedited issuance food stamp benefits. Again, since March of 2002 Los Angeles County has refused to submit the reports required by state regulations.

State regulations require that each county submit a report STAT-46. This report reveals how many food stamp recipients received benefits for only three months. The last report was filed in September of 2003.

CCWRO SERVICES FOR LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Types of Services Offered: Litigation, Fair Hearing Representation, Consultation, Informational Services, Research Services & In-Depth Consultation.

Programs Covered:

CalWORKs, Welfare to Work (WtW), Food Stamps, Medi Cal, General Assistance & Refugee/Immigrant Eligibility

Statistical Report of the Week

December, 2003 WtW Sanctions

This week we look at the trends in sanctions in the Welfare to Work (WtW) program of California

Table 1 below reveals the highest percentage of sanctions statewide. Some counties, like Merced, Colusa, Fresno, Napa and Trinity counties, have more people being sanctioned that they have actual unduplicated participants in the WtW program.

In December of 2002, 36% of the WtW participants were sanctioned. In December of 2003, California achieved a new milestone in the WtW program - they increased the sanction rate from 36% to 46%, a statistically significant 10% increase in one year.

Meanwhile, 57% of the unduplicated participants in California were not receiving transportation assistance for December of 2003, which is a major reason for this high sanction rate in California.

It is estimated that 50% of these sanctions have been in place for more than 12 months

Many of the people being sanctioned would like to participate, but some counties have made contacting workers about sanctions difficult . In Los Angeles, a participant who, after a year of sanctions, needs to contact his or her worker to say, "I want to participate", finds that it could take a week or more to reach that worker. Then he/she is told to call the GAIN worker. The sanctioned person calls the GAIN worker and leaves several messages, but no call back. Finally, the person goes to the GAIN office and finds out that the GAIN worker is no longer working in the GAIN program. The GAIN office tells the sanctioned person that there is no worker assigned to your case, but we would notify you when a worker is assigned to your case. It could take weeks and even months before a worker is assigned. And then more weeks to get an appointment to agree to participate. And, thus, the high sanction rate in California.

Ironically, there is a form, a request that the sanction be cured, that a participant could complete, but the form is never offered to the sanctioned participant by DSS and counties.

TABLE 1

% of Unduplicated Participants Sanctioned During December, 2003							
Statewide	46.20%	San Luis Ob.	69.23%	Tulare	42.87%	Stanislaus	25.03%
Merced	138.11%	Los Angeles	67.65%	Tuolumne	42.33%	Santa Cruz	23.47%
Colusa	135.00%	Siskiyou	64.38%	Butte	42.09%	Orange	21.98%
Fresno	127.46%	Plumas	63.89%	Kings	39.34%	Santa Barb.	21.13%
Napa	120.65%	Monterey	63.44%	Lassen	36.96%	El Dorado	19.69%
Trinity	102.50%	San Diego	59.58%	Mariposa	36.76%	San Fran	18.37%
Yolo b/	88.04%	Sutter	59.07%	Contra Costa	36.52%	Santa Clara	17.96%
San Joaquin	86.47%	Humboldt	58.47%	Madera	34.27%	Ventura	16.68%
Amador	82.86%	Shasta	56.49%	Marin	32.17%	Solano	16.46%
Sonoma	80.87%	Alameda	53.26%	Inyo	31.58%	Alpine	12.50%
		Tehama	52.14%	Nevada	31.49%	Riverside	11.95%
		Calaveras	51.26%	San Mateo	29.43%	Yuba	11.68%
		Glenn	50.00%	Placer	27.62%	Modoc	11.11%
		Lake	47.07%	San Bern.	27.35%	Del Norte	6.21%
		Mono	46.67%	Sierra	27.27%	Sacramento	4.41%
		Mendocino	46.28%	San Benito	26.09%	Imperial	2.19%
		Kern	44.84%				