



CCWRO Welfare News

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc.
 1901 Alhambra Blvd.
 Sacramento • CA 95816
 (916) 736-0616 (916) 736-2645 (fax) (916) 712-0071 (cell)

<http://www.ccwro.org>

September 5, 2014
 Issue #2014-09

Medi-Cal Affordable Care Act Applications Pending as of August 19, 2014

10-13	11-13	12-13	1-14	2-14	3-14	4-14	5-14	6-14	TOTAL
3,000	5,000	40,000	45,000	36,000	107,000	67,000	21,000	25,000	349,000

Source: Department of Health care Services

TROUBLING NEWS - 70,000 cases have been approved in CalHEERs, but do not show up in MEDS, thus, they are not able to access their approved health care benefits.

Confusing County CalFresh Expedited Services Reports DFA 296 and DFA 296X

During April, May and June 2014, many counties had more people being considered for CalFresh Expedited Service (CFES) than total applications for CalFresh. (See Table #1, 4th column) Statewide 468,161 CalFresh applications were received and 392,709 were considered for CFES. Yuba County had 955 applicants, yet 1,628 of them were considered for expedited. San Mateo County has 4,095 applicants but considered 5,992 households for expedited services—that's 1,897 more households than the number of applications.

Counties TABLE #1	Applications received during the report quarter	Applications processed under ES received during the report quarter	Applications processed under ES exceeding the number of applications received during the report quarter	Percentage of Applications processed under ES received during the report quarter
Yuba	955	1,628	673	170%
San Mateo	4,095	5,992	1,897	146%
Napa	907	1,207	300	133%
Del Norte	536	708	172	132%
Lake	1,248	1,644	396	132%
Nevada	1,180	1,533	353	130%
Kings	2,207	2,803	596	127%
Colusa	246	308	62	125%
Madera	1,979	2,443	464	123%
Mariposa	227	277	50	122%
San Joaquin	9,873	11,900	2,027	121%
Merced	4,444	5,317	873	120%
Kern	15,533	18,562	3,029	120%
Siskiyou	825	963	138	117%
Monterey	4,492	5,231	739	116%
Stanislaus	9,673	11,150	1,477	115%
Shasta	3,343	3,732	389	112%
Riverside	32,731	35,889	3,158	110%

How does this happen? When the county can't get their numbers straight, it's obvious why

Con't from Page 1

California's Welfare-to-Work Program Maintains a High Sanction rate

there are so many children and families in California suffering “economic child abuse”.

As evidenced by Table #2, Welfare to Work sanctions are high because the program is designed to achieve welfare-to-sanction and not welfare-to-work. Rarely do counties make a determination of good cause before the sanction is imposed. When a WtW participant is summoned by the county for a good cause determination, the county does not complete the WtW 27 Request for Good Cause Determination, during the interview so as to allow the participant to establish good cause. The county's only purpose of the good cause determination interview is to get the participant to sign a compliance plan, the WtW 32. The question “why didn't you participate” is rarely asked by the county WtW worker.

We challenge DSS to review case files of sanctioned participants to determine if the county actually conduct-

ed a good cause interview and completed a WtW 27 during the interview.

Thousands of families and their children are subjected to “county economic child abuse” when they had good cause for not participating which is ignored by the county. These families are forced to survive below 25% of the federal poverty level and below 20% of the federal supplemental poverty level.

Since 2006, counties have received over \$90 million to reduce WtW sanctions. This money was authorized through AB 1808, Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006. TABLE #2 shows that showering counties with millions has not reversed the sanction trend. The primary purpose of the WtW program – sanctions – thrives.

In order for a person to cure the sanction the person needs to know why they were sanctioned. The statute provides that a sanction shall stop at any point that

TABLE #2

January Month of the Year	Unduplicated Participants	Participants Sanctioned	Percentage of Unduplicated Participants Sanctioned	Participants who landed a job that ended welfare	Percentage Participants who landed a job that ended welfare
2000	190,502	33,571	18%	7,077	4%
2001	181,473	28,410	16%	7,296	4%
2002	184,134	35,891	19%	5,891	3%
2003	149,723	44,847	30%	6,388	4%
2004	121,807	46,030	38%	4,983	4%
2005	110,504	42,046	37%	3,613	3%
2006	104,170	38,504	32%	2,884	3%
2007	111,022	35,107	27%	3,022	3%
2008	120,685	32,461	25%	2,758	2%
2009	138,240	34,315	25%	2,928	2%
2010	141,806	35,273	25%	3,345	2%
2011	138,960	33,834	24%	3,413	2%
2012	119,810	33,148	28%	3,145	3%
2013	116,010	36,124	31%	3,280	3%
2014	117,845	41,225	38%	2,492	2%

Con't. on page 3

Source: CDSS WtW 25 reports

Con't from Page 2

the participant performs the activity that he or she previously refused to perform.

“11327.5 (d) ... This sanction shall terminate at any point if the noncomplying participant performs the activity or activities he or she previously refused to perform.”

Counties implement this section by requiring the participant to contact the county worker and use the magic words “I want to cure the sanction.” There is no obligation for the county to periodically contact the participant and offer an opportunity to cure the sanction. Some counties do this, but it is done very poorly and with very bad outcomes.

Usually the county uses the WtW 31 to contact the participant about curing the sanction. This form does not identify the activity that the participant refused to perform. Often, the county requires the participant to perform activities beyond the scope of the original refusal in order to cure the sanction.

The counties memorialize the activities needed in order to cure the sanction by using the WtW 32. Nothing on that form identifies the previous refusal so as to empower the participant to point out that the proposed cure requires more than the activity that the participant previously refused to perform.

In most counties, the eligibility worker cannot cure the sanction. The participant must contact the WtW worker. Reaching any worker in most counties is a major undertaking. If one is lucky to reach the WtW office, they will be told that nobody has their case. Before the participant can talk to the WtW worker, the control clerk must assign the case to a worker. Eventually, after some time, a day, week or month, the worker may get back to the participant.

Although Welf. & Inst. Code § 11327.5 (d) states that the sanction ends “... at any point if the noncomplying participant performs the activity or activities he or she previously refused to perform” DSS’ invalid regulations provide that the sanction stops the following month.

Ms. Jones was sanctioned because she did not agree with the WtW plan and refused to sign it. Instead of following the law and referring her to a third-party assessment, the county decided to meet the primary purpose of the WtW program

and sanction her. Now that she has been illegally sanctioned, she wants to cure her sanction so she can have a place to live rather than being homeless with her three-year old and sleeping in the park or in somebody’s car.

In desperation, she contacts the WtW office on September 2. She is told there is no worker assigned to her case. She waits and waits but nobody calls her. She calls again on September 8 and again is told that when the case is assigned to a worker they would contact her. After additional calls, Ms. Jones is given the name of the WtW worker and told that she will receive an appointment letter. Finally she gets the appointment for October 5. She appears for the appointment and signs a WtW 32 form that says she has to do 4 weeks of job search in order to cure the sanction. The form does not say that the previous act was not signing the WtW plan. So she signs the form thinking that this is a lawful document and it does not violate her basic human and legal rights. She is not offered any money for transportation and is referred to a childcare program.

The next Job Club starts early November. If she completes Job Club in December her benefits would be restored January 1 2015. There is no regulation that states a homeless person is exempt from the WtW program.

As far as most counties are most counties are concerned all they want to do is meet the Federal Work Participation Rates no matter how much “economic child abuse” it causes impoverished families and minor children.

There are thousands of Ms. Jones’ out there enduring severe county economic child abuse through the unlawful actions of the California Counties.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO STOP COUNTY ECONOMIC CHILD ABUSE

DSS must revamp the sanction curing process. The sanction should stop the day the participant completes what was not previously done.

Revise the WtW 31 to identify the previous action that the participant refused to do that caused the sanction and how to perform that act. The WtW 31 should always accompany the WtW 32. Examples: If the participant did not go to job club, the WtW 32 should have a date and time that the participant can attend job club. If the participant did not sign the WtW 2 form, a WtW 2 form should be included with a self-addressed envelope for the participant to sign and return to the county.

These recommendations may get participants to cure the sanction, something that \$90 million a year has not achieved.

Working CalWORKs Mom A Victim of Sacramento County Child Care Program Abuse

Ms. 1B19726 works for a temp agency and is currently placed at the University of California, Davis in Yolo County. She lives in Sacramento County. Ms. 1B19726's mother is the childcare provider.

For a period of time, Ms. 1B19726 drove her three-year old to her mom's house. Due to finances, Ms. 1B19726 and her mother moved in together to share a home. Thereafter, Ms. 1B19726 was told by her caseworker that, as she is now living with her mom, she cannot get childcare. The mom is not part of Ms. 1B19726's assistance unit. After further research, it was discovered that Sacramento County decided to stop Ms. 1B19726's Stage 1 child care because her mom did not cooperate with the Stage 2 agency's requirement of completing an in-person interview with the Stage 2 agency.

In 2012-2013 Sacramento County was allocated \$23,470,067 for childcare but spent only \$12,789,130. Sacramento County left \$10,680,937 on the table most likely by unlawfully denying childcare payments like they are trying to do to Ms. 1B19726. State Department of Education Management Bulletin 07-09 states:

California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (5 CCR), Education, Section 18409, clarifies the transfer process by which families move from Stage 1 to Stage 2. The regulations specify that the sending Stage 1 program must provide nine data elements to the receiving Stage 2 contractor. The nine data elements specified in 5 CCR, 18409(a) are listed below:

1. The parent's(s) full name(s), address(es), and telephone number(s);
2. The names and birth dates of all children under the age of 18 living with the family, regardless of whether they are served in the CalWORKs program;
3. The number of hours of childcare needed each day for each child;

4. The names of other family members in the household who are related by blood, marriage, or adoption;
5. The reason for needing childcare services;
6. Family size and adjusted monthly income;
7. Employment or training information for parent(s) including name and address of employer(s) or training institution(s) and days and hours of employment or training;
8. Rate of payment; and
9. The name, address, and telephone number of the child care provider.

Once the receiving Stage 2 contractor receives these nine data elements and determines that the information is complete, the receiving Stage 2 contractor must do the following:

Assume the full responsibility for reimbursing the provider for childcare services provided to the family.

Send or otherwise provide a notice to the family that documents the nine data elements, and requires the family to certify, by signature, that the information is correct or inaccurate. This letter notifies the family of the time frames by which this certification must be returned. The letter also informs the family that if the certification is not returned within the identified time frame, child care will be terminated.

There is no requirement for the childcare recipient or the provider to make an appearance at the Stage 2 provider's office in order to retain childcare. Such terminations are unlawful and illegal. Yet Sacramento County has been conducting this unlawful practice for two decades without shame. We wonder what action the State Department of Social Services will take? Ask the county to take correc-

Medi-Cal Affordable Care Act Applications Pending as of August 19, 2014

10-13	11-13	12-13	1-14	2-14	3-14	4-14	5-14	6-14	TOTAL
3,000	5,000	40,000	45,000	36,000	107,000	67,000	21,000	25,000	349,000

Source: Department of Health care Services