

CCWRO 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

<http://www.ccwro.org>

July 9, 2013
Issue #2013-10

Illegal and Designed to Imposed Government induced Economic Child Abuse

Effective January 1, 2013 SB 1041 imposed a punitive 24-month time limit on CalWORKs recipients. To offset this Welfare-to-Work Plan Process Illegal and Designed to Imposed Government induced Economic Child Abuse

The purpose of a Welfare-to-Work plan is allegedly for the county and the participant to mutually develop a self-sufficiency plan that achieves self-sufficiency that reflect the alleged robust assessment. Many counties do plans in stages. This results in county opportunities to sanction the participant.

CDSS and counties insist that WtW participants are involved in the decision as to what path to take towards self-sufficiency by coming up with a "self-sufficiency plan." In real life, WtW participants are given a plan for a certain activity, then another one for another activity, or a plan for part 1 of the activity, such as attending the fall semester at college, and then another brand new plan for stage two of the same activity, such as the spring semester at college. Why is this done this way? We looked at the county sanctions to see if this plays a part in the California sanction ridden welfare-to-work program.

We found that one of the major reasons for sanctioning WtW participants in California is the alleged failure to sign a welfare-to-work plan. Counties force participants to sign multiple WtW contracts which often result in sanctions. The last CDSS WtW report showed that 35% of the WtW participants were sanctioned while only 4% of the participants in the same month found employment that resulted in termination of CalWORKs benefits. This does not necessarily mean that families achieve self-sufficiency. Many families terminated from CalWORKs continue to live in deep poverty. Is this legal? We looked at W&IC § 11325.21 to see if the statute permits counties to require multiple WtW plans and found that there is no authority in the statute for multiple WtW plans. The statute requires that counties do a WtW plan within 90 days that "...shall include the activities and services that will move the individual into employment." This does not provide for a separate WtW plan for each activity that would enhance the opportunities for the county to impose WtW sanctions on WtW participants resulting in government induced "economic child abuse."

Subsection (e) provides that the plan "...shall specify, and shall be amended to reflect changes in, the participant's wel-

fare-to-work activity, a description of services to be provided in accordance with Sections 11322.6, 11322.8, and 11322.85, as needed, and specific requirements for successful completion of assigned activities including required hours of participation."

There is a major difference between amending a plan and having a brand new plan. If a plan is not for 48 months, then the plan is a sham and is designed to achieve the actual purpose of the program – imposing sanctions on impoverished families.

W&IC § 11327.4(a)(2) does not authorize counties to impose WtW sanctions for failure to sign the amended plan. It expressly limits the county ability to impose sanctions only for "failing or refusing to sign a welfare-to-work plan" and not an amended plan. Thus, counties have been subverting the statute to achieve the ultimate goal of the WtW plan – sanctioning WtW participants to impose government induced economic child abuse upon poor families.

W&IC § 11327.4 (a)(2) states: "For the purposes of this article, the phrase "failed or refused to comply with program requirements" shall be limited to: failing or refusing to sign a welfare-to-work plan, participate or provide required proof of satisfactory progress in any assigned program activity, pursuant to this article, including self-initiated programs described in Section 11325.23 or accept employment; terminating employment; or reducing earnings."

SB 1041 Preliminary Look

- In October 2012 there were 119,946 unduplicated participants. In May of 2013 there were 116,686 unduplicated participants. This is a 3 percent reduction in WtW participation, even though counties received an increase in their single allocation to serve more people.
- The number of families being sanctioned increased 3% from October 2012 to May 2013. The families in May of 2013 lost \$9.5 million dollars to these inhumane sanctions that are often only because the county failed to verify that they family had supportive services before being forced to participate in a welfare to work activity or being asked to sign a contract over and over again.
- In October of 2012, and May of 2013 only 3% of the unduplicated participants were terminated from CalWORKs due to employment. This, compared to 67% of the unduplicated participants who were either already sanctioned or being sanctioned in May of 2013.

Con't from page 1

- Taxpayer cost for securing a CalWORKs recipient employment that result.
- In October 2012 there were 119,946 unduplicated participants. In May of 2013 there were 116,686 unduplicated participants. This is a 3 percent reduction in WtW participation, even though counties received an increase in their single allocation to serve more people.
- The number of families being sanctioned increased 3% from October 2012 to May 2013. The families in May of 2013 lost \$9.5 million dollars to these inhumane sanctions that are often only because the county failed to verify that they family had supportive services before being forced to participate in a welfare to work activity or being asked to sign a contract over and over again.
- In October of 2012, and May of 2013 only 3% of the unduplicated participants were terminated from CalWORKs due to employment. This, compared to 67% of the unduplicated participants who were either already sanctioned or being sanctioned in May of 2013.
- Taxpayer cost for securing a CalWORKs recipient employment that resulted in termination of CalWORKs is \$65,157.
- Over 46% of the unduplicated participants are being deprived of transportation supportive services by counties who REFUSE to allow participants to claim transportation on-line. For the month of May 2013 WtW participants may have been shorted out of \$6.5 million in transportation reimbursements.
- October 2012, 8.76% of the unduplicated participants were self-initiated program participants.
- May 2013, 8.10% of the unduplicated participants were self-initiated program participants. This is a .66% reduction as a result of the alleged flexibility that SB 1104 is providing to WtW participants.

We still get calls from WtW participants who are not allowed to go to school. One person was told by his WtW in Riverside “nobody pays for my transportation, why should I pay for yours.”

It is shameful and appalling that after 15 years of unlawful sanctions upon impoverished families and children, coun-

HSS Fraud Investigators Do Not Practice Integrity But Demand Integrity from IHSS Beneficiaries

ties continue to get away with this kind of blatant abuse of CalWORKs families and government induced economic child abuse.

Since 2009 counties have been getting millions of dollars for so-called “IHSS Program Integrity Investigations” and

related services.

When counties received this money they were required to submit quarterly reports just like CalWORKs and food stamp recipients are required to do. When a

FY 2009-2010	\$26.4 million	Source: CFL No. 09/10-54
FY 2010-2011	\$28.2 million	Source: CFL No. 10/11-53
FY 2011-2012	\$10.1 million	Source: CFL No. 11/12-19

CalWORKs or food stamp recipient fails to submit the report their benefits are immediately stopped.

We wondered if welfare fraud investigators were actually completing the quarterly reports in return for the millions of dollars they receive. The answer is no. In ACL 12-17, page two (2) DSS admits that, “... many, if not all of the participating counties, were unable to provide all of the data elements and in many cases the gaps in the reporting were consistent.” None of these counties were told that they needed to return the money for failing to submit quarterly reports.

ACL 12-17 also reveals that CDSS received feedback from county Special Investigative Units and District attorney’s offices on a new report form. It was hoped that maybe now counties would actually meet their reporting requirements even though there are no penalties for not reporting and they continue getting the money.

15 counties or 31% of the counties did not submit a report after the county Special Investigative Units and District attorney’s offices had been consulted and agreed to the revised reporting form.

County	Funding Allocated	Quarterly Report
Los Angeles	\$386,573	No Report
Alameda	116,679	No Report
Riverside	112,188	No Report
Stanislaus	64,659	No Report
Ventura	61,669	No Report
Merced	59,723	No Report
Solano	33,755	No Report
Tehama	29,263	No Report
Shasta	18,637	No Report
Napa	15,713	No Report
Sutter	15,190	No Report
Nevada	15,045	No Report
Yuba	14,965	No Report
Colusa	13,920	No Report
Trinity	13,920	No Report