

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>

June 28, 2013
 Issue #2013-12

Counties Fail to Use the Child Care Allocation for CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work

For fiscal year 2012-2013 DSS allocated \$432,203,000 to California's 58 counties to pay for Welfare-to-Work (WtW) childcare. The third-quarter allocation-expenditure report reveals that only \$207,964,462 has been given to Welfare-to-Work participants. Over 51% of the total 2012-2013 Child Care Allocation (\$224,275,877) remains available to pay for childcare in the last fiscal quarter. Counties paid an average of \$69,321,487 per quarter. Annualizing this number means that approximately \$154,964,390 will be returned to DSS even though approximately 50% of the WtW participants do not receive childcare according to the April 2013 CW115 reports.

County	2012-2013 Child Care Allocation	Amount Spent During 3 Quarters	Unspent Amount for last quarter	Percentage of Unspent Amount for last quarter
Chart #1				
Alameda	\$21,701,221	16,185,955	5,515,266	25%
Fresno	19,226,151	6,787,768	12,438,383	36%
Kern	12,959,313	5,230,686	7,728,627	80%
Los Angeles	133,557,273	52,117,699	81,439,574	46%
San Joaquin	9,014,365	2,325,805	6,688,560	66%
Solano	4,704,049	1,527,005	3,177,044	41%

It is fascinating to look at the utilization of childcare from county to county. Riverside, Alameda and San Bernardino pay for childcare to over 80% of the unduplicated participants. On the other hand only 19 % of the unduplicated participants received childcare in Sacramento, 22% in Stanislaus, 28% in Tulare, 29% in Contra Costa, 40% in San Diego, 43% in Orange and 46% in Los Angeles. See Chart #1.

Why do 80% of the unduplicated participants in Riverside, Kern and Alameda need and receive childcare while neighboring Los Angeles and San Diego County only provide 40% of the unduplicated participants childcare? It just does not add up. Could it be that in Los Angeles and San Diego 80% of the participants need childcare, but only 40% receive it?

Counties Fail to Use the Child Care Allocation for CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work

On June 19, 2013, the United State House of Representatives presented legislation cutting over \$20 billion out of the SNAP program over a 10-year period. The major cuts included elimination of categorical eligibility and the "eat and heat" program. Speaker Boehner said the Farm Bill (HR 1947) is one of the priorities of the house. Majority Leader Cantor supported the legislation.

Pennsylvania Republican Tom Marino proposed an amendment to HR 1947 to require that FNS establish a Soviet style surveillance plan to snoop and determine what soldiers, veterans, underpaid workers and other families purchases with SNAP benefits.

Another proposed amendment would limit farm welfare checks (also known as "farm subsidies") to recipients with less than \$250,000. 15 members of Congress receive farm subsidies. Congressman Fincher of Tennessee, who between 1999-2013 received \$3,483,823 dollars, said on the floor that if you "don't work, you can't eat", repeating what his comrade Vladimir Lenin said in 1920s.

Republican Congressman Richard Hudson of North Carolina proposed that all SNAP recipients be drug tested, but forgot to mandate that the 15 members of Congress getting farm subsidies also be tested. He also did not require drug testing of the major corporations with income over \$250,000 who get welfare checks from the Department of Agriculture under the Farm Bill.

Even with a majority in the House, the Republicans could not get it passed. There were several California Democrats who voted for the Farm Bill including Ami Bera, Julie Brownley, Jim Costa, Sam Farr and John Garamendi. 62 Republicans, or 25% of the Republican caucus voted against HR 1947. This is a major embarrassment for the Speaker and a major victory for the beneficiaries of the SNAP program. With time running out, it looks like there will be no Farm Bill in 2013 because Congress will be working on budgets and immigration reform. The farm bill programs will continue through an instrument called "continued resolution"

County Client abuse on page 2

Con't from Page 1

COUNTY WELFARE DEPARTMENT VICTIM REPORT



● **Los Angeles DPSS Staff Hang Up on Customers-** Ms. BING224 conference called the Los Angeles County DPSS office to talk to her worker with the advocate being on the second line. After ringing over 10 times, a clerk by the name of Vema picked up the phone and informed Ms. BING224 that her worker was not available to talk to her. When asked to be connected with the supervisor Vema rudely instructed Ms. BING224 that she cannot talk to the supervisor and hung up. How dare a DPSS customer want to talk to the supervisor. That must certainly be against DPSS policy of customer service.

● **Los Angeles DPSS Cancels Two Interviews and CalFresh Applicant Gives up on Getting Food Stamps.** Ms. R.N. 501016's case record shows she applied for CalFresh on 12/27/12 and was given an appointment for 1/7/13. On 1-25-13 the application was denied based on reason code "withdrawal at the client's request." There was no signed withdrawal form on file. Ms. R.N. 501016 states that the 1-7-13 interview was canceled at the request of the DPSS worker. The interview was rescheduled, but that interview was also cancelled by the DPSS worker. Ms. R.N. 501016 stated that she was never given any notices regarding missed appointments, or the status of the application. Ms. R.N. 501016 decided not to pursue the application after the second cancellation due to the inconvenience of having to take time off from her employment to attend a face-to-face interview that is cancelled by DPSS. Mission accomplished. One less CalFresh recipient. The DPSS corrective action plan was more training and telling caseworkers to document - document even if the documentation is a lie for the ultimate goal is to discourage applicants from receiving food stamp benefits.

● **Los Angeles DPSS Denies CalFresh for Failure to Provide Verification that DPSS Already Had.** Ms. R.N. 501019 applied for CalFresh in Los Angeles County on 12-26-12. The applicant was screened for expedited service, but the interview was scheduled for 1/7/13. On 1/25/13 the application was denied for failure to verify identity. DSS states that the "applicant was already known to the system since she was receiving CalFresh benefits for several months until August, 2012, and had been J-verified in the MEDS system which lists her name, DOB and SSN as verified. Per ACIN-I-45-11 "if identity has been verified via MEDs, then the verification of identity requirement in the CalFresh is considered to be met." DPSS' corrective action plan was to continue to deny food stamp applications for failure to verify identity even if the county is able to verify the identity as provided in ACIN I-45-11.

● **Los Angeles DPSS Customer Disservice Exposed.** B1BZC57 received a notice for a missed telephone interview. B1BZC57 wrote a letter to Los Angeles County

"I have received your letter indicating that I have missed the

telephone interview that was scheduled on June 4, 2013 @ 12:15p.m. Your letter to me is incorrect. I did not receive a phone call from you or anyone from the Chatsworth office on June 4, 2013 @ 12:15p.m. In fact, I waited until 1:00p.m. on June 4. You did not attempt to contact me otherwise! In fact, the number listed on the notice

page (866-613-3777) along with other various correspondence, is a voice mailbox that is full during working hours of 8-5 p.m. I have attempted to contact you via phone, mail and through other means of voice contact. Unfortunately, I have gotten no response from you! This is completely frustrating on my end. How can I reach a social worker, if their business voice mailbox is full? How is it that the Dept of Social Services allows you to have a voice mailbox that is full for several months? And how is it that you are employed with the State of California? I just don't understand how you can get away with your unprofessional conduct! This really needs to be brought to management's attention. You should not be working with individuals that need assistance. You should not be work for the State of California!

I am requesting that Dept of Social Services change my social worker immediately to someone that can be contacted, has a working telephone number and someone who is professional. Again, it is impossible to contact you otherwise.

With this said, I am requesting a hearing to the Appeals and State Hearing Section. I will also indicate that you are unprofessional, unreasonable and with a doubt, the worse social worker!

A copy of this letter will be accompanied the Appeals & State Hearing Section, State Welfare Rights Organization and the Local Legal Aid Office.

"NOTE THAT YOU PURPOSELY HAVE NOT CORRECTED MY NAME ON EACH CORRESPONDENCE. YOU HAVE MY LAST NAME LISTED AS "ITEEG". AGAIN, FOR THE 100TH TIME, MY LAST NAME IS "STEEG". UPDATE YOUR RECORDS ACCORDINGLY!!!"

● **Contra Costa County Denies Emergency Food Stamps Wrofully and More.** Contra Costa County denied Ms. R.N 502017's CalFresh expedited service on 12/27/12 without any reasons cited. That was ERROR # 1. On 1/16/13 the worker requested verification that Ms. R.N 502017 is no longer a student when the county already had this verification. ERROR # 2. Finally Contra Costa County denied the application by sending out a notice of action on 1/28/13, which is over 30 days. ERROR #3.