

CCWRO Weekly New Welfare News

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc. 1901 Alhambra Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95816
• Telephone (916) 736-0616 • Cell (916) 712-0071 Fax (916) 736-2645

July 21, 2008,
Issue #08-08

Madera County Policy - Do Not Tell WtW Participant of Their Rights

A Madera County WtW victim was scheduled for an appointment with worker Champagne Brown for July 7th, 2008. He kept the appointment, but Ms. Brown was not in the office. He was told to go home without being seen by anybody else. The participant is now being told by Ms. Brown that he has to keep another appointment for July 21, 2008 or he will be sanctioned. Ms. Brown informed the participant that even if he files for a state hearing before the sanction takes effect, he will still be sanctioned. Her Supervisor Ms. Greg Rios verified that Ms. Brown could not tell a participant that if he or she files for a timely request for a state hearing, the sanction will be stopped until a hearing decision is issued or the hearing is abandoned. Ms. Rios insisted that the Employment Worker has no duty to tell participants what their rights are. In fact she insisted that it is Madera County policy that Employment Services cannot tell WtW participant anything about aid paid pending, one of the state hearing rights of WtW participants.

It is also ironic, but common county practice, that there is no sanction for Ms. Brown requiring this participant to appear for an appointment that she refuses to keep and Madera County refused to have somebody see him. Now Ms. Brown is threatening with a sanction and refusing to provide truthful information. No county accountability in California for willful refusal to do their job. We are sure that Ms. Brown got her paycheck for July even if she did not do her job.

We also looked at the performance of the Madera County WtW program for April of 2008. 70% of the WtW participants are not getting transportation during April 2008. During April 2008 Madera County had 284 persons sanctioned while they **only found jobs that resulted in termination of CalWORKs for 20 participants**. The county has 845 participants and only 254 of them received transportation. How are the other 591 participants getting transportation in this rural county?

Homeless Assistance Institutional Lawbreaking by DSS and C-4 counties

A C-4 county client was authorized permanent homeless assistance as a result of a fair hearing conditional withdrawal. The county was not able to issue the payment to the recipient. It took a week or more before the payment was issued to the recipient. **When we asked the county why the county was unable to issue the homeless assistance payment on the EBT card or by check to the recipient, we were told that the C-4 computer is programmed to issue all homeless assistance payments to landlords or hotels.** The county was forced to do a work around, which took more than a week to issue a check. Thus, federal and state money has been appropriated to build a computer system that is designed to break the law. As we have said before in these columns often welfare bureaucrats ignore the law while persecuting welfare recipients for breaking the law. DSS and counties have intentionally built a computer system that breaks the law.

The law requires that such assistance be issued on the date of the request, but no later than the next working day. MPP §44-211.534. The payment shall be issued to the assistance unit unless the assistance unit has shelter at no cost.

"MPP §44-211.512 - ... a homeless assistance payment shall not be issued to an AU if the CWD establishes that the AU has shelter at no cost."

MPP §44-211.516 provides:

"The county shall comply with the AU's written request to make payments to the AU or to the provider of temporary shelter, permanent housing or utilities unless the conditions in Section 44-211.517 exist."

Section 44-211.517 provides that the AU shall receive restricted payments when the county established a finding of mismanagement of AFDC cash assistance. The designers of the C-4 computer composed of state and county welfare officials have decided that all welfare recipients receiving cash assistance in the C-4 counties are guilty of mismanagement of their AFDC cash assistance.