

CCWRO Welfare News

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc.

1901 Alhambra Blvd. Sacramento, CA 95816

<http://www/ccwro.org>

December 6, 2012

Issue # 2012-20

In Brief

Grant Reductions, CW sanctions and Penalties Equals Child Abuse - Recent research revealed that when children in poverty receive 20 additional dollars a month it has a positive effect on the child's development. Conversely, the punitive provisions that CalWORKs laws are infested with, such as reduction of benefits for the family by 25% or more for failure to participate in a workfare activity, failure to immunize children under the age of 6, attendance of school by children and cooperation with child support that primarily benefits the government and not the children, are actually state acts of child abuse that if committed by the citizenry would be classified as a felony.

Placer County Welfare Officials Save Another Life

- Mr. 1BOLG45 had a huge share of cost that was preventing him from obtaining appropriate medical care. He was also working part time and needed to be eligible for the 250% program. With the assistance of local welfare advocates, Mr. 1BOLG45 contacted Placer County early on 11-26-12 and by the end of the day, his 250% program was active effective 11-1-12. Kudos to Placer County.

SIP Issue - Ana White, of the Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services GAIN Program Policy Section II, is the DPSS SIP analyst. ((562) 908-5741 anawhite@dpslacounty.gov.) On 7-2-12 she contacted Mr. Miller of DSS inquiring whether a person who is in a masters program and a teaching credential program, can be a SIP. Mr. Miller responded that; if "the program is a blended credential and masters program, the SIP would be fine. There may be a problem if the credential is earned before the master degree is attained."

Student Homework DSS Policy - On June 18, 2012, Counties asked DSS, what the state policy for counting student homework for computing the federal TANF work participation rates is. DSS answered that the educational institution should develop a general policy about the number of hours of homework that are expected per class and used that policy to compute the number hours of homework needed. The policy, plus the classes taken by the student, should be sufficient verification for federal reporting purposes.

DSS Wants Inter-Country-Transfer Recipients to Make an Application Without Legal Authority - Regulation Interpretation dated 97-12 asking whether a county receiving a inter-county-transfer (ITC) needs a new SAWS-1. Crystal Grant and Paulette Stokes of DSS responded on 9-20-12 that "As the sending county is required to provide that most recent SAWS 1, a new SAWS 1 should not be needed unless the change in circumstances is

such that a determination of continued eligibility cannot be made without it." We wonder if they have taken a good look at the SAWS 1. How would the SAWS 1, which is an application form, provide information to make an eligibility determination? All the SAWS 1 asks for is the name of the applicant, the social security number of the applicant and some other information, like Immediate Need, etc. It seeks no information about members of the Assistance Unit (AU), the social security numbers of the members - information that is vital to make any determination. Moreover the law and the regulations are clear - ITC is not an application, therefore it would be unlawful to require an ITC family to submit a SAWS 1 as a condition of eligibility. A simple review of MPP 40-187, that is the official state policy (not an underground rule like this Regulation Interpretation) does not even mention a SAWS 1 as a condition of transferring case from one county to another. Moreover, this "regulation interpretation" fails to mention the regulation that justifies county's desire to seek a SAWS 1.

50/50 Custody and Medi-Cal Eligibility. On August 23, 2012, Lori Lady from Tulare County asked DSS about the following scenario: "Mom and dad share custody and care-taking responsibility of Maggie. Dad comes in and applies for CalWORKs for himself and Maggie. According to both parents, the court papers provided, both parents have 50% custody and legal responsibility for Maggie. Because of Medi-Cal regulations allow only one parent to be linked to Medi-Cal, would dad be allowed cash based Medi-Cal in the CalWORKs case? Mom is already receiving Medi-Cal." On September 10, 2012 somebody at DSS, (the name of the responder was withheld for some unlawful reason) responded as follows:

"No, dad would be granted CalWORKs cash aid only for himself and Maggie and his linkage to Medi-Cal would be suppressed. Mom would continue to receive Medi-Cal for herself and child. Had dad applied for CalWORKs first, he would have been granted case aid based Medi-Cal."

Face-to-Face Interview for CalWORKs Not - On May 2, 2012 the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA)-County Advisory Committee (CAT) asked DSS whether "a face-to-face interview is required for CalWORKs redetermination interviews? Also, are electronic signatures acceptable for CalWORKs?" On July 23, 2012 DSS responded that, "Applications are acceptable through the use of an electronic or handwritten signature, transmitted by fax or other electronic transmission for both CalWORKs and Cal-Fresh programs" (ACIN 1-14-11)

Con't on Page 2

CCWRO is an IOLTA funded support center serving IOLTA legal services programs in California. Types of Services Offered: **Litigation, Co-Counseling, Fair Hearing, Representation, Consultation, Informational Services, Research Services, In-Depth Consultation and Welfare Training.** Programs Covered: CalWORKs, Welfare to Work (WtW), Food Stamps, Medi-Cal, General Assistance & Refugee/Immigrant Eligibility. Refugee/Immigrant Eligibility. All Rights Reserved. **Contributors: Kevin Aslanian, Grace Galligher, Seth Blackmon, Stephen Goldberg and Diane Aslanian**

September 2012 California Welfare-to-Work Program Outcomes Report How Much Do We Spend and What Do We Get?

**2012-2013 Welfare-to-Work
Services Appropriation**
\$936,188,654 million

**2012-2013 Welfare-to-Work
Child Care Stage 1
Appropriation**
\$464,440,952 million

Number of Unduplicated Participants During September, 2012	117,372
Gross Number of Unduplicated Participants Being Sanctioned	49,870
Number of Participants Sanctioned During September, 2012	8,886
Percentage of Gross Unduplicated Participants being Sanctioned During The Month of September 2012	42%
Dollar Loss to CalWORKs Families Due to Sanctions this Month Estimates at \$125 Per Sanction for During September 2012	\$6.2 million
Number of Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs During september 2012	4,286
Percentage of Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs During September 2012	3%
Taxpayer Cost Per Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs During September 2012	\$27,232
Number of Participants NOT Being Paid Transportation by the County During September 2012	64,473
Percentage of Number of Participants NOT Being Paid Transportation by the County During September 2012	55%
Estimated Dollar Amount Poor Families Defrauded by Counties Not Receiving Transportation @ \$100 Per Participant During September 2012	\$6.4 million

*Source: State Department of
Social Services WtW 25 reports*