

A. Public Benefits Advocates Training Project Objectives:

Objective 1: To conduct 10 two-hour long curriculums -based, basic-skills public benefits training workshops serving a total of between 100-200 QLSP staff throughout the state.

Objective 2: To develop two new curricula, update CCWRO's other 13 curricula, and post all 15 public benefits curricula on the CCWRO website for QLSP clients to access on a 24/7 basis.

Curricula to be Developed 2009-2010	
Child Support State Hearings	
Advanced Training: CalWORKS Budget Cuts Impact on Cal WORKS Clients	
Total:	2

Curricula to Be Updated and Posted on Website 2009-2010	
Curriculum	To be Updated
WtW Sanction Defense	X
Administrative Writs	X
Introduction to CalWIN - Major Issues	X
Public Benefits Fair Hearing	X
General Assistance	X
Food Stamps	X
Cal WORKS Cutting Edge Issues	X
County and State Advocacy	X
Citizenship Verification	X
In-Home Supportive Services Overview	X
In-Home Supportive Services Hearings	X
Public Benefits Basic Issues Training	X
Emergency Services – Expediting Benefits	X
Projected Quantitative Outcome Totals	13

3. How will the proposed services be delivered?

All QLSP client's requesting a CCWRO public benefits training will have the option of having the training provided either in-person or through available web-based technology. Public benefits training events will serve groups both large and small. All trainings are curriculum based with curricula and handouts reflecting the latest information available related to policy, law, procedure, and public benefits systems navigation issues. Detailed below are the project's three principle activities:

Curriculum Development: The current EAF 09-10 deliverable in this area includes the development of two new curricula. Curriculum developed includes between 10-16 program hours for legal, statutory, and field research and legal review, 1-3 program hours for curriculum

outline and document preparation, 2-4 program hours for final legal review and revision, and 1 program hour for final legal review, post-revision, copy, filing, binding, and website posting.

Curriculum Update: The project's 09-10 curriculum update deliverable is to update all 13 public benefits curricula during the 09-10 project grant period and after update each updated curricula will be posted on the CCWRO website in a uniform user-friendly format that is accessible to all QLSP field staff.

Updating certain curriculum such as that covering "Welfare State Hearings Administrative Writs" would involve between 8 to 12 hours of statutory, case law, and other research and legal review. However, the majority of CCWRO's public benefits training curricula require an average of between 4 to 6 hours to update. The total number of existing training curricula in the project library is thirteen. In addition, between 1 to 2 hours per curricula is needed to create and integrate each curriculum into a uniform format for final legal review before hard copy filing and binding, and for website posting. The total number of program hours needed to update all 13 public benefits curricula would be between 78-90 hours.

Training Workshops: The current EAF 09-10 deliverable in this area is to conduct a total of 10 training events throughout the state. The average training event includes between 1-3 program hours for internal discussion, scheduling, and external electronic networking, 1-3 program hours in review of curriculum and field practice, 3-14 program hours preparing handouts, confirming details and additional pre-training internal review and external networking activities, along with travel and off-site networking, 2-4 hours for training and on-site networking, and an average of 1-2 program hours for post-training de-briefing, phone, mail, and other follow-up activity. A web-based training event would involve about 12 hours, an in-person training event that does not require airfare and overnight expenses would involve about 16 hours, and a training event that requires air travel would involve about 28 hours. (5 web-based training events x 12 hours + 3 in person training events x 16 hours + 2 in person training events x 28 hours = approximately 164 hours of staff time to provide the proposed 10 training events.

The project's approach will include personalized outreach to QLSDP field offices that have not previously requested a public benefits training in order to help ensure that CCWRO training resources are known by and available to all QLSP field offices statewide. The availability of project trainings are published in e-mail alerts that go to all QLSP field offices statewide. Customized trainings are available on request and are largely in response to local urgency and issue priority; these requests are infrequent but CCWRO remains committed to being responsive to all situations in which customized trainings may help ensure the delivery of competent legal representation to public benefits recipients.

All newly developed and updated curricula will undergo final review by legal counsel prior to web-posting and prior to use in a training event.

NOTE: We have already provided the training on "Advanced Training: CalWORKS Budget Cuts Impact on Cal WORKS Clients".

The child support training will be targeted for the Pro Bono programs of California do a lot of child support work and should be receptive to training on getting administrative relief before going to court.

Agency and Division/ Program	# of State/County Agency meetings	# of pre-meetings with Advocates	# of pre-meetings with Agency State/County Agency	# QSP's in Group	Current Issues	Reason for Concern	Desired Outcome	CCWRO's Role
1 DSS MW Division	4	4	4	(8) LAFLA, BALA, LSNC, NLS, LASSD, WCLAP, CCLA, CCCL	1-1: Several counties improperly required U and T visa holders applying for CalWORKs to have a social security number. 1-2: CalWORKs recipients are being terminated from assistance for "whereabouts unknown" when mail is returned to the welfare department. Often, recipients report a change of address, which is not entered into the computer records, or the computer reverts to an old mailing address. 1-3: Counties informed CalWORKs students that EOPS/CARE vouchers for books had to be used before counties would cover the costs of books 1-4: As a result of a change in law, food stamp benefits will no longer be reduced when a CalWORKs recipient fails to participate in a CalWORKs Welfare to Work activity. 1-5: CAMN computer generated NOAs, and in particular NOAs about transportation payments, do not contain all of the detailed information that is contained in the CDSS produced NOAs. Absent the detailed information, recipients are unable to determine whether the proposed action is correct or if a hearing should be filed. 1-6: Los Angeles, Santa Clara and San Diego counties are denying advocates the right to look at clients case files since the case files on CAMN and on the Leader computer system and confidential material are interspersed with non-confidential information and the case files contained third party communications. 1-7: There are no established standards for a case to be referred to welfare fraud for investigation. Eligible families voluntarily terminate benefits when the welfare fraud investigators encourage them to do so. 1-8: Case workers often refer cases to fraud investigations without legal justification. For example, one worker referred a case to welfare fraud when a recipient bought food in another county, which is legal. 1-9: CDSS collects no data on number and rate of welfare fraud investigations and prosecutions by the counties. Advocates believe that the higher the welfare fraud investigation rate, the less likely that eligible household will apply for and receive welfare assistance. 1-10: Case workers are relying on the welfare computer systems to calculate the CalWORKs and food stamps budgets in order to determine benefits. Computers include scholarships and grants as countable income which reduces the amount of benefits. Some scholarships and grants are not countable income yet because of computer programming the assistance unit	1-1: Advocates have clients who are being illegally denied aid because of no SSN. 1-2: People are being terminated from cash aid because of an old address used by the computer. 1-3: Los Angeles County began to deny supportive services. 1-4: Counties are slow to implement changes without CDSS intervention. 1-5: Advocates noticed that computer generated notices do not contain all of the necessary information that is included in the CDSS generated notices. 1-6: Without access to the case files in Leader and CAMN advocates are unable to ensure full representation. 1-7: Fraud investigators intimidate clients to stop benefits in order to avoid "fraud" charges. 1-8: Case workers refer cases to fraud investigators without legal justification. For example, food stamps can be issued to buy food throughout California, workers refer cases to fraud when the recipient buys food in another County, and the reasons that trigger the fraud investigation on a county by county basis. 1-9: Advocates from LSNC wants the ratio of fraud investigations to cases and the reasons that trigger the fraud investigation on a county by county basis. 1-10: Los Angeles advocates complain that in calculating the CalWORKs benefits, workers count exempt scholarship/grants. CDSS agreed to issue an ACL or ACIN which will provide information on which scholarship/grants should not be counted in determining the CalWORKs benefits.	1-1: California Department of Social Services (CDSS) issue an All County Letter (ACL) or All County Information Notice (ACIN) to provide instructions to the counties on processing the applications of those CalWORKs applicants who are victims of domestic abuse under the Violence Against Women Act. 1-2: CDSS issues ACL or ACIN with specific standards to clarify to the counties that they cannot terminate benefits for whereabouts unknown solely because that mail is returned to the county. 1-3: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN clarifying that Counties cannot deny supportive services to CalWORKs students who receive EOPS/CARE vouchers. 1-4: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN clarifying that CalWORKs recipients will no longer have their food stamp benefits reduced for failure to participate in a CalWORKs welfare-to-work activity. 1-5: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN with a revised notice of action for transportation supportive services that is due process compliant. 1-6: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN that would make case files available to IOLTA recipients representing their clients in state hearings. 1-7: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN addressing major concerns raised by advocates during a workgroup meeting with DSS regarding welfare fraud 1-8: CDSS works with advocates to develop a Fraud Referral form that includes questions designed to filter meritorious cases to the Fraud Investigation Unit. 1-9: CDSS works with advocates to develop a survey of the California welfare fraud system. 1-10: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN identifying the scholarship/grants that are non-exempt in determining the CalWORKs grant level.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSP's See explanation at the bottom of the page

				receives fewer benefits.	1-11: When NOAs specify the type of excess resource, the recipient will be able to determine whether the county made a mistake and a hearing request should be filed. 1-12: Advocates complained that welfare fraud investigators do not provide interpreters when limited English speaking recipients are questioned. As such, recipients do not understand their rights and admit to investigators' statements to avoid prosecution.	1-11: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN instructing the counties that overpayment notices of actions for being over resource limit must identify the excess resources so that the recipient can prepare a defense. 1-12: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN instructing the counties that welfare fraud investigators utilize interpreters when interviewing limited English proficient persons.	
				1-11: Since the inception of the CAWIN computer system, NOAs have not adequately specified the type of resource that make the recipient ineligible for benefits. 1-12: Welfare fraud investigators do not believe that CDDS Regulations set forth in Division 21, Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs, apply to them. Consequently, the mandate to provide interpreters to non-English speakers or limited-English speakers is ignored by fraud investigators. Interviews and interrogations are conducted in English and the recipient's answers are regarded as truthful. There is no consideration of whether the recipient understood the question. 1-13: Mental disabilities and limited English proficiency affect the ability of the recipient to accurately report information that affects the grant. Such cases are referred for a fraud investigation regardless of the ability of the recipient to accurately report. 1-14: Advocates have noticed an increase of meritorious fraud allegations that were received by a county fraud hot-line. Counties do not screen fraud reports prior to sending them to the welfare fraud investigators, regardless of the source of the call.	1-13: Recipients are prosecuted for false statements made in the Quarterly Reports or to a worker when the recipient either do not understand what is being asked or has a mental disability that prevents accurate reporting. Since welfare fraud requires intent to commit fraud, mental disabilities or other conditions which impair the ability to accurately report should be considered before pursuing a welfare fraud investigation. 1-14: A CDDS-developed screening tool will reduce the number of innocent recipients from being investigated for meritorious allegations of fraud.	1-13: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN instructing the counties fraud investigations to review and consider exculpatory facts (e.g., mental disabilities, limited English Proficiency) in determining whether to pursue a welfare fraud investigation. 1-14: CDDS and OLSP advocates will jointly develop Hot-Line protocols to be used in the 58 counties of California.	
2DSS Adult Programs Division	4	4	4	(9) LAFLA, BALA, LSNIC, NLS, LASSD, CRLA, DRC, Bar Tzudek Law Center 2-1: When an elderly, disabled or blind individual who live alone requests protective supervision, counties automatically refuse to evaluate the need for protective supervision. 2-2: When elderly, disabled or blind individual requests IHSS paramedical services as a result of such medical problems as diabetes or bowel/bladder incontinence, counties automatically refuse to evaluate the need for paramedical services. 2-3: The IHSS NOAs do not contain a thorough explanation of the reasons that the county is taking the action, the specific regulations supporting the action, an explanation of the right to request a state hearing and the circumstances under which aid will be continued if a hearing is requested. 2-4: Counties automatically refuse to consider whether a person is eligible for protective supervision when the person has moderate retardation or mental disability. 2-5: Contrary to law, counties refuse to allow a live-in	2-1: Counties deny eligible persons who are elderly, disabled or blind IHSS protective supervision services in violation of the law. 2-2: Counties are denying eligible persons IHSS paramedical services in violation of the law. 2-3: The notices of action do not conform to current due process standards of an adequate notice in that the NOAs do not contain a thorough explanation of the reasons that the county is taking the action, the specific regulations supporting the action, an explanation of the right to request a state hearing and the circumstances under which aid will be continued if a hearing is requested. 2-4: Some IHSS recipients with moderate retardation or mental disability are eligible for protective supervision. An automatic denial without evaluating the recipient's medical records is contrary to the law. 2-5: State law authorizes a live-in relative to be paid to provide certain IHSS services. Without payment, the IHSS recipient could be left unsupervised	2-1: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN clarifying that elderly, disabled or blind persons living alone can qualify for In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) protective supervision services. 2-2: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN clarifying that elderly, disabled, or blind persons be evaluated for paramedical services if they are suffering from diabetes, bowel/bladder incontinence, etc. 2-3: CDDS modifies IHSS notices of actions ("NOAs") to meet the basic standards of due process of law. 2-4: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN clarifying that elderly, disabled or blind persons with moderate retardation or mental disability receive assessment for protective supervision. 2-5: CDDS issues an ACL or ACIN clarifying that elderly, disabled or blind persons can receive IHSS services from relatives with whom they live.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs See explanation at the bottom of the page

				relative to provide IHSS services.	while the live-in relative works which threatens the safety of the recipient	2-8: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN instructing counties that an IHSS application be made available to any person who contacts IHSS.	
				2-6: Sacramento County does not provide IHSS applications to people inquiring about IHSS services at the time of the initial contact. Some counties screen the calls and determine eligibility based on a few brief questions and answers without medical documentation before the county. No medical documentation is before the counties. Sacramento County does not hand the IHSS application to the applicant until the home visit, which can be 4-8 weeks from the initial contact. In the meantime, people who are suffer from major health problems which could result in placement in a nursing home, is being denied the less expensive IHSS.	2-8: Advocates including those in Los Angeles, Santa Clara and Sacramento complain that people contact IHSS for assistance but never get an application.		
3:05 State Hearings Division	6	6	6	(10) LAFLA, BALA, LNSC, LASSD, WCLAP, CRLA, ICLS, DRC, Bel Tzedek LS	3-1: This violates the law giving the claimant the right to decide whether he/she wants a telephonic hearing in lieu of an in-person hearing. 3-2: The informing notices issued by State Hearings, contain hearing process and procedural information that, if disregarded, could forfeit access to the state hearing. 3-3: The new informing notices will be written at a 8th grade level, with necessary procedural information added to give a claimant who is unaware of the hearing process guidance to prepare for the hearing. 3-4: No defined process for expedited CDSS Hearings exist, leading to inconsistent and standardless responses to expedited hearing requests. 3-5: Only after receiving the decision denying the claim does unrepresented claimant go to legal aid for assistance. Until June 30, 2009, legal aid could sometimes get a rehearing for the claimant when there was a showing of abuse of discretion, arbitrariness in the decision or the decision violated the law. On July 1, 2009, State Hearing stopped processing rehearing requests. ALJs rely on the claimants to raise basic due process issues or to raise substantive arguments. A checklist would shift the responsibility of raising these issues from the claimant to the ALJ—thus avoiding procedural and substantive errors requiring appeal.	3-1: CDSS amends the policy to schedule administrative hearings as in-person unless the claimant requests a telephone hearing or a home hearing. 3-2: CDSS starts to translate SHD issued administrative hearing notices in languages other than English and Spanish. 3-3: CDSS revises the notices relating to the administrative hearing process to be written at an 8th grade level. 3-4: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN for Expedited State Hearings for persons in need of emergency assistance whereby a hearing will be held in five working days, the decision will be issued in ten working days and standards for granting expedited hearing requests will be clearly defined. 3-5: CDSS develops a check list for administrative law judges (ALJ) that would highlight all of the major points the ALJ must cover at the start of the hearing.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs *See explanation at the bottom of the page
4:05S Civil Rights Division	6	6	6	(7) LAFLA, BALA, LNSC, NLS.	4-1: Advocates in Los Angeles County complain that disabled claimants with oversized wheel chairs or oxygen tanks cannot fit through the hearing room doors so that the confidential hearing must be heard in the public lobby. 4-2: The Civil Rights Bureau is responsible for the enforcement of Division 21.	4-1: Civil Rights Bureau (CRB) visits the sites used for administrative hearings to evaluate the accessibility of the hearing room to disabled claimants. 4-2: Welfare fraud units and D.A.s are ordered to comply with Division 21	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs *See explanation at the bottom of the page

					6-4: When CDSS promulgated its NOAs relating to excess income, CDSS determined that to meet the standards of an adequate NOA, the months in which the excess income was received and the type of income had to be identified. Since the inception of the CALWIN computer system, NOAs have not adequately specified the source and type of income that made the assistance unit over income for assistance.	6-4: If CALWIN NOAs contained all of the information that is required for a legally sufficient NOA, including identifying the type and amount of income which makes the recipient ineligible for assistance, the recipient will be able to determine whether the county made a mistake and a hearing request should be filed.	6-4: CDSS issues an ACL or ACIN instructing the counties that overpayment NOAs for being over income limit for eligibility must identify the exact months and type of income so that the recipient can prepare a defense.	
7. Department of Health Services (new in 2009)	4	4	4	(5) LAFIA, LNS, WCL&P, BALA	7-1: Medi-Cal notices of action are not easily understood and the forms do not contain information required by due process. 7-2: With increased Medi-Cal case terminations, counties are not considering whether recipients are entitled to alternative Medi-Cal programs for coverage as required by SB 67 prior to Medi-Cal termination. 7-3: Many Medi-Cal recipients are receiving NOAs that continuing eligibility for Medi-Cal is premised on paying a monthly share of cost (SOC) before being eligible for Medi-Cal services. Within the last year, advocates have seen the monthly SOC in the amount of \$1,000-\$2,000, money that the Medi-Cal recipient does not have to pay Medi-Cal bills.	7-1: With increased Medi-Cal case terminations, the NOAs must be understandable so that the recipient can decide whether to challenge the benefits termination. 7-2: Counties are responsible for the Medi-Cal cases within their boundaries. It is necessary for counties to evaluate whether a recipient would be eligible for continued Medi-Cal benefits under a different Medi-Cal program. 7-3: When Medi-Cal recipients are unable to meet their share of costs, they lose Medi-Cal. If recipients are told how to meet their share of costs, they will be able to keep Medi-Cal.	7-1: California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) issues an ACL regarding Medi-Cal NOAs. The ACL will set forth state policy for revised notices of action and a host of revised NOAs. 7-2: DHCS issues an ACL requiring counties to review the case for alternative Medical Eligibility before discontinuing the case. 7-3: DHCS issues an informing notice to Medi-Cal recipients with a share of cost on ways to meet the share of cost requirement.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs *See explanation at the bottom of the page
8. California Department of Child Support Services	6	6	6	(1) LSNIC	8-1: Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) initiated its own administrative hearing procedures on July 1, 2009. Currently, the only appointment of authorized representative form is part of the hearing request. Claimants often request a hearing before obtaining an authorized representative. Without a separate authorized representative form, claimant would have to submit a new hearing request form to inform DCSS of the identifying information for the authorized representative. 8-2: DCSS initiated its own administrative hearing procedures on July 1, 2009. At this time, DCSS has no formal policies or procedures for their prescreening process that determine which cases meet the guidelines for a hearing or if a hearing is necessary. 8-3: DCSS did not consider assigning codes to issues argued in administrative hearings. Assigning a code to each issue that is decided by an administrative law judge will allow DCSS to identify the number of times a specific issue was raised during the hearing. 8-4: A complaint resolution is a prerequisite to requesting a hearing. After a complaint resolution is requested, the	8-1: To institute a method for claimants at administrative hearings to notify Child Support Services and the Office of Administrative Hearings that subsequent to the hearing request filing, the claimant obtained an authorized representative for the hearing. 8-2: DCSS relies on two staff to do all of the prescreenings. If one or both staff are absent from work, the prescreening process is delayed and cases are not set for hearing. In addition, the prescreening process directly affects due process rights to a hearing. The prescreening process must be based on standardized policies and procedures that are not arbitrary and capricious. 8-3: DCSS initiated its own administrative hearing procedures on July 1, 2009. Without issue codes to track the disposition of administrative hearing cases, advocates are unable to determine if a questionable policy is isolated to a specific case or it is a statewide problem. 8-4: By issuing instructions on how to respond to complaint resolutions, DCSS will promote the efficient and timely use of the administrative hearing	8-1: DCSS develops a separate authorized representative form that is not part of the hearing request form. 8-2: DCSS formalizes the prescreening process for requests for administrative hearings. 8-3: DCSS identifies and assign hearing codes to issues raised at administrative hearings. 8-4: DCSS issues instructions to the Local Child Support Agencies on responding to requests for complaint resolutions.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs *See explanation at the bottom of the page

8. California Department of Child Support Services	6	6	6	(1) LSNC	B-1: Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) initiated its own administrative hearing procedures on July 1, 2009. Currently, the only appointment of authorized representative form is part of the hearing request. Claimants often request a hearing before obtaining an authorized representative. Without a separate authorized representative form, claimant would have to submit a new hearing request form to inform DCSS of the identifying information for the authorized representative. B-2: DCSS initiated its own administrative hearing procedures on July 1, 2009. At this time, DCSS has no formal policies or procedures for their prescreening process that determine which cases meet the guidelines for a hearing or if a hearing is necessary. B-3: DCSS did not consider assigning codes to issues argued in administrative hearings. Assigning a code to each issue that is decided by an administrative law judge will allow DCSS to identify the number of times a specific issue was raised during the hearing. B-4: A complaint resolution is a prerequisite to requesting a hearing. After a complaint resolution is requested, the Local Child Support Agency (LCSA) must make a written response within 30 days. Some LCSAs provide a generic answer that is not responsive to the parents complaint and does not inform parents as to whether an administrative hearing is needed.	B-1: To institute a method for claimants at administrative hearings to notify Child Support Services and the Office of Administrative Hearings that subsequent to the hearing request filing, the claimant obtained an authorized representative for the hearing. B-2: DCSS relies on two staff to do all of the prescreenings. If one or both staff are absent from work, the prescreening process is delayed and cases are not set for hearing. In addition, the prescreening process directly affects due process rights to a hearing. The prescreening process must be based on standardized policies and procedures that are not arbitrary and capricious. B-3: DCSS initiated its own administrative hearing procedures on July 1, 2009. Without issue codes to track the disposition of administrative hearing cases, advocates are unable to determine if a questionable policy is isolated to a specific case or is a statewide problem. B-4: By issuing instructions on how to respond to complaint resolutions, DCSS will promote the efficient and timely use of the administrative hearing process.	B-1: DCSS develops a separate authorized representative form that is not part of the hearing request form. B-2: DCSS formalizes the prescreening process for requests for administrative hearings. B-3: DCSS identifies and assign hearing codes to issues raised at administrative hearings. B-4: DCSS issues instructions to the Local Child Support Agencies on responding to requests for complaint resolutions.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs *See explanation at the bottom of the page
9. Sacramento Department of Human Assistance	6	6	6	(2) LSNC, NLS	B-1: The CalWIK computer system in Sacramento County discontinues recipients from the Transitional Food Stamp Program who have not submitted a Quarterly Report. B-2: A large percentage of CalWORKs recipients are not receiving transportation funds.	B-1: State law provides that recipients receive Transitional Food Stamps automatically for five months without being required to submit Quarterly Reports. Eligible food stamp recipients are being wrongfully denied food stamp assistance. B-2: State law requires that counties advance transportation money when a CalWORKs recipient is engaged in Welfare to Work activities so that CalWORKs do not have to use the CalWORKs grant to pay for transportation. <i>A descriptive protocol that over 80% of the Welfare to Work population are not</i>	B-1: Department of Human Assistance (DHA) researches and reprograms the CalWIK computer system to prevent the discontinuance of Transitional Food Stamp recipient for not submitting a Quarterly Report. B-2: DHA monitors payment for transportation expenses and collect payment statistics, including the number of cases in which advance transportation is paid.	Facilitator and principal advocate for LSPs *See explanation at the bottom of the page

*Role of the Facilitator – Facilitator is the lead person for LSPs for the various workgroups. As stated in the proposal, the lead person meets with the agency between workgroup meetings and discusses the issues, determines where the Department is on each issue, and provides additional information and comments. This entails researching the issues and doing statistical analysis, if needed. CCWRO attends all workgroup meetings. All issues raised are thoroughly researched by CCWRO before they are put on the table. It is CCWRO's role to be thoroughly familiar with the issues in order to represent these matters for the LSPs before the state agencies.

The facilitator will be responsible for setting up the pre-meeting calls, gather issues, analyze the issues, compose issue memos when needed for presentation to DSS, meet with DSS before and after each meeting to make sure work on issues on getting the attention from state staff.

CCWRO staff also makes regular contacts with persons who have responsibility at the state level to work on the issues.

Finally, CCWRO participates on spin off workgroups, such as the CV91 workgroup revising the disability verification forms, fraud workgroup considering changes recommended by QLEPs, DV-ICT workgroup working on protocols for victims of domestic violence moving from one county to another and transportation workgroup to increase transportation payments to VWV participants.

Each of these workgroups need legal and statistical information gathered and analyzed to be presented at the workgroup meetings