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INTRODUCTION

The City’s welfare rolls fell by half from 1.1 million in July 1995 to 560,000 in July 2000. While an improving economy did reduce the need for assistance, the caseload reduction far exceeded the reduction in need.

The “excess” caseload reduction was the product of the Giuliani Administration’s restrictive welfare policies. Over thirty studies from diverse sources reveal that those policies have had human consequences which receive scant attention from public officials and the media:

- Between a third and a half (or more) of welfare leavers are unemployed, most report very modest or no income, and up to a majority (or more) have also been cut off from food (food stamps) and health care (medicaid) assistance.

- Thousands upon thousands of eligible people have been denied entry to welfare or kicked off.

- Hunger and homelessness remain at high, apparently growing levels, despite economic boom and a substantial decline in unemployment.

- Unregulated, uninspected informal child care has become the norm for welfare children whose parents are in welfare work programs.

- An excessive expansion of the WEP workfare program has driven recipients from education and training, replaced paid civil servants with unpaid welfare workers, and sanctioned recipients off welfare rampantly and arbitrarily.

These consequences go beyond any legitimate vision of welfare reform. As unlikely as it may be, it is not too late for the current Administration to reverse course. If it fails to do so, the next Administration must.

Welfare-to-work should be about employment, not about reducing the rolls willy-nilly. Those who accept their work obligations should receive the welfare, food stamp, and medicaid benefits for which they are eligible. At a bare minimum, wages and/or income support benefits should suffice to prevent hunger and homelessness. Welfare children, like other children, deserve quality child care, and their parents must be given a real opportunity to choose care that is regulated and inspected. Welfare-to-work programs should promote education and training, not hinder it; should expand work for wages, not work for welfare benefits; and should use sanctions only as a tool to induce compliance, not as a tool for caseload reduction.
The remainder of this report identifies and summarizes the studies which show the consequences listed above. The studies and reports are available only from their sources. These sources include: Action Research Project on Hunger, Homelessness, and Family Health; Citizens Budget Commission; Citizens Committee for Children; [NYC] Coalition Against Hunger; [NYC] Coalition for the Homeless; Community Food Resource Center; Community Voices Heard; Food For Survival; [NYC] Human Resources Administration; Hunger Action Network of New York State; [NYC] Independent Budget Office; Make the Road by Walking; Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government; New York Times; Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation; NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund; [NYS] Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance; Public Advocate for New York City; Southeast Asian Youth Leadership Project; the State Comptroller; Task Force for Sensible Welfare Reform; Urban Justice Center; U.S. Department of Agriculture; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York; U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

A. BETWEEN A THIRD AND A HALF (OR MORE) OF WELFARE LEAVERS ARE UNEMPLOYED, MOST REPORT VERY MODEST OR NO INCOME, AND UP TO A MAJORITY (OR MORE) HAVE ALSO BEEN CUT FROM FOOD (FOOD STAMPS) AND HEALTH CARE (MEDICAID) ASSISTANCE.

Supporting evidence:


   This welfare leaver study consisted of interviews with 50 NYC families whose welfare cases had been closed. Among the findings: 72% had had their case closed involuntarily. 50% had not worked at all since leaving welfare. The top reason for unemployment was lack of child care. 40% of those who had worked earned less than $200 a week. 30% of the children and 50% of the adults had no health insurance. 66% were not receiving Food Stamps. 32% were doubled up or in a shelter. 64% had had to borrow money to pay the rent. 44% had been threatened with eviction. 20% had become homeless. 74% had run out of money for food at least once. 56% had used a Food Pantry or Soup Kitchen. 54% had no income or less than $100 a week at the time of the interview.


   This welfare leaver study examined wages and benefit receipt in the subsequent four quarters for families who left welfare in the 1st quarter of 1997 and stayed off welfare for...
at least two months. *Among the findings:* 62% of NYC welfare leavers, and 58% in the rest of the state (ROS), had no reported employment for at least one of the four quarters after leaving welfare; 37% of NYC leavers and 25% in ROS had no reported employment at any time in the year after leaving welfare; median annual earnings for those employed at any time were $11,713 in NYC and $7,974 in ROS; at the end of the follow-up period, only 22% of NYC leavers, and 26% ROS, were receiving Food Stamps and only 43% statewide were receiving Medicaid.


This welfare leaver study involved interviews with 126 randomly selected former recipients whose cases had been closed six months earlier. No questions were asked about hunger, homelessness, or other hardship. *Among the findings:* 33% had not worked at all since leaving welfare and 42% were jobless at the time of the interview. 48% of those who were employed said that their income was the same or less than welfare. Only 51% of those working had health care coverage from their employer (43%) or from Medicaid even though all were eligible for Medicaid. (Note: the report acknowledges that its statistics may paint an “unduly rosy” picture because the survey excluded those who could not be contacted due to a telephone disconnect or eviction.).

4. **Local District and State Performance Measures, Tables TA 4a, TA 4b.** (January 1998). NYS Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance, 40 North Pearl St., Albany, NY 12243.

The State welfare agency matched employer earnings reports against the list of those who left the City’s welfare rolls in March 1997. *Among the findings:* Only 22% of the parents and 15% of the single adults had reported earnings in the quarter after leaving welfare.

**B. THOUSANDS UPON THOUSANDS OF ELIGIBLE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN DENIED ENTRY TO WELFARE OR KICKED OFF.**

*Supporting evidence - Items 1-4 above, and:*


This study reports on a survey of about 200 Southeast Asian adults and 100 children receiving public assistance in the Northwest Bronx, which is home to the largest concentration of Southeast Asians (Cambodia and Vietnam) in New York. *Among the findings:* Less than 10% of those who needed translation services received them from
HRA. “Forty-eight percent of the people we surveyed had their welfare reduced as a direct result of language barriers.” “Asian immigrants were offered WEP only.” “WEP never provided ESL classes to Southeast Asian WEP workers in their native language.” “More than 86% of the youth we surveyed said that they had to miss school when they translated for their parents at the Welfare Center.”


This is a federal court class action case on behalf of persons with HIV/AIDS who challenge the City’s administration of the Division of AIDS Services and Income Support (“DASIS”), the HRA division which is supposed to assist those with HIV/AIDS to access the public assistance, Food Stamp, Medicaid and other benefits for which they are eligible. The court concluded that DASIS systematically violated federal and state law, and appointed a federal magistrate to monitor and compel compliance. *Among the court’s findings*: “The evidence presented demonstrated an alarming failure to provide plaintiffs with the intensive case management and assistance that DASIS was supposed to provide.” “DASIS’ systemic failure to provide its clients with meaningful access to their benefits was also conclusively established through defendants’ own quality assurance data.” “In practical terms, [the DASIS data] means that thousands of indigent New Yorkers living with AIDS stand an almost fifty-fifty chance of having their rights violated by this agency -- rights to critical subsistence benefits for which they have been determined fully eligible.” (As of September 2000, a copy of the decision was available online at [http://www.nyled.uscourts.gov/pub/rulings/cv/1995/95cv00641mo.pdf](http://www.nyled.uscourts.gov/pub/rulings/cv/1995/95cv00641mo.pdf))


This is a federal court class action case challenging revised application procedures which the City began implementing on a welfare office-by-office basis in 1998. In 1999, and again in 2000, the court barred the City from extending the new procedures to additional offices, after finding that the City was illegally deterring and denying applications for welfare, food stamps, and medicaid at the offices where the new procedures were in place. *Among the court’s findings*: “Individuals with emergency needs often go without immediate assistance”. “The City defendants’ practices continue to endanger numerous individuals in need of public assistance, including children, expectant mothers, and the disabled”. “Many applications are denied without written notice”. “The city defendants argue that these problems were isolated incidents ... not indicative of a systemic violation ... this court can not agree”. (The two decisions are available on the Welfare Law Center’s web site, www.welfarelaw.org).

This study report on interviews with 210 welfare applicants. *Among the findings:* Over 40% of those interviewed were reapplicants whose earlier application(s) had been denied. “58 percent of the applicants who had applied for public assistance two or more times were not told of their right to request a fair hearing.”


This study reports on 225 households which were referred to the Project by social service agencies in upper Manhattan because the households needed resources or were experiencing problems receiving services. *Among the findings:* “77.3% of the Project’s 225 cases cited public assistance problems”. “93.4% of the 174 PA cases identified either case opening failure or wrongful case closings as problems .. in almost every case, the action taken was determined to be in error … these findings support allegations that welfare reform is more about case churning (an effort to deliberately generate a substantial number of administrative case closings to reduce the size of the public assistance rolls) than moving people off public assistance into jobs”.


This study reports, based on interviews with welfare claimants and workers, on the City welfare agency’s administration of the “Family Violence Option”, under which welfare applicants and recipients are temporarily excused from requirements such as work and child support cooperation when the requirement could place families at further risk or make it more difficult to leave an abusive situation. *Among the findings:* “The majority of those interviewed … were never screened”. “The city fails to refer [more than half the] applicants and recipients who say … that they are domestic violence victims to domestic violence liaisons”. “A majority” of applicants and recipients were not informed about the Family Violence Option.” “Domestic violence liaisons are granting very few waivers to the individuals they do see … only about a third”.

This Office of Civil Rights (OCR) decision found that City welfare administration discriminates against Limited English Proficient (LEP) persons and against hearing-impaired persons. *Among the findings:* Welfare offices “fail to provide LEP persons with adequate language assistance … due to the lack of such assistance, LEP clients experience significant difficulties when applying for or accessing public assistance benefits”. Welfare offices “lack the ability and fail to provide auxiliary aids and services to hearing-impaired clients .. This … denies hearing-impaired clients the means by which to effectively communicate with office staff ..”


This study reports on the Emergency Assistance Unit (EAU) at which homeless families apply for city shelter, based on interviews with 905 families applying for shelter. *Among the findings:* “Sixty-six percent of the 905 families … had already applied and been found ineligible at least once.” “The median number of ineligibility findings was 4 … the City’s churning policy had forced 40 percent of these families to apply for shelter 10 or more times”. “The city gave applicant families no information on … how to prove they were homeless”. “The city did not comply with Justice Freedman’s court orders (in McCain v Giuliani) … to make sure that applicant families actually had a double up to which they could return before it found them ineligible..”

13. **System Failure, Mayor Giuliani’s Welfare System is Hostile to Poor and Immigrant New Yorkers.** (April 1999). Make the Road by Walking, 301 Grove Street, Brooklyn, NY 11237, 718 4187690.

This study reports on a survey of 724 welfare recipients in Brooklyn’s Bushwick neighborhood. *Among the findings:* 65% of Spanish-speaking recipients reported problems communicating with their caseworkers. 55% of all recipients reported that they feel frustrated by the treatment they receive at the welfare centers.


The federal Food Stamp oversight agency reviewed the City’s Food Stamp application procedures. *Among the findings:* Welfare offices “do not make Food Stamp Program applications readily accessible to potentially eligible households” and “impose eligibility requirements that exceed the standards set by the Food Stamp Act and regulations.”

This study reports on the Emergency Assistance Unit (EAU) at which homeless families apply for city shelter. *Among the findings:* The EAU “went from being a conduit toward shelter to being a place where deliberate bureaucratic delay, deterrence and denial of shelter eligibility foster desperation in an environment of uncertainty, turmoil, and disease”. “The City denied their applications [for shelter] over and over again, thus depriv[ing] [families] of any semblance of normal family life for weeks and months on end.” “The City consistently failed to provide the families to whom it denied shelter the legally required notification in writing of the reason for the denial [which] families needed .... to know what more the City wanted them to do to prove they were homeless.”


This study discusses new welfare application procedures called NYC WAY and EVR. *Among the findings:.* “A more important explanation for the drop in public assistance cases is the new eligibility and work requirements of NYC WAY”. “There is evidence that elements of the NYC WAY initiative are causing otherwise eligible indigent New Yorkers to be denied cash benefits.” “Administrative procedures could be revised to avoid inappropriate rejection of application and inappropriate closing of cases.” “In 1996, however, [hearing] requests rose 43% from 84,300 to 120,800, despite the drop in the number of cases.” “[D]ata showed that 80 percent of the clients who appealed EVR-related decisions to close cases were victorious; that figure increased to 98 percent when the client was represented ...”.

17. **From Welfare to Work: Getting Lost Along The Way.** (July 1997). Public Advocate for New York City, 1 Centre St., NY, NY 10007, 212 669-7200.

This study reports on the City’s welfare administration. *Among the findings:* “The City’s centralized welfare bureaucracy continues to focus its administrative efforts on the speedy reduction of the welfare rolls — not on the placement of welfare recipients in new jobs.” “Almost uniformly, line workers and clients report that they are placed in adversarial, rather than supportive, relationships.” “[T]he application process was often confusing.” “No visible effort was made to serve non-English speaking client populations by posting signs .. in other commonly spoken languages such as Spanish or Russian.” “[I]n Fiscal Year 1996, HRA also ‘lost’ — was proven to be mistaken or wrong — in the resolution of 85% of the issues raised by clients on an issue-by-issue basis during fair hearings.” “In many respects, EVR [a new step in the application process] appears simply to be a method designed to keep people off the rolls”.

*Downside, Page 7*
C. HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS REMAIN AT HIGH, APPARENTLY GROWING LEVELS, DESPITE ECONOMIC BOOM AND A SUBSTANTIAL DECLINE IN UNEMPLOYMENT.

Supporting evidence:

18. **Legacy of Neglect - The Impact of Welfare Reform on New York’s Homeless.**

   This study reports on welfare reform’s impact on homelessness based on a statewide survey of homeless service providers. *Among the findings:* 88% of providers reported an increase in their homeless client populations since 1995; 87% reported that clients were experiencing difficulty in accessing benefits more often (36%) or much more often (51%) than in 1994; and 86% reported “dramatic” losses in public assistance benefits for one or more client groups.


   This study reports on a 1998 survey of New York City’s Emergency Feeding Programs (EFP’s) -- food pantries and soup kitchens -- and compares the results with a prior survey in 1995. *Among the findings:* From 1995 to 1998, the number of EFP’s grew from 735 to 971, a one third increase; the number of meals served a month grew from 2.7 million to 5.2 million, an increase of 91%; the number of persons served a month grew from 309,280 to 615,858, an increase of 99%. “In 1998, children and the elderly comprised the majority of food recipients (56%).” “80% of EFPs report that the increase in meals served is due to the impact of Welfare Reform.” “67% of EFPs report that clients have either lost or had their government benefits reduced as a result of welfare reform.” “34% of EFPs reported that during 1998, they were forced to turn people away.” (Report available at www.foodforsurvival.org)


   This study reports on the Coalition’s 1999 survey of New York City’s more than one thousand Emergency Feeding Programs. *Among the findings:* Requests for emergency food assistance grew 36% from January 1998 to January 1999. Hundreds of thousands of requests for food went unmet, with 74,000 turnaways in January 1999 alone, as compared to 59,000 one year earlier. Over 40% of all programs said they had given out smaller amounts of food during the past year in order to avoid turning others away. 52%
reported that the City’s new welfare policies had increased hunger. Reasons for hunger cited by emergency food providers included “public benefits that were too low”, cited by 75%, “loss of food stamp and welfare benefits” cited by 74%, and “being turned down for public assistance” cited by 63%.

21. **Hungry City: Are We Doing Enough to Feed the Needy?** (May 1999) NY City Council Member A. Gifford Miller, 336 East 73rd Street (Suite C), NY, NY 10021, 212 535-5554.

This study reports on a random selection survey of thirty-one of the City’s 1,100+ soup kitchens and food pantries. *Among the findings:* 87% reported that there had been an increase in requests for emergency food over the past six months. 71% reported an increase in demand since “welfare reform” was implemented. 55% reported that they had been forced to give smaller food rations in order to avoid turning people away.

22. **Living on the Edge.** (Nov. 1998). Hunger Action Network of New York State, 305 Seventh Avenue, NY, NY 10001, 212 741-8192.

This study reports on a survey of 763 households seeking assistance from emergency feeding programs (EFP’s) in New York City and several counties outside the City. *Among the findings:* “The low level of public assistance and food stamp benefits was the single biggest factor leading to the use of EFP’s, cited by 44% of households”. “68% of the EFP households had some interaction with the [Welfare]Department”. “At least 30% of the households who had interacted with [the Welfare Department] had had their benefits reduced or terminated in the last six months”.


This study reports on the Coalition’s 1998 survey of New York City’s more than one thousand Emergency Feeding Programs. *Among the findings:* Requests for emergency food assistance grew 24% from January 1997 to January 1998. Hundreds of thousands of requests for food went unmet, with 59,000 turnaways in January 1998 alone. The two most common reasons for hunger cited by emergency food providers were “public benefits that were too low”, cited by 76% of respondents, and “loss of food stamp and welfare benefits” cited by 74% of respondents.
D. UNREGULATED, UNINSPECTED INFORMAL CHILD CARE HAS BECOME THE NORM FOR WELFARE CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS ARE IN WELFARE WORK PROGRAMS.

*Supporting evidence - Item 32 below and:


This study reports on the City’s welfare child care policies based on interviews with 92 welfare parents who were required to participate in the City’s WEP program. *Among the findings:* “Most parents were concerned that they would be sanctioned if they were unable to work, even if their reason for not working was lack of child care. Almost half of the parents reported that their caseworkers threatened them with sanctions if they could not get child care. More than half of the parents received no assistance from their caseworkers in getting child care. Most parents with child care in place relied on informal care. The majority of parents without child care either planned to rely on informal care or had no idea what they were going to do.”


The State Comptroller’s office reviewed several aspects of the City’s welfare administration. *Among the findings:* “We interviewed a number of officials and case workers at the Greenwood Center, and none of them were aware that public assistance recipients may be excused from normally required work activities if they are unable to find appropriate child care. HRA’s response indicated that perhaps we were misdirected to staff not directly involved with employment-related activities. However, one of the officials we interviewed was the Center Director.”


This study reports on child care policies and practices in the City’s welfare work programs. *Among the findings:* “The system is a chaotic and ineffective bureaucracy which fails to assure that children are being cared for in safe, appropriate child care settings, frequently contradicts its own mandates and undermines parents’ efforts to become self-sufficient”. There has been a “shift to informal child care arrangements and away from regulated care”. “[O]f the approximately 15,000 children whose child care is currently being paid for by OES ... 12,000 are being cared for in unregulated child care.” “New York City does not require basic health and safety provisions for informal
caregivers”. “Such arrangements therefore often place children in potentially hazardous situations and do not provide the kind of quality care and education known to be critical to a child’s healthy development.” The City “pressures parents to find and utilize the cheapest” care. The City “routinely violates state laws requiring that parents be given information and assistance in finding appropriate care.”

E. AN EXCESSIVE EXPANSION OF THE WEP WORKFARE PROGRAM HAS DRIVEN RECIPIENTS FROM EDUCATION AND TRAINING, REPLACED PAID CIVIL SERVANTS WITH UNPAID WELFARE WORKERS, AND SANCTIONED RECIPIENTS RAMPANTLY AND ARBITRARILY.

Supporting evidence: Item 5 above and:

27. Use of Work Experience Program Participants at the Department of Parks and Recreation, an article in Inside The Budget newsfax. (No. 72, November 2 2000.)
NYC Independent Budget Office, 110 William St., 14th floor, NY, NY 10038, 212 442-0632.

This report tries to explain why overall parks acceptability in the City increased from 57% in 1992 to 89% in 2000 even though the number of employees in the City’s Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) plummeted from 4,285 to 2,025 between 1991 and 2000. Among the findings: “Much of the explanation may be due to the increase of Work Experience Program (WEP) participants.” Between 1991 and 2000 the “full-time equivalent of WEP workers … increased by 2,055 (from 182 to 2,237).” “Assuming that WEP participants do the work of a City Park Worker, a low-level full-time equivalent WEP participant would earn $21,000 if salaried.” (Author’s note: $21,000 is over 5 times the maximum annual welfare benefit for an individual, and over 3 times the maximum annual public assistance benefit for a family of three.)


This study reports on the City’s Work Experience Program, commonly called WEP, in which welfare recipients are required to work for up to 35 hours a week without pay or fringe benefits, and without the legal rights of employees. The study included interviews with 649 WEP workers. Among the findings: By 1999, the Giuliani Administration had raised WEP participation from a few thousand to nearly 40,000 recipients at any one time. “Workfare workers are doing critical work for the city, ranging from keeping parks clean and safe, doing light repair work and doing entry-level receptionist duties”. “While the vast majority … are performing entry-level jobs, many are also doing more complex jobs with higher degrees of responsibility”. “At least 86% of all survey respondents report doing the same work as municipal employees”. “The cost to the City for an hour of
a workfare worker’s [work] is only $1.80 … based on the city’s share of the welfare check”. “The New York City public sector has developed into a two tier system of workers: union workers who work for benefits above the poverty level and workfare workers performing the same functions for below poverty level wages and under constant threat of losing their only source of income.”


This study examined the process for assessing and assigning welfare recipients to welfare work programs based on a review of 200 randomly selected case files, 75 of which were in New York City. *Among the findings*: “We found that, for 40 of the 200 (20 percent) recipients, there was no documentation … that an employability assessment had been performed … for 63(39 percent) of the 160 assessments, there was no documentation … that the recipient’s literacy/English language proficiency skills were evaluated … for 20 (12 percent) there was no documentation … that the recipient’s need for supportive services was evaluated … for 33 (21 percent) there was no documentation … that the recipient’s skills and prior work experience were evaluated.” “There was no indication that recipients were placed in work activities on the basis of information obtained from the assessments.” “A total of 86 of the 200 recipients had not obtained a high school diploma or its equivalent … only 29 of them were placed in an educational program.”


*Among the findings*: “The City’s nearly exclusive focus on [WEP] as its primary employment strategy is not justified either by prior research … or by any available data on the current program’s effectiveness”. “There is “a persistent information gap …. New York City has also declined to participate in independent [research] projects …. and has denied access to information on welfare to the Office of the State Comptroller for its recent analysis of statewide implementation.”.


*Among the findings*: “Because the city has provided virtually no data on the welfare and labor market experience of work program participants and nonparticipants, meaningful evaluation of the city’s work programs has not been possible. This compromises effective policy development ..”.

*Downside*, Page 12

Among the Findings: “Evidence is scant that workfare leads to full-time jobs”. “Many workfare participants are taking the place of city workers.”. “And while mothers without proper [child] care are supposed to be excused from workfare, caseworkers sometimes threaten to cut off their welfare benefits, pushing them into leaving their children in substandard care”. “When welfare recipients challenge these [workfare] sanctions in administrative hearings, they are successful two thirds of the time.” “Workfare participants are still sometime denied access to toilets and drinking water or lack basic equipment like raincoats and boots.”


This study reports on a survey of 182 WEP participants. Among the findings: Half of those who had been in school or training immediately prior to placement in WEP had been forced to drop out. 26% of those with children had a problem getting adequate child care. Most were assigned to cleaning or trash pickup. 40% had received no training at all. 22% had complained about their working conditions. Sanctions -- benefit terminations for non-compliance with WEP rules -- are much more common than job entries from WEP.


This study reports on the City’s WEP program. Among the findings: Generally, WEP does not result in employment but does result in sanctions, displacement, and the denial of the educational opportunity needed to leave welfare for good. “[O]ver 40% of Home Relief (HR) recipients called into WEP were sanctioned .. [This] is more than 8 times the number of HR recipients the City claims moved from welfare to employment.” “[A] major non-profit who subcontracts with HRA to distribute WEP participants to other non-profit organizations reported that only 1.67% of WEP participants found jobs through their current site ..” “In the past several years, New York City’s municipal labor force has been reduced by over 20,000 union workers .. The tasks that these workers performed are now being done by WEP workers.” “It is believed that up to 9,000 recipients attending CUNY have been systematically pushed out of school due to WEP ..”