



IN BRIEF

✓ **SB 1104 WORKGROUP:** California Department of Social Services recently issued All County Letter (ACL) implementing the 2005 Budget Trailer bill, SB 1104. DSS convened a workgroup to receive input for the ACL as instructed by the SB 1104. The members of the workgroup members were Kate Meiss of Neighborhood Legal Assistance of Los Angeles, Jodie Berger of Legal Services of Northern California, Nu Usaha of WCL&P, Susan Nobles, Director of Yuba County Welfare Department, formerly working for CDSS; Jo Weber of Riverside County, formerly working for CDSS, Cathy Sunderling of CWDA; C. Nunez of Kings County, Peter Ansell of Los Angeles County, Alette Lundberg of Santa Clara County, Gail Gronert of the State Assembly and Nicole Vazquez from the State Senate.

The ACL have been published and it is now known as ACL 04-41.

ACIN I-73-04 Food Stamps

This all county information notice outlines several food stamp policy statements regarding treatment of CalWORKs benefits for household members sanctioned for failing to cooperate with the CalWORKs WtW program; treatment of child support payments; excluded income; homeless shelter deductions; treatment of loans; vendor payments; timely notice of action; self-employment and student eligibility.

Some of the highlights are:

✓ Are child support payments received directly by a Public Assistance Food Stamp recipient considered income? Answer: NO.

The ACL states:

"In accordance with MPP 63-502-122, child support payments that are received by a CalWORKs household directly from a nonhousehold member and which must be turned over to the District Attorney are exempt as income regardless of whether the payments are actually turned over to the District Attorney." See page 3 of the ACL.

✓ Is Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) income excluded for food stamp purposes?

Answer: YES. See page 4.

✓ If a person is being billed for shelter cost, but not paying it, can the shelter cost be used to compute the food stamps?

Answer: Yes. It is an obligation; the client is billed for shelter costs, therefore, the expense is an allowable shelter cost deduction." See page 7.

In This Issue

- In Brief
- ACIN I-73-04 Food Stamps
- California Welfare to Work Unlawful Sanctions Blossom
- Many Counties Refuse to File IEVS Reports

**California Welfare to Work
Unlawful Sanctions Blossom**

During July 2004 there were 108,889 unduplicated participants; 46,414 of them were sanctioned. This represents more than a 50% sanction rate.

We were hoping the counties were doing their jobs by making WtW participants self-sufficient by helping them get off welfare. We discovered that only 4,431 participants were terminated from CalWORKs because they found employment. This data does not include jobs that WtW participants found on their own, which is often. This is a 99.7% failure rate by counties and CDSS whose WtW mission is to make families self-sufficient.

Meanwhile, of the 108,889 participants, only 51,504 received transportation assistance. Counties continue to deny transportation money from WtW participants. 53% of the WtW participants did not receive transportation assistance.

Studies done by counties have revealed that many are sanctioned due to lack of supportive services. In July 2004, there were 46,680 persons sanctioned and 57,385 persons did not get transportation assistance. It seems that the denial of transportation services are a contributing factor in the high sanction rate of California.

One of the leaders in sanctioning poor families is Los Angeles County. In July, they had

29,566 unduplicated participants. Participation in the WtW program means traveling from home to the location where the WtW activity is. They were able to sanction 23,563 participants and were only able to provide transportation to 19,756 participants. This means that 9,810 participants were unlawfully denied transportation by Los Angeles County for the most part.

Los Angeles

Unduplicated Participants	108,889
Sanctioned	46,414
Received Transportation	51,504

Other counties that deserve a mention are:

Siskiyou

Unduplicated Participants	154
Sanctioned	70
Received Transportation	1

Napa

Unduplicated Participants	90
Sanctioned	67
Received Transportation	3

Lake

Unduplicated Participants	456
Sanctioned	130
Received Transportation	24

Sutter

Unduplicated Participants	460
Sanctioned	135
Received Transportation	39

Many Counties Refuse to File IEVS Reports

Under state law, counties are required to make quarterly reports to the state regarding the Income and Eligibility Verification System Management (IEVS), also known as the DPA 482 reports. Just like counties require welfare recipients to submit quarterly reports, counties are also required to submit quarterly reports.

There is a major difference on how welfare recipients and counties are held accountable. If a welfare recipient fails to submit the report, his or her family's benefits are halted.

If the county fails to submit a report, nothing happens. It appears that the State holds no county welfare bureaucrats accountable.

To determine the level of accountability by the counties we submitted a Public Records Act Request for copies of all DPA 482 filed with CDSS by the counties during the first and second quarter of 2004.

On or about October 20, 2004, CDSS responded.

During the first quarter of 2004, 26% of the counties did not file a quarterly report. During

the second quarter of 2004 31% of the counties did not file a quarterly report. The specific counties who failed to file the state mandated reports and continue to receive IEVS funding

from CDSS are set forth in Chart #1.

During the first quarter of 2004, 26% of the counties did not file a quarterly report. During the second quarter of 2004, 31% of the counties did not file a quarterly report.

CHART # 1

1st Quarter 2004

Amador
Calaveras
Del Norte
Imperial
Inyo
Kern
Marin
Modoc
Mono
Monterey
Placer
Sacramento
San Joaquin
Tehama
Tulare

2nd Quarter 2004

Amador
Calaveras
Del Norte
Inyo
Kern
Modoc
Monterey
Placer
Sacramento
San Joaquin
Tehama
Tulare
Glenn
Nevada
Orange
San Mateo
Santa Barbara
Santa Clara