

CDSS Staffers Told to Delete PRA Information Requested by CCWRO

According to reliable sources it is alleged, that in July of 2003, at a meeting of the CDSS Welfare Eligibility staff, Kevin Campbell, a supervisor at CDSS Eligibility Branch, stated that Public Records Act (PRA) information obtained by Kevin Aslanian of CCWRO had become problematic, and that some policy interpretation could become embarrassing, incorrect, or burdensome for CDSS to produce, Supervisor Kevin Campbell instructed the staff to immediately and regularly delete all email communications from their computers. Campbell told staff that deleting the documents would relieve CDSS of the duty to produce the documents pursuant to the PRA. Some CDSS staffers were shocked at this suggestion and did not comply, while others did.

We talked to Maria Hernandez of CDSS who denied these allegations made by at least three former employees of CDSS, but assured us that there will be no withholding of PRA information.

IHSS Changes Meetings in Sacramento

SB 1104 requires the Department of Social Services to review and revise the In Home Supportive Services Program. CCWRO is participating in the Hourly Task Guidelines Workgroup. This Workgroup is charged with the responsibility to establish statewide, uniform hourly task guidelines for each of the 25 tasks for In Home Supportive Services.

The group is mostly composed of CWDA representatives, IHSS case workers and county social workers. In addition to

CCWRO, PAI and Sacramento's Resources for Independent Living are participating.

In developing the "normal" time for each of the tasks, the Workgroup seeks to involve individual IHSS clients, providers, family members who help with IHSS tasks and IHSS advocates in rural areas as well as urban areas.

CCWRO wants more client/provider input as to how long activities take to perform and whether there are activities that should be covered but are not currently recognized under the IHSS Program.

If you have a client who would be interested in providing input or whose need should be considered, let us know.

If you are interested in participating or providing input to establishing the hourly task guidelines, please contact Grace Galligher at ccwro@aol.com.

Bush 2006 Budget

Generally, the President's proposed budget shows the five year impact of all proposed program reductions and increases.

However, the Bush 2006 budget document shows only how the cuts will impact programs in 2006 but does not mention the five (5) year impact.

The Bush budget proposed reducing funding for medicaid by \$45 billion over a 10 year period.

- ⇒ **CDSS Staffers told to delete PRA information Requested by CCWRO**
- ⇒ **IHSS Revisions Meeting in Sacramento**
- ⇒ **Bush 2006 Budget-**
- ⇒ **TANF Reauthorization Update -**
- ⇒ **CWD officials make false statements**
- ⇒ **December, 2004 WtW Report**

Publisher: CCWRO. Reporters: Kevin Aslanian and Grace A. Galligher. Contributors: Steve Goldberg and Diane Aslanian.

In this issue



The fifth TANF authorization expires March 31, 2005. There is a Senate Bill and a House bill. Neither the House, or Senate bills address the cruel, irreparable and harmful provisions of the current TANF legislation, such as time limits, full family sanctions, limiting options for families to become self-sufficient. Both bills allow States to continue to abuse and misuse TANF funds as they have done since the enactment of TANF.

The Senate Finance Committee bill reauthorizing TANF contains \$6 billion additional funding for TANF. The Senate Budget Resolution, which sets the mark of how much the Senate can spend on various programs has TANF set to be reauthorized without any increased TANF spending. This means that the TANF bill needs 60 votes to pass with the increased funding. This has change the landscape for Senators working on TANF reauthorization and it will be harder to pass the TANF reauthorization legislation through the Senate with more money in it.

The House is working on H.R. 4838, which contains provisions that are opposed by states relating to caseload reduction credit. Some States can face an immediate loss of 5% of their TANF funding.

The House has an extension bill which contains the modified caseload credit provision that States hate. This is the first TANF reauthorization which is not *clean* in that it makes changes in the TANF program. Some people expect more policy changes will be attached

to TANF extension legislation. Many assume that TANF will be extended again until June 30, 2005.

TANF reauthorization will not bring any joy to poor families. It will only bring suffering to poor families and parents who are trying to parent their children.

COUNTY WELFARE OFFICIALS MAKE FALSE STATEMENTS

Government officials get away with making false statements, while the poor, who make false statements, do jail time, get fined, or lose benefits for months, etc. (See 42 U.S.C. 1320a-8 and 1320b-10)

A classic example of false statements by welfare officials is when CCWRO mailed a letter seeking forms that applicants complete prior to being interviewed for public assistance benefits under the California Public Records Act.

On March 22, 2005, Plumas County Deputy County Counsel Brian Morris made a false statement alleging that the county does not have a form that an applicant is required to complete prior to the face to face interview. FALSE. The TRUTH is that applicants are required to complete a Plumas County form "Reception Inquiry"

On March 22, 2005, Calaveras County Program Manager Nita Reynon made a false statement alleging that the county does not have a form that an applicant is required to complete prior to the face to face interview. FALSE. The TRUTH is that applicants are required to complete a Calaveras County form "Worksheet 83-5000".

On March 24, 2005, Inyo County Welfare Director Jean Dickenson made a false statement alleging that the county does not have a form that an applicant is required to complete prior to the face to face interview. FALSE. The TRUTH is that applicants are required to com-

plete a Inyo County form "Household Factsheet".

Each of these persons making false statements have been mailed letters requesting the forms be provided as required by California State law.

There are no sanctions for these government officials making false statements - they just get away with it.

DECEMBER, 2004 WELFARE TO WORK REPORT

The alleged purpose of the welfare to work program, with an appropriation of over \$1 billion dollars, is to make families with children self-sufficient. However, the program has been a total failure in making families self-sufficient, but has become a well-greased sanctions machine.

During December of 2004, out of 93,767 unduplicated participants, over 47,369 families were sanctioned by the county welfare departments of California. Of the 93,767 persons participating in a welfare to work activity, 49,934 persons, or 57% of the participants were not paid transportation, which is mandatory for those who need transportation. This is premeditated, widespread stealing of money from poor families by sanction-happy counties of California.

Statewide, only 4% of the unduplicated participants obtained employment that made them self-sufficient, compared to the 51% sanctioned rate.

This is only 3,812 persons in December who found employment that made them ineligible for CalWORKs. The cost of this is an estimated \$22,000 for each job and there is not evidence that the county had anything involvement in securing these jobs. The counties often take credit for jobs secured by families and friends of welfare recipients.

Some counties do not even bother to report. And why should they file state mandated reports? There are no consequences for devi-

ant county behavior. Counties always want incentives and bonuses. During December of 2004 Merced, Riverside, San Bernardino and Stanislaus counties simply did not submit a WtW report as required by CDSS duly promulgated regulations.

However, Merced, Riverside, San Bernardino and Stanislaus counties showed no holiday compassion to families who failed to turn in their quarterly reports. 1,034 families received zero benefits on January 1, 2005 because the county did not get a report from these families.

December, 2004 WtW Report	
Participants (unduplicated)	93,767
Sanctions	47,369
Transportation	43,833
Obtained Employment (that resulted in termination of CalWORKs Benefits)	3,821
Taxpayer Cost Per Job	\$22,322

Los Angeles County, the largest county in the State, is a leader in sanctioning WtW participants at 82%. Los Angeles County was able to sanction 23,389 participants during December of 2004, while they could only find 511 persons jobs that resulted termination of CalWORKs benefits. In fact there are more than 500 WtW employees in Los Angeles County. FIGURE #1 shows the percentage of sanctions imposed on WtW participants during December of 2004, a typical Christmas Greetings from California Counties.

COUNTY JOB PERFORMANCE - Statewide, the best performing counties are small counties performing below 20% and the highest large counties performing below 10 percent are Sacramento at 8.4%, San Diego at 8.2%, Fresno at 5.5%. The remaining large counties are below 5%. The high sanction county Los Angeles was able to achieve 1.8% and

Orange County came in .58%. Clearly the emphasis of this program is on sanctions and not jobs, which is why the Schwarzenegger Administration is pushing for more sanctions because they know they have failed to create jobs that welfare recipients need and want. The welfare bureaucracy was never designed to do employment services, rather it was created to do eligibility, like imposing sanctions - be it often, unlawfully. FIGURE 2 is a county-by-county numbers of WtW unduplicated participants found employment that resulted in termination of CalWORKs benefits.

The final FIGURE #3 reveals the number of WtW participants who are participating in a WtW activity, but are not getting transportation assistance. The law mandates the payments of transportation if the participant needs it in order to participate. It is hard to imagine a worker, student or trainee who does not incur

transportation costs in California. It is harder to imagine somebody participating in a welfare to work activity in San Francisco and not incurring transportation costs - 74% of the San Francisco WtW were not paid transportation. Many rural counties have transportation less than 10%.

It is clear from Figure #3 that while some counties are paying transportation for 75% of the participants, other counties are paying for less than 10%. There is no logical explanation for this discrepancy except that certain counties are unlawfully and currently stealing money from WtW participants month after month without any shame. The ironic part is that many of these counties that are stealing money from WtW participants by not paying for their transportation as required by State law are prosecuting welfare recipients for overpayments that exceed \$400.

FIGURE #1- PERCENTAGE OF UNDUPLICATED PARTICIPANTS SANCTIONED DURING DECEMBER, 2004

Statewide 50.52%

Colusa	102.94%	Siskiyou	43.05%	Solano	22.84%
Fresno	93.88%	Glenn	42.86%	Orange	21.39%
Amador	91.67%	Santa Barb.	41.25%	Lassen	20.89%
Los Angeles	81.97%	Contra Costa	38.42%	Ventura	20.22%
San Luis Ob	77.41%	Lake	37.32%	Alpine	20.00%
Sonoma	76.99%	San Mateo	36.32%	San Fran	19.30%
Plumas	69.05%	Kings	35.79%	Butte	17.22%
Kern	62.60%	Mariposa	35.14%	San Benito	15.14%
Napa	61.21%	Placer	35.04%	Tuolumne	12.06%
Shasta	59.54%	Alameda	33.82%	Yuba	12.02%
Mendocino	58.44%	San Joaquin	33.54%	Del Norte	7.08%
San Diego	56.65%	Santa Cruz	32.15%	Mono	6.25%
Monterey	55.42%	Inyo	30.56%	Imperial	5.15%
Humboldt	51.63%	Nevada	28.00%	Modoc	3.70%
Calaveras	50.00%	Madera	27.09%	Sacramento	3.33%
Yolo	49.40%	Sutter	24.43%	Sierra	0.00%
Tehama	48.77%	Santa Clara	24.41%	Merced	NO REPORTS
Marin	45.83%	Trinity	24.00%	Riverside	NO REPORTS
Tulare	44.38%	El Dorado	22.87%	San Bern.	NO REPORTS
				Stanislaus	NO REPORTS

SOURCE: County WTW 25 Reports

FIGURE #2-
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF
UNDUPLICATED PARTICIPANTS WHO OB-
TAINED EMPLOYMENT THAT RESULTED IN
TERMINATION OF CALWORKS BENEFITS
DURING DECEMBER, 2004

Statewide 3,821 4.07%

Alameda	103	2.00%	Orange	29	0.58%
Alpine	0	0.00%	Placer	45	11.51%
Amador	3	8.33%	Plumas	2	4.76%
Butte	37	3.43%	Riverside	NO	RPRT
Calaveras	4	3.57%	Sacra,	717	8.41%
Colusa	0	0.00%	San Benito	8	4.32%
Contra Cos	113	4.79%	San Bern.	NO	RPRT
Del Norte	3	0.85%	San Diego	274	8.21%
El Dorado	5	1.71%	San Fran	95	3.37%
Fresno	307	5.57%	San Joaq,	95	3.01%
Glenn	1	0.71%	San Luis	43	14.29%
Humboldt	6	0.93%	San Mateo	88	19.26%
Imperial	19	1.44%	Santa Barb	155	19.80%
Inyo	2	5.56%	Santa Clara	186	4.37%
Kern	88	1.68%	Santa Cruz	97	15.59%
Kings	23	2.36%	Shasta	27	2.93%
Lake	7	1.71%	Sierra	0	0.00%
Lassen	1	0.63%	Siskiyou	4	2.65%
Los Ang.	511	1.79%	Solano	130	18.11%
Madera	82	8.92%	Sonoma	61	10.10%
Marin	8	2.56%	Stanislaus	NO	RPRT
Mariposa	3	4.05%	Sutter	11	2.28%
Mendocino	7	1.33%	Tehama	14	3.84%
Merced	NO	RPRT	Trinity	4	8.00%
Modoc	0	0.00%	Tulare	177	9.60%
Mono	1	3.13%	Tuolumne	3	1.51%
Monterey	30	3.29%	Ventura	103	5.23%
Napa	7	6.03%	Yolo	58	11.51%
Nevada	4	2.00%	Yuba	20	3.34%

SOURCE: County
WTW 25 Reports

FIGURE #3
PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS RECEIVING
TRANSPORTATION SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
DURING DECEMBER, 2004

County	% of Part Getting Transp.	County	% of Part Getting Transp.
Plumas	0.00%	Placer	32.23%
Siskiyou	1.32%	Trinity	34.00%
Lassen	5.70%	Mariposa	35.14%
Napa	7.76%	San Benito	35.14%
Lake	9.51%	Fresno	35.40%
Imperial	12.05%	Alameda	35.55%
Ventura	13.06%	Colusa	38.24%
Butte	14.72%	Sacramento	38.56%
Glenn	15.00%	San Joaquin	39.51%
Mendocino	15.37%	Alpine	40.00%
Mono	15.63%	Tuolumne	42.71%
Tehama	16.44%	Santa Cruz	43.09%
Inyo	16.67%	Nevada	44.50%
Sutter	18.01%	Orange	46.30%
El Dorado	18.43%	Sonoma	50.83%
Del Norte	18.98%	Yolo c/	52.18%
Madera	19.04%	Contra Costa	53.69%
Tulare	19.21%	Amador	55.56%
Shasta	20.39%	Solano	60.03%
San Mateo	20.79%	Marin	62.82%
Kern	23.40%	Los Angeles	66.82%
Santa Barb	24.52%	Monterey	71.63%
San Luis Ob.	25.25%	Santa Clara	72.32%
Humboldt	25.27%	San Diego	75.18%
San Fran	25.54%	Modoc	111.11%
Sierra	26.67%	Merced	NO RPRTS
Yuba	27.88%	Riverside	NO RPRTS
Calaveras	30.36%	San Bern.	NO RPRTS
Kings	30.77%	Stanislaus	NO RPRTS

SOURCE: County
WTW 25 Reports

Statewide 46.75%

CCWRO SERVICES AVAILABLE TO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS & WELFARE RECIPIENTS REFERRED TO US BY LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Types of Services Offered: Litigation, Fair Hearing Representation, Fair Hearing Consultation, Informational Services, and Research Services, in depth Consultation.

Programs Covered: CalWORKs, Welfare to Work (WtW), Food Stamps, Medi-Cal. General Assistance and Refugee Immigration Problems