



IN BRIEF

✓ **Governor's Illusionary Child Care Savings**

The Governor's 04-05 budget proposes to save millions of dollars by declining child care for children, 11-12 years old when "afterschool" care is unavailable. The California County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) child care committee minutes of their 3/4/04 meeting reads: "Counties again stated that they have a large population of 11 and 12 years olds. There are not enough afterschool programs to take all of them in, even if the parents all worked a nice M-F 8-5 job. There are a lot of assumptions about savings in this proposal that the committee didn't believe would be realized. Committee doesn't believe the State will realize the millions they have stated they will save with this proposal. It will be an "administrative nightmare." It appears based on assumption that our CalWORKs parents all have tidy 8-5 jobs Monday-Friday."

CCWRO COMMENT: It is true. The writers of these proposals may never have experienced a nontraditional job.

✓ **FNS New Policy on IPV Waivers** - On March 30, 2004, FNS Western Regional office released FNS Administrative Notice (AN) 04-24 regarding "Fraud Policy: 7 CFR 273.16.

This AN addresses the issue of some states and counties within the states asking food stamp recipients to agree to a waiver of a Administrative Disqualification Hearing (ADH) when the agency has not even de-

veloped the sufficient basis for setting a ADH for the alleged food stamp overissuance.

The AN states: "The State must not offer an ADH waiver if it intends to refer the case to prosecution and not suggest prosecution if the waiver is not signed." This is standard practice in many counties of California.

The AN further states: If an ADH waiver is offered, it should be because the State agency has already determined that an administrative hearing is appropriate in this..." and not prosecution.

✓ **High CAPI Denial Rates** - In the January of 2004 CAPI application report known as CA 1037 reveal that California had 902 applications for CAPI and 600 denials or withdrawals. This is a 66% denial rate. The report does not show how many cases where withdrawn and how many were denied.

One of the leading county's for CAPI denials is Los Angeles County at 76%. They had 379 applications and denied 289 of those applications.

San Mateo County had an 81% denial rate.

Statewide there are only 5,325 cases as of January 2004.

In This Issue

- IN BRIEF
- Expedited Food Stamp Statistical Analysis
- April 15th Budget Hearings

DSS REGULATIONS TO BE HEARD

April 21, 2004- Job Retention Services for Former CalWORKs Recipients ORD# 1003-24

May 19, 2004 - Transitional Food Stamps Interview Exemptions ORD# 1003-23

For more information go to: http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/ord/PublicHear_675.htm

EXPEDITED FOOD STAMPS STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In this bulletin we have been complaining about the lack of reports on expedited food stamps. We had a surprise this week- the DSS webpage has actually posted Food Stamp Expedited Service (FS/ES) data for 2003.

The last time we had data was for 2002. The delay was that of Los Angeles County. There are still other counties who continue to refuse to report, Marin and San Benito Counties. We hope that someday Marin and San Benito County will start meeting their reporting responsibilities as they demand Food Stamp recipients to meet their own quarterly reporting responsibilities.

During the months of October through December 2003, 51% of food stamp applicants were considered for Expedited Service.

Los Angeles County considered 76% of the applicants for expedited food stamps. 60% of the applicants considered for ES were denied. Of the 40% who were granted ES, 39% of them received their benefits beyond the three days required by law.

Other counties who refused to issue timely ES to food stamp recipients were El Dorado County at 46%; Humboldt at 47%; Santa Cruz at 46% and Tehama at 59%.

The report reveals no demands by DSS for these counties to shape up and start obeying the law. In fact, statewide, 24% of the ES households received their ES benefits pass the legal three days timeline.

One of the counties that denied the most FS/ES was Santa Clara County at 87%. This is the highest denial rate in California. Santa Clara County also was 23% late in giving ES benefits to the very few households who were able to clear the Santa Clara County Berlin Wall between the FS applicants in dire need of food and the benefits to which they are legally entitled to.

Right behind Santa Clara County was San Diego County at 76% denial rate. San Diego County was late with 4% of the cases eligible for ES, which is a statistically significant number for such a large county.

ADVOCACY NOTE: If your county is breaking the law, you should write a letter to the county welfare director requesting that they explain the reasons for breaking the law and what steps they are taking to remedy the situation.

You should mail or e-mail a copy of the letter to CCWRO so we can keep track of what other legal services programs are doing to assure that the low-income household who are entitled to expedited food stamps receive such benefits within the timeframes required by law.

CCWRO Welfare News Bulletin #2004-9- April 27, 2004 - Page 3

Countie	Appl. Filed	Requested ES	% Seeking ES	ES Entit.	% In-Eligible for ES	Issued 3 Days	Issued In More Than 3 days	% of Cases Issued More than 3 days
Statewide	266400	134710	50.57%	59067	43.85%	44,656	14,411	24.40%
Alameda	5340	2425	45.41%	1756	72.41%	1,552	204	11.62%
Alpine	1.5	6	400.00%	2	33.33%	2	0	0.00%
Amador	225	77	34.22%	63	81.82%	61	2	3.17%
Butte	2319	733	31.61%	556	75.85%	496	60	10.79%
Calaveras	370.5	126	34.01%	116	92.06%	100	16	13.79%
Colusa	195	37	18.97%	29	78.38%	27	2	6.90%
Contra Co	4887	1655	33.87%	500	30.21%	485	15	3.00%
Del Norte	448.5	156	34.78%	128	82.05%	125	3	2.34%
El Dorado	1039.5	140	13.47%	93	66.43%	50	43	46.24%
Fresno	10092	2947	29.20%	2241	76.04%	1,864	377	16.82%
Glenn	342	87	25.44%	73	83.91%	73	0	0.00%
Humboldt	1693.5	469	27.69%	391	83.37%	208	183	46.80%
Imperial	1623	18	1.11%	8	44.44%	8	0	0.00%
Inyo	196.5	62	31.55%	51	82.26%	50	1	1.96%
Kern	8293.5	4468	53.87%	1448	32.41%	1,404	44	3.04%
Kings	1750.5	661	37.76%	341	51.59%	292	49	14.37%
Lake	691.5	273	39.48%	209	76.56%	199	10	4.78%
Lassen	298.5	156	52.26%	64	41.03%	53	11	17.19%
L.A	93238.5	71314	76.49%	28735	40.29%	17,445	11,290	39.29%
Madera	831	263	31.65%	205	77.95%	198	7	3.41%
Marin	0					0	0	
Mariposa	132	28	21.21%	26	92.86%	19	7	26.92%
Mendocino	969	245	25.28%	230	93.88%	218	12	5.22%
Merced	583.5		0.00%			0	0	
Modoc	60	1	1.67%	1	100.00%	1	0	0.00%
Mono	81	4	4.94%	3	75.00%	3	0	0.00%
Monterey	3918	1160	29.61%	472	40.69%	449	23	4.87%
Napa	598.5	375	62.66%	102	27.20%	92	10	9.80%
Nevada	399	98	24.56%	66	67.35%	59	7	10.61%
Orange	10084.5	660	6.54%	539	81.67%	538	1	0.19%
Placer	1407	307	21.82%	175	57.00%	164	11	6.29%
Plumas	175.5	39	22.22%	27	69.23%	27	0	0.00%
Riverside	10204.5	4828	47.31%	1543	31.96%	1,393	150	9.72%
Sacramento	16647	3726	22.38%	1141	30.62%	1,027	114	9.99%
San Benito	0					0	0	
San Bern.	20697	8740	42.23%	7136	81.65%	6,530	606	8.49%
San Diego	10858.5	8136	74.93%	1935	23.78%	1,859	76	3.93%
San Fran.	7843.5	3855	49.15%	1884	48.87%	1,879	5	0.27%
San Joaq.	5107.5	200	3.92%	174	87.00%	140	34	19.54%
San Luis	1465.5	591	40.33%	224	37.90%	215	9	4.02%
San Mateo	0	532	0	521	97.93%	459	62	11.90%
Santa Barb.	3151.5	1399	44.39%	308	22.02%	304	4	1.30%
Santa Clara	8964	4949	55.21%	636	12.85%	490	146	22.96%
Santa Cruz	2436	1338	54.93%	446	33.33%	241	205	45.96%
Shasta	1813.5	438	24.15%	325	74.20%	287	38	11.69%
Sierra	22.5	7	31.11%	7	100.00%	7	0	0.00%
Siskiyou	556.5	180	32.35%	127	70.56%	116	11	8.66%
Solano	2922	596	20.40%	589	98.83%	520	69	11.71%
Sonoma	2065.5	1613	78.09%	927	57.47%	888	39	4.21%
Stanislaus	3945	400	10.14%	159	39.75%	121	38	23.90%
Sutter	777	227	29.21%	125	55.07%	117	8	6.40%
Tehama	718.5	379	52.75%	166	43.80%	68	98	59.04%
Trinity	156	62	39.74%	46	74.19%	40	6	13.04%
Tulare	7108.5	727	10.23%	453	62.31%	432	21	4.64%
Tuolumne	474	388	81.86%	122	31.44%	116	6	4.92%
Ventura	4078.5	1321	32.39%	814	61.62%	555	259	31.82%
Yolo	1050	353	33.62%	336	95.18%	329	7	2.08%
Yuba	1053	735	69.80%	273	37.14%	261	12	4.40%

Source:
California
State
Department
of Social
Services

APRIL 15, 2004 BUDGET HEARINGS

On April 15, 2004, the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee #3 Health, Human Services, Labor and Veterans Affairs held a hearing on CalWORKs, Food Stamps and Immigrant Assistance Programs.

The Subcommittee Chair Senator Wes Chesbro and Senator Gill Cedillo of Los Angeles were present at the hearing.

A 30 page analysis of the various budget cuts proposed by Arnold Schwarzenegger was available at the hearing written by committee consultant Ana Matosantos.

Because of the lack of a full committee membership attendance, this was more of an informational hearing. Chairman Chesbro announced that the voting will take place on or about May 13, 2004.

The budget analysis revealed that since the enactment of the CalWORKs program benefits to the poor have been taking continuous hits while administration and services money for the bureaucrats has been going up and up. The Graph on the following page reveals the TANF spending trend during the past 5 years.

While California spends \$907,913,597 less on Payments to Families, it spends \$64,167,692 on CalWORKs Administration, \$315,81,052 for welfare to work services and \$203,878,412 for child care.

Clearly the spending trends show that the Governor and the Legislature have found that spending money for the bureaucracy is more important than spending money on meeting the basic survival needs of the babies, chil-

dren and families living on a fixed income of what persons similarly situated received in 1989.

The Governor proposes reduction of benefits and denial of the 1971 Ronald Reagan automatic cost-of-living adjustments.

There was eloquent and comprehensive testimony from welfare moms who would be effected by the Schwarzenegger draconian benefits reductions.

De-linking CalWORKs COLA from Vehicle License Fee. The Governor had proposes specific language, drafted by Legislative Counsel, that would de-link the CalWORKs COLA to the Vehicle Tax.

At the hearing, the Administration withdrew this proposed legislation because the linking of the CalWORKs COLA to the tax reduction was only a year statute. A court order in Guillen v. Schwarzenegger has ordered the State to issue the October 2003 COLA. So far, Schwarzenegger has refused to obey the court order. The Schwarzenegger Administration appears to be above the law.

TANF Transfers to non-CalWORKs Programs - TANF money for poor families living on a fixed income of the level set for families living in 1989 have been used to balance the California budget since the enactment of the CalWORKs program in 1998-1999. Over the past five years, over \$3.3 billion of TANF money has been used for "non-CalWORKs transfers". These include transferring money to Title XX and other transfers.

The Senate Subcommittee report reveals that: "Since 1998-1999, TANF/MOE funding for non-CalWORKs program has increased 50% to \$1.1 billion. CalWORKs program funding has decreased by 757.5 million in the same period."

This means that California has been taking money out of the mouths of poor families with needy babies and children and used to fund non-CalWORKs programs - or what is more commonly known as the bureaucracy.

Chairperson Chesbro of the Sub. #3 expressed his displeasure with taking money from the CalWORKs program and using it for non-CalWORKs programs.

**MONEY TRANSFERRED
TO NON-CALWORKS
PROGRAMS**

98-99	\$284,965,000
99-00	\$531,654,000
00-01	\$606,149,000
01-02	\$497,376,000
02-03	\$636,521,000
03-04	\$747,993,000
04-05	\$832,627,000*

*The Schwarzenegger Administration raid on TANF.

SOURCE: Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee

TRANSITIONAL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

-
At the hearing, the Department of Finance informed the subcommittee that the Administration is dropping its proposals to repeal the Transitional Food Stamp program.

Work Participation Reforms. The Schwangenegger Administration has proposed a host of ill-conceived changes to the Welfare to Work program. All of the testimony was adverse to the proposals.

In our last bulletin, we described some of the proposals that the Schwangenegger Administration is proposing. There was a lot of discussion about the **mandatory job search proposal**. Under this proposal all applicants will have to do job search before they can get cash aid. The County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) and County Supervisors Association of California (CSAC) opposed this proposal and others. CCWRO testimony stated that over 30-40 percent of the CalWORKs applications are denied. It is foolish to spend child care, transportation and job club money for applicants who will have been denied aid anyhow.

Universal Participation - The crux of the Schwangenegger Administration proposals are to comply with the upcoming TANF reauthorization by the federal government. Legislative representative of Western Center on Law and Poverty Michael Herald testified convincingly that making wholesale changes in the program without knowing what the federal legislation would look like is premature and unwise. Even if the TANF reauthorization is passed this year, which is very unlikely given the fact that the TANF bill is stuck on the Senate floor, the State could still make changes in the law next to comply with federal law.

CWDA and CSAC urges the Legislature to leave the program alone, which in essence means not to enact the Schwangenegger Administration proposals.

A copy of the proposed trailer bill was available to the attendants of the hearing. CCWRO will provide a copy of this bill to its readers upon request.

The next budget hearing will be on May 5, 2004, at 1:30 PM in room 444. This will be the Assembly Budget Committee Sub. #1 chaired by Assemblyman Merv Dymally of Los Angeles County.