

REPORT

On The

VICTIMS

Of The

SAN DIEGO COUNTY WORKFARE PROGRAM

1984

**COALITION OF CALIFORNIA
WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS**

BOARD MEMBERS

MERKEL HARRIS, PRESIDENT
SAN DIEGO

KEVIN ASLANIAN
SACRAMENTO

CYNTHIA ANDERSON
LOS ANGELES

NANCY BERLIN
LOS ANGELES

BONNIE CANO
STOCKTON

HILDA GRANADO
SAN JOSE

CATHERINE-ELIAS JERMAN
SAN FRANCISCO

HELEN LITTLE
SAN FRANCISCO

ANN MCGREGOR
KEENE

DAN OWENS
SACRAMENTO

ROBERT TEETS, JR.
SAN FRANCISCO

Forward

This report was prepared by the San Diego County Welfare Rights Organization and the Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations.

The San Diego County Legal Aid Society also provided a great amount of technical and legal assistance in the preparation of this report.

We would also like to extend our greatest appreciation to Cresencia Garza who made this report possible by typing and editing the report.

January 10, 1984

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Executive Summary..... 1

Introduction 3

Case #1..... 5

Case #2..... 7

Case #3..... 8

Case #4..... 10

Case #5..... 12

Conclusion..... 13

Statistical Analysis of the San Diego
Work Program..... 15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines some of the problems that AFDC recipients face while participating in San Diego County's Employment Preparation/Experimental Work Experience Program (EPP/EWEP), ~~which is due to expire June 30, 1984.~~

As the program progresses, San Diego County has become the mecca of structured visits for visitors from throughout the country and the state.

The visits are controlled by County personnel. Visitors are taken to the sites chosen by the County and are presented a one-sided picture.

All stories, however, have two sides. This report presents the other side -- not cold statistics and planned demonstrations -- but actual case histories of victims of the San Diego Workfare Program.

The San Diego Program carelessly applies harsh sanctions to entire families when the head of the household (allegedly) fails to cooperate. Sanctions are applied without allowing people their right to the 30-day conciliation period, which was designed to protect those persons who want to cooperate from such sanctions. San Diego County has admitted that, notwithstanding the fact that the law requires all persons be provided with the opportunity to a conciliation period, they have chosen to ignore this requirement. Not one victim mentioned in this report was allowed the 30-day conciliation period as provided by law.

Summary of the cases contained herein:

- An illiterate person was assigned to EPP/EWEP. After ~~+~~ completing the job search portion, he proceeded to work for ~~+~~ the benefit portion of EWEP. While working off his AFDC ~~+~~ benefits, his father had a stroke and he went to see his ~~+~~ father. His wife told the Welfare department but when he ~~+~~ returned his entire family was meted out a three-month ~~+~~ sanction while the head of the household went to his ill ~~+~~ father's bedside.
- Another AFDC recipient was ordered to do a work assignment by the Court while he was doing his EPP/EWEP assignment. He called his worker who approved of his request to obey the Court ordered work assignment. His entire family was then subjected to a three-month sanction for obeying a Court order.
- A woman applied for AFDC because her work hours were cut back. Yet, she continued to work for the hospital under an "on-call" basis. EPP/EWEP prevented her from responding to the hospital call-ins and, therefore, she lost her part-time job with the hospital, which could have turned into a full-time job. Prior to completing her EPP/EWEP assignment, she moved to Kern County and informed her worker of the move. When she returned to San Diego County, she was sanctioned for three months for failure to complete her EPP/EWEP assignment.

- Another AFDC recipient had already completed his EPP/EWEP assignment but was asked to go through the program once more. San Diego County alleges that they require recipients to go through EPP/EWEP only once. This man's entire family was sanctioned for three months because he accepted a training assignment to which the County Welfare Department specifically referred him.

EPP/EWEP participants are instructed during the 2- to 3-week job search phase of EPP/EWEP by program personnel not to accept an offer of employment, if offered one at a job interview, until they have completed the three-week EPP assignment. Federal law, however, provides that they can be sanctioned for failure to accept employment.

These cases only represent those situations in which we filed for a fair hearing. In many cases recipients are afraid to file for a fair hearing because their county workers retaliate against them for filing such hearings and try to cut them off aid for any phony reason they can find. One of the more common methods of harassment is to request verification over and over again regarding the same item.

Some of the typical cases that have not been elevated to the fair hearing level are:

- A woman receives \$526 per month in AFDC and her absent parent pays \$200 per month to the District Attorney's Office as child support for her two children. Rather than being required to work off the difference between \$526 and \$200 she is required to work off the entire \$526, which means she has to work off her child support payments also. Had the law not required the child support to be paid to the D.A., then she would have received her \$200 child support payment and a \$326 AFDC grant. But, because she has the unfortunate luck to have her child support be paid to the D.A.'s office, because the San Diego County District Attorney receives a bounty for making sure that the money goes to the D.A.'s office, which amounts to 12.5% of all child support collected the AFDC mother is rewarded by being required to work off her child support payments through the performance of an involuntary servitude act.
- Another common situation is when the AFDC family has some sort of income which is counted two months down the line. Thus, if the AFDC recipients had \$200 net income in October, then their grant would be \$200 less for December. However, San Diego County still requires the EWEP participant to work off the full AFDC grant during the month of December, eventhough the December grant was reduced by \$200.

Do these recipients get paid for the free mandatory labor that they provide to the County? No. It is free labor provided to the County over and above their AFDC grant. What happens to the County for forcing recipients to work off hours over and above their AFDC benefits? NOTHING. What happens if the recipient fails to work off their AFDC hours? They are terminated from AFDC for 90 days -- a stiff sanction. IS THIS EQUITABLE???

INTRODUCTION

San Diego County has implemented workfare in the General Assistance Program, the Food Stamp Program, and now in the AFDC program. This report will deal with the AFDC workfare program in San Diego.

The program got under way in August 1982, and is called the Employment Preparation Program (EPP)/Experimental Work Experience Program (EWEP). Because of its experimental nature, it does not yet include all AFDC recipients. The County hails EPP/EWEP as an "innovative welfare program" that features "unprecedented cooperation between such agencies as the County Department of Social Services (DSS) and the State Employment Development Department (EDD) . . ."

EDD provides Job Development Counselors (JDCs) who work with the participant during the first three weeks of EPP/EWEP (Job Search Stage). DSS monitors the next three months of EPP/EWEP through its eligibility workers, which is the Work-for-Benefit Stage. At this stage, participants work 32 hours per week in various public and private non-profit agencies as a condition for their AFDC check. The remaining eight hours per week are reserved for supervised job search activities.

On March 23, 1982, the San Diego Welfare Rights Organization met with San Diego County workfare officials to discuss the County's EPP/EWEP Program that was getting into swing. WRO was assured that, unlike other workfare programs, EPP/EWEP was not sanction oriented. Further, if a participant were sanctioned, she or he would have an EDD notice of deregistration followed by DSS notice of welfare termination. These two notices, plus the EDD WIN requirement that allows 30 days for exhaustion of conciliation efforts, assured that EPP/EWEP sanctions would be minimal and participants' rights to appeal preserved. WRO's experience and the following case histories do not support this view. EPP/EWEP routinely sanctions people like the case histories herein reveal and is a "sanction oriented" program.

WRO submits the following case histories to suffice as their preliminary report on the EPP/EWEP Program in San Diego County. Most of these cases have gone to a fair hearing and at all hearings San Diego County has been willing to vigorously defend the following abusive actions, which indicates that the County considers its policies correct. Consequently, the practices revealed herein are widespread. WRO is of the opinion that these cases merely represent the tip of the iceberg and that the vast majority of workfare abuses go unchallenged and never come to our attention. Considering these case histories, this is indeed a frightening prospect.

WRO has attempted to obtain reports from county and state officials for this report, but has not received the requested information. Specifically, on March 28, 1983, WRO requested progress reports from the County, which could not be met because none "had been prepared." Furthermore, WRO's May 19, 1983, written request to the State Department of Social Services for the State's quarterly reports on workfare was ignored. In spite of our lack of reports and statistical data, we think the following case histories speak for themselves.

Many of the families described herein have been sanctioned illegally by the County of San Diego in that they were not afforded the opportunity to rectify the problem through the 30-day reconciliation period provided by law. Today they are victims of the County's illegal acts. The real victims, however, are the children of these families who are currently living with these harsh sanctions.

We now take you through the case histories of the victims, most of which are children.

CASE #1

"Mr. A" has a wife and three children aged 2, 3, and 5 years. The County claims that Mr. A did not cooperate with the County's EPP/EWEP Program, therefore, the entire family is being punished. The County calls it "sanctioned." The entire family cannot receive any AFDC benefits, regardless of their need, for three full months.

Mr. A is illiterate. He told the County that, while he could sign his name, he could neither read nor write. This condition did not prevent the County from selecting him for participation in the EPP/EWEP Program and was told to sign an Agreement of Understanding, even though he could not read the document, if he wanted to receive AFDC benefits.

While participating in the work-for-benefit phase of EPP/EWEP, a family emergency occurred one weekend. Mr. A's father suffered a stroke requiring his immediate departure to Virginia with the assistance of his relatives. Mr. A told Mrs. A to call the County and convey this news first thing Monday morning, which she did. After two weeks, Mr. A returned to San Diego on a weekend when he was promptly arrested for outstanding traffic tickets. Unable to post bail, Mr. A was incarcerated for ten days.

When he finally came home, there were two letters from EDD which he did not understand. He personally took the letters to EDD to determine the problem and what he should do to get back to work. Unbeknownst to him, EDD was deregistering him and his time to request an EDD hearing for that action had almost run out. Rather than assist Mr. A, (an illiterate) in requesting a hearing, EDD sent him over to DSS. Of course, DSS sent him back to EDD where his opportunity to request a hearing had not terminated.

In addition, as he was shuttled back and forth between the two agencies, DSS sent him a notice terminating his AFDC benefits. Since he couldn't read this notice, he was unaware of his right to appeal. Also, since no one was assisting him or informing him that precious moments were ticking away, he missed the deadline to receive aid pending the DSS hearing. Thus, Mr. A, Mrs. A, and their three small children are currently receiving no aid.

As Mr. A recalls, a sympathetic observer in one of the agencies could no longer bear to witness his futile efforts to understand what was happening, who he should talk to, and what he should do. This person pulled him aside and told him to see the San Diego Welfare Rights Organization for help.

WRO assisted Mr. A to appeal both the EDD notice of deregistration and the DSS notice of termination. The EDD hearing has already taken place and the sole issue was whether he was timely in requesting his hearing. It was decided that he was not and, therefore, he was prevented from challenging the EDD deregistration. EDD's fault in causing the untimely request apparently was not relevant.

Mr. A also had a DSS hearing where he presented his story. The County admitted that they were aware of his reading and writing problems, but they contended that he did sign an Agreement of Understanding and that, if he had only contacted them, they would have helped. Helped indeed!

Mr. A's family, with three small children, is now awaiting DSS's decision. If the DSS hearing follows past practice, it will simply adopt the EDD decision, stating that DSS has no jurisdiction over the matter and his opportunity to challenge the action has run out in both hearings.

CASE #2

"Mr. B", the father of four children, aged 8, 10, 12 and 13 years, was in his second round with San Diego County's EPP/EWEP Program when he was sanctioned. He was selected in January 1983, and completed the entire program once. Then he was selected again for EPP/EWEP participation in the Spring. San Diego County alleges that families will be required to participate in EPP/EWEP only once. Apparently, this is not true.

While Mr. B was participating in his second work-for-benefit phase of EPP/EWEP, he received a court sentence requiring that he complete a 5-6 day work assignment. Mr. B contacted his Job Development Counselor (JDC) and it was agreed that he be assigned to continue EPP/EWEP on June 27, 1983. On June 27, 1983, Mr. B arrived on time at the Boy's Club ready to finish the eight days he had left for his second EPP/EWEP Program assignment. However, the worksite superintendent noted that neither he nor Mr. B had a worksite assignment sheet and, therefore, he would not allow him to work. He was instructed to contact his JDC counselor to determine why he never received his worksite assignment sheet. Over the next few weeks, Mr. B, who has no phone and has to use pay phones, tried to reach the JDC, but to no avail.

Meanwhile, DSS sent a notice terminating the entire family from AFDC because of Mr. B's alleged failure to cooperate with EPP/EWEP. Precious time ticked away as he futilely contacted DSS and EDD about the termination and the worksite sheet, but he was never able to reach the right person and was always shuttled to the other agency. By the time he appealed, the DSS notice of termination, his right to aid pending the hearing had run out and Mrs. B arrived at the Welfare Rights Organization frantic as school was starting for the four children and no check was forthcoming.

Finally, Mr. B received his worksite assignment sheet about six weeks after his attempt to report to work for EPP/EWEP. It had been erroneously sent to this old address. Mr. B had, in a timely manner, notified the County of his new address.

At the hearing the main issue was how long it takes the post office to reroute a letter from an old address to a new address.

Perhaps Mr. B will prevail at the hearing. Perhaps he won't. In any event, he won't know for at least a couple of months and meanwhile the family has nothing. All this because of a court order that was duly reported to the County and the County's failure to mail the assignment sheet to the proper address.

CASE #3

"Ms. C" represents a new class of EPP/EWEP participant. Recently, the County of San Diego changed the method by which EPP/EWEP participants are selected. Now, all mandatory registrants must participate in EPP/EWEP.

When Ms. C applied for AFDC on behalf of herself and three children, she was an employed person. She had been employed full-time as a dietary assistant at the University hospital for two years, but her hours had been cut back recently necessitating her application for AFDC. She liked her work and anticipated that her hours would increase so that her dependence on welfare would be short lived. She felt that she had developed important patient skills which is why they continued to call her.

But the EPP/EWEP Program had different plans. This "job" development program took an employed person whose outlook and dependence on welfare looked exceedingly temporary, and transformed her into an unemployed person whose outlook and dependence on welfare has increased considerably.

Consider the rules. Ms. C was not exempt from registering with WIN because her part-time employment was less than 30 hours per week. Because she was a mandatory registrant, she became a mandatory EPP/EWEP participant.

It is important to understand that the hospital employed her on a call-in basis to work different shifts. They would call at 8 a.m. or at 12 noon and require her presence during day or night hours.

It is also important to understand that Ms. C was unaware that she was part of a special experimental program allegedly designed to get her employed. She thought all welfare recipients were required to meet EPP/EWEP requirements. Therefore, she tried desperately to meet the demands of her part-time job and EPP/EWEP.

The County cannot claim ignorance as to her employed status. This fact was clear when her eligibility was determined and her monthly grant was calculated by anticipating that she will receive income during the month of application and the month following the month of application.

Being warned that EPP/EWEP was mandatory and failure to meet the requirements would result in the termination of her benefits, Ms. C heroically managed to complete the "job search" portion of EPP/EWEP (the first three weeks). During this time, she took the shifts at the hospital that would not conflict with EPP/EWEP (usually night). Then she dutifully went to the daytime EPP/EWEP sessions where she was taught how to find a job by looking in the yellow pages and making phone calls. Meanwhile, she had to turn down three eight-hour shifts at the hospital because EPP/EWEP required her presence so they could teach her how to secure a job. She was sent out on interviews, but was instructed by her JDC to turn down employment if offered. She was not to accept employment until the three-week job search training phase was completed.

At the end of three weeks, EPP/EWEP presented her with a certificate of completion of their "training program" and her hospital employer presented her with a termination notice because she was not able to respond to their call-ins as they conflicted with her EPP/EWEP hours.

At this point, she duly notified the County Welfare Department and moved her family to Bakersfield. Now she has returned to San Diego, is accused of failing to cooperate with EPP/EWEP and is facing a three-month sanction. She is required to start a three-month EPP/EWEP cycle all over again.

CASE #4

"Mr. S" has a wife and is the father of four children. This family received a notice that they would all be sanctioned and receive no aid for three months because of Mr. S's failure to cooperate with EPP/EWEP.

Mr. S had almost completed the entire EPP/EWEP cycle when he received a notice from DSS addressed to him, telling him to report for an interview where he would be evaluated for a job training program. The notice stated that failure to appear will cause the suspension of his AFDC benefits.

Mr. S was in a quandry. By reporting as instructed, he would not be able to finish the last five days of this EPP/EWEP Program. With two conflicting instructions, he contacted his JDC who stated that he would get back to him. The JDC never did get back to Mr. S. Therefore, Mr. S left EPP/EWEP and went to the interview with an EDD employee where he was assigned to a new job training program. He was, after all, following written instructions from the County and oral instructions from the interviewer.

Actually, Mr. S welcomed the County's new job training assignment because his EPP/EWEP experience had been disappointing. After working two months in a particular position, the position became available for employment. With hopes high, he applied for the position, but an outside person was selected and Mr. S was required to train the new person in the job. Understandably, Mr S was beginning to doubt if his EPP/EWEP experience would lead to bona fide employment. So the County's assignment to a new training program raised his spirits and hopes for employment.

When Mr. S had nearly completed his new training program, his wife was shocked to receive a phone call from DSS stating that Mr. S had never completed his last five days in EPP/EWEP and that the entire family could look forward to three months without aid. She was told that he should quit the training that he was now completing and return to the former place to complete his five days.

Mr. S called and reasoned that he only had a few weeks of training left, that he felt the training was valuable, and could he complete the remaining five days with EPP/EWEP after the completion of his current training? The answer was a firm NO! In fact, he recalls being told that if he didn't like the arrangement, he could leave the state.

Mr. S, thinking that surely reason will prevail, completed his training. After all, he was following written instructions and the oral instructions of the person who interviewed him and assigned him to his current training.

Of course, the DSS notice terminating the entire family arrived and Mr. S appealed. At the hearing, the issue was whether the mailed instructions telling him to go to the new training site was addressed to him specifically

or whether it was just a stuffer. The County contended that what he received was just a stuffer intended for non-EPP/EWEP people and he should have ignored it. Mr. S contended that it was addressed specifically to him, but he did not have the letter to prove this. Finally, during the hearing, the critical letter was inadvertently discovered by the hearing officer in one of the County's files. Yes, the letter had been addressed specifically to Mr. S.

The point in this incident is that, if common sense and reason had prevailed, Mr. S would never have been sanctioned and the costly hearing could have been avoided. Mr. S was one of the lucky few that requested a hearing in time and received aid pending the hearing.

The decision is pending. Perhaps he will prevail. The point is that, after conceding the fact that they sent him written instructions to report to an interview, and interviewing him, and assigning him to a new training program, the County seriously contended that somehow and for some reason, he should have known to ignore their written and oral instructions.

This case exemplifies the total confusion between and amongst the County agencies running EPP/EWEP. Yet, these agencies expect the participants to read their confusing messages with total clarity. They are even expected to identify and ferret out erroneous messages and ignore them. It's not easy to be an EPP/EWEP participant.

CASE #5

"Mr. R" has a wife and five children, ages 8, 7, 5, 4, and 3. The entire family is facing a three-month sanction action from the County because Mr. R allegedly failed to cooperate with the EPP/EWEP program. Mr. R has two years of experience as a journeyman sheet metalist.

Mr. R completed the job search phase of EPP/EWEP where he watched films, went through the yellow pages, made telephone calls and even went to some interviews, but was instructed not to accept employment if offered at these interviews until his job search phase of EPP/EWEP had been completed.

After completing the job search phase of EPP/EWEP, he moved on to the work-for-benefit phase of EPP/EWEP and worked at a worksite as a "gardener." In reality, however, he tended latrines rather than flowers. While working at this site for three weeks, he was simultaneously setting up interviews for police work. As the demands of these interview sessions increased, he called his JDC who appeared to understand his very tight schedule. After confirming with another WIN person, the JDC gave Mr. R three weeks off from EWEP to enable him to interview and test. He was told he need not report to EWEP until the 25th of the month.

Before his three-week reprieve was up, Mr. R realized that his opportunity would not materialize. He called the DSS worker and stated his willingness to commence work earlier than anticipated. However, she told him not to return until the 25th.

By the 22nd, Mr. R was getting anxious because he had not heard from the Welfare Department about where he should report on the 25th. He had been warned that if he "blew it" he would be sanctioned, but at least he had been assured that aid for his wife and five children would continue.

Not wanting to cause any problems, he called two days early on the 22nd and inquired as to where he should report on the 25th. He was told not to bother because he and his entire family were being sanctioned and would receive no aid for three months. On the 24th, one day before the agreed date he was to return to EWEP, he received written notice that, commencing on the 31st, he and his entire family would be punished for three months because of his failure to cooperate with EPP/EWEP.

WRO assisted this family by appealing this action in time, therefore, they qualify for aid paid pending. However, this does not assure this family that aid will continue uninterrupted. WRO's experience indicates that aid paid pending checks can be anywhere from one to six weeks late. As the rent is now due, and the check is late, Mr. R is understandably quite worried.

CONCLUSION

There are several problems that EPP/EWEP presents to AFDC recipients and the victims, who are children. This is a very important fact to remember, because the AFDC program is designed to protect the health and welfare of the CHILD AND THE FAMILY.

It is the view of CCWRO and the San Diego Welfare Rights Organization that, although the program may be helping some, it is also needlessly hurting too many. This is where we differ with the proponents of EPP/EWEP. The proponents believe that there is no problem with hurting helpless children for other's benefit. We believe, however, that the program should be structured to ensure that no child and family should be hurt because of the EPP/EWEP program.

THE MANDATORY NATURE OF THE PROGRAM ENSURES THAT SOME WILL BE HURT

If the proponents are sincere and confident as to the program's benefits and if they are sure the participants are indeed happy, then there is no reason to make it mandatory. The nonmandatory nature of the program will assure that "innocent families will not be hurt". We believe that most of the proponents don't want to see a family with needy children going foodless and homeless.

Reports from persons visiting San Diego's pre-planned tours of workfare state that participants are happy and wouldn't have it any other way. We believe that San Diego County should be delighted to make the program voluntary as a demonstration that our perceptions are invalid. A voluntary program would also protect the health and welfare of the children in workfare families, in that children would not be punished because of actions or inactions of their parents.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHOULD OBEY THE LAW

As our case histories indicate, EWEP families are deregistered without the opportunity of a reconciliation period as required by Unemployment Insurance Code Sections 5302(b) and 5304. Moreover, San Diego County welfare officials have admitted that they have made a conscious decision to ignore the state law. Unfortunately, there are no sanctions against San Diego County for knowingly and willfully disobeying the law by sanctioning hundreds of families without the 30-day conciliation period.

SAN DIEGO TOURS ARE NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING

CCWRO has always been suspicious of controlled visits. Los Angeles County was deluged with visits to see how monthly reporting and retrospective budgets operated there. As a result of these visits, Congress mandated this program on all states. Today a majority of the states are appealing to the federal government for exclusion from this requirement and have asked Congress to make monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting optional.

Moreover, as a condition of eligibility, recipients must exert all efforts to appear happy at EPP/EWEP worksites and perhaps many of them are. But certainly not all!!!

Here are some problems:

- Persons not needing assistance in how to find a job are put in the same group that does need assistance and are taught how to make phone calls; how to go through the yellow pages; and how to read the "want ad" section of the paper. It's like putting a college graduate in a class with fifth graders.
- Many persons in EPP/EWEP do not need work experience. They need real non-welfare cycle jobs or retraining! EWEP does neither.
- EPP/EWEP recipients are forced to spend their meager AFDC funds to meet the high cost of EPP/EWEP participation.
- EWEP participants are assigned to an EWEP site to do one thing but end up doing something else.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SAN DIEGO WORKFARE PROJECT

The San Diego work experiment is composed of two (2) primary components: (1) the Employment Preparation Program; and (2) the Work Experience Program.

The Employment Preparation Program is targeted towards helping AFDC applicants getting off of welfare while their application is being processed.

The Employment Work Experience Program (EWEP) is targeted towards two-parent families, which has been expanded to single parent families during the summer of 1983.

Table #1 examines the impact that this program has had in San Diego program upon the number of applications that have been approved for the AFDC program compared to the rest of the state.

Table #2 examines the San Diego County AFDC-U caseload with the statewide AFDC-U caseload.

OUR FINDINGS SHOW THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE STATE-WIDE CASELOAD MOVEMENT IN THESE CATEGORIES AND THE CASELOAD MOVEMENT IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

These findings support CCWRO's position that *welfare recipients generally find their own jobs without "government intervention"* and these programs really do not effect the caseload in any meaningful way.

TABLE # 1

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EMPLOYMENT
 PREPARATION PROGRAM IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Applications Approved

Month	State-Wide	San Diego County
7/82	22,922	2,002
8/82	24,676	2,758
9/82	25,556	2,753
10/82	25,909	2,474
11/82	24,259	2,469
12/82	27,737	3,845
1/83	25,269	2,711
2/83	24,140	2,584
3/83	28,596	3,675
4/83	22,024	2,210
5/83	22,594	2,591
6/83	24,257	2,983
7/83	22,818	2,438

TABLE # 2

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY
WORKFARE PROGRAM

AFDC-UP Cases

Month	State-Wide	San Diego County
7/82	78,597	6,194
8/82	79,749	6,374
9/82	79,301	6,457
10/82	78,384	6,386
11/82	79,142	6,362
12/82	82,227	6,605
1/83	85,452	6,784
2/83	86,743	6,664
3/83	89,703	6,983
4/83	90,296	6,921
5/83	89,703	6,737
6/83	85,983	6,537
7/83	84,026	6,408