

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

June 2, 2014
 Issue #2014-05

<http://www.ccwro.org>

In Brief

■ The United States of America, the so-called “compassionate” country, is very hypocritical when it comes to its own people. The childhood poverty rate in the United States is 21%. In 2012, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) issued a report finding that the United States had the second highest childhood poverty rate in the developed world. Only Romania had a higher childhood poverty rate. Whereas many developed countries have a much lower rate. Finland’s child poverty rate is 4%, Denmark’s is 4%, Sweden’s is 5%, Norway’s is 5% and Holland’s is 6%.

In most developed countries no food stamp programs or nutrition programs exist because these countries provide income support that is often above 50% of median household income. That means the family can buy their own food rather than relying on food coupons and other 20th Century means of supporting the poor.

■ How much is the State of California stealing from CalWORKs families? The answer is \$1,522,450,000. Yes, that is \$1.5 billion. In his recently released May revised budget, the Governor continues to steal money from the CalWORKs program while forcing impoverished families to suffer in deep poverty. TABLE # 1 reveals the CalWORKs average grants and compares the average grants to the Federal Poverty Level and the Supplement Poverty Level.

■ Each month, CalWORKs clients who live in deep poverty, are forced to pay over \$75,000 in EBT fees just so they can access their meager CalWORKs grant. From January through April 2014, banks have fleeced welfare recipients out of \$302,775.37 in surcharges.

2014-2015 State Budget
\$1.5 billion will be taken from CalWORKs as INVOLUNTARY contribution to the State General Fund.

The CalHEERS Blues

State and county employees developed California’s new computer system called CalHEERS without any meaningful input from the consumer community. Like other computer systems CalWIN and LEADER there are numerous problems that need to be fixed. Millions of dollars will be wasted because the system was not programmed correctly in the first place.

■ CalHEERS distinguishes between native born and naturalized US citizens. The system has a different set of questions for naturalized citizens. This is wrong and CalHEERS has agreed to use more taxpayer dollars to fix this error.

■ CalHEERS asks applicants to identify the “primary tax filer”. This confuses applicants. How does an applicant answer this question if the applicant has no earned income and does not file an income tax return. When applicants do file tax re-

Con’t. on page 1

TABLE # 1

2014-2015 CalWORKs Average Grant Payments & Various Poverty Levels

CalWORKs Average Monthly Benefits Compared to the 100% Federal Poverty Level (FPL) & the Supplemental Poverty Levels (SPL)

Family Size	2014 Federal Poverty Level	2014 Supplemental Poverty Level	2014-2015 CalWORKs Average Grant	% of Federal Poverty	Percentage of Supplemental Poverty Level
1	\$973	\$1223	\$276	28%	23%
2	1311	1708	452	34%	26%
3	1649	2431	600	34%	23%
4	1966	2832	668	34%	24%
5	2326	3193	760	33%	24%
6	2664	3586	853	32%	24%

CalWORKs Average Monthly Benefits Compared to the 100% FPL & SPL for CalWORKs Families with 1 Excluded Person Due to a Variety of CalWORKs Penalties and Sanctions.

Family Size	2014 Federal Poverty Level	2014 Supplemental Poverty Level	2014-2015 CalWORKs Average Grant	% of Federal Poverty	Percentage of Supplemental Poverty Level
1	\$973	\$1223	\$00	0%	0%
2	1311	1708	\$276	21%	16%
3	1649	2431	452	27%	19%
4	1966	2832	600	28%	20%
5	2326	3193	668	29%	21%
6	2664	3586	760	29%	21%

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, and Diane Aslanian.**

Con't. from page 1

turns, CalHEERs gets a copy of the tax return which shows the primary tax filer. Can't people at the county and the state read English?

■ CalHEERs freezes whenever the applicant states that he or she is a noncitizen. The current remedy for this problem is to LIE to CalHEERs and say that the person is a citizen, then go back and correct it after completing the application.

■ CalHEERs only accepts USA addresses. If an applicant lists a tax dependent who lives outside of the USA, the system refuses to accept the information. Again people completing the forms have been told that they should lie and not input the address of a person who does not have a US address.

■ CalHEERs sends applications to the wrong county that delays the processing of the Medi-Cal applications.

■ CalHEERs refuses to recognize the unmarried parent who lives in the home but files a separate tax return. This problem improperly reduces the family size that may impact the child's Medi-Cal eligibility.

■ Some Medi-Cal eligible applicants are told that they are eligible for Medi-Cal while CalHEERs directs the applicants to select a non-Medi-Cal plan.

■ The Covered California Certified Eligibility Counselors (CEC) who assist applicants with the Medi-Cal application are not allowed to assist their clients with the county. The county refuses to talk to them because they are not authorized representatives. The MC 210 Section 8 had a space for the applicant to authorize the assistor to talk to the county. The CalHEERs application does not have this feature.

■ When a CEC wants to review information contained on a prior page of the application, CalHEERs thinks that the application has been amended. If no change has been made, the application freezes. Thus, the CEC must enter different information that is a LIE, and then after completing the information reenter the true information; just a lot of waste.

CalFRESH Expedited Services Benefits Not Getting to the Hungry



For a whole year CDSS did not release reports on CalFresh Expedited Services which detail the number of applicants reviewed for expedited services and how many received it in 2013. Finally in May 2014, CDSS posted the 2013 DFA 296X reports and 2013 was a very mean year for the hungry in California.

Federal law requires that every SNAP/CalFRESH applicant be considered for expedited services. In 2012, FNS realized that California was out of compliance with federal law in that not all applicants were being considered for expedited services.

CDSS alleged that the law needed to be changed and the Legislature enacted AB 1359, chapter 468, Statutes of 2012 effective January 1, 2013. During 2013, the counties only evaluated 22% of the CalFresh applicants for expedited services. That means that California violated federal law by not evaluating the remaining 78% of the applications. To put it in human terms, 6,898,281 hungry people made applications but only 1,542,244 applications were even reviewed for Expedited Services.

But wait it gets worse. Of the 6,898,281 households that should have been considered for expedited services, only, and we mean only, 537,668 households were found eligible for Expedited Services. Fewer than 10% of the applicants were approved for expedited services in 2013.

TABLE # 2 reveals county-by-county the percentage of applicants whose cases were ap-



proved. Many of the households denied had to continue to endure hunger and food insecurity in the State of California.

TABLE # 2 . This table reveals the number of households that applied for food stamps during calendar year 2013, and the meager number of households issued expedited service food stamp benefits, which was 8% statewide.

COUNTY	Applications Received by the County During 2013	Expedited Service Food Stamps (FS-ES) Issued During 2013	Percentage of Applications Received FS-ES During 2013	COUNTY	Applications Received by the County During 2013	Expedited Service Food Stamps (FS-ES) Issued During 2013	Percentage of Applications Received FS-ES During 2013
Statewide	6,898,281	537,668	8%	Nevada	17,985	1,819	10%
Alameda	299,009	18,434	6%	Orange	364,466	21,848	6%
Alpine	337	60	18%	Placer	26,184	2,569	10%
Amador	7,943	842	11%	Plumas	4,497	408	9%
Butte	64,723	6,308	10%	Riverside	526,803	44,417	8%
Calaveras	9,122	1,063	12%	Sacramento	340,354	15,165	4%
Colusa	3,811	322	8%	San Benito	12,517	1,037	8%
Contra Costa	110,734	6,585	6%	San Bernardino	588,001	60,440	10%
Del Norte	8,339	978	12%	San Diego	542,049	34,759	6%
El Dorado	28,845	3,456	12%	San Francisco	98,375	8,269	8%
Fresno	207,887	19,407	9%	San Joaquin	179,489	13,239	7%
Glenn	4,509	511	11%	San Luis Obispo	32,769	2,426	7%
Humboldt	46,997	4,899	10%	San Mateo	117,504	4,783	4%
Imperial	58,181	4,258	7%	Santa Barbara	39,728	2,613	7%
Inyo	4,363	457	10%	Santa Clara	144,216	7,262	5%
Kern	237,666	21,029	9%	Santa Cruz	55,024	2,919	5%
Kings	62,347	3,523	6%	Shasta	55,929	4,794	9%
Lake	18,732	1,673	9%	Sierra	551	79	14%
Lassen	7,261	791	11%	Siskiyou	13,711	1,136	8%
Los Angeles	1,625,436	127,971	8%	Solano	56,196	5,669	10%
Madera	55,314	3,312	6%	Sonoma	62,532	4,780	8%
Marin	24,585	2,185	9%	Stanislaus	146,713	15,731	11%
Mariposa	3,471	337	10%	Sutter	19,985	2,067	10%
Mendocino	26,981	3,448	13%	Tehama	15,061	1,900	13%
Merced	66,101	6,865	10%	Trinity	4,279	433	10%
Modoc	2,613	173	7%	Tulare	149,168	13,600	9%
Mono	3,943	385	10%	Tuolumne	12,648	1,251	10%
Monterey	75,363	7,379	10%	Ventura	119,856	8,252	7%
Napa	19,094	1,346	7%				

Source: CDSS WtW 25 and 25A.

March 2014

California Welfare-to-Work Program Outcomes Report

2013-2014 Welfare-to-Work Services Appropriation

\$1,479,084,400 million

Source: CDSS

Source: State Department of Social Services WtW 25 Report

Number of Unduplicated Participants During March, 2014	122,258
Gross Number of Unduplicated Participants Being Sanctioned During the month of March of 2014	56,818
Number of Participants Sanctioned During March of 2014	11,409
Percentage of Gross Unduplicated Participants being Sanctioned During March of 2014	56%
Dollar Loss to CalWORKs Families Due to Sanctions this Month Estimates at \$125 Per Sanction for During March of 2014	\$18.5 million
Number of Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs During March of 2014	2,869
Percentage of Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs During March of 2014	2%
Taxpayer Cost Per Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs During March of 2014	\$42,961.67
Number of Participants NOT Being Paid Transportation by the County During February, 2014	53,422
Percentage of Number of Participants NOT Being Paid Transportation by the County During March of 2014	44%
Estimated Dollar Amount Poor Families Defrauded by Counties Not Receiving Transportation @ \$100 Per Participant During March of 2014	\$5.3 million

March 2014

California Welfare-to-Work SB 1041 Program Participant Impact Report

ACTIVIES	MARCH 2013	MARCH 2014	Percentage Change
Number of Unduplicated Participants	117,122	122,258	4%
Number of Participants Already Being Sanctioned	50,529	56,818	12%
Number of Unduplicated Participants Who Entered Employment That Resulted In Termination of CalWORKs	3,865	2,869	-35%
Number of Participants Being Paid Transportation by the County	42%	42%	0%

Source: State Department of Social Services WtW 25 Report