



CCWRO Welfare News-2018-12

December 27, 2018

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

In Brief

► **CalFresh Dashboard:** <https://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Data-Portal/Research-and-Data/CalFresh-Data-Dashboard>

The CDSS CalFresh Dashboard has information regarding the issuance of emergency food stamps for food insecure children and families. But, this information is not available after the 2nd quarter of 2016. Does this information not warrant up to date data on the dashboard?

► The Legislature has appropriated an over \$95 million block grant for county housing assistance programs. To date, homeless families in California, the intended beneficiaries of the \$95 million, have no idea what part of this money is available to them and what portion will be used for administration, case management, data reporting, travel, etc. Moreover, families have no idea what the \$95 million means for them in their counties. Counties and CDSS do not want the homeless families to know about the \$95 million handed over to the counties for the homeless as a block grant. Some homeless may ask for assistance!

No wonder Republicans want to block grant the SNAP and Medicaid programs. If a blue state like California can block grant homeless money to counties, why couldn't the federal government block grant food stamp and Medicaid money to the States? Good question.

► Online CalWORKs Appraisal Tool (OCAT) will now be in the hands of the counties and not CDSS. The OCAT portal developed by under the supervision of CDSS will now become the property of the counties who will have total control of what OCAT does and what OCAT will reveal.

When the State where in charge of OCAT, counties insisted that OCAT only identify problems and leave it up to the county worker to decide if it is an employment barrier that needs to be addressed. For example, three (3) persons have the identical domestic violence (DV) problem. One worker in the same county or another county will refer the person for DV services. The next worker in the same county or another county will refer the DV victim to job club. And the third worker in the same county or another county will declare the same DV victim exempt. This way the county has maximum flexibility but the CalWORKs victim of domestic violence is victimized again and again by giving the county so much flexibility and zero (0) flexibility to the CalWORKs parent or the victim of DV.

► Del Norte County asked DSS for an additional \$158,000 to serve eight homeless families during 2018-2019. That is \$13,167 per family per year for their CalWORKs Housing Support Program. The Del Norte County asserted "Increasing our target population from 32 families to 40 families will require additional funding above the base allocation of \$158,000.00. Del Norte County seeks 10% for case management, 5% for data collection and 15% for administration. Data collection and administration is also funded with the county single allocation, but then why not download more money from the HSP program while families are homeless?"

Will Governor Newsom's 2019-2020 Proposed Budget Reflect His Campaign Promise?

The 2018-2019 state budget redirected \$2.3 billion CalWORKs dollars out of the mouths of CalWORKs children enduring deep poverty in California and used it for non-CalWORKs TANF expenditures. See **TABLE #1** below, produced by the State of California. What this document reveals is that **\$252 a month** is redirected from CalWORKs babies and children living in deep poverty to non-CalWORKs programs of California.

We wonder if Governor Newsom's 2019-2020 proposed state budget would reflect the promises made by candidate Newsom and stop this raid on California's children enduring deep poverty amounting to State Child Abuse?

During the campaign Gavin Newsom stated "**1.9 million California children—one in five who live in our great state—are living in poverty. As a candidate for Governor, he's making the elimination of child poverty the north star of a Newsom administration. Every policy will be guided by that goal.**" It's a two-pronged strategy, one that starts with boosting initiatives that help kids who are growing up in deep poverty today. The second thrust consists of de-

(Con't on page 2)

(Cont'd from page 1)

veloping a long-term strategy to break the cycle of multi-generational poverty through education and creating real opportunities for economic advancement for every child.

Immediate Action to Combat Deep Poverty

In the immediate term, our leaders in Sacramento must do more to help young people and their families who are currently living in deep poverty. The deck has been stacked against too many kids—particularly those from households at the bottom of the income ladder. Families in many parts of California have battled wage stagnation, income inequality, persistent unemployment and exorbitant housing costs, and a faltering safety net. And the stress of deep poverty has created an almost insurmountable barrier to economic advancement for so many families. Our state’s fight for kids who are living in deep poverty needs a shot in the arm. Here are three ways we can act now to help those families:

Reward Work: California can, and must, get serious about preparing folks for the jobs of today and tomorrow by refocusing our career tech and workforce development programs. We then have to expand our statewide Earned Income Tax Credit for very low-income earners—a program that rewards work and allows families to

The 2018-2019 adopted state budget redirected **\$252 a month out of the mouths of CalWORKs babies and children to non-CalWORKs program.** We wonder if Governor Newsom’s 2019-2020 proposed budget would reflect the promises made by candidate Newsom and stop this raid on California’s children enduring deep poverty amounting to State Child Abuse?

of their purchasing power over the last 20 years. They’re not enough to pay for a decent apartment, let alone the other necessities like food and clothing, a kid needs to thrive. It’s also time to explore allowing welfare recipients to keep a greater portion of their grant aid.”

Table #1 reveals that the 2018-2019 adopted state

keep more of their hard-earned money.

Restore Benefits: California can, and must, dramatically increase CalWORKs grants, a life-changing program that provides financial and other assistance to families in need. Most very poor children live in homes with parents on welfare, but the grants those families receive have lost much

budget redirected \$252 a month from the mouths of CalWORKs babies and children to non-CalWORKs program. The question is - would Governor Newsom stand by the promises made by candidate Newsom and stop this raid on California’s children who endure deep poverty amounting to State Child Abuse?

TABLE # 1 - 2019-2019 CalWORKs Budget Appropriations

Program	Appropriations
Total TANF Grant/Required MOE	\$ 6,561,935,000
CalWORKs Program¹	5,004,490,000
Grants	2,810,025,000
Administration	627,833,000
Services	1,131,543,000
Child Care	308,483,000
Mental Health/Sub. Abuse Services	126,606,000
Tribal TANF	81,295,000
TANF Transfer to Student Aid Commission	1,066,011,000
Kin-GAP Program	89,047,000
Non-TANF/MOE Eligible Expenditures	(842,128,000)
Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS	402,300,000
Other MOE Eligible Expenditures	552,153,000
State Support Costs	29,938,000
Total Expenditures	6,383,106,000
Federal TANF	3,385,443,000
General Fund (MOE) ²	1,136,655,000
County Funds	1,861,008,000
Total TANF Transfers	451,965,000
Non-CalWORKs Transfers ³	192,118,000
CalWORKs/Tribal TANF Transfers	259,847,000
TANF Block Grant/Required MOE	6,561,935,000
TANF Block Grant Transfer/Carry Forward ⁴	274,505,000
Excess MOE Needed to Fund Programs	157,224,000
Single Allocation Reappropriation	0
Total Available Funding	\$ 6,993,664,000
Total Funding Needed	\$ 6,835,071,000
Total TANF Reserve	\$ 158,593,000
NET TANF Carry-Over Funds ⁴	0
CalWORKs Contribution to the General Fund⁵	\$ 2,382,265,000
CalWORKs Subaccount Reserve ⁶	\$ 200,000,000

¹ Because of the flexible nature of the Single Allocation, for display purposes the administration, (Cont'd on page 3)

(Cont'd from page 2)

Services (other than mental health and substance abuse), and child care budgeted dollars for FY 2018-19 are adjusted for the actual expenditure patterns by cost type.

² The FY 2018-19 reflects a funding shift from GF to county funds payable through the CalWORKs MOE Subaccount, the Realignment Family Support Subaccount, and the Child Poverty and Family Supplemental Subaccount. With the exception of the subaccount funding utilized for the non-MOE population, this funding is MOE countable. See the CalWORKs AB 85 County Repayment and Funding Subaccount Premise for additional information.

³ This item includes the TANF transfer to Title XX for non-CalWORKs programs (FC, CWS, and DDS).

⁴ Carry forward projections are point in time and are not updated in subsequent FYs. In the budget year, the net TANF carry-over funds reflect the difference between available funds and funding needed and total TANF Reserve.

⁵ CalWORKs contribution to GF includes the TANF Transfer to Student Aid Commission, Kin-GAP Program, Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS, Other MOE Eligible Expenditures, Non-CalWORKs TANF Transfers, and WPR adjustment (if applicable). This includes \$58.1 million in CalWORKs Automation in FY 2018-19. In addition, beginning FY 2016-17 this item also includes the TANF to Title XX funding transferred to CDE for Stage Two Child Care.

⁶ The purpose of this reserve is to set aside funds for the future expenditures of two programs: CalWORKs and Medi-Cal. Therefore, this funding is not reflected in the 2018-19 local assistance budget for CalWORKs.

California Counties' Contribution to Deep Poverty & Increased Homelessness

CalWORKs WtW sanctions are a major contributor to California's deep child poverty and child homelessness. When a family of two is sanctioned, their monthly cash aid of \$577 is reduced down to \$355 a month. **TABLE #2** reveals large and medium counties that have more people being sanctioned than participating. Why? Counties can use the \$1,134 monthly allocation for each sanctioned person anyway they want – increase salaries, take trips, get new furniture or whatever.

In the 2006-2007 budget act, the California State Legislature passed AB 1808, giving counties \$230 million annually to increase welfare to work engagement and reduce sanctions. To pay for it, the 2006-2007 state budget suspended the meager CalWORKs COLA that would have cost only \$143 million. To date, this additional \$2.5 billion appropriation to the county block grant (county single allocation) has resulted in a 2% reduction of sanction rate from 23% in 2006, to 21% in 2018 - \$1.25 billion per one percent.

TABLE #2

County - July 2018	Unduplicated Participants	Sanctions
Statewide	73145	56087
San Joaquin	1095	3133
Kern	2073	5605
Madera	198	465
Butte	370	550
Mendocino	141	157
Stanislaus	1334	1478

Source: WtW25 and 25A

TABLE #3 reveals the number sanctions that have lasted for more than one year.

NOTE: Fresno County has a total of 1,043 sanctions and 1,373 are sanctions over one year. One may wonder how could that be? Yet, these are numbers provided by the Fresno County Welfare Department on their CA 237CW to the California Department of Social Services. Spending billions of dollars over several decades on county operated computer systems reveals that county run computer systems are unreliable and a gross abuse of tax dollars.

Yet the State of California continues to delegate the computer systems to these incompetent actors. It is not rare that county representatives confirm that their reported numbers are unreliable, even before the State Legislature. This is even after CDSS engages counties, exclusively in most cases, to come up with a reporting State Policy that counties have agreed to.

Spending billions of dollars over several decades on county operated computer systems reveals that county run computer systems are unreliable and a gross abuse of tax dollars.

TABLE #3

County - July 2018	Sanctions	Sanctions Plus 1-Year	Percentage
Statewide	56087	26207	47%
Fresno	1043	1373	132%
Alameda	881	760	86%
Solano	186	153	82%
Del Norte	15	12	80%

Source: CA237CW

Con't on page 4

(Cont'd from page 3)

Unlawful County Denials of WtW Transportation Contributes to California's Child Poverty Crisis

State law and regulations provide that the county shall pay for transportation for individuals who need it and are being asked to participate in a WtW activity. As indicated above, WtW participants are living in deep poverty that results in irreparable harm to CalWORKs babies and children.

For years, less than 50% of the WtW participants have been getting transportation. The reason is that counties intentionally make transportation inaccessible to CalWORKs recipients living in deep poverty. County administrators and workers can create a travel claim and submit it to fiscal for payment. A WtW participant cannot take a day off work to submit the travel claim, they may lose their job.

An advocate suggestion that travel claims be submitted on-line was vetoed by counties, most likely because that would mean money coming out of the single allocation going to CalWORKs families that counties would prefer to use elsewhere. Some counties pay mileage at the rate of 23¢ a mile for CalWORKs recipients and 56¢ a mile for county employees.

Many counties have adopted complex transportation rules that erect barriers for CalWORKs parents from getting the transportation for which they are entitled.

Table #4 shows some of the more egregious counties not paying for transportation.

TABLE #4

County	Unduplicated Participants	Getting Transportation	Percentage
Statewide	53756	34941	65%
Del Norte - rural	48	0	0%
Lassen - rural	10	0	0%
Lake- rural	108	14	13%
Colusa- rural	6	1	17%
Ventura- rural	830	157	19%
Glenn- rural	15	3	20%
San Mateo	202	46	23%
El Dorado- rural	142	35	25%
Santa Barbara- rurla	438	109	25%
Orange	2903	765	26%
Merced-rural	554	147	27%
Shasta- rural	278	81	29%

Source: WtW 25 and 25A

THE FINAL WORD - The victims of “county welfare department abuse” often end up homeless while counties get \$95 million to fix the problems they’ve created - it is known as the “\$95 million County Housing Support Program”. There are a whole host of county policies, legal and illegal, that cause homelessness of CalWORKs families with babies and little children. The law gives county demanded flexibility to enact policies. These policies not only cause family homelessness in California, they have also been major contributors to the child poverty crises in California. **When will this stop?** Will the Newsom Administration review all county policies to see if they cause or eliminate child poverty in California consistent with his campaign promise? “...**elimination of child poverty is the north star of a Newsom administration. Every policy will be guided by that goal.**” We shall see.

CalWORKs - Who Needs Child Care and Other Supportive Services? - No One Knows

.The



Statewide	53756	34941		65%
Del Norte	48	0		0%
Lassen	10	0		0%
Lake	108	14		13%
Colusa	6	1		17%
Ventura	830	157		19%
Glenn	15	3		20%
San Mateo	202	46		23%
El Dorado	142	35		25%
Santa Barbara	438	109		25%
Orange	2903	765		26%
Merced	554	147		27%
Shasta	278	81		29%

“Engage with stakeholders?” There are zero advocate engagement in the 32 CalSAWS workgroups set forth on page 4 through 6.



“Transparency?” CalSAWS it’s all “secrecy”.

“Meaningful?” There are zero advocate inclusion in the 32 CalSAWS workgroups set forth on page 4 through 6.

TABLE # 2



Supportive Services? - No One Knows

.The



