

# 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

November 3, 2008,  
Issue #08-21

## In Brief

● **NO VACATION ALLOWED FOR CalWORKS WORKING POOR.** - The federal TANF work participation regulations state that paid vacation does not count as work - welfare recipients are second class workers in the eyes of the Bush Administration.

● **COLLEGE STUDENTS BEING HARASSED BY COUNTIES** - The California Welfare-to-Work law gives wide discretion to counties. One discretion counties have is to come up with a policy whether or not the student is making "satisfactory progress."

Rationally, satisfactory progress should be defined by the educational institution and not the welfare bureaucrats.

However, many counties are requiring students to bring in monthly reports to prove that they are making satisfactory progress. This takes a lot of county bureaucratic time and lot of time from the students and the college.

Now that counties have had their "single allocation" reduced by \$88 million, one would think that they would engage in more efficient administration of the WtW program.

● **STATE HEARINGS ON THE RISE** - During February through July of 2008 there were 1,219 more hearing held than during the same period in 2007.

## Statistical Fact of the Month

The Governor is again talking about using CalWORKs money to balance the budget. In the 2008-2009 state budget just passed welfare recipients contributed \$1.3 billion to balance the state budget. To date Welfare recipients have contributed \$12.5 billion. CalWORKs grants are at the same dollar level that they were in 1989 and there has been no COLA for three years.

## CWD CLIENT ABUSE REPORT

In October 25, 2008 Ms. K.F. of Contra Costa County was mailed a letter denying her application of on or about September 24, 2008. She reapplied for CalWORKs, Food Stamp and Medi-Cal on October 29, 2008. The county completed her SAWS1 although she did not asked the county to complete it for her. She did indicate that she will run out of food in three days and needed assistance with money for transportation which appeared on the SAWS1. She was told to return in the morning of October 30, 2008 for orientation. At orientation she was called out of orientation and told to go home. Her former welfare worker told her that she cannot reapply for CalWORKs, Food Stamps or Medi-Cal.

We contacted Contra Costa County for a comment, and did not receive any comment. It appears this is common practice in Contra Costa County. What laws have been broken by Contra Cost County?

**COUNT ONE** - Violation of **MPP §40-109.1** Right to Apply for Aid "...any person has the right to apply for aid, either on his/her own behalf or on behalf of another. An applicant who appears ineligible must still be allowed to exercise his/her right to make an application." Ms. K.F. was not allowed to do so.

**COUNT TWO**- Violation of MPP § **40-128.33** "The county shall not complete the Immediate Need section of the application or the Immediate Need Payment Request (CA 4, 9/90), except at the applicant's specific request." Ms. K.F was not allowed to complete the SAWS1.

**COUNT THREE**- Violation of MPP **§40-128.41** "If the applicant indicates on the initial application or the Immediate Need Payment Request (CA 4, 9/90) that the family has an emergency situation as defined in MPP 40-129.13, the county shall conduct an Immediate Need interview no later than the next working day following the date the Immediate Need request is received." Ms. K.F. had no interview the next working day.

**COUNT FOUR** - Violation of MPP **§63-301.5**. Refusal to issue expedited service food stamp benefits. If the applicant has less than \$100 in liquid resources and has no other income, then they shall received Food Stamp benefits within three days. Ms. K.F. did not get any food stamps by 10-31-08.