

# 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

**June 6, 2010**  
**Issue # 2010-14**

## In Brief

- On March 30, 2010, every county was informed of the county participation rates for Federal Fiscal Year 2008. Only one county, Glenn, met the 50% federal participation rate. Every other county, after spending over \$1 billion for the welfare to work bureaucrats and over \$.5 billion on childcare, failed to meet the 50% participation rates, but they sanctioned many poor families as evidenced on page 2. No county met the two-family 90% participation rates.

- Overall child care expenditures for the State declined by 16%. The number of families served declined by 11% from July 2009 to January 2010 because of short term exemptions enacted last year. These exemptions exempted families with children under the age of two and families with one of more children under the age of six from participating in Welfare-to-Work activities.

- The California Department of Education (CDE) is working on 13 regulation packets that are being withheld from advocates, but have been shared with the County Welfare Department Association (CWDA) and others. It will take CDE 5 months to respond to reasonable Public Records Act requests. CDE seems to be rejecting the idea of open government and instead is practicing closed/secret government. On the other hand CDE has requested that DSS share their draft ACL/ACINs with CDE.

## County Client Abuse Report

**Los Angeles CalWORKs client getting paid for 20 hours of work from TANF ECF money, then forced to perform 15 hours of UNPAID LABOR doing the same job.** A client in Los Angeles is working for 20 hours a week doing one of the 100,000 jobs that Los Angeles County developed for CalWORKs recipients with the TANF ECF for Subsidized Employment. The same client is mandated to do another 15 hours of unpaid labor at the same job location doing identical work. 20 hours paid – 15 hours unpaid. Why not pay for 35 hours?

**Los Angeles County imposes sanction for future acts of the claimant.** Ms. Latoya O. (B100Q79) applied for aid in 2005 for herself and her minor child. For one month she received aid. Then her aid was reduced due to alleged failure to cooperate with the child support bureaucracy. For the last five (5) years she has never received aid for more than one person. On January 23, 2008 she received a Notice of Action stating that her aid would be reduced from \$359 to \$17 for failure to cooperate with the Los Angeles County WtW program known as the GAIN program. The reason given on this notice of action (NOA) was "...our records show that you did not: Participate or make good progress in your Job Club with Orientation activity because you did not comply with GAIN requirements." The next sentence gave her an appointment with the county for 2-4-08 to "...talk with you about this problem."

A complete search of all WtW regulations, All County Letters and All County Information Notices did not reveal any WtW activity called "Job Club Orientation." Maybe Los Angeles County has promulgated its own state regulations. Who knows? Ms. Latoya O. requested a state hearing which was conducted in late May of 2010. The county representative testified under oath that Los Angeles County sanctioned Ms. Latoya O. with the NOA dated 1/23/08 for failure to attend the 2/4/08 and 4/13/08 meetings. After being questioned about the absurdity of sanctioning Latoya O. for future acts, she insisted that the sanction was correct. Ms. Latoya O. is waiting for a decision.

**San Bernardino County imposes a sanction without a 30-day Notice in violation of MPP §42-721.23.** Ms. 20106009 received a notice of action dated December 14, 2009 imposing a sanction effective January 1, 2010. This victim requested a state hearing and the Administrative Law Judge, retired annuitant Jack Wright, ignored the law that mandates a 30-day notice of action before imposing a Welfare-to-Work sanction and upheld the unlawful sanction.

*"§ 42-721.23 Upon determination that an individual has failed or refused to comply with program requirements, the CWD shall send the individual a notice of action effective no earlier than 30 calendar days from the date of issuance."*

**Alameda County refuses to provide supportive services to a working CalWORKs family while using the income to reduce his CalWORKs grant each month.** Mr. 2010026106 has been working 24 hours a week since June of 2009. The hearing decision states that he is a CalWIN participant. This is wrong. He is a CalWORKs recipient and a WtW participant. In this case, supportive services were not paid for over 6 long months while the earned income of Mr. 2010026106 was being used to reduce his CalWORKs grant every month. Although the earnings reported were being used to reduce Mr. 2010026106's CalWORKs grant each month, Alameda County continued to refuse to pay supportive services because they were unable to verify that he was actually working. The hearing officer ruled that the county should pay supportive services as required by law.

**Sacramento County cannot meet the work participation rates but tries to stop a family who are meeting the work participation, from meeting such rates.** Mr. and Mrs. 1B18D27, a Sacramento couple on CalWORKs, are working 36 hours a week work study because they are attending school 8 hours a week. Sacramento County is refusing to pay for supportive services for the 8 hours a week of school that can result in the loss of 36 hours a week employment at the school. In Federal Fiscal Year 2008 Sacramento County missed the 90% participation rates for couples by 66%. No wonder. They try to discourage people who are actually meeting the participation rates by coming up with all kinds of bureaucratic schemes not to pay for supportive services.

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, Media Cal, General Assistance & Refugee/Immigrant Eligibility. Refugee/Immigrant Eligibility. All Rights Reserved. **Contributors: Kevin Aslanian, Grace Galligher, Steve Goldberg and Diane Aslanian**

# California Welfare-to-Work Program Update How Much Do We Spend and What Do We Get?

## 2009-2010 Welfare-to-Work Services Appropriation

# \$1,013,810.00

## 2009-2010 Welfare-to-Work Child Appropriation

# \$515,197.00

	Jan. 2010	Febr. 2010	March 2010
Number of Unduplicated Participants	141,566	140,909	142,799
Gross Number of Participants Being Sanctioned	46,183	45,104	44,286
Number of Participants Sanctioned THIS MONTH	25,495	25,523	23,673
Dollar Loss to Families and Children Being Sanctioned	\$5.5 million	\$5.6 million	\$5.5 million
Number of Participants Who Entered Employment	7,628	7,250	9,136
Number of Participants Who Entered Employment that Resulted in Termination of CalWORKs	3,369	3,400	3,501
<b>TOTAL JOBS</b>	<b>10,997</b>	<b>10,650</b>	<b>12,664</b>
<b>TOTAL SANCTIONS IMPOSED</b>	<b>25,495</b>	<b>25,523</b>	<b>23,673</b>
<b>HOW MANY MORE PARTICIPANTS WERE SANCTIONED V. FOUND EMPLOYMENT?</b>	<b>14,498</b>	<b>14,473</b>	<b>11,009</b>
Number of Unduplicated Participants NOT Being Paid Transportation by the County	77,866	76,339	70,231
Estimated Dollar Loss to the Family Not Being Paid Transportation by the County	\$7.8 million	\$7.6 million	\$7 million

## Analysis

During **March** of 2010 17% of participants were sanctioned by the Welfare-to-Work Program. 9% of participants found employment.

Thus, 8% more participants were sanctioned compared to the percentage of participants who found employment. This difference provides significant statistical evidence that the program is slanted toward sanctioning participants rather than making participants self-sufficient.

Sanctions resulted in the loss of **\$5.5 million dollars** each month for California's impoverished families.

During **March** of 2010 51% of participants who are entitled to transportation did not receive these benefits. The law provides that needed transportation assistance be paid in advance to assure that participants do not use money from their fixed incomes; incomes which are at the same level that CalWORKs recipients received in 1989 for transportation. Over 90% of the participants have to use some means of transportation to reach the location of their WtW activity.

During **March** of 2010 CalWORKs recipients were denied **\$7 million** in transportation services by county welfare departments with the cooperation of the State Department of Social Services.