



# CCWRO Welfare News 2017-06 - 8-7-17

Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, Inc. (CCWRO)  
 1111 Howe Ave., Suite 150 • Sacramento, CA 95825-8551  
 Telephone (916) 736-0616 • Cell (916) 712-0071 • Fax (916) 736-2645

## California's Segregated WtW Program UPDATE

The California segregated WtW program continues to excel in its primary mission – sanctioning participants while failing to assist participants to obtain jobs that result in termination of CalWORKs benefits and achieving self-sufficiency.

During August 2016, 36% of the CalWORKs participants were sanctioned. In April 2017 that number increased to 39%. Meanwhile, during September 2016 about 4% of the unduplicated participants got jobs that result in termination of CalWORKs benefits (which does not necessarily mean that the jobs allowed self-sufficiency) while in April 2017 only 3% obtained jobs.

Counties continue to deprive CalWORKs recipients from achieving self-sufficiency by not allowing them to obtain the tools needed to achieve self-sufficiency in the 21st century economy – the knowledge based economy. Just 3% of the CalWORKs WtW participants are allowed an opportunity to attain the tools needed to achieve self-sufficiency by the administrators of the segregated welfare-to-work program. See **TABLE #1** below.

| <b>TABLE #1</b> | Sanctions | Jobs  | College |
|-----------------|-----------|-------|---------|
| 16-Aug          | 36%       | 3.40% | 2.87%   |
| 16-Sep          | 36%       | 3.83% | 2.92%   |
| 16-Oct          | 37%       | 3.36% | 3.02%   |
| 16-Nov          | 37%       | 3.08% | 3.01%   |
| 16-Dec          | 37%       | 3.07% | 2.98%   |
| 17-Jan          | 38%       | 2.58% | 2.76%   |
| 17-Feb          | 38%       | 2.82% | 2.87%   |
| 17-Mar          | 38%       | 3.04% | 2.97%   |
| 17-Apr          | 39%       | 2.98% | 2.92%   |

## ABAWDS Work Requirement Coming September 1, 2018 Advocate Input Needed

The existing statewide waiver of the work requirements for the Able Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWD) Work Requirements will end in most California counties on August 31, 2018. For the past two years, the California Department of Social Services has conducted meetings with counties, advocates, food bank representatives and others to develop policy for the re-implementation of these often harshly restrictive rules.

CDSS staff are presenting a series of informational “webinars” to introduce the ABAWD rules to county staff, advocates and others working to reduce hunger in California. The next presentation is August 15, 2017 and will discuss the vital issue of exemptions from the ABAWD rule. For more information review the information at the CDSS [CalFresh webpage](#).

At the August 1, 2017 ABAWD work group meeting, CDSS staff discussed three key issues:

- The outline for the ABAWD Handbook 1.0 (expected release in September 2017);
- Guidance for the use of the 15% allocation of special exemptions; and
- Standard CalFresh certifications for ABAWDs.

CDSS’ proposal is that for ABAWDS who are working and meet the requirements of the program and ABAWDS who clearly qualify for an exemption will be granted a standard 12-month certification period.

Con’t on page 2

CDSS proposes that individuals who are not working the required number of work hours at the time of their certification interview will be granted a four-month certification.

CDSS explained that the four-month certification is to encourage continued contact with the individual and encouragements to become enrolled in a work program or evaluated for eligibility for some type of a waiver. At least one county was extremely concerned about the workload impact of this proposal.

CCWRO has offered to solicit comments from the advocate community about the positive and negative impacts of the 4-month certification period. Please e-mail Daphne Macklin with your comments at [tlk2014dlm@gmail.com](mailto:tlk2014dlm@gmail.com). Daphne will share CDSS' written proposal on certification periods when it is released.

### CalFresh Expedited Service Denials

The CalFresh Program's expedited services (ES) component is to ensure that applicants who are food insecure do not have to endure food insecurity. The following households are eligible for expedited service food stamps:

- Rent or mortgage and utility costs that are more than your liquid resources and this month's income before deductions (see the other side of the page for definitions of income and liquid resources),
- OR
- No more than \$100 liquid resources and less than \$150 income for the month before deductions,
- OR
- No more than \$100 liquid resources and at least one member of the household is a migrant or seasonal farmworker.

Persons found eligible for ES are issued benefits within three days from the date of application. The denial rates of expedited service is above 50% of the caseload and there is no data to explain why food insecure human beings are sentenced to continue food insecurity by counties throughout California.

**TABLE #2** reveals statewide level of sentencing food insecure humans to continued food insecurity by denying expedited service CalFresh benefits - emergency food stamps.

**TABLE #2-Percentage of households denied emergency food assistance**

| Month/Year | Percentage of CF-ES Denied | Month/Year | Percentage of CF-ES Denied |
|------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| 7-16       | 56%                        | 12-16      | 56%                        |
| 8-16       | 57%                        | 1-17       | 53%                        |
| 9-16       | 59%                        | 2-17       | 56%                        |
| 10-16      | 58%                        | 3-17       | 55%                        |
| 11-16      | 56%                        | 4-17       | 53%                        |

**TABLE # 3**, on page 3, reveals county-by-county rate of ES denials for the month of April 2017. Sacramento County at a whopping 69%. Santa Clara, San Diego, San Mateo Counties are between 12% and 9% over the state average of 53%.

### Alleged Remedy for Denial of Expedited CalFresh - "Agency Conference"?

The state and federal regulations provide that if an applicant is found to be ineligible for CF-ES, the applicant cannot request a state hearing – no due process – but they can ask for a so-called agency conference. Most, if not all applicants, have no idea what an "agency conference" is or that they are entitled to one.

A DSS CF-ES Q&A addressed questions from a county whether or not there is a form that applicants can use to request an agency conference.

"Question 8: Is there a particular form to be used for agency conference appointments?"

Answer 8: No, there is no particular form. Counties are instructed to document in the case file the date and time of the scheduled appointment and the outcome of the agency conference."

How do applicants ask for an agency conference that they have no idea about it. If DSS was serious and wanted to help people ask for an agency conference, they would have a form that would be given to applicants who are found not to be eligible for CF-ES. Applicants denied CF-ES never get a written statement saying that they have been denied CF-ES and that their CF application will be processed within 30 days. In fact, it is not unusual for CalFresh applicants call their worker inquiring about their benefits and the answer is "we have 30 days to process our application".

Con't on page 3

“Question 11: If the household did not request an agency conference, is there a requirement to document in the case comments? DSS CF-ES Q&A.

Answer 11: There is no requirement, but it is beneficial for the county to document in the case file that the household did not request an agency conference if they were found non-entitled for ES.”

It really looks like an agency conference is just a joke as far as SNAP/CalFresh administrators are concerned. Although you have a right to an agency conference, counties won’t inform applicants about the availability of an agency conference and won’t document in the case that you did not ask for something that you have no idea about.

## CalFresh Procedural Denials

CalFresh applicants may very well be eligible for CalFresh but denied “procedural reasons” such as missing an appointment and not being able to reschedule, failing to provide verification that was never properly requested or that the county did not use the CW 2200. Question 10 deals with a procedural denial.

“Question 10: Please clarify if a second interview appointment is required prior to denying the application? Can the application be denied prior to the 30th day for missed interview?”

Answer 10: If a household misses the initial scheduled interview appointment, the county must send a NOMI to the household. The NOMI informs the household that they are responsible to contact the county to schedule a second interview if they wish to participate in the program.”

If the household does not schedule a second interview, the county denies the CalFresh application.

**T  
A  
B  
L  
E  
  
#  
3**

|   | Percentage of ES Denials |  | Percentage of ES Denials |                          | Percentage of ES Denials |
|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Statewide                                 | 53                       | Madera   | 58%                      | Contra Costa & Mendocino | 47%                      |
| Sacramento                                | 69%                      | San Francisco & Shasta                             | 57%                      | Lassen & Los Angeles     | 46%                      |
| Napa                                      | 67%                      | El Dorado, Imperial, Kern, Riverside & San Joaquin | 56%                      | Solano & Ventura         | 45%                      |
| Colusa                                    | 66%                      | Sutter   | 55%                      | Placer & Yuba            | 44%                      |
| Santa Clara                               | 65%                      | Fresno, Santa Cruz & Sonoma                        | 54%                      | Trinity                  | 43%                      |
| Plumas                                    | 63%                      | San Benito, Stanislaus & Tuolumne                  | 53%                      | Modoc                    | 41%                      |
| San Diego, Monterey, San Mateo, Del Norte | 62%                      | Calaveras, Kings & Mariposa                        | 52%                      | Santa Barbara            | 35%                      |
| Nevada, Orange, Siskiyou                  | 61%                      | Tulare   | 51%                      | San Luis Obispo          | 31%                      |
| Mono, Butte, Amador                       | 60%                      | Alpine   | 50%                      | Sierra                   | 20%                      |
| Glenn, Humboldt, Marin & Tehama           | 59%                      | Inyo & San Bernardino                              | 49%                      | Yolo                     | 0%                       |
|   |                          | Lake   | 48%                      |                          |                          |

## CalWORKs Applicants with Needy Children not Screened for CalFresh Expedited Service (CF-ES)

Welfare & Institution Code 18914(b) provides that "Pursuant to the federal requirements of Section 273.2(i)(2) of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the county human services agency shall screen all CalFresh applications for entitlement to expedited service." During the month of May of 2017, according to the CW 237 CalWORKs report, there were 38,865 CalWORKs applications. The CF 296 report reveals, that **only** 4,404 of them were screened for CalFresh Expedited Service. The CalWORKs cases are known as the Public Assistance Cal Fresh cases. The CF 296 reveals that only a meager 7% of the needy families with children received CF-ES. See **TABLE #4** below.

This is also circumstantial evidence that there is widespread unlawful denial of CalWORKs emergency assistance benefits required by W&IC §11266 and MPP § 40-129. These laws provide that emergency CalWORKs assistance can be denied if the family's sole need is food and they were issued food stamps on the date of application, but no later than the next day.

The data below reveals the appalling public benefits state of affairs for California's poor families and children - the evident widespread denial of immediate public benefits to nutritionally and financially challenged families that looks like **"government state and county child abuse"**.

**TABLE #4**

| May-17           | CalWORKs applications<br><b>CW 237</b> | CalWORKs applications not reviewed for ES | PACF ES reviewed<br><b>CF 296</b> | PACF ES Denied<br>CF296 | Percentage of CalWORKs Applicants Getting CF-ES | Percentage of CalWORKs Applicants Reviewed for CF-ES |
|------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Statewide</b> | <b>38,865</b>                          | <b>34,461</b>                             | <b>4,404</b>                      | <b>1,541</b>            | <b>7%</b>                                       | <b>11%</b>   |
| Alameda          | 1,009                                  | 1,009                                     | no reports                        | 0                       | 0%  | 0%   |
| Alpine           | 0                                      | 0   | 0                                 | 0                       | 0%  | 0%   |
| Amador           | 37                                     | 35  | 2                                 | 1                       | 3%  | 5%   |
| Butte            | 273                                    | 262                                       | 11                                | 6                       | 2%  | 4%   |
| Calaveras        | 47                                     | 40  | 7                                 | 4                       | 6%  | 15%  |
| Colusa           | 17                                     | 17  | 0                                 | 0                       | 0%  | 0%   |
| Contra Costa     | 763                                    | 722                                       | 41                                | 17                      | 3%  | 5%   |
| Del Norte        | 50                                     | 47  | 3                                 | 1                       | 4%  | 6%   |
| El Dorado        | 201                                    | 188                                       | 13                                | 4                       | 4%  | 6%   |
| Fresno           | 1,360                                  | 1,300                                     | 60                                | 31                      | 2%  | 4%   |
| Glenn            | 34                                     | 32  | 2                                 | 2                       | 0%  | 6%   |
| Humboldt         | 158                                    | 143                                       | 15                                | 6                       | 6%  | 9%   |
| Imperial         | 378                                    | 341                                       | 37                                | 14                      | 6%  | 10%  |
| Inyo             | 13                                     | 10  | 3                                 | 1                       | 15%   | 23%  |
| Kern             | 2,103                                  | 1,909                                     | 194                               | 76                      | 6%  | 9%   |
| Kings            | 294                                    | 269                                       | 25                                | 9                       | 5%  | 9%   |
| Lake             | 123                                    | 115                                       | 8                                 | 5                       | 2%  | 7%   |
| Lassen           | 46                                     | 41  | 5                                 | 4                       | 2%  | 11%  |
| Los Angeles      | 9,399                                  | 7,226                                     | 2,173                             | 626                     | 16%   | 23%  |
| Madera           | 418                                    | 397                                       | 21                                | 11                      | 2%  | 5%   |

| May-17          | CW applica-<br>tions CW 237 | CW applica-<br>tions not<br>reviewed for<br>ES | PACF ES<br>reviewed<br>CF 296 | PACF ES<br>Denied<br>CF296 | Percentage of Cal-<br>WORKs Applicants<br>Getting CF-ES | Percentage of Cal-<br>WORKs Applicants<br>Reviewed for CF-ES |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Marin           | 64                          | 56   | 8                             | 2                          | 9%  | 13%  |
| Mariposa        | 30                          | 29   | 1                             | 1                          | 0%  | 3%   |
| Mendocino       | 100                         | 82   | 18                            | 7                          | 11%   | 18%  |
| Merced          | 560                         | 507  | 53                            | 19                         | 6%  | 9%   |
| Modoc           | 19                          | 18   | 1                             | 1                          | 0%  | 5%   |
| Mono            | 8                           | 8  | 0                             | 0                          | 0%  | 0%   |
| Monterey        | 439                         | 413  | 26                            | 14                         | 3%  | 6%   |
| Napa            | 66                          | 65   | 1                             | 1                          | 0%  | 2%   |
| Nevada          | 65                          | 58   | 7                             | 3                          | 6%  | 11%  |
| Orange          | 1,169                       | 1,055  | 114                           | 61                         | 5%  | 10%  |
| Placer          | 198                         | 198  | 0                             | 0                          | 0%  | 0%   |
| Plumas          | 12                          | 10   | 2                             | 1                          | 8%  | 17%  |
| Riverside       | 3,171                       | 2,887  | 284                           | 88                         | 6%  | 9%   |
| Sacramento      | 2,386                       | 2,120  | 266                           | 139                        | 5%  | 11%  |
| San Benito      | 53                          | 51   | 2                             | 0                          | 4%  | 4%   |
| San Bernardino  | 4,264                       | 3,855  | 409                           | 118                        | 7%  | 10%  |
| San Diego       | 2,636                       | 2,534  | 102                           | 49                         | 2%  | 4%   |
| San Francisco   | 337                         | 287  | 50                            | 18                         | 9%  | 15%  |
| San Joaquin     | 1,103                       | 999  | 104                           | 41                         | 6%  | 9%   |
| San Luis Obispo | 198                         | 183  | 15                            | 3                          | 6%  | 8%   |
| San Mateo       | 264                         | 249  | 15                            | 8                          | 3%  | 6%   |
| Santa Barbara   | 304                         | 280  | 24                            | 11                         | 4%  | 8%   |
| Santa Clara     | 630                         | 596  | 34                            | 20                         | 2%  | 5%   |
| Santa Cruz      | 121                         | 107  | 14                            | 9                          | 4%  | 12%  |
| Shasta          | 274                         | 256  | 18                            | 11                         | 3%  | 7%   |
| Sierra          | 2                           | 2  | 0                             | 0                          | 0%  | 0%   |
| Siskiyou        | 75                          | 72   | 3                             | 1                          | 3%  | 4%   |
| Solano          | 359                         | 342  | 17                            | 7                          | 3%  | 5%   |
| Sonoma          | 184                         | 169  | 15                            | 4                          | 6%  | 8%   |
| Stanislaus      | 909                         | 837  | 72                            | 39                         | 4%  | 8%   |
| Sutter          | 152                         | 138  | 14                            | 5                          | 6%  | 9%   |
| Tehama          | 138                         | 133  | 5                             | 0                          | 4%  | 4%   |
| Trinity         | 20                          | 18   | 2                             | 2                          | 0%  | 10%  |
| Tulare          | 865                         | 822  | 43                            | 24                         | 2%  | 5%   |
| Tuolumne        | 67                          | 63   | 4                             | 2                          | 3%  | 6%   |
| Ventura         | 633                         | 613  | 20                            | 9                          | 2%  | 3%   |
| Yolo            | 138                         | 128  | 10                            | 0                          | 7%  | 7%   |
| Yuba            | 129                         | 118  | 11                            | 5                          | 5%  | 9%   |