File AB 1117

4493 25th Avenue
Sacramento, Calif. 95820
Tel. 916 456-8362

March 27, 1967

Mr. Jack T. Casey, Chairman
Assembly Committee on Social Welfare
California Legislature
State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Assembly Committee on Social Welfare

Dear Mr. Casey:

I would like to congratulate you on the excellent report, "Protective Services for Children" submitted to the Legislature by the Assembly Interim Committee on Social Welfare. This report makes a real contribution to a more complete understanding of the problem and why there is such a pressing need for legislation.

As one of the Regional Directors of the Epidemiological Study of Child Abuse now being conducted by Brandeis University, I would like to make one or two comments about the section on "Measuring the Incidence." First, I was delighted to see the reference to our study in terms which indicate an appreciation of its aims and intent. On the other hand, I think there are one or two inaccuracies or at least ambiguities.

It is true that Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Mateo are involved in a more comprehensive study, since they are three of the 40 units selected at random to represent the entire United States. In these areas, research schedules will be completed on <u>all</u> children who are reported as abused during the year 1967, not just cases chosen on "a selective basis." Incidentally, these schedules will be completed out of regular working hours by staff members who will be financially reimbursed.

The statewide tabulation will be based on all reports reaching the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation as a result of AB 49 passed by the 1966 Legislature. As you know, this legislation amended the terms of AB 277 (1965) making it mandatory not only for the medical profession and religious practitioners but also for directors of county welfare departments and superintendents of schools to report cases of suspected abuse. This widens the universe considerably.

Your report further states that these cases are "not currently being reported to Criminal Identification and Investigation by the State Department of Social Welfare because of the lack of protective service programs to do follow up." I assume that this should read "by Criminal Identification and Investigation to State Department of Social Welfare," otherwise the sentence does not make any real sense.

I make these points to keep the record straight. Be assured that the Brandeis Study staff is anxious to help in any way possible toward the provision of adequate protective services for children who need them. We hope that our findings will have important implications for planning preventive and treatment programs nationwide, since every State in the Union is participating in the study.

Sincerely,

Meg Brimlow

Miss Meg Brimlow
Regional Director

cc: Mr. Tom Joe, Consultant
Assembly Committee on Social Welfare
Room 4144 - State Capitol
Sacramento, California

Mr. John C. Montgomery, Director
State Department of Social Welfare
2415 First Avenue
Sacramento, California

Mr. Arlo Dehnert, Chief
Bureau of Family Services
State Department of Social Welfare
2415 First Avenue
Sacramento, California

Mr. Verne Gleason
State Department of Social Welfare
2415 First Avenue
Sacramento, California

Dr. David Gil
Brandeis University

J 13.123
X A2.2/2

November 18, 1968

Honorable Eugene A. Chappie
Assembly Committee on Social Welfare
California Legislature
State Capitol, Room 315
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Gene:

This is to forward to you the requested distribution of actual housing costs for Aid to Families With Dependent Children derived from our 1968 survey, which was made on a sample stratified by county. The county-by-county data have been combined to give this statewide distribution. As you realize, housing costs can vary considerably from county to county.

Please let me know if we can be of further assistance to you or your staff.

Very truly yours,

ORIGINAL SIGNED:
John C. Montgomery
Date _____ Noted By _____
Date Sent 11-19

John C. Montgomery
Director

Attachment

MW:em

Control #16231

bcc: Director's File ✓
Central Files
R&S Files
E. E. Silveira
Verne Gleason
W. L. Parker
John McCoy

Assembly Committee on Social Welfare

State of California
Department of Social Welfare

Research and Statistics
November 18, 1968

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Family Group and Unemployed Parent Cases

Distribution[1] of Actual Housing Costs[2] of AFDC Families in California

July 1968

Housing cost	Number of families	Percent	
		Total families	Families with housing cost
Total	208,532	100.0	
Non-needy relative and free housing	22,655	10.9	
With housing cost	185,877		100.0
$ 1 - 10	651	0.3	0.4
11 - 20	1,858	0.9	1.0
21 - 30	4,077	2.0	2.2
31 - 40	9,777	4.7	5.3
41 - 50	19,501	9.4	10.5
51 - 60	23,638	11.3	12.7
61 - 70	30,993	14.8	16.7
71 - 80	28,276	13.5	15.2
81 - 90	23,124	11.1	12.4
91 - 100	16,820	8.1	9.0
101 - 110	7,134	3.4	3.8
111 - 120	7,573	3.6	4.1
121 - 130	5,607	2.7	3.0
131 - 140	3,194	1.5	1.7
141 - 150	1,786	0.9	1.0
151 - 160	957	0.5	0.5
161 and over	911	0.4	0.5

1/ Percentage distribution was derived from a sample of 15,705 families and has been applied to the July 1968 AFDC caseload.

2/ Excludes the cost of utilities; includes taxes and insurance for those purchasing a home.

Source: 1968 AFDC Housing Cost Sample Survey.

State of California

Health and Welfare Agency

Memorandum

To : E. E. Silveira

Date : November 15, 1968

Subject: Distribution of Actual AFDC Housing Costs Requested by Assembly Committee on Social Welfare

From : Department of Social Welfare

W. L. Parker W. L. Parker

Attached is the distribution of actual housing costs for AFDC derived from the 1968 survey which was requested by Assemblyman Chappie. Also attached is a suggested letter of transmittal for Mr. Montgomery's signature.

The request for this data actually originated from Dave Roberts, who states that it is needed by him in his efforts to establish a single uniform standard of need in the public assistance categories. He has discussed this to some extent with Verne Gleason. It is suggested that Mr. Gleason be consulted about the transmittal of this data before it is released to Mr. Chappie.

As Dave Roberts explained it to us, he would try to use the 90th percentile (or some politically feasible percentile) from this distribution as a basis for beginning to build an estimate of a minimum cost of living in California.

Attachment

MW:em

State of California
Department of Social Welfare

Research and Statistics
November 18, 1968

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Family Group and Unemployed Parent Cases

Distribution[1] of Actual Housing Costs[2] of AFDC Families in California

July 1968

Housing cost	Number of families	Percent	
		Total families	Families with housing cost
Total	208,532	100.0	
Non-needy relative and free housing	22,655	10.9	
With housing cost	185,877		100.0
$ 1 - 10	651	0.3	0.4
11 - 20	1,858	0.9	1.0
21 - 30	4,077	2.0	2.2
31 - 40	9,777	4.7	5.3
41 - 50	19,501	9.4	10.5
51 - 60	23,638	11.3	12.7
61 - 70	30,993	14.8	16.7
71 - 80	28,276	13.5	15.2
81 - 90	23,124	11.1	12.4
91 - 100	16,820	8.1	9.0
101 - 110	7,134	3.4	3.8
111 - 120	7,573	3.6	4.1
121 - 130	5,607	2.7	3.0
131 - 140	3,194	1.5	1.7
141 - 150	1,786	0.9	1.0
151 - 160	957	0.5	0.5
161 and over	911	0.4	0.5

1/ Percentage distribution was derived from a sample of 15,705 families and has been applied to the July 1968 AFDC caseload.

2/ Excludes the cost of utilities; includes taxes and insurance for those purchasing a home.

Source: 1968 AFDC Housing Cost Sample Survey.

A2.22

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY RONALD REAGAN, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE

2415 FIRST AVENUE, P.O. BOX 8074
SACRAMENTO 95818

January 28, 1969

Honorable Eugene Chappie, Chairman
Assembly Committee on Social Welfare
Room 315, State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Assembly Committee on Social Welfare

Dear Gene:

Thank you for your letter of January 17 with copies of the final reports on the studies completed for the Assembly Social Welfare Committee by Social Psychiatry Research Associates and Planning Research Corporation. I have personally read both these documents, finding them of considerable interest and use for improved administration of the public welfare program in California.

The Department of Social Welfare accepts your invitation to meet and discuss these reports, and I have asked Verne Gleason to make appropriate arrangements with Bob Rosenberg.

Very truly yours,

John C. Montgomery

John C. Montgomery
Director

cc: Mr. Robert Rosenberg
Mr. Verne Gleason

State of California

Memorandum

File AB 2196

Health and Welfare Agency

To : Mr. Robert Rosenberg
Assembly Committee on Social Welfare
315 Capitol Building
Sacramento, California

Date : July 24, 1969

Subject : Reimbursement for Bank Issuance Costs in Food Stamp Program

From : Department of Social Welfare , 744 P Street, Sacramento 95814

As you requested a clarification of the DHEW reimbursement of county administrative expenses for the issuance costs (usually via banks) in the Food Stamp Program, this is what our Fiscal Division has assured us is the current situation.

Both the Food Stamp Manual (Section 63-000 of the PSS Manual) in Section 63-204.64, and our Fiscal Procedures Manual, Section F-660.50, clearly state there is no DHEW reimbursement for these costs, and this has not been changed.

There has been some misunderstanding, however, among both county and state staff regarding the method of determining program costs. Although the cost allocation processes of bank issuance will fall into Line J of Table VII of the Administrative Claim Form DFA 327.4 (2/69), these costs are not reimbursed by DHEW. Line J is for county-only costs.

The only change which has occurred is that all county welfare department costs since July 1967 have been determined through application of a cost allocation plan, and direct charges to program have been eliminated. Although the application of the cost allocation system has increased the total reimbursement, it has not resulted in DHEW sharing of food stamp issuance costs.

The only federal reimbursement for the Food Stamp Program is that obtained from USDA through direct reporting of the certification workers (Social Worker or Eligibility Worker) and their immediate supervisor's time spent in certifying "pure" Nonassistance Household cases; and the normal DHEW reimbursement for the certification (including clerical support) of food stamp households containing a public assistance recipient (either Assistance Households or "mixed" Nonassistance Households).

Eileen C. Jensen, Chief
Food Stamp Bureau

bcc: E. Newman
M. Chopson
V. Gleason 7-17-10
H. Rodseth

Assembly Committee on Social Welfare

J8641

May 26, 1970

Mr. Gil Oster
Consultant
Assembly Committee on Public
Employment and Retirement
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Eligibility of Strikers for
Welfare Benefits

Dear Mr. Oster:

In response to a request you made to Mr. Michaels, I am forwarding to you a copy of a recent reply to an inquiry on the above subject.

If you desire any further information, please do not hesitate to request it.

Very truly yours,

Robert Martin 5/27

Robert Martin
Director

bcc: Director's Files ✓
Central Files
Legal Office
Chron. File

Phil Manriquez

RHM:maw

Assembly Committee on Public Employment & Retirement

This is in reply to your letter of May 11, 1970, in which you raised the question as to whether strikers are eligible for welfare.

The whole policy on this issue is now under intensive study. At the present time, the family man who is engaged in a bona fide, lawful, and sanctioned strike is not automatically disqualified from receiving welfare benefits. He must, of course, have dependent children and meet all other eligibility requirements for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, including personal property limitations to get welfare.

If the strike is not sanctioned and lawful--such as the "wildcat" situation found recently in Los Angeles and mentioned by you--there is no eligibility. This point may not have been clearly understood by everyone in the past, but it is and has been the position of the Directors in the past and it certainly is Robert Martin's, the present Director. He is taking immediate steps to see to it that there is no uncertainty or lack of clarity on this aspect of the general problem.

Now pending before the Legislature is Senate Bill 852 which was introduced by Senator Gordon Cologne. This bill provides that persons on strike are ineligible for public assistance. This measure has the full support of the Governor.

I hope that this serves to clarify the situation on the receipt of welfare by strikers and that the Governor can count on your support of Senate Bill 852.