14-518-34



1725 Fairmount Avenue, Unit 102 | Philiadelphia, PA 19130 | pt: 215-769-0659 | ft: 215-769-2765

www.hungercoalition.org | www.hungerwalk.org | Fighting hunger through education, outreath and advocacy

May 21, 2010

2833

Office of Income Maintenance Bureau of Policy

VIA EMAIL (EZogby@state.pa.us)

MAY 2.5 2018

Edward J. Zogby, Director, Bureau of Policy Health and Welfare Building, 4th Floor. Harrisburg, PA 17105

REFER TO:

RECEIVED

MAY 2 4 2010 9:06 Am INDEPENDENT REGULATORY

RE:

Proposed Regulations #14-518

Revisions to the Special Allowance for Supportive Services Requirements

Dear Mr. Zogby:

On behalf of the Greater Philadelphia Coalition Against Hunger, I write to oppose the Department of Public Welfare's recently proposed regulations that would severely and unnecessarily limit the INDEPENDENT REGULATORY REVIEW COMMISSION availability of welfare-to-work supports for Pennsylvania families.

The Greater Philadelphia Coalition Against Hunger fights hunger in Southeastern Pennsylvania through education, outreach, and advocacy. Each year, we help over 7,000 families apply for SNAP benefits and other work supports through our successful Food Stamp Hotline.

Special allowances allow families receiving TANF or SNAP (food stamp) benefits to obtain employment, education, or training. Current TANF grants pay less than one-third of the poverty line. A family of three, for example, receives only \$403 per month in most Pennsylvania counties. This is simply not enough to pay the costs of transportation, books, school supplies and other work supports that families face when trying to better themselves and move off of welfare. The Department of Public Welfare's (DPW's) proposals would make it even more difficult for families to escape poverty.

This package in regulations is not necessary, as existing regulations and policies, strengthened last Fall by DPW through the regulatory changes, already ensure that work support are issued only to families who prove both that I think work supports are needed and (2) the payment is used for its intended purpose. It appears that I I is a supports are needed and (2) the payment is used for its installed purpose. It appears that I I is a support and it is either the poorest Pennsylvanians – even at the risk of prevanian those families from gaining education jobs enabling them to be the poverty.

We are most construed that the proposed regulations would impose low and arbitrary mosts on the artisunt of critical special allowances that a family might beceive. Forestantele, an initiational would be able to receive \$2,000 in her libetime to spend on better and school allowed as, and \$7.500 per year transportation. If a partial reaches the instantial symmetries seemed fall in or boats and supplies, may be forced to abandon her sequential attaining, quit a partial state for each of the sequential state. monts will prevent many people fine monthing enough relies to leave washe behind

We recommend that these annual and the time limits be dropped.

RECEIVED

MAY 2 6 2010

We are also troubled by several other provisions:

Proposed 55 Pa. Code §165.1 (a) appears to require that those who are exempt from RESET (work) requirements as a result of the disability, domestic violence, or other circumstance, but nonetheless wish to volunteer for education or training activities, comply with hours requirements they may not be able to meet consistently. This will discourage clients with barriers from preparing themselves for eventual employment. And, we believe this provision violates the "exempt volunteer" rule in the Pennsylvania Welfare Code at 65 P.S. §405.1(b).

We recommend that DPW delete the proposed language stating that clients "and shall comply with the requirements of the AMR or EDP."

Proposed 55 Pa. Code §165.44(b)(2)(viii) would impose a supportive services overpayment for
non-compliance with work requirements, without regard to the degree of non-compliance. Under
this provision, a client who, for example, attends her program for 29 hours in week, instead of the
required 30 hours, could be required to pay back the full amount of supportive services payments
issued to her in that week, even though those work supports were actually required and used for
their intended purpose.

We recommend that DPW drop subsection (viii) from this proposed regulation.

• Proposed 55 Pa. Code §165.44(a)(2) would create unnecessary red tape by requiring employers and training providers to verify that transportation to the work or training site is required, even when the need for such transportation is readily apparent. Employers should not be asked to prove the obvious, especially as they often have no more knowledge than welfare office staff of the employee's transportation options. Individuals who live more than walking distance from their job or training site should not have to prove they need transportation to get there.

We recommend that DPW add the following exception to the requirement that need be verified: "unless, with regard to the need for transportation, readily available information regarding the travel distance demonstrates the need."

In this recession, Pennsylvanian families need more help — not less — to obtain quality education and training that will lead to self-sufficient jobs. These regulations will only hurt families as they try to work their way out of poverty.

Sincetely yours,

Carey Morgan

Executive Director

Greater Philadelphia Coalition Against Hunger

CC: Arthur Coccodrilli, Chair, Independent Regulatory Review Commission