

- 
- Purchasing and maintaining the child's clothing.

Each case is to be evaluated on a case by case basis, with no single factor being conclusive.

*California Department of Social Services - State Hearings Division  
Notes from the Training Bureau - April 20, 2000*

**Item 00-04-02J**

CDSS ACIN I-08-00 -- February 8, 2000 (Synopsis): 1999 Chaptered Legislation

**1999 Chaptered Legislation**

This ACIN summarizes legislation involving the SSI/SSP program, IHSS, and the CAPI program.

Effective July 22, 1999, the state CAPI program was extended indefinitely. In addition, AB 1111 created time limited CAPI eligibility for certain immigrants. The time limited eligibility for these immigrants ends September 30, 2000. Immigrants who are the victims of sponsor abuse are exempt from sponsor deeming rules.

Senate Bill 708 amended the sponsor deeming period to five years (from three years) for the new time limited population of immigrants and specifies that the five year period begins from the date of the affidavit of support or the date the immigrant arrives in the U.S., whichever is later. This legislation is also effective July 22, 1999.

*California Department of Social Services - State Hearings Division  
Notes from the Training Bureau - April 20, 2000*

**Item 00-04-02I**

CDSS ACIN I-01-00 -- January 4, 2000 (Synopsis): Food Stamp Questions and Answers

**Food Stamp Questions and Answers**

This ACIN provides several questions and answers on a variety of topics. The answers to some of the questions are as follows:

- The food stamp allotment may not be increased due to a reduction in the CalWORKs grant if the reduction was caused by an individual's failure to comply with a program requirement resulting in a penalty or sanction. Food stamps counts the CalWORKs grant the same as if the sanction had not occurred.
- Per MPP §20-300.33, one or more IPV's which occurred prior to August 22, 1996, are considered to be one disqualification. Thus if a person had three IPV's prior to August 22, 1996 and again committed an IPV after August 22, 1996, the IPV committed after August 22, 1996 would be considered a second disqualification.

- If a person commits an IPV that begins before new rules went into effect as of August 22, 1996, but continued after August 22, 1996, the county should impose the new IPV penalty. For example, if a person committed his first IPV by failing to report income for six consecutive months beginning in July 1996 and continuing through December 1996, the county should impose the 12 month penalty that became effective as of August 22, 1996. (Note: Although not stated in this ACIN, MPP §20-300.32 states: "The disqualification penalties shall apply only to individuals disqualified for IPV's which occurred during a certification period after the household has been notified by the CWD of the new disqualification penalties". Thus in the above example, the county should impose the 12 month penalty (instead of the six month penalty in effect for a first sanction prior to August 22, 1996) only if the failure to report continued into a new certification period and if the county had notified the person of the new IPV penalty).
- If a legal noncitizen establishes food stamp eligibility based on his/her spouse's quarters of employment, the noncitizen would lose those quarters if there is a divorce, once the divorce becomes final. If the noncitizen is a current food stamp participant at the time of the divorce, the county may wait until the next recertification to redetermine the noncitizen's eligibility.
- CAPI income is treated prospectively like any other assistance grant
- CAPI recipient's are not categorically eligible.

*California Department of Social Services - State Hearings Division  
Notes from the Training Bureau - April 20, 2000*

#### **Item 00-04-02H**

CDSS ACL 00-19 -- March 7, 2000 (Synopsis): Verification of Shelter Costs and Utility Expenses in Food Stamps

### **Verification of Shelter Costs and Utility Expenses in Food Stamps**

#### **Reference: 7 CFR 273.2(f)(1)(iii) and 7 CFR 273.2 (f)(3)(i)**

Pursuant to federal law, CDSS has chosen to permit counties flexibility in verification of certain shelter costs. Effective January 1, 2000, counties are no longer required to routinely verify all shelter costs. Those counties that choose the option of not verifying all shelter costs must continue to verify utility expenses when the household wishes to claim its actual utility expense is in excess of the standard utility allowance. These counties must also verify questionable claims.

Counties may elect to continue to require verification of shelter costs at application, recertification, and when there is a change of residence.

*California Department of Social Services - State Hearings Division  
Notes from the Training Bureau - April 20, 2000*