

CCWRO New Welfare News

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc.

1901 Alhambra Blvd. Sacramento, CA 95816

Telephone (916) 736-0616 • (916) 712-0071 (Cell) • (916) 736-2645 (Fax) • www.ccwro.org

April 12, 2010
Issue # 2010-09

In Brief

• The Governor's 2010-2011 proposed budget proposes cutting CalWORKs grants by 15.7%. This will save \$130 million for the General Fund. This will bring CalWORKs grants down to what recipients were getting in 1985. How much will CalWORKs families contribute to the General Fund in 2010-2011 under the Governor's proposed budget? **\$1.3 billion**. How much have California's impoverished families contributed to the General Fund since the enactment of the anti-family TANF/CalWORKs program? **About \$13.7 billion**. This is accomplished by using federal TANF dollars for non-CalWORKs expenditures. Source: Swarzanegger Administration. A copy of the document verifying this fact is attached hereto.

• The California Department of Social Services CalWORKs Eligibility Bureau is now down to 10 people. Of those 10, Angela Scott and Jennie McKendrie are on medical leave. Linda Johnson has returned from retirement as a unit manager. She has Dennis Ragasa, Beverly Brown and Matthew Deverux in her unit. Paulette Dreher is a unit manager with 2 people out on medical leave and has one analyst, Mahsa Patton. Finally there is Peggy Hansen, whose unit has two vacancies, She has Owen Stewart and Cynthia Stone in her unit. Maria Hernandez is the Bureau chief. ACIN 63-99 reveals that this bureau used to have 22 authorized positions.

County Food Stamp Law Violations In California

DSS publishes Food Stamp Management Evaluation Reports of various counties as required by federal regulations. These reports are not posted on the web even though the Administration was directed to post all monitoring reports on the web. We have secured these reports under the California Public Records Act in our continued efforts to monitor county compliance with the laws and regulations governing public assistance programs of California.

Los Angeles DPSS Ignores State Regulations Designed to Protect the Hungry

On 2-8-09 through 2-13-09 DSS conducted a review of the Los Angeles County Food Stamp system and found some issues that may be present in many other counties of California.

1. The report shows that many applicants were seen standing in line to get a food stamp application when they should be able to pick up an application without standing in line. The report states that "The county should ensure that all offices have the FS applications readily available in the lobby to allow eligible households (HH) access to applicants without having to stand in line to request one from reception (MPP §63-300.34)

2. The report reveals that Rancho Park District Office receptionists do not date stamp the application. The intake worker placed the date on the application during the intake interview. MPP § 63-300.33 states "The CWD shall document the date the application was

filed by recording on the application the date it was received by the food stamp office." This is required to protect the date that the application was filed with the county.

3. Individuals requesting Non-Assistance Food Stamps in the Southwest Special District office or Rancho Park office are not provided the food stamp application at initial contact in violation of MPP §63-300.31 which states "Each household shall be advised of their right to file an application, either paper or electronic, on the same day they contact the Food Stamp office during office hours." The report states "Applicants are given a pre-interview work sheet to complete and asked to wait until they are called by the reception or the case opening clerk. The application (SAWS 1) is computer generated for the applicant's review and signature. If the person leaves the office prior to returning the pre-interview form, the household would lose an opportunity to obtain and file an application on the initial day of contact."

This is also a violation of MPP § 63-300.21 that states:

"Screening

Applicants shall not be required to complete any CWD developed prescreening form."

This violation was not mentioned in the DSS report.

4. Individuals requesting Medi-Cal and FS or General Relief (GR) and FS in the Southwest Special and Rancho Park District offices are given two different FS applicants (SAWS 1 and DFA 285 A1) to complete. The applicant should be given only one of these required applications. MPP §63-300.2.

5. In violation of MPP Section 63-300.34, Los Angeles County refuses to take food stamp application from persons not liv-

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, Steve Goldberg and Diane Aslanian**

ing in the zip codes covered by the office that the applicant initially contacts. MPP Section 63-300.34 requires that an application can be filed at any County Welfare Department office, and the application is to be forwarded to the correct office for an interview.

6. In all offices reviewed by DSS food stamp applicants were not verbally informed of expedited service (ES) and how to apply for it. "In most instances, applicants are just asked to sign the SAWS1 at reception without clear information on ES."

7. Los Angeles County continues to fail to review cases for Expedited Service. Los Angeles County was cited for the same failure during DSS' 2008 review.

The report does not discuss whether any of the Los Angeles County Offices were in compliance with MPP § 11.601.314 that states:

"Post notices in prominent locations within the CWD's offices and in the public areas, including the doors, immediately outside the CWD's offices which inform the public of the following:

- (a) The working days, or the regular eight hours of a working day, when the offices will be closed;
- (b) The procedures for obtaining and filing applications for Food Stamp and AFDC benefits during these hours of office closure; and
- (c) The procedures for applying for and receiving expedited Food Stamp, immediate need AFDC, and homeless assistance benefits within the time limits prescribed by federal and state law, during these hours of office closure." Most of the offices do not comply with this regulation."

It seems like Los Angeles County is refusing to obey several laws designed to protect food stamp recipients. These kinds of repetitive and callous violations of the law by county officials hurt poor households and innocent children. Los Angeles County uses a pre-

screening form in violation of the law. Los Angeles County refuses to allow applicants to complete a SAWS1 as required by state regulations while they terminate recipient's benefits for any alleged failure.

Ventura County Review

In a Ventura review conducted by DSS in January of 2009, DSS made the following findings:

Application filing date is not recorded on the application upon receipt in violation of MPP § 63-300.33.

The normal business hours are not displayed in the exterior of the Oxnard office in violation of ACL 04-55 and MPP § 11.601.314. The Oxnard office refuses to accept food stamp applications 2 p.m. They require applicants to return the next day to file the application. This results in the loss of benefits for between one and three days depending on which day this unlawful county act occurs.

Ventura County refuses to verbally advise applicants of the availability of Food Stamp Expedited Service as required by law.

Riverside County Review

A food stamp management review was done by DSS during May of 2009. The report made the following findings:

Like other counties, Riverside County fails to make applications available as mandated by MPP §63-300.34. Individuals have to stand in a long line to get their application for Food Stamps.

"Applicants are not provided with the opportunity or advised of their right to file an incomplete application on the initial day of contact at the Indio District Office (MPP §63-300.31 and .32.) This occurs in situations where an applicant is unable to stay in the office to complete the application packet, thus not protecting the date of aid. An incomplete application requires only the applicant's name, address and signature. This was also a finding from the last FFY's ME." It appears that Riverside County is ignoring laws and regulations designed to protect food stamp recipients by intentionally not complying after being told in writing of their violations.

Applicants are asked to sign the SAWS1 under penalty of perjury that they have

been informed of their right to Food Stamp ES when the county is refusing to do so upon application in violation of state regulations.

In one case, a Riverside County Eligibility Worker refused to issue expedited services to a homeless family for failure to provide verification of residency. The worker also said that he would deny both Food Stamps and CalWORKs to this homeless family for failure to provide verification of residence. Neither Expedited Service food stamp nor CalWORKs benefits can be denied to homeless families for failure to have an address.

Another worker at the Hemet office refused to issue FS-ES benefits for failure to provide a copy of the social security card, although the applicant did provide verification of identity.

Placer County Review

Placer County was found not posting hours of operations in violation of MPP § 11.601.314, refusing to make applications available without the necessity of standing in line at the food stamp office, and not telling applicants that they can file an application without waiting for a hour or more to be prescreened. Moreover, the monitoring report states Placer County workers are not aware of FS-ES rules.

Humboldt County Review

Humboldt County refuses to allow applicants file an incomplete application to protect their date of application. Reception staff does not know the FS-ES rules, thus they are not able to verbally inform applicants of their right to FS-ES as required by law.

CONCLUSION

The Management Evaluation reports show continued widespread violations of food stamp regulations. The reports state that many of the violations were found in previous reports but were not corrected. Unfortunately, the California Department of Social Services seems unable to compel County Welfare Departments to correct these violation.

CalWORKs and TANF Funding Chart

	FY 1998-99	FY 1999-00	FY 2000-01	FY 2001-02	FY 2002-03	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10 Governor's Budget	2010-11 Governor's Budget
Total TANF Grant/Required MOE	6,640,971,000	6,639,655,000	6,457,111,000	6,439,482,000	6,425,431,000	6,425,952,000	6,420,148,000	6,408,523,000	6,406,842,000	6,402,415,000	6,583,092,000	6,577,997,000	6,568,562,000
CalWORKs Program (Actuals) ^{1/}	5,452,464,887	5,644,024,929	5,228,224,151	5,065,837,686	5,234,304,599	4,726,400,275	4,977,898,939	4,827,632,403	4,780,360,853	5,035,819,569	5,341,526,077	5,584,669,000	5,297,562,000
Grants	3,728,895,597	3,409,184,226	3,110,590,925	3,126,453,615	2,998,104,490	3,058,377,136	3,272,331,000	3,067,470,861	2,949,089,178	3,006,359,917	3,275,981,220	3,429,131,000	3,167,478,000
Administration	518,317,463	563,062,953	539,640,224	554,944,600	499,797,000	477,145,347	577,510,368	534,258,293	555,745,996	584,572,008	579,578,620	603,204,078	585,065,548
Services	450,275,279	569,166,870	659,554,385	725,821,297	766,605,000	593,584,707	666,412,363	692,825,442	717,380,363	804,993,424	829,198,822	862,999,589	837,048,928
Child Care	360,733,329	524,045,984	571,661,082	537,865,541	548,577,000	486,111,807	451,267,208	428,742,096	450,703,076	526,040,292	542,554,111	564,670,333	547,690,524
Substance Abuse/Mental Health Svcs	21,212,219	67,946,896	96,777,535	98,752,643	118,377,109	111,241,278	110,378,000	104,335,711	107,442,240	113,853,928	114,313,304	124,664,000	120,279,000
County Share of Admin/Svcs ^{2/}	80,807,136	82,344,889	70,220,490	63,070,804	65,344,000	53,410,000	61,429,000	57,462,000	27,550,000	36,489,082	27,214,878	8,368,000	0
Tribal TANF ^{3/}											71,001,000	77,092,000	88,385,000
Performance Incentives(budgeted)	373,031,000	510,618,000	250,000,000	20,000,000	302,844,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Probation	201,413,000	201,413,000	201,413,000	201,413,000	201,413,000	201,413,000	67,138,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student Aid Commission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,336,000
KinGAP	0	0	25,919,000	69,859,000	76,232,000	88,318,000	94,308,000	96,340,000	137,425,000	120,737,000	114,052,000	112,113,000	114,828,000
ARRA Subsidized Employment - ECF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41,327,000
Non-CalWORKs MOE/TANF in CDSS	(11,269,000)	(8,429,000)	(7,708,000)	(14,356,000)	(2,330,000)	(12,363,000)	(10,322,000)	(10,219,000)	(197,460,000)	(192,378,000)	(196,041,000)	(188,607,000)	(146,323,000)
Other MOE/TANF in CDSS	305,663,000	334,380,000	344,605,000	402,604,000	384,872,000	331,849,000	315,403,000	331,194,000	214,330,000	263,857,000	271,073,000	306,246,000	297,985,000
MOE in Other Department Budgets	402,839,000	410,869,000	466,450,000	474,184,000	377,043,000	461,401,000	411,967,000	500,527,000	476,424,000	1,005,748,000	714,079,000	668,044,000	627,301,000
State Support	29,016,000	26,714,000	26,592,000	29,198,000	23,979,000	27,242,000	27,462,000	26,060,000	24,909,000	25,774,000	28,131,000	29,988,000	29,906,000
Total Expenditures ^{4/}	6,380,126,887	6,608,971,929	6,285,095,151	6,228,739,696	6,295,513,599	5,824,320,275	5,883,854,939	5,771,534,403	5,435,988,853	6,259,557,569	6,272,820,077	6,748,023,000	6,329,307,000
Federal TANF	3,472,973,887	3,703,134,929	3,561,802,151	3,523,075,696	3,603,900,599	3,132,186,275	3,422,342,000	3,297,312,000	2,972,412,000	3,722,511,000	3,560,047,000	3,903,844,000	3,494,563,000
General Fund	2,733,123,474	2,708,262,505	2,545,307,737	2,477,681,856	2,521,316,388	2,487,383,000	2,490,171,000	2,483,755,000	2,518,089,000	2,498,949,000	2,715,820,000	2,705,199,000	2,657,569,000
Other State Funds (ETF)	0	30,000,000	30,000,000	86,700,000	30,000,000	56,432,000	40,475,000	38,010,000	20,087,000	45,000,000	35,000,000	20,000,000	0
Other State Funds (DAPT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73,000,000
Other State Funds (Prop 10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104,175,000
County Funds	174,029,526	167,574,495	147,985,263	141,282,144	140,296,612	148,319,000	155,684,000	152,940,000	134,848,000	124,648,000	133,454,000	118,980,000	104,175,000
Total TANF transfers	284,965,000	531,654,000	606,149,000	497,376,000	636,521,000	675,546,000	475,396,000	689,917,000	798,270,000	468,773,000	442,017,000	447,936,000	458,848,000
Non-CalWORKs Transfers	0	0	5,339,000	0	70,793,000	100,135,000	85,579,000	191,489,000	176,409,000	175,403,000	169,793,000	176,613,000	217,697,000
Transfers to Stage 2, Title XX for Child Care, Tribal TANF & Reserves	284,965,000	531,654,000	600,810,000	497,376,000	565,548,000	575,411,000	389,817,000	498,428,000	621,861,000	293,370,000	272,224,000	271,323,000	241,151,000
TANF Grant/Required MOE	6,640,971,000	6,639,655,000	6,457,111,000	6,439,482,000	6,425,431,000	6,425,952,000	6,420,148,000	6,408,523,000	6,406,842,000	6,402,415,000	6,583,092,000	6,577,997,000	6,568,562,000
General Fund Above Base MOE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prior Year TANF Carryforward	617,020,000	854,309,000	520,661,000	503,004,000	283,783,000	509,190,000	545,245,000	638,369,000	424,356,000	457,466,000	119,532,000	75,374,000	7,265,000
ARRA - Emergency Contingency Funds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	259,212,000	391,345,000	171,001,000
ARRA - Subsidized Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158,508,000	158,508,000	41,327,000
Net TANF Block Grant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unspent Performance Incentives	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High Performance Bonus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Available Funding	7,257,991,000	7,493,964,000	6,977,772,000	6,942,486,000	7,309,214,000	6,949,261,000	6,972,437,000	7,059,814,000	6,831,198,000	6,859,881,000	6,961,836,000	7,203,224,000	6,788,155,000
Total TANF/MOE Expend	6,665,091,887	7,142,163,682	6,880,657,505	6,708,379,364	6,916,571,463	6,472,469,139	6,584,068,000	6,661,934,000	6,234,258,853	6,728,330,569	6,714,837,077	7,195,959,000	6,788,155,000
NET TANF Carry-over Funds	592,899,113	351,800,318	97,114,495	234,106,636	392,642,537	476,891,861	388,369,000	397,880,000	387,492,000	0	75,498,000	7,265,000	0
CalWORKs contribution to the General Fund	708,502,000	745,249,000	1,021,913,000	1,126,647,000	1,088,940,000	1,163,238,000	1,087,321,000	1,299,448,000	1,184,134,000	1,745,291,000	1,268,997,000	1,263,016,000	1,278,147,000
Excess MOE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492,498,000	172,000,000-324,000,000	115,800,000-265,800,000	0	0
CDE Child Care Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44,149,000	0	72,000,000	0	0
After School MOE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225,349,000	100,000,000-252,000,000	37,800,000-187,800,000	0	0
Community College Fee Waivers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CalGrants MOE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223,000,000	0	0	0	0
Total Contribution to Date												\$13,702,696,000.00	

Note: CalWORKs Contribution to the General Funds Includes KinGAP, Other MOE in CDSS, Other Department MOE, Non CalWORKs TANF Transfers and the WPR adjustment for meeting the rate.

^{1/} CalWORKs Program Expenditures (except Performance Incentives and Tribal TANF) represent actuals for FY 1998-99 through 2008-09. Other expenditures represent budgeted figures; however, the Services, Administration and Child Care figures reflect an adjustment to display the budgeted dollars based on actual expenditure levels.

^{2/} This is a non-add line because the estimated county share is included in the CalWORKs actual budgeted expenditures.

^{3/} The Tribal TANF funds reflected in FY 2008-09 were formally included in the Grants, Admin and Services sections but are now shown separately.

^{4/} The Total Expenditures are based on actual figures for prior years and estimated amounts in current and budget year. The sharing of expenditures is based on estimated amounts.