

CCWRO Welfare News

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc.
1901 Alhambra Blvd. Sacramento, CA 95816

<http://www.ccwro.org>

January 15, 2012
Issue # 2012-01

A View of Welfare

“Today I want to talk about welfare. If there was no welfare I would not have to pay taxes. I know that because I have educated myself - welfare (TANF) costs about \$14 billion a year. Yes, I know our federal budget is \$3.7 trillion and growing, but all of my tax dollars go to welfare for the poor.

You see I have this neighbor. Her husband is wealthy, but does not pay child support. Now she goes on welfare and I have to pay for it. She has three kids, 3, 5 and 8. She could get a job and have the 8-year old watch the 3 and 5 year old. That's what our forefathers did. And why can't she find a job? There are 14 people looking for every three (3) available jobs. I know there are a lot of jobs. All you have to do is apply and boom you have a job.

Her 8 year old goes to school with my 8 year old. He seems to always be hungry. Why I do not understand. He steals food from my kid just because he is hungry. If he has no food he should not eat. He should get a job and earn his food. Ask Gingrich. He'll tell you. I asked his mom why is her 8-year old hungry sometimes and she says that she runs out of food in the middle of the month. Why can't she work for food? There are 14 people looking for 3 available jobs and people know that. Last month my kid came home sick because my welfare recipient neighbor sent her sick kid to school. I asked her why and she said that they would reduce her welfare check if the kid does not go to school. I asked her even if your kid is sick? She said “yes” unless I have medical verification that he was sick. I said why can't you get that? She said she does not have bus fare to get to the doctor. I had no idea that we had buses in my town. Doesn't the welfare give you a car I asked? That's what the Heritage Foundation says. She says not true. Wow.

I asked how much she gets on welfare for three people. I know that my tax dollars are used to the benefit of the poor. And I found out that she gets a lot of money from welfare – she gets the same amount that a family of three got in 1985 - \$608 a month. I had no idea we paid so much for a family of three. Anybody should be able to get by with \$7,200 a year. Our forefathers did it why can't she?”

\$10 Million Cut from the Ill Conceived IHSS Anti-Fraud Program Is Welcomed

The Budget for 2011-2012 passed by the State Legislature this year recognized the potential risk to the state's fiscal condition if revenues fell short of the forecast and established cuts that would go into effect in that event.

Chapter 41, Statutes of 2011, requires the Director of Finance (Department) to update the estimate of General Fund revenues for 2011-12, compare those revenues to the Legislative Analyst's November estimate, and determine which estimate is higher.

The Department of Finance's updated revenue estimate for 2011-12 to be \$86,247,700,000. This amount is \$2,204,800,000 lower than the revenue specified in Section 3.94 of the Budget Act.

The Legislative Analyst's estimate was \$84,764,000,000. The Department of Finance estimate is higher and therefore is the operative forecast.

Pursuant to Section 3.94 and other sections of law, the Legislature established certain specific spending reductions or revenues that shall occur based on the operative revenue forecast.

The IHSS program was supposed to face a 20% cut in hours, but that was blocked in court.

The reduction in the so-called anti-fraud \$10 million gift to the county district attorneys also went into on January 1, 2012 and we welcome this cut. The report that these so-called anti-fraud units have been issuing is full of contrived estimates of savings that are not verifiable. Ultimately, IHSS anti-fraud efforts spend more on staff than they save.

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, Seth Blackmon, Stephen Goldberg and Diane Aslanian**

How a Bill Becomes Law in U.S. Congress

HR 3765 that contains a two-month extension of the middle class tax cut, unemployment benefits and TANF authorization.

H.R.3765 Latest Title: Temporary Payroll Tax Cut Continuation Act of 2011

Sponsor: Rep Camp, Dave [MI-4] (introduced 12/23/2011)
Cosponsors (None)

Related Bills: H.R.3630, H.R.3743

Latest Major Action: 12/23/2011 Signed by President.

MAJOR ACTIONS:

12/23/2011	Introduced in House
12/23/2011	Committee on Ways and Means discharged.
12/23/2011	Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged.
12/23/2011	Committee on Transportation discharged.
12/23/2011	Committee on Natural Resources discharged.
12/23/2011	Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged.
12/23/2011	Committee on Financial Services discharged.
12/23/2011	Committee on The Budget discharged.
12/23/2011	Passed/agreed to in House: On passage Passed without objection.
12/23/2011	Presented to President.
12/23/2011	Signed by President.

It all happened in one day. What a way to run a Country.

EBT Assults Food Stamp Recipients Food Privacy

On July 14, 2011 Loel Griffith of Lassen County send an email to DSS posing the following question:

“Client comes into apply and states that he/she is a Lassen resident and is currently homeless. This becomes a change-reporting household, once that case is granted and must report any change with 10 days. No contact from client and we look up EBT history or get the “Out of County/State Usage Report”, showing that the client has been spending all of their benefits in Washington or Idaho or Montana (not a border state) for multiple months. We discontinue the case, but are those previous months considered an over-issuance? Should we contact the State they where using their card to see there is duplicate aid? Is there an over-issuance, what month would the over-issuance start (example: started using FS in Washington on 4/6/11 and we discontinued the case 7/1/11)?”

On August 5, 2011, Eden-Marie Eulingborough responded that:

“...pursuant to MPP 63-801.311(c)(1), an over-issuance begins the first month in which the change would have been effective had it been timely reported. Therefore, in your scenario, it appears the recipient began using benefits in Washington on 4/7/11. It is reasonable to assume that this is the date the recipient established residency in that state. Therefore, the over-issuance would begin May 2011.”

It has been a long-standing federal policy that a food stamp recipient can use his or her EBT card anywhere in the United States of the America. **Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations § 274.12(h)(10)** provide:

“Interoperability. State agencies must adopt uniform standards to facilitate interoperability and portability nationwide. The term “interoperability” means the EBT system must enable a coupon issued in the form of an EBT card to be redeemed in any State.”

The California Food Stamp Agency sanctioned County termination of Food Stamp benefits solely based on the fact that the HH was exercising its federal right to use the food stamps throughout the United States of America places a chilling effect on anybody trying to exercise rights under 7 CFR 273.12(h)(10).

It is very clear – food stamp recipient can use their EBT card anywhere. But that does not mean the state and county food stamp officials would not retaliate against food stamp recipients to exercise this right.

Many counties in California regularly invade the privacy of food stamp recipients by looking at where they used their food stamp benefits and how they used those benefits. Yes. Big Brother is watching us in the form state and county food stamp officials. They never tell you that when you get food stamps you also give up your food privacy for most part.

In this case there was no evidence that this food stamp recipient had established residence in another state. Moreover, in the United States of America even food stamp recipients have a right to travel.

DSS told the county to establish an over-issuance against this household (HH) without any evidence that the HH had established residence somewhere else. The prudent suggestion from Lassen County that they should contact the other states to see if the HH was receiving duplicate aid was rejected by DSS. That may be because if the county found out that the HH was not receiving aid from the another state then they are still a resident of California and not of another state.

The California Food Stamp Agency sanctioned County termination of Food Stamp benefits solely based on the fact that the HH was exercising its federal right to use the food stamps throughout the United States of America places a chilling effect on anybody trying to exercise rights under 7 CFR 273.12(h)(10).