

Preface

This paper provides comparative information on the rules and regulations governing General Relief (GR) or GR-type programs in six California counties, including Los Angeles County. As of December 2010, Los Angeles County had close to 110,000 recipients enrolled in its GR program, up from roughly 61,000 in December 2007, an increase of 75 percent. San Francisco's County Adult Assistance Program has the next largest number of recipients in the State, but, as of December 2010, its caseload was only about 7 percent the size of Los Angeles County's GR caseload. Caseload sizes in four of Los Angeles County's neighboring counties – Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and San Diego – are even smaller, and with the exception of Orange County's caseload, their rate of growth since December 2007 has been much slower than the growth rate in Los Angeles County. This report has been written at the request of DPSS in order to examine how policy differences might explain differences in caseload sizes and caseload growth. While the larger size of Los Angeles County's overall population partly accounts for its larger GR caseload in absolute terms, population size differences do not explain the size and growth rate of the County's caseload relative to other counties. Moreover, the recession that officially began in December 2007 also does not account for the County's relative caseload size and rate of growth since the economic downturn can be assumed to have had an approximately equal impact over the State as a whole. Programmatic comparisons reveal some important policy differences across counties, particularly in the areas of supportive services, income exemptions, sanctions, and property and asset limits. However, this paper is only intended as a supplement to the two more detailed reports (one qualitative, the other quantitative) that the Chief Executive Office's Research and Evaluation Services unit is preparing in connection with DPSS' efforts to restructure Los Angeles County's GR program. As DPSS works to make GR more effective in its promotion of self-sufficiency, efficient in the delivery of services, and humane in the care provided to some of the County's most vulnerable inhabitants, all three sources of information – e.g. this supplemental report and the two larger evaluations – should be used together to help guide the restructuring process.

Manuel H. Moreno, Ph.D.
Director of Research,
CEO/SIB/RES

Acknowledgements

The Chief Executive Office's Research and Evaluation Services unit wishes to thank the people who provided the information, assistance and support that were indispensable in the research and writing that went into this report. Phil Ansell at DPSS is the executive sponsor of the report. He offered valuable guidance and helpful comments on an earlier draft of the report. More importantly, his unflagging belief in the importance of evidence-based policy formation is an inspiration to us and continues to add immeasurably to the quality of RES' work. Judith Lillard and LaShonda Diggs at DPSS took time from their extremely busy schedules to provide us with GR policy and process details and were responsive to the many questions we had about the functionality of the GR program in Los Angeles County. Michael Bono at DPSS ensured that we had the resources needed to conduct our research and provided useful suggestions on the survey instruments we developed and used to gain information from other counties. Brenda Williams at DPSS also made sure we had everything we needed to complete this report. Within the CEO, Trish Ploehn, Carrie Miller and Leslie Blacher were supportive of our efforts and gave us valuable feedback on the report as it was being finalized. We would also like to extend special thanks to our RES colleague, Halil Toros, who helped us process and understand census data and made the report stronger with his keen understanding of data and its interpretation. Finally, we wish to recognize the critical assistance we received from Cheryl Cartwright and Bonnie Odehnal in Riverside County, Steve Couchot in San Bernardino County, Kim Forrester, Dale Fleming, Suzette La Pierre, Silvia Molina and Dave Hopkins in San Diego County, Raymond Perez and Elliot Bubis in Orange County, and Dorothy Enisman and George Aluska in San Francisco County, for agreeing to participate in our survey and responding to our many follow-up questions about the rules and regulations governing the GR programs in their counties. The information they provided for us formed the basis of the bulk of this report, and we'd like to extend our warmest thanks to each of them for their knowledge, collegiality, and generosity.

A Comparison of the Rules and Regulations Governing General Relief Programs in Six California Counties

Introduction

The Chief Executive Office's (CEO) Research and Evaluation Services (RES) unit is conducting two major studies in connection with the Department of Public Social Services' (DPSS) efforts to restructure Los Angeles County's General Relief (GR) program. Among the questions these studies will address in looking at the rules and regulations governing the County's GR program is why the program's caseload has grown so rapidly over the last several years. The first report addresses this issue quantitatively through an in-depth analysis of administrative records for the GR program, and the second report addresses the issue qualitatively through interviews with GR recipients, case managers, and SSI advocates. The purpose of the present supplemental paper is to provide comparative context for these two studies by looking at the extent to which Los Angeles County's GR program differs from GR or GR-type programs in five other California counties. More specifically, RES has conducted surveys of GR/GR-type programs in the counties of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and San Francisco in an effort to explore how policy differences might explain why so many more people in Los Angeles County are on GR, as well as why the growth rate of Los Angeles County's caseload over the last several years has been considerably higher than all but one of the other counties observed.

The Size of Los Angeles County's GR Program in Comparative Context

The number of individuals living under the official poverty threshold in Los Angeles County as of December 2010 was seven times larger than the number of individuals living under the threshold in San Francisco County, six times larger than the number of individuals living under the threshold in Riverside and San Bernardino counties, four times larger than the number of individuals living under the threshold in Orange County, and three times larger than the number of individuals living under the threshold in San Diego County.¹ At the same time, however, Los Angeles County's GR caseload was more than 14 times the size of California's next largest caseload in San Francisco County. Moreover, while San Francisco's County Adult Assistance Program (CAAP) caseload grew by only 14 percent between December 2007 and December 2010, Los Angeles County's GR caseload grew by 75 percent over the same period.² Therefore,

¹ These calculations are based on numbers taken from U.S. Census Bureau, *2005-2009 American Community Survey*

² These calculations are based on numbers provided in California Department of Social Services, report GR237, December 2010.

although the larger size of the overall population in Los Angeles County accounts for caseload size and growth rate differences in *absolute* terms, population size differences do not provide an explanation for the growth rate of the County's GR caseload *relative* to other counties. The recession that officially began in December 2007 also does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the comparative caseload size and rate of growth in Los Angeles County since the economy's effects can be assumed to be approximately constant over the State as a whole.

Table 1, which shows the ratio of individuals living under the official poverty threshold to the size of the GR or GR-type caseloads in Los Angeles County, four of its neighboring counties, and San Francisco County, lends validity to the hypothesis that programmatic differences in Los Angeles County's GR program have the effect of attracting recipients on a much larger scale than what occurs in other counties. While the ratio was one recipient for every three individuals living under the poverty threshold in Los Angeles County, San Francisco County had the next largest ratio at approximately 1 in 6. The four neighboring counties considered here each have ratios of less than 1 GR/GR-type recipient per 100 individuals living under the poverty threshold, and San Bernardino County's ratio is close to 1 in 300.

Table 1.
Ratio of Individuals, 18 to 64, Living
Under Poverty to General
Relief/General Assistance Caseload,
December 2010

County	Living Under Poverty Threshold³	GR/GA Caseload⁴	Ratio
Los Angeles	329,423	107,214	1:3
Orange	77,946	623	1:125
Riverside	52,777	180	1:293
San Bernardino	53,327	519	1:103
San Diego	102,115	1,011	1:100
San Francisco	46,045	7,479	1:6

³ Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2005-2009 American Community Survey.

⁴ Source: California Department of Social Services, report GR237, December 2010.

These numbers provide the backdrop for the present paper. RES surveyed four neighboring counties and San Francisco County on factors such as eligibility requirements, time limits and sanctions. While the formal distinctions shown through the comparisons may not be the sole reasons for the relative size and growth rate of Los Angeles County's GR program, policy differences, combined with factors revealed in analyses provided in the other quantitative and qualitative reports RES is preparing, will together provide a balanced picture of factors affecting the County's caseload growth.

Caseload Growth

By sheer size differential alone, the comparative caseload numbers provided in Table 2 indicate how different Los Angeles County's GR program is from GR/GR-type programs in other counties. Of the four neighboring counties considered here – San Diego, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino – San Diego County's program is the largest, but its caseload as of December 2010 was less than 1 percent the size of the GR caseload in Los Angeles County. Additionally, while Orange County's caseload has technically grown at a much faster pace than the GR program in Los Angeles County, the comparison is of limited value due to the relatively small size of the numbers involved in looking at Orange County's caseload.

**Table 2.
GR/GR-type Caseloads in Six
California Counties, December 2007
and December 2010**

County	2007	2010	Percent Change
Los Angeles	61,396	107,214	75%
Orange	218	623	185%
Riverside	142	180	27%
San Bernardino	379	519	37%
San Diego	663	1,011	52%
San Francisco	6,551	7479	14%

Source: California Department of Social Services report GR237, October 2007 – October 2010.

Benefits, Rules and Regulations

Table 3, at the end of this report, provides the results of RES' survey of the benefits received by GR/GR-type recipients and the rules and regulations governing programs in four neighboring counties and San Francisco County. Policy differences between these

counties and Los Angeles County, as well as some of the key implications of these policy differences for caseload size and growth, are elaborated in the sections below.

Cash Grant

Los Angeles County provides GR recipients with the smallest maximum monthly cash grant of all the counties considered in this report (\$221 for a single adult), with the exception of Riverside County, where the GR program offers recipients vouchers for housing, utilities, food and personal items in place of cash. However, it should be noted that the maximum monthly value of these vouchers is \$291 for a single adult. The size of the monthly cash grant therefore does not appear to offer an explanation for Los Angeles County's outsized caseload and rate of growth.

However, policymakers might look to the examples of Riverside and San Francisco counties and consider the potential effect that offering services in lieu of cash could have on Los Angeles County's caseload. Of the six counties examined here, Riverside County had the smallest caseload as of December 2010, some 2.5 times smaller than San Bernardino County, the next smallest caseload. San Francisco's CAAP program, an umbrella program consisting of four sub-programs, should also be noted in this context. The four programs falling under CAAP are General Assistance (GA), Personal Assisted Employment Services (PAES), Supplemental Security Income Pending (SSIP), and Cash Assistance Linked to Medi-Cal (CALM). While the GA program offers recipients a monthly cash grant of \$342, the PAES, SSIP and CALM programs offer monthly grants of \$412. However, homeless recipients participating in these programs are placed in the County's Care Not Cash (CNC) program and receive housing, utilities and food in exchange for a considerably smaller amount in cash. GA recipients in CNC receive a monthly grant of \$59, and recipients in PAES, SSIP, and CALM who are placed in CNC receive monthly grants of \$65. The example of San Francisco County is noteworthy because it is more comparable to Los Angeles County, and yet the growth of its CAAP caseload was limited to 14 percent between December 2007 and December 2010, as compared to the 75 percent GR caseload increase in Los Angeles County over the same period. The examples of Riverside and San Francisco counties together suggest that cash aid may be more immediately attractive to potential recipients, and the provision of housing, services and food in place of cash might act as a check on caseload growth.

Supportive Services

Los Angeles County currently has 1,500 housing subsidies available to homeless GR recipients. San Francisco County's CAAP program also offers subsidized housing and, like Los Angeles County's GR program, provides SSI advocacy and referrals for substance abuse and mental and physical health problems. Riverside County's GR

program, by comparison, does not specifically provide substance abuse or mental health services, but does offer medical care through its Medical Indigent Services Program (MISP), as well as vouchers for housing, utilities and food. San Diego County provides substance abuse counseling and medical services but does not offer housing or services specifically for mental health issues. Additionally, over the past two years, San Diego County has referred disabled recipients to Legal Aid for SSI advocacy. In Orange County, medical care is available through the Medical Services Initiative (MSI), but housing and other supportive services are otherwise not available through the GR program. In San Bernardino County, which appears to have the least generous GR program of all those considered here in terms of services, shelter funds are available to recipients in need, and disability status is determined through a medical examination made by County medical staff, but additional supportive services are not made available through the program.

Residency Requirements

All six GR/GR-type programs considered here require recipients to be residents of the counties within which they are applying for benefits. Los Angeles, San Diego and Riverside counties require 15 days of residency. San Francisco County also requires 15 days residency for all CAAP programs except for the PAES program, which requires 30 days of residency. San Bernardino and Riverside counties do not impose a minimum number of residency days, but applicants must provide proof of intent to remain within either county, e.g. a rental receipt or utility bill. San Diego similarly requires applicants to provide proof of intent to remain in the County. In the cases of homeless applicants in San Diego and San Bernardino, the counties accept a signed statement of intent to remain in the County, which is subject to verification by investigators. Riverside County requires homeless applicants to provide a collateral contact but they do not have mechanisms in place to verify the validity of this contact. Recipients in both San Diego and San Bernardino must verify their eligibility status on a month-to-month basis. San Francisco County monitors EBT card usage and aid can be terminated if recipients fail to provide adequate explanation for transactions outside the County. Los Angeles County has similarly adopted the practice of monitoring EBT transactions.

Property and Asset Limits

GR recipients in Los Angeles County cannot own personal property in excess of \$500 in value, and applicants cannot have more than \$50 cash on hand or in bank accounts at intake. However, Los Angeles County allows approved GR cases to have up to \$1,500 cash in addition to their monthly grant. Recipients in Los Angeles County can also have up to \$34,000 in real property, to be used as a home, and a vehicle with a value of up to \$4,500. By comparison, individuals in San Diego County are rendered ineligible if they

possess liquid assets beyond their cash grant at any time. The overall personal property value limit in San Diego and Orange Counties is \$1,000, but San Diego's policy specifically stipulates that recipients can only own up to \$250 in personal effects and a vehicle with a value up to \$1,000, both of which count towards the \$1,000 property limit, whereas a vehicle is exempt in Orange County up to a value of \$1,500.⁵ Moreover, while a home is exempt in Orange County, recipients possessing real property in San Diego County must demonstrate extreme hardship and obtain a waiver from the County Health and Human Services Agency before any funds are disbursed. Riverside County's program imposes a \$250 personal property limit with vehicles exempted for three months in a 12-month period if they are used for employment and/or commuting purposes. Real property is exempt in Riverside County if it is used as a home. In San Francisco County, recipients may retain assets up to but not exceeding the maximum grant amount. All property in excess of the maximum amount is deducted from the grant on a dollar-for-dollar basis. A home in San Francisco County is exempt provided monthly housing expenses do not exceed available income, including the maximum monthly grant amount. A vehicle is excluded from the property limit in San Francisco County up to a value of \$4,650.

While Los Angeles County's personal property limits are not the most permissive of all the programs considered here, the County's policies regarding the cash recipients can possess once they become approved cases may be a contributor to its relative caseload size and growth. Additionally, Los Angeles County's caseload may be affected by the relatively lenient limit its GR program places on the value of automobiles owned by recipients, which is 50 percent higher than the next highest limit in San Bernardino County.

Income Limits

The intake processes for the six GR/GR-type programs observed here each feature a version of Los Angeles County's 'net income test' for eligibility. The tests measure a potential recipient's net earned income against the monthly cash grant, and if the net income is less than the GR grant, then the applicant is eligible for aid. Net income is determined by subtracting the amounts each County allows to be disregarded from recipient gross income for Federal and State taxes, insurance, transportation, certain meals away from home, in-kind income, and work costs such as money spent on tools and uniforms. Ongoing eligibility for aid in each County depends on whether net income remains below the monthly GR grant. Since Los Angeles County's monthly grant is the lowest of all the GR/GR-type programs considered here, income limits and the net income test for eligibility are not likely contributors to the relative size and growth rate of the County's caseload. However, it should be noted that Los Angeles County exempts

⁵ The limit on a vehicle in San Diego is relaxed up to \$1,500 if no other property is owned.

certain types of income from the net income test that are not listed as allowed exemptions in the guidelines for most of the other observed programs. One example of this is “payment to meet GR special needs,” which Los Angeles County’s GR guidelines describe as “payments up to the GR ceiling made by a third party to meet a recognized special need item,” an example of which is a son who pays his GR mother’s property taxes. Additionally, Los Angeles County exempts “(t)he portion of any loan which is used solely to meet the food, housing, or personal needs of an individual...up to the GR grant amount for the particular need item for which it is used.” In order to be exempt, “the loan must be received either during the 30-day period immediately preceding the date of application or during the period when the application is pending.” San Francisco County is the only other observed county that includes this type of exemption in its written guideline material on eligibility and income exemptions. However, in San Francisco County, the exempted part of a loan is limited to the cost of “enabling that participant or applicant to pay her/his rent, or for the purpose of payment of first and last month’s rent and any lawful rental deposit.”

Mandatory Work Programs and Employability Status

All GR/GR-type programs examined for this report feature mandatory work programs for employable recipients. These programs seek to encourage self-sufficiency by attaching receipt of aid to employment, and they provide recipients with basic work skill training and assistance in finding jobs. Employability is a key issue with respect to caseload size because State law prohibits counties from imposing time limits on aid in the cases of unemployable GR/GR-type recipients. Recipients can be deemed unemployable if they have mental or physical ailments that prevent them from working, are illiterate, are receiving rehabilitation training, are pursuing certain types of education, or are 65 years of age or older, among other reasons.

In Orange and Riverside counties, recipients who are unemployable for 12 months or more must apply for SSI. In San Francisco County, an inability to work initially leads to a status of ‘temporarily unemployable’ and is verified every three months up to 12 months. After 12 months, recipients move from temporarily unemployable to unemployable status and are provided with SSI advocacy services. In Los Angeles County, recipients who are determined to be permanently unemployable by the County’s contracted medical provider, or by collocated Department of Mental Health staff, are referred to the County’s GR SSI and Medi-Cal Advocacy Program (GR SSIMAP) for assistance with applying for SSI benefits. Recipients with mental health disabilities are referred to GR SSIMAP for SSI advocacy services and are given additional support to assist in applying for SSI, but they are not mandated to apply for the benefits.

In San Diego and San Bernardino counties, the inability of an unemployable recipient to work must be confirmed on a monthly basis. In Los Angeles, Riverside and Orange counties, those who are unable to work for reasons of mental or physical health maintain their unemployable status for a period of time set by contracted County medical staff in their examination of the recipients.

As part of its GR Restructuring process, Los Angeles County's DPSS is currently boosting efforts to gain SSI eligibility for unemployable recipients through an SSI Advocacy initiative. Insofar as the time limits clock stops for unemployable GR recipients, policymakers may additionally wish to examine the examples of San Diego and San Bernardino counties more closely and consider requiring recipients to verify their employability status more frequently.

Time Limits

A comparison of time limit policies offers a complicated picture of their potential effects on caseload sizes. As noted above, State law prohibits counties from imposing time limits on unemployable GR/GR-type recipients. San Francisco County places no time limit on the GA grant, but imposes a 27-month limit on employment services. San Francisco County's GA program therefore has the most lenient time limit policy of all the counties observed. At the same time, Riverside and San Bernardino have the two smallest caseloads of the six counties examined here, yet neither of them imposes any time limits on employable or unemployable recipients either. This would appear to suggest that stricter time limit policies do not necessarily yield smaller caseloads. However, in Los Angeles County employable recipients are limited to six months of aid in a 12-month period, plus an additional three months for continued participation in General Relief Opportunities for Work (GROW), the program's welfare-to-work component. Once the nine-months of aid have been exhausted, a recipient can re-apply for aid at the conclusion of the 12-month period, or can leave aid for a given period of time and re-apply later in such a way so as to avoid reaching the limit of nine-months of aid within 12 months. Orange and San Diego counties have time limits that are structured similarly to the time limits in Los Angeles County except that they each offer recipients considerably shorter periods on aid, three-months within a 12-month period in both cases. Policymakers might therefore look more carefully at recipient patterns of cycling off and back onto aid in Los Angeles County. If the GR caseload consists of a significant portion of recipients who have received aid in multiple years, then it may be the case that time limit policies provide part of the explanation for the County's caseload size and rate of growth. This issue will be addressed in greater detail in RES' forthcoming quantitative analysis of the County's GR program. However, it should be noted that a shift towards more restrictive time limit policies would legally compel the County to increase the size of the monthly GR cash grant. Welfare and Institutions Code Section 17000.6 (f)(1) requires Los Angeles County to maintain a time limit of no

shorter than 9 out of 12 months for employable GR recipients as a condition of maintaining the GR grant at \$221 per month for all GR recipients otherwise the Los Angeles County Grant would have to be at least \$297 per month for both employable and unemployable GR recipients.

Sanctions and Compliance

In Los Angeles County, a first incidence of noncompliance – e.g. failure to meet GROW requirements, show up for a substance abuse assessment, or complete substance abuse treatment under the Mandatory Substance Abuse Recovery Program (MSARP) – leads to a sanction that terminates the case. Recipients receiving a first sanction can reapply for aid but must resolve their compliance issue in order to regain eligibility. A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 30 days, and a third incidence carries a sanction of 60 days. Sanctions for failure to comply with GROW and MSARP requirements can run concurrently. This sanctions policy, where the first sanction is removed and aid continued upon resolution of the noncompliance and reapplication for cash aid, is therefore the most lenient of all the counties observed. In Orange County, by comparison, a first incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 90 days, a second incidence carries a sanction of 180 days, and a third incidence terminates the case permanently. San Diego County imposes a 30-day sanction for a first incidence, a 180-day sanction for a second incidence, and a 360 day sanction for a third incidence. San Bernardino, Riverside and San Francisco Counties all impose 30-day sanctions for a first incidence, 60-day sanctions for a second incidence, and 90-day sanctions for a third incidence.

Los Angeles County's relatively lenient penalties for noncompliance might be a factor contributing to the comparatively large size and growth of the County's caseload. However, Orange County's GR program features much stricter penalties, yet its caseload over the period from 2007 through 2010 increased by 185 percent, the largest proportional increase of all the counties considered in this report. Moreover, San Diego County's GR program, which also features considerably stricter sanctions policies than Los Angeles County, still grew by 52 percent over the same period. As noted above, while the much smaller caseloads in San Diego and Orange counties render the comparisons with Los Angeles County of limited value, their caseload growth rates over the past three years do not suggest that stricter sanctions policies necessarily yield smaller caseloads or even slow caseload growth.

Conclusion

The most significant policy differences distinguishing Los Angeles County's GR program from the GR/GR-type programs in the five other California counties observed for this paper are seen in the areas of supportive services, income exemptions, sanctions, and

property and asset limits. Los Angeles County's relatively permissive rules regarding the cash that approved cases can possess may be a factor adding to the number of individuals on GR in Los Angeles County. Additionally, the value limit on vehicles for recipients in Los Angeles County is second highest to San Francisco by a difference of only \$150, and is 50 percent higher than the next highest vehicle value limit in San Bernardino County. Los Angeles County's income limit is not a likely contributor to its GR caseload size because the County provides recipients with a relatively low monthly cash aid amount, which means that only those with especially low incomes will pass the net income test for eligibility. However, the County's exemption of payments received by recipients to meet special GR needs might be a factor that qualifies individuals for GR who might otherwise not be eligible. Moreover, penalties for noncompliance with GR program regulations are relatively lenient in Los Angeles County. However, the 185 percent caseload growth in Orange County between 2007 and 2010, and the 52 percent caseload growth in San Diego County over the same period, suggest that there may not be a strong relationship between sanctions policies and caseload growth since both counties impose penalties for noncompliance that are considerably stricter than the noncompliance penalties imposed in Los Angeles County.

Other issues to consider in connection with caseload size and growth are time limits policies and the substitution of services, food and housing for cash aid. It is not likely that the monthly cash aid amount is by itself a factor affecting the relative growth of Los Angeles County's caseload since, as noted above, the County provides recipients with a relatively small cash grant. However, the examples of Riverside and San Francisco counties can be useful to policymakers because both experienced relatively small caseload growth over the three-year period from 2007 through 2010, and both have voucher based programs that may be less attractive to potential recipients than cash.⁶ Although Los Angeles County's monthly cash grant is not large in comparative terms, its GR program is among the most generous of all the counties considered here in terms of providing recipients with services for physical health, mental health, and substance abuse.⁷ It may be the case that the combination of these supportive services *and* a monthly cash grant together attract recipients to a degree not experienced in other counties.

Los Angeles County's time limits policies are structured similarly to time limits policies in Orange and San Diego counties, but Los Angeles County offers recipients between six

⁶ As discussed earlier, San Francisco County provides homeless individuals in its CAAP programs with a considerably smaller monthly cash grant in exchange for housing, utilities and food.

⁷ As noted earlier, Los Angeles County also has 1,500 housing subsidies available for homeless GR recipients. However, the small number of subsidies relative to the size of the GR population in Los Angeles County means that their effect on the County's GR caseload is minimal.

and nine months on aid within a 12-month period, whereas Orange and San Diego counties only offer recipients three months within a 12-month period.⁸ While this suggests that more lenient time limits policies could contribute to larger caseloads, Riverside and San Bernardino counties have the two smallest caseloads of the programs observed, yet neither of them place time limits on either employable or unemployable recipients. Moreover, while San Francisco County has the most lenient time limits policy of all the counties considered here, its rate of caseload growth between 2007 and 2010 was the smallest of all the observed counties. The effects of time limits policies will become clearer with the release of the quantitative piece of RES' GR process evaluation. If it can be shown that significant numbers of GR recipients in Los Angeles County repeatedly cycle on and off aid so as to avoid reaching their six to nine month time limit on aid within 12 months, or if recipients reach these time limits and then go off aid for three months before cycling back into the program, then it could be concluded that the County's GR time limits policies prevent the program from losing old recipients fast enough to offset influxes of new recipients, and these policies could then be seen as factors inadvertently contributing to caseload growth, especially under conditions in which a deep recession has pushed increasing numbers of individuals into unemployment.

The comparisons presented in this paper provide clues as to the policy differences that may be contributing to the relatively large size and growth rate of Los Angeles County's GR caseload. However, this paper is only intended as a complement to the more detailed analyses that will be made available in RES' forthcoming quantitative and qualitative process evaluations. As DPSS works to restructure GR, all three sources of information – the two evaluation reports and this supplemental paper – should be used together to help guide program changes.

⁸ As noted earlier, Welfare and Institutions Code Section 17000.6 (f)(1) requires Los Angeles County to maintain a time limit of no shorter than 9 out of 12 months for employable GR recipients as a condition of maintaining the GR grant at \$221 per month for all GR recipients. Otherwise the Los Angeles County Grant would have to be at least \$297 per month for both employable and unemployable GR recipients.

Table 3. GR Program Characteristics in Neighboring Counties

Program Characteristic	County					
	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Bernardino	Orange	Riverside	San Francisco
Caseload as of October 2010⁹	107,214	1,011	519	623	180	7,479
Caseload change between October 2007 and October 2010	+75%	+52%	+37%	+185%	+27%%	+14%
Maximum Monthly Cash Grant for single adult	\$221	\$274	\$280	\$239	None. Program is voucher based. Vouchers are equal to \$291 in value.	\$342 for GA recipients not placed in Care not Cash, and \$59 for those who are. \$412 for PAES, SSIP and CALM recipients not participating in Care not Cash, \$65 for those who are.
Supportive Services						
<i>Subsidized Housing</i>	Approximately 1,500 housing subsidies are currently available to homeless GR	None offered	Shelter funds are made available to those homeless recipients.	None offered	Housing vouchers are available to homeless recipients.	Yes, subsidized housing is made available to homeless recipients participating in

⁹ Source: California Department of Social Services, GR 237 report, October 2010.

Program Characteristic	County					
	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Bernardino	Orange	Riverside	San Francisco
	recipients.					the Care not Cash program.
<i>SSI and SSI Advocacy</i>	<p>GR Restructuring efforts include enhanced SSI advocacy efforts.</p> <p>Physically incapacitated recipients are required to apply for SSI once DPSS determines that they may be SSI-eligible.</p>	Disabled recipients are referred to Legal Aid for SSI advocacy.	No SSI advocacy.	Unemployable recipients are required to apply for SSI after one year on aid.	Unemployable recipients are required to apply for SSI after one year on aid.	<p>CAAP program includes SSI advocacy.</p> <p>Incapacitated recipients are given a status of 'temporarily unemployable' and their status is verified every three months for up to 12 months. After 12 months, the status changes from temporarily unemployable to unemployable, and the recipients are provided with SSI advocacy.</p>
<i>Substance Abuse Services</i>	Yes, applicants are screened and those in need of substance abuse treatment are required to participate in MSARP.	Yes, applicants are screened and those with substance abuse issues are referred for counseling.	None offered.	No specific substance abuse services are available through the program but medical services available through MSI.	No specific substance abuse services are available through the program but medical care available through MISP.	Yes, substance abuse treatment available as part of CAAP's triage care.

Program Characteristic	County					
	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Bernardino	Orange	Riverside	San Francisco
<i>Mental Health Services</i>	Yes, clinicians affiliated with DMH set exemption periods and provide counseling.	No specific mental health services are available through the program, but medical services are made available to recipients.	No mental health services are available through the program except examination by County medical staff in cases where an inability to work requires verification.	No specific mental health services are available through the program, but medical services are available through MSI.	No specific mental health services are available through the program, but medical services are available through MISP.	Yes, mental health services are available through the County's triage care.
<i>Physical Health Services</i>	Yes, medical care is made available to recipients. Medical staff affiliated with DHS set exemption periods.	Yes, medical care is available to recipients.	No medical care is available through the program except examination by medical staff in cases where an inability to work requires verification.	Yes, medical services available through MSI. Medical staff affiliated with the County set exemption periods.	Yes, medical services available through MISP. Medical staff affiliated with the County set exemption periods.	Yes, medical services available through the County's triage care.
<i>Other</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Vouchers are made available to recipients for food, utilities, and personal items.	N/A
Residency Requirements	15 days as County resident.	15 days as a County resident and proof of intent to reside, i.e. rental receipt or utility bill. In the case of	There is no duration of days for the residency requirements, but there must be some proof of some 'place of	15 days as County resident.	There is no duration of days for the residency requirements but applicants must provide proof of intent to remain	15 days as a County resident for all CAAP programs except for the PAES program, which requires 30 days

Program Characteristic	County					
	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Bernardino	Orange	Riverside	San Francisco
		homeless applicants, the County accepts a statement of intent to remain in the County, which is included with the signed Statement of Facts they submit with their application, and which is subject to verification by investigators. Recipients must verify their eligibility status for every month they receive aid.	abode' established by the end of the first full month of receiving assistance. In the case of homeless applicants, the County accepts a signed statement of intent to remain in the County, which is subject to verification by investigators. Recipients must verify their eligibility status for every month they receive aid.		in the County for purposes that are not temporary in nature. In the case of homeless applicants, the County requires them to provide a collateral contact but they do not currently have a mechanism in place to verify the validity of this contact.	as a County resident. ¹⁰
Property and Asset Limits	Personal property not to exceed \$500 in value. At intake, a recipient can have no more than \$50 cash on hand or in bank accounts (\$100	Possession of liquid assets, beyond the GR cash grant, renders a participant ineligible for cash aid. Recipients may	\$500 personal property limit, including no more than \$50 in liquid assets. For employable and disabled recipients, a vehicle with a	Personal property not to exceed \$1,000 in value. Recipients cannot possess cash exceeding the amount of the maximum monthly cash	\$250 personal property, including liquid assets. A vehicle is exempt for up to three months in a 12-month period if it is necessary	Recipients may retain assets up to but not exceeding the monthly maximum benefit amount. All assets in excess of the maximum monthly grant are

¹⁰ San Francisco County monitors EBT card usage and aid can be terminated if the recipients fail to provide an adequate explanation for transactions outside the County.

Program Characteristic	County					
	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Bernardino	Orange	Riverside	San Francisco
	<p>for family cases).</p> <p>Approved GR cases can have no more than \$1,500 cash on hand or in bank accounts in addition to their cash grant.</p> <p>Recipients can own one piece of real property, to be used as a home, provided its assessed value does not exceed \$34,000.</p> <p>A vehicle not to exceed \$4,500 in value.</p>	<p>possess an automobile worth a maximum of \$1,500, and personal effects worth a maximum of \$250, but they are ineligible for aid if they own property totaling more than \$1,000 in value.¹¹</p> <p>Recipients who own real property must demonstrate extreme hardship and obtain a waiver from San Diego County's Health and Human Services Agency in order to become eligible for cash aid.</p>	<p>maximum value of \$3,000 is exempt from personal property.</p> <p>Recipients can have real property worth a maximum of \$32,000.</p>	<p>grant.</p> <p>Vehicles are exempt from the personal property value limits up to a value of \$1,500.</p> <p>Real property used as a home is exempt.</p>	<p>for employment or needed for the purposes of a daily commute.</p> <p>Real property is excluded if it serves as the recipient's only home. The equity value of additional real property counts towards the property limit.</p>	<p>deducted from cash aid on a dollar-for-dollar basis.</p> <p>A home is excluded from the overall property limit provided monthly housing expenses do not exceed available income and assets, including the maximum monthly benefit amount.</p> <p>A vehicle is excluded from the property limit provided its cash value is less than \$4,650.</p>
Mandatory Work Program	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
Time Limits	Six months within a 12-month period for	Three months in a 12-month period for	Program is not time limited for either employable	Three months in a 12-month period for	Program is not time limited for either employable	No time limit on the GA grant. However, the

¹¹ Recipients in San Diego County can own a vehicle worth up to \$1,500 provided they do not own any other property.

Program Characteristic	County					
	Los Angeles	San Diego	San Bernardino	Orange	Riverside	San Francisco
	<p>employable recipients, plus an added three months for continued participation in GROW.</p> <p>State law prohibits counties from imposing time limits on unemployable GR/GR-type recipients.</p>	<p>employable recipients.</p> <p>State law prohibits counties from imposing time limits on unemployable GR/GR-type recipients.</p>	<p>or unemployable recipients.</p>	<p>employable recipients.</p> <p>State law prohibits counties from imposing time limits on unemployable GR/GR-type recipients.</p>	<p>or unemployable recipients.</p>	<p>County imposes a 27-month time limit on employment services.</p>
Sanctions	<p>A first sanction terminates the case, but a recipient can re-apply and regains eligibility once the noncompliance issue is resolved.</p> <p>A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 30 days.</p> <p>A third incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 60 days.</p>	<p>A first incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 30 days.</p> <p>A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 180 days.</p> <p>A third incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 360 days.</p>	<p>A first incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 30 days.</p> <p>A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 60 days.</p> <p>A third incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 90 days.</p>	<p>A first incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 90 days.</p> <p>A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 180 days.</p> <p>A third incidence of noncompliance ends eligibility for aid permanently.</p>	<p>A first incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 30 days.</p> <p>A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 60 days.</p> <p>A third incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 90 days.</p>	<p>A first incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 30 days.</p> <p>A second incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 60 days.</p> <p>A third incidence of noncompliance carries a sanction of 90 days.</p>