

**REPORT  
OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE**

**REPORTED TO  
THE GOVERNOR  
AND  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



**HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 11**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
Department of Purchases and Supply  
Richmond  
1976**

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA  
Department of Welfare

Office of the Commissioner

November 21, 1975

State Building  
8007 Discovery Drive  
Box K - 178  
Richmond Virginia 23288

Commissioner:  
Robert E. Hodson  
Deputy Commissioner:

TO: The Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr.  
Governor of Virginia

And

The General Assembly of Virginia

The report contained herein is pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 213 which was passed by the 1975 session of the General Assembly. This report and its recommendations comprise the response to the directive that a study be conducted on "the cost of statewide uniformity in the general relief program and the desirability and feasibility of increasing the State's share of the cost of such a uniform statewide general relief program." The Task Force which prepared the report recommended the General Relief program become uniform statewide; however, the Department takes no position with respect to this recommendation due to economic conditions in the State and other Department needs.

Respectfully submitted,

  
William L. Lukhard

WLL/jhm

REPORT  
OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE  
TO  
THE GOVERNOR  
AND  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA



COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
Department of Welfare  
Richmond  
1975

DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE

STATE BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Robert A. Browning, Jr.,  
Mr. John H. Clements  
Mr. Charles Hugo Curl, Sr.  
Mr. James E. Edmunds  
Mr. Wilford P. Ramsey  
Mr. William Ferguson Reid  
Mr. J. Powell Royall, Jr.  
Miss Barbara K. Watkins  
Mr. John W. Williams, III, Chairman

William L. Lukhard  
Commissioner

Prepared by: Bennet Greenberg  
Executive Assistant and Planner

GENERAL RELIEF TASK FORCE

Robert L. Masden (Chairman)  
Deputy Commissioner  
Department of Welfare

Ed Anundson  
Chief of Eligibility  
Fairfax County Department  
of Social Services

Mary Hale  
Director, Richmond Regional Office  
Division of Field Operations  
Department of Welfare

Love W. Cox  
Director  
Carroll County Department  
of Social Services

Eugenia G. Kirkpatrick  
Public Assistance Policy Specialist  
Division of Financial Services  
Department of Welfare

Judith Crittendon  
Virginia Municipal League

George A. Koger  
Chief of Payment and Eligibility  
Virginia Commission for the  
Visually Handicapped

Shirley E. Culpepper  
Director  
Newport News Department  
of Social Services

Helen Olano  
State Human Resources Chairman  
League of Women Voters of Virginia

Mildred G. Davis  
Superintendent  
Henrico County Department  
of Public Welfare

John Russell  
State Client Involvement Committee

Bennet Greenberg  
Executive Assistant and Planner  
Department of Welfare

Lawrence G. Shaw  
Assistant Director  
Division of Administration  
Department of Welfare

June Griffin  
Virginia Association  
of Counties

Edith Starkey  
Eligibility Specialist  
Roanoke Regional Office  
Division of Field Operations  
Department of Welfare

Report of the  
Department of Welfare  
to  
The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia  
Richmond, Virginia

To: Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor of Virginia  
and  
The General Assembly of Virginia

INTRODUCTION

House Joint Resolution No. 213 of the 1975 session of the General Assembly directed the Department of Welfare, together with at least three persons not connected with the Department and one person selected by the Commission for the Visually Handicapped, to conduct a study of the general relief program. Specifically, the study would determine the projected costs of a uniform statewide program and the appropriateness of increasing the State's share of the cost of such a program.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 213

Directing the Department of Welfare to make a study of general relief.

Patrons - Slayton, Council and Vickery

WHEREAS, general relief is provided in every locality in the State to one degree or another; and

WHEREAS, there is a lack of uniformity in this program to the extent that some localities provide general relief in emergency situations only, while others provide the maximum amount allowed by State guidelines; and

WHEREAS, general relief meets the needs of those persons who are unable by reason of temporary unemployment or an unusual occurrence such as a prolonged illness or physical disability and who are not eligible for federally funded public assistance programs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the State Department of Welfare, together with at least three persons not connected with the Department who shall be selected by the Director of Welfare and one person selected by Commission for the Visually Handicapped, is hereby directed to study the cost of Statewide uniformity in the general relief program and the desirability and feasibility of increasing the State's share of the cost of such a uniform Statewide general relief program.

The study shall be concluded and recommendations made to the Governor and the General Assembly not later than August one, nineteen hundred seventy-five.

The study was begun by the Department of Welfare in April, 1975 with the formation of a preliminary planning methodology. During April and May, two primary efforts were carried out. The first was the determination of appropriate persons from within the Department and persons not connected with the Department to serve as members of a task force for the purposes of providing leadership in the direction of the cost study and making needed program recommendations.

The second primary effort carried out during April and May was the investigation and assessment of all available information and data pertaining to the general relief program in Virginia and other states throughout the country. These efforts were assisted by the American Public Welfare Association as well as the Department's Bureau of Research and Data Systems and Bureau of Fiscal Management. Extensive information was obtained from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning general assistance programs in other states whose welfare programs are locally administered and state supervised as it is in Virginia. Elaborate information was retrieved from within the Department concerning all categories of general relief program cases and expenditures by locality in Virginia.

The task force held its first meeting in June, met twice in July, and concluded its formal sessions with its fourth meeting in August. The task force provided the Department with guidance concerning all phases of the cost study. Among its accomplishments are the following activities:

1. A compilation of appropriate advantages and disadvantages of a uniform statewide general relief program.
2. The submission of a general relief questionnaire pertaining to essential local financial and caseload considerations of the program to each local department of public welfare in Virginia.
3. The determination of a methodology by which systematic cost projections of a uniform statewide program could be made.
4. The consideration of all available data and information relative to the general relief program.
5. The development of other relevant program recommendations.

This report is organized as follows:

Section I	Summary of Cost Projections and Program Recommendations
Section II	Current General Relief Program in Virginia
Section III	Cost Study Methodology
Section IV	Analysis and Projection of Administrative Costs
Section V	General Relief Program Recommendations
Appendix I	General Relief Policy in Virginia



Appendix II	Tables Illustrating General Relief Expenditures and Caseloads
Appendix III	Summary of Responses to the General Relief Program Questionnaire #1
Appendix IV	Summary of Responses to the General Relief Program Questionnaire #2
Appendix V	General Relief Program Budget Requests of Local Departments of Public Welfare for the 1975-76 Fiscal Year
Appendix VI	Summary of General Assistance Programs in States with Locally Administered and State Supervised Welfare Systems
Appendix VII	Methodology for Conducting a Cost Study of a Uniform Statewide General Relief Program
Appendix VIII	Summary of Significant Cost Study Data by Counties and Cities in Virginia
Appendix IX	Cost Projections for a Uniform Statewide General Relief Program with Varying Percentages of Need and State Local Shares
Appendix X	Minority Report Submitted by Judith L. Crittenden of the Virginia Municipal League

Acknowledgement is made of those agencies and individuals who have contributed their time, effort and guidance to this study. As has already been indicated, this study effort was accomplished with the assistance and expertise of many State and local welfare staff persons, as well as many representatives of organizations and agencies not connected with the Department of Welfare. These include the Virginia Commission for the Visually Handicapped, the League of Women Voters of Virginia, the Virginia Municipal League, the Virginia Association of Counties, the Tayloe-Murphy Institute and the American Public Welfare Association. Too numerous to mention are the various persons in the Department, other than those previously mentioned, who assisted in the acquisition of information and data and in the preparation of this report. However, special thanks go to Miss Karen Fish, a summer intern with the Department, who provided essential assistance in the development of program information and data.

SECTION I - SUMMARY OF COST PROJECTIONS AND PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

PAYMENT COST PROJECTIONS

Following is a table which indicates the statewide costs for the current general relief program payments by category for a twelve month period ending May 31, 1975 and the projected payment costs of the general relief program if it were uniform statewide:

	General Relief Category				
	Maintenance	Medical	Burial	Transient	Total
Current Program	\$ 9,546,373	\$ 306,327	\$ 74,104	\$ 9,475	\$ 9,936,279
Uniform Program	\$33,097,205	\$7,138,158	\$1,285,593	\$111,550	\$41,632,506

The above total costs are further delineated in the following table in accordance with the current State/local ratio of general relief program expenditures and the new ratio which the task force recommends be adopted if the program were to become uniform statewide:

	State/Local Share			
	State	Local	Total	
Current Program (1)	\$ 6,210,174 (62.5%)	\$ 3,726,105 (37.5%)	\$ 9,936,279	(100%)
Uniform Program (2)	\$31,224,484 (75%)	\$10,408,162 (25%)	\$41,632,506	(100%)

- (1) Percentages in parentheses reflect the current shares of general relief program expenditures for the State and for each locality in accordance with current State law.
- (2) Percentages in parentheses reflect those shares of general relief program expenditures for the State and for each locality in accordance with the task force recommendation.

The last table below indicates the statewide caseload for the current general relief program and the projected statewide caseload for a uniform general relief program:

	General Relief Category				
	Maintenance	Medical	Burial	Transient	Total
Current Program	90,938	7,455	279	302	98,974
Uniform Program	269,918	157,924	4,402	3,556	435,800

The methodology by which the above cost and caseload projections were made is explained in detail in Section III.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST PROJECTIONS

The expansion of the general relief program if it were made uniform statewide would also cause an increase in the costs necessary to administer the program. The following table indicates the administrative costs of the current program compared with the projected administrative costs of the uniform program (this information is explained in more detail in Section IV):

	State - Local Share		
	State (80%) <sup>1</sup>	Local (20%) <sup>2</sup>	Total (100%)
Current Program	\$ 2,438,835	\$ 609,709	\$ 3,048,544
Uniform Program	\$ 5,963,776	\$ 1,490,944	\$ 7,454,721

<sup>1</sup>The State Department currently reimburses the locality for 80% of the costs to administer the general relief program.

<sup>2</sup>The locality currently funds 20% of the costs to administer the program.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a list of task force recommendations concerning the total general relief program. Detailed explanations and justifications for these recommendations will be presented in Section V.

Recommendation #1

All local departments of public welfare shall provide general relief in the maintenance and medical categories.

Recommendation #2

Local departments of public welfare shall provide general relief in the burial and transient categories with the exception of those local departments in communities which have other adequate resources available. Those local departments deciding not to provide general relief to burial and transient cases shall seek and receive approval of the State Department's Division of Financial Services before they may cease providing such assistance.

Recommendation #3

There shall be a uniform general relief policy which is followed by all local departments in determining client eligibility for general relief assistance.

Recommendation #4

The State Department of Welfare shall develop and implement appropriate supervisory procedures to insure statewide compliance with a uniform statewide program.

Recommendation #5

All general relief clients shall have the responsibility to cooperate in the determination of initial and continuing eligibility, the satisfaction of employment requirements, and the securing of medical care and rehabilitation services.

Recommendation #6

The State share of funds expended statewide in the general relief program shall be increased from 62.5% to 75% and the local share reduced from 37.5% to 25% for those localities which maintain or increase the amount of their current general relief appropriations. If the locality decreases its general relief appropriation, the ratio of State to local funds would continue to be 62.5%/37.5%, except where the decreased appropriations are the result of a decreased number of general relief clients, and the per capita appropriation amounts are at least maintained.

Recommendation #7

For general relief maintenance cases assistance payments shall be made through either the vendor method, where appropriate, or a flat allowance system similar to the ADC program. For the flat allowance system, the State Board of Welfare shall determine the maximum and minimum percentages of need to be met, with the maximum percentage of need for which the State share shall be applicable to be equal to that percentage of need to be met by the ADC program. Each local department shall have the flexibility to supplement the flat allowance system at a rate greater than the maximum percentage of need, but all funds expended above this level per case shall be local funds. When vendor payments are utilized, the general relief maintenance payment shall be determined by subtracting from the appropriate flat allowance payment any income or resources available to the family.

Recommendation #8

For any individual to be released from an institution under the State Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and for whom social services or financial assistance would appear to be needed, prior planning shall be made with the local welfare department before the person's return to the community. In addition, the Department of Welfare and the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation shall agree upon established procedures by which persons are to be deinstitutionalized in order to minimize the problems related to the person's return to the community.

Recommendation #9

Each local department of public welfare shall develop and continue to maintain a directory of local resources available to transients and attempt to utilize these resources to their fullest extent.

Recommendation #10

Each local department shall attempt to establish a contract with a local provider for service to all appropriate general relief burial cases.

The above recommendations will be explained in further detail in Section V. A minority report, which has been submitted by Judith Crittendon, a representative on the task force from the Virginia Municipal League, and which takes exception to some of the above recommendations, is enclosed as Appendix X.

SECTION II - CURRENT GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM IN VIRGINIA

This section of the report will assess the general relief program as it currently functions in the State of Virginia and the basic issues and problems related to the operation of the program statewide.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The general relief program is an unusual public assistance program in the sense that it is operated by the Department of Welfare in Virginia with no federal financial participation. The program is totally a State/local program in which 62.5% of the funds expended by each local department of public welfare are reimbursed by the State, while the remaining 37.5% of general relief expenditures are derived from local appropriations. In addition, each locality may expend local-only general relief funds in conformity with procedures established for the State matched program.

This program is available in almost all political subdivisions in the State in varying degrees. The eligibility requirements and the categories of assistance for the general relief program are described in detail in Appendix I, which is that portion of the Manual of Policy and Procedure for Local Welfare Departments - Assistance Programs, Volume II which pertains to general relief. However, the program categories for which general relief assistance is provided are described briefly below:

1. Maintenance - General relief funds are provided to meet maintenance needs of individuals who are unemployable for reason of (a) physical or mental disability, (b) age and/or lack of training and experience, or (c) family illness or other home responsibilities.

In all appropriate cases, job opportunities are explored and redetermination of eligibility is a continuing process as circumstances change, such as an improvement in one's disability. Maintenance payments may be provided as emergency assistance for persons whose eligibility determination is pending for assistance in a federally funded program. In addition, maintenance payments may be utilized for persons receiving domiciliary care. Each locality may determine the percentage of need which it decides to meet for maintenance purposes.

2. Medical - General relief funds are also expended for payment of medical care for persons who meet the eligibility requirements. Such expenditures may include prescriptions, doctor bills, etc. Long-term hospitalization is funded through the State-Local Hospitalization Program. As with GR-maintenance payments, the recipient of GR-medical cannot be found eligible for aid in a federal category of assistance. Thus, GR-medical payments are not intended to be provided to individuals who have been determined to be eligible for the Medicaid program, which is federally reimbursed.
3. Burial - General relief funds may be used to provide assistance which cannot be provided through other means, such as burial of indigent persons. This feature of the program is optional and is dependent upon the approval of the local welfare board. The social security program provides a death benefit payment equal to \$255 for eligible persons; therefore, GR-burial is used either for persons who are not eligible for the social security payment or to supplement the social security death benefit.

4. Transient - General relief assistance is also provided to transient persons. This is also an optional feature of the program and varies considerably state-wide in its implementation, depending upon the availability of private resources to meet this need, such as Traveler's Aid offices or the Salvation Army.

Another optional feature of the general relief program is the exception made to the requirement that eligible persons be unemployable; that is, GR assistance, upon the discretion of the local welfare board, may be granted to persons who are temporarily unemployed. However, unlike other GR maintenance payments which can continue as long as a person remains eligible, the total amount of assistance granted to an employable person and/or his or her family in a 12-month period may not exceed an amount equal to three times the monthly Aid to Dependent Children Standard of Assistance.

It should be pointed out that the task force considered the potential impact of Virginia adopting the ADC-unemployed parent program, which would make GR assistance to unemployed but employable persons unnecessary. With the federal government providing 58.34% of the funds necessary in this program if it were implemented in Virginia, it would initially seem that State and local funds expended for employable persons would be reduced considerably; however, this would not be the case for two reasons. First, the number of persons eligible for and actually receiving such assistance would increase dramatically over that of the GR maintenance category. Second, such persons would be eligible to receive a total amount of assistance payments that would far exceed an amount equal to three times the monthly ADC payment as in general relief. Therefore, State and local costs would actually increase upon its full implementation.

#### PROGRAM OPERATION

The expenditure of funds in the General Relief program has increased substantially in recent years, in much the same way that expenditures in all financial assistance programs have increased. This increase is illustrated in detail by the accompanying tables found in Appendix II.

While the above information describes the basic program from the point of view of policies and procedures, the actual implementation and on-going operation of the program varies considerably statewide. This is a result of the options and flexibility granted local welfare departments and boards in the administration of the program as well as the limited program monitoring and supervision provided by the State Department of Welfare in the past. This diversity can be graphically illustrated by the results of two questionnaires recently submitted to all local departments of public welfare in Virginia.

In June, 1975 each of the seven regional offices of the State Department of Welfare was asked to poll the local departments within their region and ask the following questions:

1. Does your agency have a general relief program?
2. Does your agency provide general relief funds for . . .(a) Medical expenses? (b) Burial expenses? (c) Transient expenses? (d) Maintenance payments?
3. For maintenance purposes, what percentage of need does your local general relief program permit you to meet?

Responses were received from 118 of the 122 local departments of public welfare in Virginia, and these are summarized in Appendix III. The diversity of the General Relief program in Virginia can be well illustrated by the following information received:

1. At least four local departments of public welfare in Virginia (4%) do not provide GR maintenance, 24 (20%) provide no GR-transient, and eight (7%) provide no GR-burial. The information received for GR-medical payments is inconclusive due to a misunderstanding in the request made by three of the regional offices to local departments.
2. Thirty local departments meet 100 percent of need with GR-maintenance payments, while an additional 40 local departments more meet 90 percent of need. Ninety percent is that level of need met by the Aid to Dependent Children program. For those localities meeting 100 percent of need, no expenditures at greater than 90 percent of need are reimbursable by the State and must be provided by local funds only.

Thus, at least forty-eight local departments (41%) provide maintenance at less than 90 percent of need, including the four who provide no GR-maintenance. Two other local departments provide GR-maintenance on a specific need basis; that is, payments are provided recipients in the exact amount of specific needs, such as housing, utilities, and/or food. Of all the percentages of need reported by local departments, the lowest was 50 percent.

The program diversity is further illustrated by the responses received to the second set of questions sent to all local departments by the Central Office. One hundred and two responses were returned to this more lengthy questionnaire, the results of which are summarized in Appendix IV. While many of the questions were designed to obtain appropriate local input on issues relating to possible program changes, others provided further indication of the diverse ways in which the general relief program is administered statewide:

1. To question #3, thirty-two percent of the local departments responded that their GR-maintenance payments meet less than ninety percent of need. The majority of reasons given to explain why indicated that limited local funds did not allow a greater percentage of need to be met. (In fact, a number of local departments in the past year have reduced their percentage of need met for GR-maintenance due to the increased demands on GR which have resulted from the increased unemployment rate during the recession. While waiting for their unemployment compensation, for which there have been delays of eight weeks and more, many persons have applied for and received GR-maintenance.)
2. The majority of local departments (60%) indicated in response to question #5 that they provide assistance to employable persons who are temporarily unemployed.
3. Responses to questions #7 and #8 indicated that, while the majority of GR-maintenance payments in on-going cases were made in the form of money payments, emergency GR payments are much more frequently made as vendor payments.

4. The diversity by which GR-burial and GR-transient expenses are met is amply illustrated by the responses to questions #9 and #11, respectively. Burial payments in the State range from \$75 to over \$600. Transient expenses are met by such varied methods as transportation costs to one's destination, hotel lodging, bus fare to the Traveler's Aid office, and a flat allowance payment.
5. Again, the reasons why most local departments do not provide all GR assistance categories are generally the lack of local funds or the availability of alternative local resources for transient persons, as indicated by the responses to question #12.

Further evidence of the methods by which local departments of public welfare in Virginia implement the general relief program is provided by Appendix V, which is an itemized list by program category of GR budget requests submitted by all local departments of public welfare for the 1975-76 fiscal year. While the total dollar amounts indicated are difficult to interpret without corresponding caseload projections, it is significant that the following numbers of local departments requested no funds in the indicated categories:

<u>Medical</u>	<u>Burial</u>	<u>Transient</u>	<u>Maintenance</u>
19	17	40	7

Appendix VIII also contains significant data which indicates the variation of implementation of the general relief program statewide. Rows J, K, L, and M identify the percentages of 1974 poverty level families or persons in each locality who receive GR maintenance and medical assistance monthly and GR burial and transient assistance yearly. The program variation is highlighted by the following table which indicates the highest, lowest, and mean percentages of 1974 poverty level families (GR-maintenance, medical, and transient) or persons (GR-burial) receiving GR assistance:

	Category of General Relief			
	Maintenance (Monthly)	Medical (Monthly)	Burial (Yearly)	Transient (Yearly)
Highest %	34.53%	8.76%	0.61%	12.18%
Lowest %	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mean %	3.53%	.62%	.04%	.37%

#### GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Most, if not all, states have a financial assistance program similar to Virginia's general relief program. These programs are typically referred to by the phrase "general assistance programs". That such programs are common would be expected by the nature of federally funded programs. The programs dictated and reimbursed by the federal government would be expected to have gaps in service in addition to a method of administration which would not allow expansion by individual states in recognition of local needs. Thus, general assistance programs, such as the general relief program, are designed to fill assistance gaps and to allow states and localities to design an assistance program to meet their specific needs.



As part of the study on the general relief program, information was requested from the American Public Welfare Association concerning general assistance programs administered in other states who have state supervised and locally administered welfare programs. The pertinent information received concerning these eight other states is summarized in Appendix VI. The General Relief Task Force reviewed this information and found it not to be of significance to the study at hand.

#### UNIFORM STATEWIDE PROGRAM

The general relief program as it is presently being administered by local departments of public welfare in Virginia is discussed in some detail above. The problems relating to such administration become quite apparent as one makes a critical assessment of the implementation of specific program categories. The task force has attempted to deal with some of these problems with its recommendations summarized in Section I and discussed in more detail in Section V of this report. An implicit assumption behind these recommendations is that many of the current problems in the program result from its lack of uniformity statewide and that a uniform statewide program would be a preferable alternative to the current program. House Joint Resolution No. 213 requested the Department to make a cost study of a uniform Statewide general relief program, but the benefits of having a uniform statewide program had not been fully explored. Therefore, the task force decided to assess the advantages and disadvantages of having a uniform statewide program and these are indicated below.

#### Advantages of a uniform statewide GR program:

1. Program uniformity for all GR clients in localities throughout the State.
2. Deterrence of client movement to localities having larger GR payments.
3. Uniformity in policy for the different categories in the program, which will simplify local administrative procedures and decision-making.
4. Uniformity in the statewide appeal process, resulting in better enforcement of standards and "quality control" mechanisms.
5. Statewide training for proper program implementation.
6. Uniform response to needs of GR clients and potential GR clients in localities now having limited programs.
7. Better statewide program planning.
8. Statewide agreements with human affairs agencies in meeting the needs of certain individuals being released from institutions.

#### Disadvantages of a uniform statewide GR program:

1. Loss of autonomy and program control by local agencies and governing bodies.
2. Loss of local flexibility to meet specific community needs.

3. General relief program costs, as well as the costs for administering the program, will significantly increase.

It is the opinion of the task force that with respect to a uniform statewide general relief program, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. It is also important to note that the task force feels that certain optional features of the current program are preferable to making a standard GR policy inflexibly applicable throughout the State. In this way, the best features of local flexibility in the GR program can be retained.

SECTION III - COST STUDY METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

House Joint Resolution No. 213 directed the State Department of Welfare "to study the cost of statewide uniformity in the general relief program". Department staff persons and task force representatives considered alternative approaches for conducting the cost study but many of those approaches considered were significantly hampered by the unavailability of appropriate data, inadequate staff resources, and the need for very specific cost and caseload projections. However, a methodology was selected based upon the following assumptions and conditions:

1. The basic approach taken would have to determine the number of projected cases statewide and the average cost per case for each of the general relief categories. In this way, total costs could be determined.
2. If one assumes that the general relief program is not currently uniform statewide, it follows that local departments of public welfare vary in the level of adequacy of their present GR program. It also follows, that the adequacy of each local GR program by category must be assessed and compared with other programs. Then, projections can be made on a statewide basis by determining caseloads based upon the more adequate programs.
3. General relief caseloads in localities with adequate programs are not projected to decrease significantly from their peak in the spring of 1975. This statement is based upon the continuing increase in welfare caseloads in general, the increased willingness of indigent persons to apply for and accept financial assistance from local welfare departments, and the projections being made for a slow recovery of the nation's economy from the current recession. Virginia's economy is a critical factor in projecting future GR caseloads, and a sharp upturn in the economy, while not expected by most experts, would reduce the projected caseloads significantly.
4. The general relief program, even if all the task force recommendations were implemented quickly, could not achieve uniformity throughout the State immediately. It is projected that it will take approximately two to three years before such uniformity is achieved and statewide caseloads reach their projected peaks.
5. Currently, there are no changes being anticipated in federally-funded financial assistance programs which will significantly influence the general relief cost study projections.

Following is a step-by-step description of the cost study methodology agreed to and carried out by the task force and the State Department of Welfare staff. Appropriate steps will include an indication of the significant data elements developed. A much briefer description of the methodology by which the cost study was made is presented in Appendix VII. A more elaborate presentation of all data elements developed for each step can be found in Appendix VIII.

STEP I

For each county and city in Virginia, the most current statistics available were obtained for the following information:

1. number of families whose income is less than the poverty level, and
2. number of persons in families whose income is less than the poverty level.

A decision was made to base the study upon the number of indigent persons and families in each locality in Virginia rather than the total number of persons and families. This decision was made because only indigent persons and families would be eligible for general relief assistance and also because the percentages of persons and families who are indigent in different localities in Virginia vary considerably throughout the State.

Data was first obtained for each county and city in the 1970 U.S. census. This information was then updated by using the 1974 population projections for each county and city in Virginia which were published by the Tayloe-Murphy Institute. From these 1974 population projections, a percentage population change was determined for each locality, and this percentage change was applied to the 1970 census figures to yield 1974 data on number of indigent persons and families. The Research Section of the State Department concluded that this would be a valid method of updating poverty figures because other studies have indicated that the percentage of poverty level population tends to remain static over such a period of time.

The figures derived in Step I are indicated in rows A, B, C, D, and E, in Appendix VIII. The major disappointment in the development of this data in Step I relates to the determination of poverty level for different localities in Virginia. The only poverty level data available was that derived for the 1970 census. However, poverty level for the purposes of the census are determined by applying a nationwide standard of need for all nonfarm areas and reducing this need by fifteen percent for all farm areas. This is inaccurate because of the obvious variances there are in the cost of living from one community to another throughout the State and the nation. Much research was conducted to discover an accurate cost of living indicator by which localities could be compared and poverty population figures could be adjusted; however, no such indicators were available.

The next step in the cost study methodology was the determination of current GR maintenance and medical caseloads for each city and county in Virginia. Because of the significant impact upon these caseloads by the economic recession, caseloads were determined on a month-by-month basis from data made available by the Department's Bureau of Research and Data Systems. Because the peak caseloads statewide were reached in February, March or April, depending upon the locality, the peak

caseload for each locality in the GR maintenance and medical categories was chosen from one of these three months. The peak monthly caseloads (in families) chosen for each county and city are presented in rows F and G (See Appendix VIII) for the general relief maintenance and medical categories, respectively.

STEP III

The caseloads for the general relief burial and transient categories were determined differently. It was decided by the task force to use annual caseloads for each locality for these categories, because the number of cases in either category for a given locality were so few for a given month that an unusual increase of one or two cases for that month would distort the real statistics needed for projection purposes. Therefore, the number of GR burial and transient cases for each county and city in Virginia were totaled for the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and the total caseloads for the year are indicated in rows H and I in Appendix VIII.

The next step was a critical one in the projection of costs of a uniform statewide general relief program. From the data developed in Steps I, II, and III, it was determined for each county and city the percentage of its families whose incomes are below the poverty level who also are receiving General Relief financial assistance for each program category. That is, for the maintenance and medical categories, a monthly percentage of poverty level families receiving GR of these types was calculated for all localities by dividing the peak monthly caseload determined in Step II by the number of poverty level families calculated in Step I, and then multiplying this number by 100. For the burial and transient categories, an annual percentage of poverty level families (transient) or persons (burial) receiving GR of these types is calculated for all localities in the same way. The percentages calculated for each of the four GR categories for all counties and cities can be found in rows J, K, L, and M in Appendix VIII.

The percentages determined in Step IV provided a means of comparison of the adequacy of the general relief program as implemented in each locality in Virginia. There is little flexibility utilized by local departments of public welfare in the implementation of federally funded programs. The task force feels that if the GR program were implemented in such a consistent manner, the percentages of poverty level persons/families receiving GR by category would vary relatively little across the State; in fact, the highest and lowest percentages of poverty level persons/families receiving general relief by category are as follows:

	Category of General Relief			
	Maintenance	Medical	Burial	Transient
Highest %	34.53%	8.76%	0.61%	12.18%
Lowest %	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

STEP V

The next step in the cost study methodology was to determine for each of the four GR categories the one local department of public welfare in Virginia which provides GR assistance in that category to the appropriate percentage of its poverty level persons/families.

In the initial stages of the cost study, it was assumed that the highest percentage of poverty level persons (for the burial category) or families (for the maintenance, medical, or transient categories) found to receive GR for a given category would be the most appropriate figure to use for projecting statewide caseload estimates. This assumption was based upon the opinion that the best GR programs would serve the greatest percentages of its eligible populations, since no locality would be expected to provide GR to ineligible persons, given the large percentage of local funds involved in the program. The task force continued to believe that this method would be appropriate for the medical, and burial categories, but not for the maintenance and transient categories, for reasons to be explained below.

The reasons for the change of opinion in the maintenance category are several. Most importantly, the localities which had the highest percentages of poverty level families receiving GR maintenance were metropolitan areas, most of which were experiencing a decrease in population. It is felt that this population decrease was in actuality resulting in a larger percentage and a higher number of poverty level persons/families in the locality than that which was determined by Step I. Given this to be the case, the real percentage of poverty level families receiving GR maintenance is actually smaller than that which was determined by the methodology. Another factor in this decision was the appearance of a natural break in the calculated maintenance percentages; that is, there is a consistent continuum of percentages up to approximately 15%, above which are only four localities which do not fit into the same pattern. Therefore, it was agreed to by the task force that with all factors considered, the most appropriate percentage of poverty level families who would be expected to receive GR maintenance if the program were uniform statewide would be 15%.

A similar situation occurred in the transient category. There was a steady continuum of percentages of poverty level families receiving transient assistance up to a peak of 2.37%, with four local departments clustered within .01% of each other. However, two localities had percentages several times that figure. Investigation revealed unusual circumstances which led to such high percentages. In one case, the local department by contract was reimbursing the Salvation Army for transient services rendered, an unusual and generally unacceptable procedure which was later terminated by the local department. It was realized that the other locality had an unusually large number of cases because it is located at the junction of two heavily traveled interstate highways, in addition to being the home of a State mental hospital from which many persons were being deinstitutionalized. Consequently, it was decided to reject these two localities as a guide and instead to use 2.37% to project transient cases statewide.

Therefore, the percentages chosen for each of the four categories from rows J, K, L, and M in Appendix VIII are:

<u>Maintenance</u>		<u>Burial</u>	<u>Transient</u>
15.00%	8.76%	0.61%	2.37%

STEP VI

The next step in the cost study was the statewide projection of the GR maintenance and medical categories, utilizing the percentages selected in Step V. The potential statewide general relief caseload per year for the maintenance and medical categories can be calculated by multiplying the total number of poverty level families in the State (see Step I) by the percentage chosen for each category in Step V, and then multiplying that result by 12 to convert monthly caseload to a annual caseload. This has been done for each county and city in Virginia and the projected caseloads for the maintenance and medical categories are identified in rows N and O in Appendix VIII.

It should also be noted that the GR medical caseload, as stated in Section II, should not include individuals who are eligible for Medicaid, which is a federally funded category of assistance. The task force was unable to determine if the projected GR medical caseload excluded all such individuals. To do so, the task force would have had to make a case-by-case analysis of Arlington GR medical recipients.

STEP VII

The statewide projection of GR burial and transient cases is done in a slightly different manner than that which was done for the maintenance and medical categories. This is a result of the calculation performed in Step III, which was an annual, rather than a monthly, percentage of poverty level persons. Therefore, the total potential statewide burial and transient cases may be projected by multiplying the percentage for each chosen in Step V by the statewide total of poverty level persons and families, respectively. The results of this calculation for the burial and transient categories for each county and city can be found in rows P and Q respectively in Appendix VIII.

While this calculation will determine a total potential caseload statewide for these categories, the actual caseload for a uniform program can be expected to be smaller as a result of Recommendation #2 of the task force, if it were implemented. The effect of this optional feature for the provision of the GR burial and transient categories cannot be determined by the task force without more experience with the option; therefore, the task force is making no allowance in its cost projections at this time, particularly since burial and transient expenses represent a small percentage of total general relief expenditures.

STEP VIII

After caseloads for each GR category in a uniform program are determined, the next step is the actual projection of potential GR costs by multiplying the total statewide projected cases per category by a standard cost per case per category. The standard chosen as a cost per case for each of the four categories has been determined in the following way:

1. Medical:       The mean cost per GR medical case for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, plus an annual inflation factor of ten percent.
  
2. Burial:         The mean cost per GR burial case for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, plus an annual inflation factor of ten percent.

- 3. Transient: The mean cost per GR transient case for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.
- 4. Maintenance: Because of similarity of payment to the ADC program in accordance with Recommendation #7 of the task force, the standard to be utilized would be the mean ADC expenditure per case of the most recent quarter less two factors - an approximate 10 percent reduction for the reduced percentage of need to be allowed by the State Board and an approximate 25 percent reduction for the potential use of vendor payments in the maintenance category.

In accordance with the above determinations, the standard chosen as a cost per case projection in a uniform general relief program, as compared with the current average cost per case in the general relief program, is indicated by the following table:

	General Relief Category			
	Maintenance	Medical	Burial	Transient
Current Mean Cost/Case	\$104.98	\$41.09	\$265.61	\$31.37
Projected Mean Cost/Case	\$122.62	\$45.20	\$292.13	\$31.37

The total statewide cost of a uniform general relief program in Virginia can now be determined. Following is a table which compares the current GR caseload per year per category with the projected caseload per year per category as determined in Step VI and Step VII:

	General Relief Category			
	Maintenance	Medical	Burial	Transient
Current Caseload/Year	90,938	7,455	279	302
Projected Caseload/Year	269,918	157,924	4,402	3,556

Multiplying the projected caseloads times the projected mean costs/case, as indicated in the above tables, yields the following statewide costs of a uniform GR program:

Maintenance	\$33,097,205
Medical	7,138,158
Burial	1,285,593
Transient	<u>111,550</u>
Total	\$41,632,506



The total projected costs per category per locality are itemized in rows R, S, T, and U in Appendix VIII, in addition to the total projected GR cost per locality, which is indicated in row V.

The State and local costs of the potential uniform statewide general relief program, utilizing the current share of costs, can now be determined. The State currently funds 62.5% of the general relief program, while the locality pays for 37.5%. Using this breakdown, the State and local costs are as follows:

<u>State (62.5%)</u>	<u>Local (37.5%)</u>	<u>Total (100%)</u>
\$26,020,316	\$15,612,190	\$41,632,506

In accordance with Recommendation #6 of the task force, the following breakdown of State and local costs for a uniform statewide GR program assumes that all localities will appropriate an amount for the GR program at least equal to the most recent fiscal year, with the ratio of State to local funds becoming 75% and 25% respectively.

<u>State (75%)</u>	<u>Local (25%)</u>	<u>Total (100%)</u>
\$31,224,484	\$10,408,162	\$41,632,506

SECTION IV - ANALYSIS AND PROJECTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The final cost of a public assistance program extends beyond simply the payment which is made to the public assistance recipient; that is, there is a substantial cost to administer the program.

The welfare system in Virginia consists of three levels of operation - central, regional, and local offices. The local departments of public welfare, numbering 122 throughout the State, administer all welfare programs, except that of licensing. The seven regional offices in Virginia supervise the local departments in their administration of programs. Finally, the central office in Richmond establishes the policies and procedures by which programs are administered.

The cost of operation of this system includes many types of expenses, including salaries for staff, utilities, furniture, travel, training, etc. Each of these expenses is applicable to all welfare programs, including general relief.

In recent months the Department of Welfare has attempted to determine the administrative costs for each of its programs. These administrative costs are often referred to as indirect costs, as compared with the direct costs of providing the appropriate amount of assistance for which the recipient is eligible. The following table summarizes these indirect or administrative costs for the 1974-75 fiscal year for all welfare programs and, specifically, for the general relief program:

	TOTAL COSTS		General Relief Cost/Case
	Total Welfare Programs	General Relief Program	
% SERVICE TIME <sup>1</sup>	100%	5.00%	-
Local Expenditures for Services <sup>3</sup>	\$30,515,877	\$1,525,794	\$ 55.47
General Welfare Expenditures <sup>4</sup>	\$ 2,380,959	\$ 119,012	\$ 4.33
Administrative Expenditures <sup>5</sup>	\$ 1,011,430	\$ 50,504	\$ 1.84
Training Expenditures <sup>6</sup>	\$ 109,794	\$ 5,493	\$ 0.20
Total Expenditures <sup>7</sup>	\$34,018,060	\$1,700,803	\$ 61.84
% ELIGIBILITY TIME <sup>2</sup>	100%	9.23%	-
Local Expenditures for Eligibility <sup>8</sup>	\$12,735,939	\$1,175,527	\$ 42.74
General Welfare Expenditures <sup>9</sup>	\$ 1,268,020	\$ 117,082	\$ 4.26
Administrative Expenditures <sup>10</sup>	\$ 538,655	\$ 49,725	\$ 1.81
Training Expenditures <sup>11</sup>	\$ 58,473	\$ 5,407	\$ .20
Total Expenditures <sup>12</sup>	\$14,601,077	\$1,347,741	\$ 49.01
Grand Total	\$48,619,137	\$3,048,544	\$110.85

<sup>1</sup> This item denotes the percentage of social services staff time in the local departments of public welfare.

<sup>2</sup> This item denotes the percentage of eligibility staff time in the local departments of public welfare.

- 3 This item denotes the total administrative expenditures by local departments of public welfare in providing social services to these recipients.
- 4 This item denotes central office expenditures for the Divisions of Financial Services, Social Services, Licensing and Field Operations (which includes regional offices) as they relate to providing social services to these recipients.
- 5 This item denotes central office expenditures for the Office of the Commissioner and the Division of Administration as they relate to providing social services to these recipients.
- 6 This item denotes expenditures in the area of training, scholarships, etc. as they relate to providing social services to these recipients.
- 7 This item represents a sum total of the social services administrative expenditures designated above.
- 8 - 12

These items represent eligibility expenditures for the central, regional, and local offices relating to the same administrative types of social services expenditures identified by items three through seven above.

It should be pointed out that the \$14,601,077 expenditure for eligibility administrative costs were expended for all types of financial assistance totaling \$150,663,409 in the 1974-75 fiscal year.

With the information indicated in the table above, one can project administrative expenditures for the general relief program if it were to be made uniform statewide. However, other information must be considered before one can project these costs accurately. For example, while the caseload is expected to increase 4.4 times that of the current program, the expenditures noted in the table above cannot simply be multiplied by this same factor. The anticipated effects of a uniform, statewide program upon the administrative categories itemized in the table above are as follows:

1. Many persons eligible for general relief are now making application to the local department of public welfare, but their application is being denied. If these same persons were to apply under the conditions of a uniform statewide program, they would be approved; however, for these cases the local eligibility staff time would not increase as much as the caseload, since staff time is already being spent to take these applications and deny their eligibility. Instead, it is projected that local eligibility expenditures would double with a uniform, statewide program.
2. On the other hand, the increased caseload would produce a more dramatic effect upon local services expenditures for general relief recipients. With a uniform statewide program, there will be some new GR clients who would be already recipients of social services from the local departments, but it is projected that a large majority of the new GR recipients will be receiving these social services for the first time. Therefore, administrative expenditures in this category are projected to increase by three times.
3. Central and regional office administrative expenditures are not expected to increase as significantly as items one and two above. Increased supervisory and statistical responsibilities are anticipated to increase the expenditures in these categories (other than training) by 50% greater than that of the current program.

4. Administrative expenditures for training are being anticipated to double as a result of the increased numbers of staff persons and the new program training demands required for the uniform statewide program.

Before the above factors can be applied to the expenditures indicated for the last fiscal year, one must anticipate that administrative expenditures should be expected to increase by approximately ten percent for the reason of inflation alone. However, this factor is not being built in to the projected administrative expenditures for the uniform statewide program, so that only increases as a result of uniformity and statewideness will be projected and clearly identified.

Given the above-stated conditions, the projected administrative expenditures for the uniform, statewide general relief program as compared with the current program are identified in the following table:

Type of Administrative Expenditure	Current Program	Multiplicative Factor	Uniform Program
Local Expenditures for Services	\$1,525,794	3.0	\$4,577,382
General Welfare Expenditures	119,012	1.5	178,518
Administrative Expenditures	50,504	1.5	75,756
Training Expenditures	5,493	2.0	10,986
Subtotal	\$1,700,803	-	\$4,842,642
Local Expenditures for Eligibility	\$1,175,527	2.0	\$2,351,054
General Welfare Expenditures	117,082	1.5	175,623
Administrative Expenditures	49,725	1.5	74,588
Training Expenditures	5,407	2.0	10,814
Subtotal	\$1,347,741	-	\$2,612,07
Grand Total	\$3,048,544	-	\$7,454,721

Thus, the task force projects that the administration of a uniform, statewide, general relief program will cost approximately \$7,454,721. The funding of administrative expenditures for the general relief program on the local level is currently broken down into a State share of 80% and a local share of 20%. Administrative expenditures on the State level (central and regional offices) are funded entirely by State dollars. Application of these shares toward the current program and uniform program administrative costs indicated above yields the following cost information:

	State - Local Share		
	State	Local	Total
Current Program	\$ 2 506,100	\$ 542,444	\$3,048,544
Uniform Program	\$ 6,064,674	\$1 390,047	\$7,454,721

SECTION V - GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

In the course of its study and assessment of the general relief program in Virginia, the task force identified many critical issues related in varying degrees to the implementation of a uniform statewide general relief program. It was the opinion of the task force that it was important to include as part of this report certain recommendations which would help resolve these issues. These recommendations are summarized in Section I; however, they are repeated below with more detailed explanation and justification. Please note that a minority report dealing with the local impact of some of the recommendations is enclosed as Appendix X.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

All local departments of public welfare shall provide general relief in the maintenance and medical categories.

Of the four program categories of general relief, the maintenance and medical categories are considered the most critical as they relate to the needs of clients in Virginia. These categories provide basic living expenses and medical assistance to indigent individuals and families who do not qualify, or have not, as yet, qualified for federally funded assistance programs, including the Aid to Dependent Children and Medicaid programs. Under the current general relief program, as indicated by Appendix V, approximately seven local departments provide no funds in the GR maintenance category, and nineteen local departments provide no funds in the medical category. Because of the critical nature of these categories, the task force recommends that they be provided without exception statewide.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

Local departments of public welfare shall provide general relief in the burial and transient categories with the exception of those local departments in communities which have other adequate resources available. Those local departments desiring not to provide general relief to burial and transient cases shall seek and receive approval of the State Department's Division of Financial Services before they may cease providing such assistance.

The burial and transient categories of the general relief program, while not being as critical as the maintenance and medical categories, are important as they fill obvious gaps in welfare services. However, the task force recommends that these categories be optional, given the approval of the State Department, because there exist other potential sources of such funds.

In burial cases of indigent persons, there are two other possible sources of funds. The largest source is the Social Security death payment received by the survivor, an amount generally equal to \$255. While this amount is sufficient to cover the average burial costs in many parts of Virginia, in many other places it is an inadequate amount which some local departments supplement with GR burial funds. Of course, not all indigent persons qualify for Social Security death benefits; in such cases, some localities prefer not to provide the GR burial category, but instead the local governing body appropriates local-only funds for burial of indigent persons. However, providing for burials in this way does not allow the locality to claim the 62.5 percent reimbursement from the State through the general relief program.

For the transient category, many communities in Virginia have a Traveler's Aid office, an office of the Salvation Army or a similar agency which provides assistance to transient persons. Consequently, many local departments of public welfare find no need to provide GR assistance to transients other than to provide transportation to that available agency.

Therefore, while it is not essential for all local departments to provide GR assistance in the burial and transient categories, it is considered essential by the task force that such assistance be available to eligible persons throughout the State. For that reason, the task force feels that the State Department should have the right to approve the deletion of these categories from the GR assistance provided in a locality only when it is assured that such assistance is available to all eligible persons from another source in that locality.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

There shall be a uniform general relief policy which is followed by all local departments in determining client eligibility for general relief assistance.

While the Department of Welfare currently has a well-distributed statement of policies and procedures for the general relief program, it is important to note the task force's positive feeling toward the need for a uniform statewide GR program, one which is followed by all local departments of public welfare in the State. This may necessitate the State Department to review the current policies and procedures to determine if appropriate revisions and modifications are necessary. On the other hand, the task force is in favor of certain optional features in the program to allow local flexibility in program implementation of the burial and transient categories, as well as the employable persons provision.

RECOMMENDATION #4:

The State Department of Welfare shall develop and implement appropriate supervisory procedures to insure statewide compliance with a uniform statewide program.

It is the opinion of many persons that even if no GR program policy and procedure revisions were made, the current program would only be lacking the necessary State Department supervision which would insure that all local departments implement the program properly. Without adequate program monitoring and evaluation, one cannot be assured that the general relief program will ever become uniform statewide. To help achieve this capability, it is recommended that the State Department of Welfare develop, issue, and implement appropriate procedures to insure the statewide compliance desired.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

All general relief clients shall have the responsibility to cooperate in the determination of initial and continuing eligibility, the satisfaction of employment requirements, and the securing of medical care, and rehabilitation services.

The task force considers it appropriate that not only should the State and local departments of welfare have responsibility to provide for persons in need, but that also these same persons have appropriate responsibilities as a result of accepting financial assistance. It is of course essential that any potential recipient cooperate fully in the determination of his or her eligibility for general relief if the determination is to be made completely and accurately. In addition, the recipient should have the responsibility to cooperate in the acquisition and receipt of any service which can help to solve or alleviate the condition without which the person would not be eligible for the assistance. Thus, the recipient would be obligated to cooperate in the receipt of medical care or rehabilitation services which would assist in the improvement of a physical or mental disability in such a way that the recipient would be more able to obtain and retain employment.

RECOMMENDATION #6:

The State share of funds expended statewide in the general relief program shall be increased from 62.5% to 75% and the local share reduced from 37.5% to 25% for those localities which maintain or increase the amount of their current general relief appropriations for each succeeding fiscal year. If the locality decreases its general relief appropriation, the ratio of State to local funds would continue to be 62.5%/37.5%, except where the decreased appropriations are the result of a decreased number of general relief clients, and the per capita appropriation amounts are at least maintained.

As indicated in the results of the cost study summarized in Section I, if the general relief program were made uniform statewide, the costs to both the State and local jurisdictions would increase dramatically. House Joint Resolution No. 213 instructed the Department to also determine the "desirability and feasibility of increasing the State's share of the cost" of the GR program. It is the opinion of the task force that the increased costs of the GR program would create difficult hardships on both the State and local governing bodies, but that it is essential for the well-being of thousands of Virginians that such hardships be endured.

It is the further consensus of the task force that given the increased administrative and financial demands being placed upon localities with respect to the GR program, it should be the State's responsibility to increase its financial commitment to the program and pick up a greater share of the program costs. It is important to note that even with the local share being reduced to 25%, total local appropriations for the uniform statewide general relief program will almost treble. Furthermore, this increased state share would only be applicable to those localities who exhibit a similar commitment to the well-being of general relief recipients by maintaining or increasing its local appropriation for the program for each succeeding fiscal year. In this way, the increased costs of the general relief program would be shared by the State and the localities. However, the recommendation deletes from this provision those localities whose total general relief appropriations decrease as a result of a decrease in the number of general relief clients. Under such conditions, over which localities may have no control if their programs are being administered properly, the locality must at least maintain its per capita appropriation.

RECOMMENDATION #7:

For general relief maintenance cases assistance payments shall be made through either the vendor method, where appropriate, or a flat allowance system similar to the ADC program. For the flat allowance system, the State Board of Welfare shall determine the maximum and minimum percentages of need to be met, with the maximum percentage of need for which the State share shall be applicable to be equal to that percentage of need to be met by the ADC program. Each local department shall have the flexibility to supplement the flat allowance system at a rate greater than the maximum percentage of need, but all funds expended above this level per case shall be local funds. When vendor payments are utilized, the general relief maintenance payment shall be determined by subtracting from the appropriate flat payment any income or resources available to the family.

The method of payment recommended here for GR maintenance cases is similar to that utilized for the ADC program. Payments would continue to be made through either the flat allowance system or vendor payments, the latter of which would be computed utilizing the flat allowance methodology.

In the current GR program, each locality may choose the percentage of need which it wishes to meet for GR recipients. As indicated in Appendix III, almost all local departments now meet from 50 to 100 percent of need in the general relief program. It is the recommendation of the task force that there continue to be local flexibility in determining the percentage of need to be met; however, this local flexibility must be within a predetermined range, with the maximum of the range being the same percentage of need met in the ADC program as determined by the State Board of Welfare. The minimum of the range, as well, would be set periodically by the State Board of Welfare. In this way, the State Board can help to adjust GR expenditures in a manner related to available State appropriations for the general relief program.

In addition, the recommendation would allow localities who wish to provide a higher standard of living for GR clients to supplement payments at greater than the maximum percentage of need; however, this supplementation would not be subject to any State reimbursement.

**RECOMMENDATION #8:**

For any individual to be released from an institution under the State Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and for whom social services or financial assistance would appear to be needed, prior planning shall be made with the local welfare department before the person's return to the community. Furthermore, the Department of Welfare and the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation should agree upon established procedures by which persons are to be deinstitutionalized in order to minimize the problems related to the person's return to the community.

The task force was repeatedly concerned over the impact upon the GR program by the S.I.D. Project conducted by the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. This project is aimed at the deinstitutionalization of appropriate persons from mental hospitals in the State. Many situations were described in which deinstitutionalized persons were released from State mental hospitals and returned to their community with no prior contact with the local department of public welfare. These individuals would later apply to the local welfare office for emergency assistance. Because of the nature of the situation, this assistance must at least temporarily be paid from general relief funds.

Many deinstitutionalized persons are eligible for assistance from the federally funded Supplemental Security Income program, or SSI. Even if the local welfare department takes the deinstitutionalized person's application for SSI, general relief funds are provided the person during the interim time period of eligibility determination.

When asked what percentage of the on-going GR maintenance cases were persons who had returned to the community through the deinstitutionalization project, local departments responded with percentages ranging from zero to ninety percent (See Appendix IV).

The task force, therefore, recommends that planning for social or financial services for deinstitutionalized persons begin before return to the community. Application and eligibility determination for SSI payments can be completed before the individual is released. In this way, the general relief program would not be strained by the deinstitutionalization project, and the deinstitutionalized person would not be placed back into the community in such an untenable financial situation. Such a procedure should be implemented statewide as a result of an administrative agreement between the two State Departments involved. The task force did not feel that any revision in the Code of Virginia would be necessary to achieve this procedure.



RECOMMENDATION #9:

Each local department of public welfare shall develop and continue to maintain a directory of local resources available to transients and attempt to utilize these resources to their fullest extent.


As indicated previously in this report, many communities throughout Virginia have resources available other than the local welfare department who are capable of assisting transient persons. Such resources include the Travelers Aid offices and the Salvation Army. Consequently, to assist in limiting the use of GR funds in the transient category, it is recommended that local departments of public welfare maintain a current directory of such resources and utilize them whenever it is appropriate to do so.

RECOMMENDATION #10:

Each local department shall attempt to establish a contract with a local provider for service to all appropriate general relief burial cases.

Many local departments of public welfare have found it convenient and more financially expedient to maintain a contract with a local funeral home for appropriate services in GR burial cases. Since there are local agencies who offer GR burial assistance but have no such contract with a local provider, the task force recommends that all welfare agencies do so.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
William L. Lukhard  
Commissioner

APPENDIX I - GENERAL RELIEF POLICY IN VIRGINIA

In accordance with State law, the general relief program is administered by policies established by the State Board of Welfare. Following are the policies established with respect to eligibility for the program, taken from the Manual of Policy and Procedure for Local Welfare Departments - Assistance Programs - Volume II.

207.1 ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS - An individual is eligible for General Relief (GR) if he:

- A. is in need of public assistance (Chapter 300);
- B. has not been found eligible for aid in a federal category of assistance (207.3); and
- C. is unemployable (207.4), except as provided in Section 207.5.

207.2 NEED - Financial need for public assistance is to be determined in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 300.

Continuing Eligibility - An individual continues to meet this requirement for eligibility as long as he remains "in need" as defined in Chapter 300.

207.3 INELIGIBILITY FOR AID IN A FEDERAL CATEGORY - An individual who has been found eligible for OAA, AB, APTD or ADC is not eligible for GR for maintenance. Temporary and nonrecurring emergency assistance from GR funds may be granted, however, to persons pending the determination of their eligibility for assistance in a federal category. In addition, there are certain conditions under which GR is to be used for payment for medical care and/or nursing home care (see Chapters 400 and 500).

Continuing Eligibility - An individual continues to meet this eligibility requirement for GR maintenance as long as he remains ineligible for assistance in a federal category.

207.4 UNEMPLOYABILITY - Unemployability is established if one of the following conditions exists:

- A. The individual's capacity for employment is substantially affected by physical or mental disability.

Medical evidence is necessary to establish that a disability exists which either renders the individual unable to work or severely limits his capacity for self-support.

If need is urgent, assistance may be granted for a period not to exceed 30 days pending receipt of the medical report.

- B. The individual is unable to find work because of age and/or lack of training and experience.

Unless it is obvious that the individual is not qualified to engage in gainful employment, job opportunities should be explored. Unemployability is established if the Virginia Employment Commission or other referral agency determines that -

- 1. the individual is not suitable for employment;

2. referrals have been made to as many jobs as possible and the individual was not accepted; or
3. the individual was unable to perform on the job.

The individual is eligible for GR during the period of job exploration.

- C. The individual is not available for employment because of illness in the family or other home responsibilities.

Continuing Eligibility - The individual remains eligible so long as the conditions described above exist. If unemployability is based on physical or mental incapacity which is subject to change, an examination and report from the physician is necessary as frequently as circumstances require and at least at the expiration of each period for which recovery was anticipated.

207.5 EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT OF UNEMPLOYABILITY - Assistance may be granted to employable persons from GR funds, provided the total amount of assistance granted to an individual or family in any 12-month period does not exceed the appropriate monthly standard basic allowance and allowable shelter (see Chapter 300), as determined at the time of application, multiplied by three. Income is not to be deducted in determining the total amount which may be granted in a 12-month period. In determining the amount of assistance for which a person is eligible in a given month, however, income is to be counted in accordance with policies set forth in Chapter 300.

207.6 OTHER USES OF GR - In addition to providing maintenance and/or medical care, as described in the preceding sections, GR funds may be used to provide assistance and services which cannot be provided through other means; e.g., payment for burial or assistance to transients.

207.7 NONMATCHED GENERAL RELIEF FUNDS - Policies for the expenditure of local only General Relief funds are established by the local board of public welfare. It is recommended, however, that the procedures should, in general, conform to those established for the State-matched program.

The following examples are illustrative of the use which may be made by local departments of local funds only: Assistance to employable persons for a period in excess of the maximum specified in Section 207.5; assistance to employable persons engaged in a work relief program operated by a locality.

APPENDIX II - TABLES ILLUSTRATING

GENERAL RELIEF EXPENDITURES

AND CASELOADS

Table No. 1. Monthly Statewide Totals of General Relief Cases and Amounts of Assistance Provided from July, 1970 to June, 1975

Month, Year	Total Cases	Amount of Assistance	Month, Year	Total Cases	Amount of Assistance
July, 1970	4,399	\$462,373	January, 1973	6,411	\$661,859
August, 1970	4,573	477,341	February, 1973	6,493	692,879
September, 1970	4,740	501,174	March, 1973	6,620	707,995
October, 1970	4,971	526,525	April, 1973	6,269	681,313
November, 1970	4,856	504,046	May, 1973	6,312	688,264
December, 1970	5,162	539,519	June, 1973	6,307	710,641
January, 1971	5,411	572,188	July, 1973	6,326	681,710
February, 1971	5,709	595,914	August, 1973	6,481	713,939
March, 1971	5,990	637,854	September, 1973	6,514	709,985
April, 1971	5,944	614,571	October, 1973	6,589	719,222
May, 1971	5,887	589,555	November, 1973	6,661	727,427
June, 1971	5,673	576,709	December, 1973	6,477	714,303
July, 1971	5,467	572,656	January, 1974	6,368	703,327
August, 1971	5,603	589,456	February, 1974	6,542	722,211
September, 1971	5,648	604,808	March, 1974	6,575	734,456
October, 1971	5,875	617,551	April, 1974	6,560	742,798
November, 1971	5,947	612,232	May, 1974	6,438	744,208
December, 1971	6,052	633,317	June, 1974	6,379	721,451
January, 1972	6,639	652,720	July, 1974	6,549	753,170
February, 1972	6,332	694,949	August, 1974	6,791	797,892
March, 1972	6,501	691,059	September, 1974	6,680	794,853
April, 1972	6,485	670,000	October, 1974	7,014	783,111
May, 1972	6,424	671,987	November, 1974	6,984	819,098
June, 1972	6,437	670,982	December, 1974	7,134	813,000
July, 1972	6,280	672,526	January, 1975	7,613	877,022
August, 1972	6,767	682,279	February, 1975	8,104	933,368
September, 1972	6,580	701,170	March, 1975	8,326	952,514
October, 1972	6,525	689,129	April, 1975	8,320	993,394
November, 1972	6,601	703,082	May, 1975	8,105	962,716
December, 1972	6,579	691,560	June, 1975	7,805	909,162

Table No. 2. Apportionment of State and Local Funds Expended for the General Relief Program for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1967 to 1975

<u>Year</u>	State Share (62.5%)	Local Share (37.5%)	Total (100%)
1967	\$1,477,564	\$ 886,539	\$ 2,364,103
1968	1,809,286	1,085,572	2,894,858
1969	2,433,409	1,460,046	3,893,455
1970	3,178,796	1,907,278	5,086,074
1971	4,123,606	2,474,163	6,597,769
1972	4,801,074	2,880,645	7,681,719
1973	5,176,686	3,106,011	8,282,697
1974	5,396,842	3,238,105	8,634,947
1975	6,493,313	3,895,987	10,389,300

Table No. 3 June Statewide Totals for Number of General Relief Cases and Average Maintenance Payment from 1953 to 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u># Cases</u>	Average Maintenance Payment	<u>Month</u>	<u># Cases</u>	Average Maintenance Payment
June, 1953	2,072	\$ 34.41	June, 1965	2,027	\$ 49.68
June, 1954	2,716	35.25	June, 1966	2,165	53.95
June, 1955	2,641	35.86	June, 1967	2,341	52.23
June, 1956	2,130	35.02	June, 1968	2,838	56.03
June, 1957	2,007	34.95	June, 1969	3,865	61.32
June, 1958	2,414	37.49	June, 1970	4,403	76.80
June, 1959	2,111	40.25	June, 1971	5,673	84.87
June, 1960	2,100	42.79	June, 1972	6,972	89.86
June, 1961	2,115	45.69	June, 1973	6,307	98.45
June, 1962	2,183	47.60	June, 1974	6,743	102.91
June, 1963	2,045	45.32	June, 1975	8,183	107.53
June, 1964	2,059	45.54			

Table No. 4. Monthly Statewide Total Cases, Total Expenditures, and Average Expenditure Per Case for General Relief Maintenance Payments for June, 1974 through May, 1975

	<u>Total Cases</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>	<u>Average Expenditure/Case</u>
June	6,636	\$669,430	\$100.87
July	6,716	961,727	143.19
August	7,229	767,822	106.21
September	6,917	760,735	109.98
October	7,312	754,062	107.46
November	7,214	785,933	108.95
December	7,392	787,517	106.53
January	8,107	793,738	97.90
February	8,624	797,626	92.48
March	8,843	911,378	103.06
April	9,006	846,067	93.94
May	6,942	710,338	102.32
TOTAL	90,938	\$9,546,373	\$104.98 (Mean)

Table No. 5. Monthly Statewide Total Cases, Total Expenditures, and Average Expenditure Per Case for General Relief Burial Payments for June, 1974 through May, 1975

	<u>Total Cases</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>	<u>Average Expenditure/Case</u>
June	28	\$ 7,609	\$271.75
July	22	5,772	262.36
August	28	6,525	233.04
September	25	5,284	211.36
October	16	5,320	332.50
November	26	9,449	363.42
December	14	3,978	284.14
January	26	5,685	218.65
February	21	6,170	293.81
March	19	5,435	286.05
April	32	8,489	265.28
May	22	4,388	199.45
TOTAL	279	\$74,104	\$265.61 (Mean)

Table No. 6. Monthly Statewide Total Cases, Total Expenditures, and Average Expenditure Per Case for General Relief Transient Payments for June, 1974 through May, 1975

	<u>Total Cases</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>	<u>Average Expenditure/Case</u>
June	13	\$ 331	\$25.46
July	22	1,015	46.14
August	28	1,118	39.93
September	19	358	18.84
October	39	1,156	29.64
November	30	1,021	34.03
December	24	554	23.08
January	25	742	29.68
February	30	1,169	38.97
March	22	819	37.23
April	31	818	26.39
May	19	374	19.68
TOTAL	302	\$9,475	\$31.37 (Mean)

Table No. 7. Monthly Statewide Total Cases, Total Expenditures, and Average Expenditure Per Case for General Relief Medical Payments for June, 1974 through May, 1975

	<u>Total Cases</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>	<u>Average Expenditure/Case</u>
June	527	\$18,476	\$35.06
July	672	41,344	61.52
August	579	24,275	41.93
September	535	28,475	53.22
October	580	22,269	38.39
November	518	22,447	43.33
December	490	10,372	21.17
June	664	30,275	45.59
February	715	10,679	14.94
March	802	22,923	28.58
April	770	44,617	57.94
May	603	30,174	50.04
TOTAL	7,455	\$306,327	\$41.09 (Mean)

APPENDIX III - SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE # 1

Each local department of public welfare was asked by its respective regional office to provide the Central Office with the appropriate answers to several very basic questions concerning its general relief program. A list of these questions and a summary of the responses received are indicated below.

1. Does your agency have a general relief program?	118 - yes	0 - no
2. Does your agency provide general relief funds for		
a. medical expenses?	84 - yes	34 - no*
b. transient expenses?	94 - yes	24 - no
c. burial expenses?	110 - yes	8 - no
d. maintenance payments?	114 - yes	4 - no
3. What percentage of need does your local general relief program permit you to meet for maintenance purposes?	30 - 100%	2 - 67.5%
	40 - 90%	2 - 65%
	1 - 85%	8 - 60%
	9 - 80%	6 - 50%
	1 - 76%	2 - need
	7 - 75%	basis
	6 - 70%	4 - none

\* Questionnaires sent to local departments of public welfare in three of the seven regions used the term Medicare instead of Medical; therefore, many local agencies responded with "No" when, in fact, they do provide GR funds for medical expenses.



APPENDIX IV - SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE #2

Due to the significance of the cost-study and its potential impact upon the general relief program as it is now implemented throughout the State, the task force felt that more input from local departments of public welfare in Virginia was essential. Therefore, a brief questionnaire was drafted and sent to each local department to determine more specifically how the general relief program now operates and the feelings of local superintendents/directors concerning the potential directions of the study effort. Following is a summary of the 104 responses received from the local departments.

Agency \_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE  
Summary of 104 Responses

1. Are you in favor of a uniform statewide general relief program of the type indicated in the current manual and State Law? Yes 78 No 26  
Why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.
2. If the State of Virginia were to have a uniform statewide general relief program would you prefer such a program . . . . .
- | YES       | NO |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| <u>16</u> | —  | a. with same standards for all local departments?   |
| <u>66</u> | —  | b. with three standards of assistance (flat allowance method)?                                  |
| <u>40</u> | —  | c. with a minimum and maximum range for percentage of need to be determined by each department? |
3. Is your agency's standard for general relief maintenance payments less than 90% of need? YES 32 NO 69 if Yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.
4. Would you prefer the general relief program in your locality to serve more people? YES 47 NO 54 If yes, which of the following would help accomplish this:
- | YES       | NO |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| <u>7</u>  | —  | a. Increased budget requests by the local welfare board   |
| <u>8</u>  | —  | b. Additional funding from your local governing body  |
| <u>51</u> | —  | c. An increase in the State share of funds expended in the general relief program greater than the current 62.5% rate |
5. Does the General Relief Program in your locality provide assistance for unemployed but employable persons? YES 62 NO 42 If no, should such assistance continue to be optional for local departments (40) or should it be mandatory (12)?
6. Do you have any on-going maintenance cases . . .
- | YES       | NO |   |
|-----------|----|---|
| <u>69</u> | —  | a. whose applications have been denied for SSI?   |
| <u>28</u> | —  | b. who have returned to the community through the Mental Health Deinstitutionalization Program? |

What percentage of on-going maintenance cases receive GR assistance as a result of a. or b. above (approximate, if necessary)? a. 0-100% b. 0-90% (Ranges)

7. Please describe the method by which GR maintenance payments are made, if other than the flat allowance method:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.

8. Are on-going general relief payments made directly to the client as money payments? 60 As vendor payments? 16 As a combination of money and vendor payments? 40

Are emergency GR payments made directly to the client as money payments? 15 As vendor payments? 45 As a combination of the two? 53

If vendor payments are made, which of the following items are included?

YES	NO		YES	NO	
<u>62</u>	—	a. housing	<u>85</u>	—	e. medical
<u>61</u>	—	b. utilities	<u>16</u>	—	f. personal care
<u>67</u>	—	c. food	<u>63</u>	—	g. transportation
<u>29</u>	—	d. clothing	<u>5</u>	—	h. other (specify)

9. Please indicate your agency standard(s) for general relief Burial payments:

\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.

10. Please indicate your agency standard(s) for general relief Medical payments:

\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.

11. Please indicate your agency standard(s) for general relief Transient payments:

\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.

12. If your agency does not provide general relief funds for all four categories - maintenance, medical, burial, and transient - what are the reasons for not doing so?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.

13. We would appreciate any additional comments you might have concerning the general relief program or the study effort which is now being made:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
See attached pages.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent/Director

NARRATIVE RESPONSES

QUESTION #1

Localities in favor of a uniform statewide general relief program gave reasons such as:

- a. equal benefits to all GR clients in the State,
- b. uniform and simplified administration, particularly for clients who transfer from one locality to another,
- c. the tendency for clients to gravitate to localities with more adequate programs will be reduced.

Reasons given as to why a uniform statewide general relief program is not favored include:

- a. decreased opportunity for local flexibility in program interpretation and implementation,
- b. increased financial burden to the localities, especially rural areas.

QUESTION #3

Local agencies who provide less than 90% of need with their GR maintenance payments generally gave two reasons. First, the current standard was established by the local welfare board, and, second, only limited local funds are available. Of course, the first reason, that of policy established by the local welfare board, is often a result of the lack of local funding resources.

QUESTION #7

Almost all local welfare agencies in Virginia provide GR maintenance payments by the flat allowance method, although the percentages of need vary considerably throughout the State. This is true except for certain emergency conditions, during which time vendor payments for such items as rent and utilities are often used, and for persons receiving domiciliary care, for whom GR payments are made at the institutional rate plus a small amount for spending money.

QUESTION #9

Local agency standards for GR burial cases in Virginia vary from \$75 to \$650. Of the agencies who responded, their burial standards are summarized as follows:

- a. less than \$100: 3 agencies,
- b. between \$100 and \$200: 25 agencies,
- c. between \$200 and \$300: 31 agencies,
- d. between \$300 and \$400: 18 agencies,
- e. between \$400 and \$500: 5 agencies
- f. more than \$500: 4 agencies,
- g. other: 18 agencies.

Several local departments indicated that they have contracts with local funeral homes for GR burial cases. Several more responded that instead of using GR funds for burial of indigent persons, local only funds are used as provided by the Board of Supervisors. Almost all local departments have a flexible standard, depending upon the needs of the individual cases.

QUESTION #10

When questioned about their standards for GR medical payments, most local departments of public welfare indicated that they provide medical payments on an as needed basis when they are not covered by other programs. Some local departments only pay for emergency medical needs, while others only provide for prescription drugs and office visits. In any case, most GR medical payments are made via the vendor payment method.

QUESTION #11

Standards for GR transient cases vary considerably throughout the State. Many local departments simply refer potential transient cases to other available agencies who provide such services, such as Traveler's Aid, the Salvation Army, and the United Way. Most other local departments provide transient payments on an as needed basis, which may include such things as lodging, meals, and transportation costs. A few local departments make a lump sum payment of as much as \$100.

QUESTION #12

When asked to give the reason why they do not provide general relief for all four program categories, the thirty responses given can be easily grouped into two types. The most frequent response related to the availability of other community resources that provide the service, such as so frequently occurs with transient cases. The other departments indicated the reason to be insufficient local funds to provide the service.

QUESTION #13

Fifty-eight of the 104 local departments of public welfare who submitted the questionnaire also responded to question #13 which requested additional comments. The content of the comments varied so much that they defy any method of categorization. Many comments were simply a reiteration or amplification of statements made earlier in the questionnaire. Of the remaining comments, a representative sample of them are quoted below:

" . . . would also like to see some provision to include adult dental care."

" . . . would like to see a fully State funded assistance program without local control by the Welfare Board and funds from the governing body."

"If we could have a set standard of rules and regulations, it would make the GR program much easier to administer and less judgmental."

"Throughout the Commonwealth, GR has been administered in such a way that violates all principles of public administration."

". . . a most necessary program since it helps clients who do not fit into the categories but are greatly in need. Broadening the program would lead to abuses because of the increasing number of people who are ready to take advantage of any program available."

"The present program is too subjective."

"I can't understand how any welfare department or person in authority can authorize a payment meeting less than 100% of needs, when the definition of need is the minimum needed to sustain a person, and it is understood that the person is eligible and does not have the means themselves to help themselves."

"Consider an ADC-unemployed persons program in order to receive more federal monies."

"The need for GR is increasing faster than the funding."

". . . require a medical for applicants who claim they are unemployable."

". . . can see having all agencies meet at least a minimum level since it is impossible for one person to live on \$100 per month."

"We need definite stable guidelines and at least 80% financial participation by the State."

"Would like flexibility with this program so that the local board could continue special projects with this money on a limited basis - such as the garden project which we now have whereby we designate X number of dollars each year to buy seed, fertilizer, etc. for individuals who want to have a garden."

"A larger matching percentage of the State would increase the number of people served but GR is considered a local program, and as such, I am not sure the localities should participate to any lesser matching percentage than they now do."

". . . prefer program to be handled as it now is."

APPENDIX V - GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM BUDGET REQUESTS OF  
 LOCAL DEPARTMENTS OF PUBLIC WELFARE  
 FOR THE 1975 - 76 FISCAL YEAR

PROGRAM CATEGORY						
COUNTIES	MEDICAL	BURIAL	TRANSIENTS	MAINTENANCE	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL
Accomack	\$ 6,000	\$ 750	\$ 700	\$ 110,532	\$ 500	\$ 118,482
Albemarle	0	1,380	0	92,620	0	96,000
Alleghany	1,500	2,000	100	18,000	2,000	23,600
Amelia	200	175	250	3,216	300	4,141
Amherst	250	600	30	25,776	125	26,781
Appomattox	4,000	2,000	2,000	10,000	1,440	19,440
Arlington	64,860	3,000	0	516,630	12,000	596,490
Augusta	200	2,500	1,000	48,240	500	52,440
Bath	150	1,200	500	38,400	360	40,610
Bedford	700	1,000	500	4,920	2,000	9,120
Bland	0	600	0	14,400	0	15,000
Botetourt	200	600	50	19,800	50	20,700
Brunswick	0	200	0	1,800	0	2,000
Buchanan	5,000	3,000	1,000	12,114	1,000	22,114
Buckingham	2,000	1,000	0	13,400	2,000	18,400
Campbell	200	600	200	17,280	100	18,380
Caroline	1,000	400	275	22,125	200	24,000
Carroll	2,500	750	500	20,880	1,500	26,130
Charles City	200	900	0	9,288	0	10,388
Charlotte	500	2,000	100	840	1,000	4,440
Chesterfield	720	1,000	0	12,480	800	15,000
Clarke	200	800	100	8,400	0	9,500
Craig	100	400	0	1,000	0	1,500
Culpeper	3,300	1,000	100	14,400	5,000	23,800
Cumberland	300	600	200	6,720	750	8,570
Dickenson	\$ 840	\$ 1,250	\$ 200	\$ 892	\$ 0	\$ 3,182
Dinwiddie	100	1,000	100	8,856	100	10,160
Essex	200	400	275	3,168	0	4,043
Fairfax	44,400	0	2,000	794,640	75,600	916,640
Fauquier	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floyd	400	400	0	3,600	0	4,400
Fluvanna	25	125	50	18,400	200	18,800
Franklin	0	800	50	14,150	0	15,000
Frederick	100	0	100	13,200	0	13,400
Giles	1,000	2,000	200	24,000	1,000	28,200
Gloucester	2,000	300	100	39,840	120	42,360
Goochland	1,000	0	0	9,000	3,000	13,000
Grayson	500	500	500	12,000	0	13,500
Greene	0	300	0	3,141	0	3,441
Greensville	3,000	1,000	500	6,000	500	11,000

PROGRAM CATEGORY

COUNTIES	MEDICAL	BURIAL	TRANSIENTS	MAINTENANCE	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL
Halifax	500	1,000	100	33,696	800	36,096
Hanover	200	400	100	12,960	300	13,960
Henrico	9,850	900	900	58,800	32,270	102,720
Henry	2,000	1,000	250	39,996	2,000	45,246
Highland	200	1,200	0	2,664	0	4,064
Isle of Wight	1,000	1,000	100	4,848	1,000	7,948
James City	1,200	1,000	300	46,800	5,000	54,300
King George	500	800	250	12,384	400	14,334
King & Queen	500	300	200	7,200	500	8,700
King William	0	250	50	3,000	100	3,400
Lancaster	1,000	700	200	17,820	1,200	20,920
Lee	1,200	4,000	1,500	48,000	0	54,700
Loudoun	4,519	1,800	1,500	46,546	5,000	59,366
Louisa	500	4,000	200	30,000	500	35,200
Lunenburg	500	300	50	2,808	0	3,658
Madison	900	1,200	200	7,920	400	10,620
Mathews	2,400	400	100	6,912	500	10,312
Mecklenburg	200	0	100	4,824	100	5,224
Middlesex	200	300	0	6,660	0	7,160
Montgomery	2,000	3,000	500	29,700	4,000	39,200
Nelson	100	700	0	14,000	3,200	18,000
New Kent	0	0	0	9,360	0	9,360
Northampton	500	800	300	36,000	0	37,600
Northumberland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nottoway	1,800	1,000	200	10,440	1,500	19,940
Orange	2,400	2,000	1,000	18,000	0	22,500
Page	500	1,500	150	14,940	300	17,390
Patrick	1,200	300	200	30,000	0	31,700
Pittsylvania	200	600	0	29,304	10,000	40,104
Powhatan	0	0	0	4,416	0	4,416
Prince Edward	150	2,000	150	9,600	200	12,100
Prince George	0	600	0	17,400	0	18,000
Prince William	22,788	10,000	10,000	126,288	0	169,016
Pulaski	3,000	500	0	68,400	2,000	73,900
Rappahannock	310	400	300	4,950	0	5,960
Richmond	500	450	0	7,056	500	8,506
Roanoke	18,000	1,500	0	108,000	24,000	151,500
Rockbridge	2,500	1,500	500	39,000	500	44,000
Rockingham	1,000	1,000	500	21,600	100	24,200
Russell	9,600	1,200	200	18,000	1,500	30,500
Scott	1,000	1,500	250	13,200	1,000	16,950
Shenandoah	500	1,500	0	15,000	0	17,000
Smyth	2,000	2,400	1,500	31,600	0	37,500
Southampton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spotsylvania	5,000	4,800	500	26,640	1,200	38,140
Stafford	1,500	2,000	150	48,000	100	51,750
Surry	0	0	0	15,984	0	15,984
Sussex	300	1,800	300	12,000	600	15,000



PROGRAM CATEGORY

COUNTIES	MEDICAL	BURIAL	TRANSIENTS	MAINTENANCE	SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL
Tazewell	1,200	3,720	300	27,000	0	32,220
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	10,650
Washington	500	1,000	100	14,400	500	16,500
Westmoreland	250	1,800	200	12,000	150	14,400
Wise	200	1,000	0	3,600	0	4,800
Wythe	400	2,000	400	14,400	0	17,200
York	600	250	0	56,880	0	57,730
CITIES						
Alexandria	17,361	2,500	720	0	583,164	603,745
Bristol	1,920	1,200	200	7,680	1,000	12,000
Buena Vista	500	500	100	7,200	100	8,400
Charlottesville	3,600	200	1,728	85,140	0	90,668
Chesapeake	25,500	5,000	5,000	163,280	40,000	238,780
Clifton Forge	500	400	0	6,000	0	6,900
Colonial Heights	300	600	0	3,600	300	4,800
Covington	1,200	2,000	100	17,000	1,200	21,500
Danville	1,000	750	500	61,689	10,618	74,060
Falls Church	1,092	0	250	28,260	1,000	30,602
Franklin	300	0	0	2,300	0	2,600
Fredericksburg	2,200	500	500	21,600	0	24,800
Galax	500	800	300	5,400	0	7,000
Hampton	3,180	500	150	1,500	250,380	255,710
Harrisonburg	600	660	50	6,000	500	7,810
Hopewell	0	0	0	0	0	15,716
Lexington	750	1,250	100	7,200	500	9,800
Lynchburg	1,000	2,500	500	25,600	15,000	44,600
Martinsville	1,450	600	50	43,200	700	46,000
Newport News	28,084	3,000	1,200	406,776	18,624	457,684
Norfolk	15,336	28,600	1,488	2,045,088	149,388	2,239,900
Norton	200	400	200	1,400	0	2,200
Petersburg	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radford	1,200	1,500	0	7,200	300	10,200
Richmond	0	0	0	3,544,056	120,000	3,664,056
Roanoke	0	0	0	499,800	0	499,800
Staunton	500	5,000	1,740	23,760	1,500	32,500
Suffolk	1,900	100	250	38,808	54,072	96,030
Virginia Beach	6,500	2,000	500	60,000	3,000	72,000
Waynesboro	0	1,000	0	22,491	16,800	40,291
Williamsburg	100	300	0	16,000	0	16,400
Winchester	1,000	3,000	300	30,000	1,300	35,600
GRAND TOTAL	\$647,104	\$181,733	\$51,306	\$10,623,538	\$1,495,071	\$12,909,368

APPENDIX VI - SUMMARY OF GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS  
IN STATES WITH LOCALLY ADMINISTERED AND  
STATE SUPERVISED WELFARE SYSTEMS\*

\*This information has been taken from a report published in 1969 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The material was obtained, compliments of the American Public Welfare Association.

STATE	Virginia
PROGRAM NAME	General Relief
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	Employable persons may receive temporary assistance but must be willing to accept employment or training.
STANDARD OF ASSISTANCE	Those for federally-aided public assistance programs are most commonly used.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	Assistance to employable persons limited to three months in a twelve month period. Localities may meet a reduced percentage of need.
FINANCING	State reimburses localities 62.5% of expenditures. Locality may augment program from local funds.
MAINTENANCE	Money payment to recipients; vendor payments to meet emergency needs.
MEDICAL CARE	Vendor payment or, for continuing care, a money payment - vendor payment for institutional care.
BURIAL	General assistance funds frequently used.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	Small expenditures for widows of Confederate Veterans.
STATE	Connecticut
PROGRAM NAME	General Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	Employable person must register with State Employment Service and accept a job offer for which he is fitted.
STANDARD OF ASSISTANCE	Those for federally aided public assistance programs are most commonly used.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	Money amounts are paid to recipients according to the standards used by the federally aided public assistance programs.
FINANCING	From local funds for administrative costs, with a 75% reimbursement by the State Welfare Department for the cost of assistance given.
MAINTENANCE	Voucher, cash, or vendor check, as decided by the individual towns; usually on a weekly basis.
MEDICAL CARE	Vendor payments made from general assistance funds for recipients not eligible for Medicaid.
BURIAL	By general assistance funds to needy persons not receiving State assistance money payments.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	None

STATE	Kansas
PROGRAM NAME	General Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	No requirements. Employment is regarded as a resource if employment opportunity exists.
STANDARD OF ASSISTANCE	
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	With the exception of persons in care, assistance is limited to 80% of the deficit. Persons in care receive 100% of the deficit.
FINANCING	State meets 52% of the cost of general assistance and the county 48%. When county funds prove insufficient, State may grant additional funds.
MAINTENANCE	Assistance may be given either in cash or vendor payments.
MEDICAL CARE	Provided through vendor payments under the State's medical program without federal reimbursement.
BURIAL	From State and county welfare funds.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	Medical eye care fund available for the restoration of sight and the prevention of blindness.
STATE	Maryland
PROGRAM NAME	General Public Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	Registration for USES; current registration with USES required for GPA.E.
STANDARD OF ASSISTANCE	Same as for the federally aided public assistance programs.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	None
FINANCING	Assistance costs: 50% State and 50% local funds. Administration costs: 80% State and 20% local funds.
MAINTENANCE	Money payment to recipients.
MEDICAL	Not provided from general assistance funds.
BURIAL	Local funds only.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	Emergency funds for Maryland veterans and their dependents.

STATE	Montana
PROGRAM NAME	General Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	No requirement.
STANDARDS OF ASSISTANCE	Similar to those for the programs of federally aided public assistance but less comprehensive in the items covered in the budget and in the amounts allowed for these items.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	None specified.
FINANCING	Combination of State and local funds for both assistance and administrative costs. The State makes grant-in-aid to counties which have ex- hausted local funds.
MAINTENANCE	Money payment to recipients; disbursing orders frequently used.
MEDICAL CARE	Vendor payments, after benefits of Medical Assistance program are used.
BURIAL	Provided from county "poor funds".
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	Aid to silicotics.
STATE	New York
PROGRAM NAME	Home Relief
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	Bi-weekly registration with State Employment Service required.
STANDARDS OF ASSISTANCE	Same as those for the federally aided public programs.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	No maximum on amount of assistance or limitation on duration of assistance.
FINANCING	Combination of State and local funds for assistance and administrative costs.
MAINTENANCE	Money payment to recipients, with restricted payments used where there is demonstrated inability to handle cash. Weekly, bi-weekly, or semi-monthly allowances.
MEDICAL CARE	
BURIAL	Costs are paid from Social Services funds with State reimbursing up to \$250.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	State and local Social Services agencies meet jointly the costs of care of transients and local homeless persons.

STATE	Ohio
PROGRAM NAME	General Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	Current registration with State Employment Service required. Able bodied unemployed persons are required to accept work relief eligible for supplementation of subsistence and also for medical care for himself and family.
STANDARDS OF ASSISTANCE	About the same as those for the AFDC program, but less comprehensive in items covered in the budget and in the amounts allowed for the items.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	No limitation amount for duration specified, at discretion of local officials
FINANCING	Combination of State and local funds for assistance and administration costs; with county share, up to a maximum of 25%, based on a formula which takes into account the percentage of low income families in the county and the per capita tax duplicate in the county. State funds make up balance.
MAINTENANCE	Both money payment to recipient and vendor payments, the latter particularly for emergency food orders or budget items other than food.
MEDICAL CARE	Largely by vendor payments to suppliers.
BURIAL	Local funds only.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	None

STATE	Oregon
PROGRAM NAME	General Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYABILITY	Employable persons must register with USES. Assistance may be provided to a fully employed person who needs supplementation, for maintenance and medical care.
STANDARDS OF ASSISTANCE	Amount of assistance: 70% of full July 1969 standard for OAA, AB, and AFDC.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	No limitations on amount of or duration of assistance except as result from limited appropriations for general assistance.
FINANCING	State funds only for assistance and administrative costs.
MAINTENANCE	Money payment to recipient and vendor or payment to meet needs for food, fuel, utilities, or rent.
MEDICAL CARE	Vendor payments.
BURIAL	General Assistance funds.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	Motor vehicle accident fund meets costs of medical care for indigent persons incurred as result of vehicular accidents in Oregon.
STATE	Wyoming
PROGRAM NAME	General Assistance
EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYABILITY	No requirement. Employment is regarded as a resource if employment opportunity exists.
STANDARDS OF ASSISTANCE	Similar to standards of assistance for AFDC and APTD, but less comprehensive in items covered in the budget.
PAYMENT LIMITATIONS	Similar to maximums in the public assistance programs; temporary assistance is given for a limited period of time, generally not to exceed 30 days.
FINANCING	State and local funds for assistance and administrative costs. Counties levy 2 1/2 mills for these purposes and are assisted from State funds, if not able to raise sufficient funds within this levy.
MAINTENANCE	Money payments or vendor payments.
MEDICAL CARE	Vendor payments.
BURIAL	Paid by County Department of Public Welfare from local General Welfare funds in accordance with a local plan of payment.
AID TO SPECIAL GROUPS	None

APPENDIX VII - METHODOLOGY FOR CONDUCTING

A COST STUDY OF A UNIFORM

STATEWIDE GENERAL RELIEF

PROGRAM

- STEP I For each county and city in Virginia, obtain the most current statistics available for the following information:
1. # families whose income is less than the poverty level, and
  2. # persons in families whose income is less than the poverty level.
- STEP II From the February, March, or April general relief statistics (choose the month for which each county or city has its largest number of total general relief cases), determine the number of general relief maintenance and medical cases for each county and city in Virginia.
- STEP III For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, determine total general relief cases for the burial and transient categories for each county and city in Virginia.
- STEP IV Determine for each county and city the percentage of its families whose incomes are below the poverty level who are receiving financial assistance from the general relief program for each program category (monthly percentage for maintenance and medical assistance, yearly percentage for transient and burial assistance).
- STEP V For the medical and burial categories, determine the one local department of public welfare which provides general relief assistance in that category to the largest percentage of its poverty level families. For the GR maintenance and transient categories, determine the most appropriate percentages of poverty level families which can be expected to receive maintenance and transient assistance.
- STEP VI Determine potential statewide general relief cases per year for the maintenance and medical categories by the following calculation:

$$\begin{array}{r} \# \text{ poverty level} \\ \text{families in the} \\ \text{State} \end{array} \quad \times \quad \begin{array}{r} \% \text{ poverty level families} \\ \text{receiving GR by each of} \\ \text{the categories in the} \\ \text{respective localities} \\ \text{chosen in STEP V} \end{array} \quad \times \quad 12$$



STEP VII Determine potential statewide general relief cases per year for the burial and transient categories by the following calculation:

# poverty level families (transient) or persons (burial) in the State	X	% poverty level families/ persons receiving GR by each of the categories in the respective localities chosen in STEP V
---	---	--

STEP VIII Determine potential general relief costs for a uniform statewide program by multiplying total statewide projected cases per category times a standard cost per case per category to be determined in the following manner:

1. Maintenance - Mean AFDC grant less 35 percent  
(See Section III),
2. Medical - Current mean cost per case plus a 10 percent  
inflation factor,
3. Transient - Current mean cost per case,
4. Burial - Current mean cost per case plus a 10 percent  
inflation factor.

STEP IX Determine the State and local cost of the potential uniform statewide general relief program utilizing the current share breakdown (62.5% State, 37.5% local).

STEP X Determine the State and local share of the potential uniform statewide general relief program if the ratio were 75%/25% respectively.

APPENDIX VIII - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT GENERAL  
RELIEF COST STUDY DATA ELEMENTS  
FOR LOCAL DEPARTMENTS OF PUBLIC  
WELFARE IN VIRGINIA

Following is a table indicating all significant data elements developed for each local department of public welfare in the course of the cost study of a uniform statewide general relief program. For purposes of simplification, each row in the table has a letter designation, each of which is specifically explained by the following descriptions:

- A. the number of persons below the poverty level according to the 1970 U.S. Census.
- B. the number of families below the poverty level according to the 1970 U.S. Census.
- C. the percentage population change for each locality from 1969 to 1974 according to population projections by the Tayloe Murphy Institute.
- D. projected number of persons below the poverty level for 1974.
- E. projected number of families below the poverty level for 1974.
- F. peak monthly GR maintenance caseload achieved during February, March, or April, 1975.
- G. peak monthly GR medical caseload achieved during February, March, or April, 1975.
- H. total GR burial caseload for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.
- I. total GR transient caseload for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.
- J. percentage of 1974 families below the poverty level receiving GR maintenance payments during the peak month.
- K. percentage of 1974 families below the poverty level receiving GR medical payments during the peak month.
- L. percentage of 1974 persons below the poverty level receiving GR burial payments during the 1974-75 fiscal year.
- M. percentage of 1974 families below the poverty level receiving GR transient payments during the 1974-75 fiscal year.

- N. projected yearly GR maintenance caseload given a uniform statewide program.
- O. projected yearly GR medical caseload given a uniform statewide program.
- P. projected yearly GR burial caseload given a uniform statewide program.
- Q. projected yearly GR transient caseload given a uniform statewide program.
- R. projected yearly total GR maintenance payments given a uniform statewide program.
- S. projected yearly total GR medical payments given a uniform statewide program.
- T. projected yearly total GR burial payments given a uniform statewide program.
- U. projected yearly total GR transient payments given a uniform statewide program.
- V. total projected yearly general relief payments given a uniform statewide program.

C O U N T I E S

	<u>Accomack</u>	<u>Albemarle</u>	<u>Alleghany</u>	<u>Amelia</u>	<u>Amherst</u>	<u>Appomattox</u>
A	8,765	5,902	2,329	2,153	3,685	2,112
B	1,898	1,153	490	469	678	445
C	+2.40	+18.85	-.49	+5.37	+3.56	+7.32
D	8,975	7,014	2,318	2,268	3,816	2,266
E	1,944	1,370	488	494	702	477
F	82	89	10	2	10	5
G	17	3	7	3	0	6
H	4	3	2	0	1	2
I	17	0	0	1	2	1
J	4.21%	6.49%	2.04%	0.40%	1.42%	1.04%
K	0.87%	0.21%	1.43%	0.60%	0.00%	1.25%
L	0.04%	0.04%	0.08%	0.00%	0.02%	0.08%
M	0.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.28%	0.20%
N	3,499	2,466	878	889	1,264	859
O	2,047	1,443	514	510	739	502
P	55	43	14	14	23	14
Q	46	32	12	12	17	11
R	\$429,047	\$302,381	\$107,660	\$109,009	\$154,992	\$105,331
S	\$92,524	\$65,224	\$23,233	\$23,052	\$33,403	\$22,690
T	\$16,067	\$12,561	\$4,090	\$4,090	\$6,719	\$4,090
U	\$1,443	\$1,004	\$376	\$376	\$533	\$345
V	\$539,081	\$381,170	\$135,359	\$136,527	\$195,647	\$132,456
	<u>Arlington</u>	<u>Augusta</u>	<u>Bath</u>	<u>Bedford</u>	<u>Bland</u>	<u>Botetourt</u>
A	9,619	6,394	1,578	5,847	1,059	2,419
B	1,687	1,390	324	1,218	273	536
C	-12.10	+10.81	-5.62	+8.87	-2.27	+10.48
D	8,456	7,085	1,490	6,365	1,035	2,672
E	1,483	1,540	306	1,326	267	592
	237	43	9	17	9	9
G	130	1	0	5	1	1
H	4	5	1	1	2	1
I	0	11	0	4	0	0
J	15.98%	2.79%	2.94%	1.28%	3.37%	1.52%
	8.76%	0.06%	0.00%	0.37%	0.37%	0.16%
L	0.04%	0.07%	0.06%	0.01%	0.19%	0.03%
M	0.00%	0.71%	0.00%	0.30%	0.00%	0.00%
N	2,669	2,772	551	2,387	481	1,066
O	1,562	1,622	322	1,397	281	623
P	52	43	9	39	6	16
Q	35	36	7	31	6	14
R	\$327,273	\$339,903	\$67,564	\$292,694	\$58,980	\$130,713
S	\$70,602	\$73,314	\$14,554	\$63,144	\$12,701	\$28,160
T	\$15,190	\$12,561	\$2,629	\$11,393	\$1,753	\$4,674
U	\$1,098	\$1,129	\$220	\$972	\$188	\$439
V	\$414,163	\$426,907	\$84,967	\$368,203	\$73,622	\$163,985

C O U N T I E S

	<u>Brunswick</u>	<u>Buchanan</u>	<u>Buckingham</u>	<u>Campbell</u>	<u>Caroline</u>	<u>Carroll</u>
A	5,204	9,679	3,506	5,322	3,233	5,294
B	958	2,116	722	1,110	642	1,316
C	-2.30	+4.77	+1.92	+16.35	+9.87	+1.33
D	5,085	10,140	3,573	6,192	3,552	5,364
E	936	2,216	735	1,291	705	1,333
F	0	5	4	15	31	57
G	0	23	0	1	1	12
H	0	7	0	0	1	0
I	0	7	0	1	3	6
J	0.00%	0.22%	0.54%	1.16%	4.39%	4.29%
K	0.00%	1.03%	0.00%	1.16%	0.14%	0.90%
L	0.00%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%
M	0.00%	0.31%	0.00%	0.07%	0.42%	0.45%
N	1,685	3,989	1,323	2,324	1,269	2,399
O	986	2,334	774	1,360	743	1,404
P	31	62	22	38	22	33
Q	22	53	17	31	17	32
R	\$206,615	\$489,131	\$162,226	\$284,969	\$155,605	\$294,165
S	\$44,567	\$105,496	\$34,984	\$61,472	\$33,584	\$63,461
T	\$9,056	\$18,112	\$6,427	\$11,101	\$6,427	\$9,640
U	\$690	\$1,663	\$533	\$972	\$533	\$1,004
V	\$260,928	\$614,402	\$204,170	\$358,514	\$196,149	\$368,270
	<u>Charles City</u>	<u>Charlotte</u>	<u>Chesterfield</u>	<u>Clarke</u>	<u>Craig</u>	<u>Culpeper</u>
A	2,195	3,386	5,551	1,662	721	3,731
B	386	672	1,144	328	172	752
C	+5.55	-2.15	+26.81	+7.38	+4.99	+8.68
D	2,316	3,314	7,039	1,784	756	4,054
E	407	658	1,450	352	180	817
F	2	2	10	3		15
G	0	1	0	0		4
H	1	0	0	3	0	1
I	0	0	0	0	0	2
J	0.49%	0.30%	0.68%	0.85%	0.00%	1.83%
K	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.48%
L	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%	0.02%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.24%
N	733	1,184	2,610	634	324	1,471
O	429	693	1,527	371	190	860
P	14	20	43	11	5	25
Q	10	16	34	8	4	19
R	\$89,880	\$145,182	\$320,038	\$77,513	\$39,729	\$180,374
	\$19,391	\$31,324	\$69,020	\$16,769	\$8,588	\$38,872
T	\$4,090	\$5,842	\$12,561	\$3,213	\$1,461	\$7,303
U	\$314	\$502	\$1,067	\$251	\$125	\$596
V	\$113,675	\$182,850	\$402,686	\$97,746	\$49,903	\$227,145

C O U N T I E S

	<u>Cumberland</u>	<u>Dickenson</u>	<u>Dinwiddie</u>	<u>Essex</u>	<u>Fairfax</u>	<u>Fauquier</u>
A	2,343	6,144	3,859	1,731	19,454	5,132
B	477	1,397	761	343	4,171	968
C	+11.67	+9.47	-14.56	+11.28	+13.49	+6.54
D	2,616	6,725	3,298	1,926	22,078	5,467
E	532	1,529	651	381	4,733	1,031
F	4	1	6	2	466	19
G	0	3	1	1	138	3
H	0	3	2	0	0	1
I	1	1	1	5	0	0
J	0.75%	0.06%	0.92%	0.52%	9.64%	1.84%
K	0.00%	0.06%	0.15%	0.52%	2.91%	0.29%
L	0.00%	0.04%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.01%
M	0.18%	0.06%	0.15%	1.31%	0.00%	0.00%
N	958	2,752	1,172	686	8,519	1,856
O	560	1,610	686	401	4,985	1,086
P	16	41	20	12	135	33
Q	13	36	15	9	112	24
R	\$117,470	\$337,450	\$143,711	\$84,117	\$1,044,600	\$227,583
S	\$25,312	\$72,772	\$31,007	\$18,125	\$225,322	\$49,087
T	\$4,674	\$11,977	\$5,842	\$3,506	\$29,438	\$9,640
U	\$408	\$1,129	4471	\$282	\$3,513	\$753
V	\$147,864	\$423,328	\$181,031	\$106,030	\$1,312,873	\$287,063
	<u>Floyd</u>	<u>Fluvanna</u>	<u>Franklin</u>	<u>Frederick</u>	<u>Giles</u>	<u>Gloucester</u>
A	1,973	2,413	5,224	3,818	3,177	2,698
B	549	513	1,129	852	748	568
C	+2.30	+8.91	+6.17	-6.21	-2.63	+18.79
D	2,018	2,627	5,546	3,581	3,094	3,204
E	561	558	1,198	800	729	674
F	3	10	4	16	25	24
G	1	0	1	3	0	6
H	1	1	2	0	6	0
I	0	2	0	2	2	0
J	0.53%	1.79%	0.33%	2.00%	3.42%	3.56%
K	0.17%	0.00%	0.08%	0.37%	0.00%	0.89%
L	0.04%	0.03%	0.03%	0.00%	0.19%	0.00%
M	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	0.25%	0.27%	0.00%
N	1,010	1,004	2,156	1,440	1,312	1,213
O	591	588	1,262	843	768	710
P	12	16	34	22	19	20
Q	13	13	28	19	17	16
R	\$123,846	\$123,110	\$264,369	\$176,572	\$160,877	\$148,738
S	\$26,713	\$26,577	\$57,042	\$38,104	\$34,714	\$32,092
T	\$3,506	\$4,674	\$9,932	\$6,427	\$5,550	\$5,843
U	\$408	\$408	\$878	\$596	\$533	\$502
V	\$154,473	\$154,769	\$332,221	\$221,699	\$201,674	\$187,175

C O U N T I E S

	<u>Goochland</u>	<u>Grayson</u>	<u>Greene</u>	<u>Greensville</u>	<u>Halifax</u>	<u>Hanover</u>
A	2,429	3,355	1,257	3,392	11,058	3,645
B	424	851	286	659	2,268	787
C	+1.30	-.25	+10.52	-1.08	-1.58	+21.40
D	2,460	3,347	1,389	3,356	10,884	4,425
E	429	849	316	652	2,233	955
F	8	12	6	2	24	15
G	0	2	0	6	1	0
H	0	1	0	0	0	0
I	0	11	2	0	1	1
J	1.86%	1.41%	1.89%	0.30%	1.07%	1.57%
K	0.00%	0.23%	0.00%	0.92%	0.00%	0.00%
L	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
M	0.00%	1.29%	0.63%	0.00%	0.04%	0.10%
N	772	1,528	569	1,174	4,019	1,719
O	452	894	333	687	2,352	1,006
P	15	20	8	20	66	27
Q	10	20	7	15	53	23
R	\$94,663	\$186,363	\$69,771	\$143,955	\$492,809	\$210,783
S	\$20,430	\$40,409	\$15,052	\$31,052	\$106,310	\$45,471
T	\$4,382	\$5,843	\$2,337	\$5,843	\$19,280	\$7,888
U	\$314	\$627	\$220	\$471	\$1,663	\$722
V	\$119,789	\$234,242	\$87,380	\$181,321	\$620,062	\$264,864
	<u>Henrico</u>	<u>Henry</u>	<u>Highland</u>	<u>Isle of Wight</u>	<u>James City</u>	<u>King George</u>
A	8,441	6,092	597	4,769	2,198	1,033
B	1,708	.,276	151	879	426	236
C	+7.67	+7.07	-1.15	+5.55	+8.11	+1.99
D	9,088	6,522	591	5,033	2,376	1,053
E	1,839	1,366	150	927	460	240
F	20	30	1	5	21	5
G	1	9	1	5	10	0
H	1	1	1	0	0	2
I	0	0	0	1	1	0
J	1.08%	2.19%	0.66%	0.53%	4.56%	2.08%
K	0.05%	0.65%	0.66%	0.53%	2.17%	0.00%
L	0.01%	0.01%	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.18%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.10%	0.21%	0.00%
N	3,310	2,459	270	1,669	828	432
O	1,937	1,439	158	976	484	253
P	55	40	4	31	14	6
Q	44	32	4	22	11	6
R	\$405,872	\$301,522	\$33,107	\$204,652	\$101,529	\$52,972
S	\$87,552	\$65,043	\$7,142	\$44,115	\$21,877	\$11,436
T	\$16,067	\$11,685	\$1,169	\$9,056	\$4,090	\$1,753
U	\$1,380	\$1,004	\$125	\$690	\$345	\$188
V	\$510,871	\$379,254	\$41,543	\$258,513	\$127,841	\$66,349

C O U N T I E S

	<u>King &amp; Queen</u>	<u>King William</u>	<u>Lancaster</u>	<u>Lee</u>	<u>Loudoun</u>	<u>Louisa</u>
A	1,622	1,619	2,381	9,215	4,331	4,176
B	366	262	533	2,220	873	832
C	+11.95	+5.38	+5.19	+11.71	+23.01	+19.25
D	1,815	1,706	2,504	10,294	5,327	4,979
E	409	276	560	2,479	1,073	992
F	6	1	16	11	37	8
G	0	1	2	1	7	1
H	1	0	0	12	2	5
I	0	0	1	9	4	3
J	1.46%	0.36%	2.85%	0.44%	3.44%	0.80%
K	0.00%	0.36%	0.35%	0.04%	0.65%	0.10%
L	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.11%	0.03%	0.10%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.17%	0.36%	0.37%	0.30%
N	736	497	1,008	4,462	1,931	1,786
O	431	291	590	2,611	1,130	1,045
P	11	10	15	63	32	30
Q	10	7	13	59	25	23
R	\$90,248	\$60,942	\$123,600	\$547,130	\$236,779	\$218,999
S	\$19,481	\$13,153	\$26,668	\$118,017	\$51,076	\$47,234
T	\$3,213	\$2,921	\$4,382	\$18,404	\$9,348	\$8,764
U	\$314	\$220	\$408	\$1,851	\$784	\$722
V	\$113,256	\$77,236	\$155,058	\$685,402	\$297,987	\$275,719

	<u>Lunenburg</u>	<u>Madison</u>	<u>Mathews</u>	<u>Mecklenburg</u>	<u>Middlesex</u>	<u>Montgomery</u>
A	3,772	2,554	1,295	8,968	1,932	5,861
B	716	540	274	1,831	443	1,165
C	+4.39	+12.29	+10.21	+1.27	+3.26	+16.84
D	3,937	2,867	1,427	9,081	1,994	6,847
E	747	606	301	1,854	457	1,361
F	0	4	4	1	4	38
G	0	2	4	0	0	12
H	4	2	0	0	0	10
I	0	0	0	1	0	0
J	0.00%	0.66%	1.32%	0.05%	0.87%	2.79%
K	0.00%	0.33%	0.28%	0.00%	0.00%	0.88%
L	0.10%	0.06%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%
N	1,345	1,091	542	3,337	823	2,450
O	787	638	317	1,953	481	1,433
P	24	17	9	55	12	42
Q	18	14	7	44	11	32
R	\$164,923	\$133,778	\$66,460	\$409,182	\$100,916	\$300,419
S	\$35,572	\$28,838	\$14,328	\$88,276	\$21,741	\$64,772
T	\$7,011	\$4,966	\$2,629	\$16,067	\$3,506	\$12,269
U	\$565	\$439	\$220	\$1,380	\$343	\$1,004
V	\$208,071	\$168,021	\$83,637	\$514,905	\$126,508	\$378,464



C O U N T I E S

	<u>Nelson</u>	<u>New Kent</u>	<u>Northampton</u>	<u>North- umberland</u>	<u>Nottoway</u>	<u>Orange</u>
A	4,041	1,396	5,915	2,718	3,337	3,513
B	845	285	1,140	591	711	689
C	-2.50	+28.30	+4.56	-.42	-2.52	+12.38
D	3,937	1,791	6,184	2,707	3,253	3,947
E	824	365	1,191	589	694	774
F	10	3	42	1	8	16
G	0	0	18	0	8	9
H	1	0	7	0	1	2
I	0	0	7	1	0	5
J	1.21%	0.82%	3.52%	0.16%	1.15%	2.06%
K	0.00%	0.00%	1.51%	0.00%	0.15%	1.16%
L	0.02%	0.00%	0.11%	0.00%	0.03%	0.05%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.58%	0.16%	0.00%	0.64%
N	1,483	657	2,144	1,060	1,249	1,393
O	868	384	1,254	620	731	815
P	24	11	38	17	20	24
Q	20	9	28	14	16	18
R	\$181,845	\$80,561	\$262,897	\$129,977	\$153,152	\$170,810
S	\$39,234	\$17,357	\$56,681	\$28,024	\$33,041	\$36,838
T	\$7,011	\$3,213	\$11,101	\$4,966	\$5,843	\$7,011
U	\$627	\$282	\$878	\$439	\$502	\$565
V	\$228,717	\$101,413	\$331,557	\$163,406	\$192,538	\$215,224
	<u>Page</u>	<u>Patrick</u>	<u>Pittsylvania</u>	<u>Powhatan</u>	<u>Prince Edward</u>	<u>Prince George</u>
A	3,343	3,013	14,679	1,492	3,624	2,296
B	748	740	2,968	290	726	476
C	+9.16	+4.04	+4.27	+33.84	+8.49	-31.25
D	3,649	3,134	15,305	1,996	3,931	1,579
E	816	769	3,094	388	787	804
F	13	21	48	3	14	9
G	4	0	10	0	4	0
H	1	0	3	0	4	0
I	0	0	0	0	3	0
J	1.59%	2.73%	1.55%	0.77%	1.77%	1.11%
K	0.49%	0.00%	0.32%	0.00%	0.50%	0.00%
L	0.02%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.10%	0.00%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.07%	0.00%
N	1,469	1,384	5,569	698	1,417	1,447
O	859	810	3,259	409	829	847
P	22	19	93	12	24	10
Q	19	18	73	9	19	19
R	\$180,129	\$169,706	\$682,871	\$85,589	\$173,753	\$177,431
S	\$38,827	\$36,612	\$147,307	\$18,487	\$37,471	\$38,284
T	\$6,427	\$5,550	\$27,168	\$3,506	\$7,011	\$2,921
U	\$596	\$565	\$2,290	\$282	\$596	\$596
	\$225,979	\$212,433	\$859,636	\$107,864	\$218,831	\$219,232

C O U N T I E S

	<u>Prince William</u>	<u>Pulaski</u>	<u>Rappahannock</u>	<u>Richmond</u>	<u>Roanoke</u>	<u>Rockbridge</u>
A	6,756	4,061	1,621	1,698	4,731	3,814
B	1,461	927	403	353	1,120	710
C	+24.21	+6.89	+5.79	-1.60	+14.05	+3.38
D	8,391	4,340	1,714	1,671	5,395	3,828
E	1,814	990	426	348	1,277	712
F	125	94	7	7	369	16
G	7	11	1	2	56	0
H	3	2	1	0	0	0
I	9	0	10	0	0	0
J	6.89%	9.49%	1.64%	2.01%	2.89%	2.24%
K	0.38%	1.11%	0.23%	0.57%	4.38%	0.00%
L	0.03%	0.04%	0.05%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
M	0.49%	0.00%	2.34%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
N	3,265	1,782	767	626	2,299	1,282
O	1,910	1,043	449	367	1,345	750
P	51	26	10	10	33	23
Q	43	23	10	8	35	17
R	\$400,354	\$218,509	\$94,050	\$76,760	\$281,903	\$157,199
S	\$86,332	\$47,144	\$20,295	\$16,588	\$60,794	\$33,900
T	\$14,899	\$7,595	\$2,921	\$2,291	\$9,640	\$6,719
U	\$1,349	\$722	\$314	\$251	\$1,098	\$533
V	\$502,934	\$273,970	\$117,580	\$96,520	\$535,435	\$198,351
	<u>Rockingham</u>	<u>Russell</u>	<u>Scott</u>	<u>Shenandoah</u>	<u>Smyth</u>	<u>Southampton</u>
A	6,500	6,900	7,274	3,582	5,478	6,236
B	1,337	1,593	1,807	811	1,170	1,180
C	+10.46	+1.50	+1.10	+7.21	+2.40	-.44
D	7,179	7,003	7,281	3,840	5,609	6,209
E	1,476	1,616	1,808	869	1,198	1,175
F	24	14	1	10	51	13
G	6	14	4	1	2	2
H	2	2	3	0	2	0
I	2	4	0	0	0	0
J	1.62%	0.86%	0.05%	1.15%	4.25%	1.10%
K	0.40%	0.86%	0.22%	0.11%	0.16%	0.17%
L	0.02%	0.02%	0.04%	0.00%	0.03%	0.00%
M	0.13%	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
N	2,657	2,909	3,254	1,564	2,156	2,115
O	1,555	1,702	1,904	915	1,262	1,238
P	44	43	44	23	34	38
Q	35	38	43	27	28	28
R	\$325,801	\$356,702	\$399,005	\$191,778	\$264,369	\$259,341
S	\$70,286	\$76,930	\$86,061	\$41,358	\$57,042	\$55,958
T	\$12,854	\$12,562	\$12,854	\$6,719	\$9,932	\$11,101
U	\$1,098	\$1,192	\$1,349	\$847	\$878	\$878
V	\$410,039	\$447,386	\$499,269	\$240,702	\$332,221	\$337,278

C O U N T I E S

	<u>Spotsylvania</u>	<u>Stafford</u>	<u>Surry</u>	<u>Sussex</u>	<u>Tazewell</u>	<u>Warren</u>
A	2,783	2,696	1,623	3,597	9,994	2,012
B	574	598	264	679	2,250	446
C	+27.25	+19.58	-4.79	-1.43	+10.76	+17.64
D	3,541	3,223	1,546	3,546	11,069	2,366
E	730	715	252	670	2,492	524
F	8	7	12	1	45	5
G	0	1	0	0	8	0
H	6	1	0	3	5	1
I	1	2	0	1	14	0
J	1.09%	0.97%	4.76%	0.14%	1.80%	0.95%
K	0.00%	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%	0.32%	0.00%
L	0.16%	0.03%	0.00%	0.08%	0.04%	0.04%
M	0.13%	0.27%	0.00%	0.14%	0.56%	0.00%
N	1,314	1,287	454	1,206	4,486	943
O	769	753	265	706	2,625	552
P	22	20	9	22	68	14
Q	17	17	6	16	59	12
R	\$161,123	\$157,812	\$55,669	\$147,880	\$550,073	\$115,631
S	\$34,759	\$34,036	\$11,978	\$31,911	\$118,650	\$24,950
T	\$6,427	\$5,843	\$2,629	\$6,427	\$19,865	\$4,090
U	\$533	\$533	\$188	\$502	\$1,851	\$376
V	\$202,842	\$198,224	\$70,464	\$186,720	\$690,439	\$145,047

	<u>Washington</u>	<u>Westmoreland</u>	<u>Wise</u>	<u>Wythe</u>	<u>York</u>
A	9,112	4,743	11,175	3,871	3,088
B	2,128	922	2,512	867	662
C	-3.51	+8.71	+9.33	+6.15	+13.24
D	8,793	5,156	12,217	4,109	3,496
E	2,054	1,002	2,746	920	749
F	23	12	0	16	19
G	5	0	0	2	1
H	3	4	2	2	0
I	1	1	0	12	0
J	1.11%	1.19%	0.00%	1.73%	2.53%
K	0.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	0.13%
L	0.03%	0.07%	0.01%	0.04%	0.00%
M	0.04%	0.09%	0.00%	1.30%	0.00%
N	3,697	1,804	4,943	1,656	1,348
O	2,163	1,055	2,892	969	789
P	54	31	75	25	21
Q	49	24	65	22	18
R	\$453,326	\$221,206	\$606,111	\$203,059	\$165,292
S	\$97,768	\$47,686	\$130,718	\$43,799	\$35,663
T	15,775	\$9,056	\$21,910	\$7,303	\$6,135
U	\$1,537	\$753	\$2,039	\$690	\$565
V	\$568,406	\$278,701	\$760,778	\$254,851	\$207,655

C I T I E S

	<u>Alexandria</u>	<u>Bristol</u>	<u>Buena Vista</u>	<u>Charlottes- ville</u>	<u>Chesapeake</u>	<u>Clifton Forge</u>
A	9,328	3,416	718	6,095	12,173	877
B	1,836	743	183	867	2,457	162
C	-2.37	+33.27	+5.84	+4.42	+12.53	-9.11
D	9,107	4,553	760	6,364	13,698	797
E	1,792	990	194	905	2,765	147
F	201	15	8	82	146	1
G	14	6	0	46	15	2
H	6	4	0	0	19	2
I	0	6	0	12	3	0
J	11.21%	1.51%	4.12%	9.06%	5.28%	0.68%
K	0.78%	0.60%	0.00%	5.08%	0.54%	1.36%
L	0.06%	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%	0.25%
M	0.00%	0.60%	0.00%	1.32%	0.10%	0.00%
N	3,226	1,782	349	1,629	4,977	265
O	1,887	1,043	204	953	2,913	155
P	56	28	5	39	84	5
Q	42	23	5	21	66	3
R	\$395,707	\$218,508	\$42,794	\$199,747	\$610,279	\$32,494
S	\$85,292	\$47,144	\$9,221	\$43,076	\$131,668	\$7,006
T	\$16,359	\$8,180	\$1,461	\$11,393	\$24,539	\$1,461
U	\$1,318	\$722	\$157	\$659	\$2,070	\$94
V	\$498,676	\$274,554	\$53,633	\$524,875	\$768,556	\$41,055
	<u>Colonial Heights</u>	<u>Covington</u>	<u>Danville</u>	<u>Emporia</u>	<u>Falls Church</u>	<u>Franklin</u>
A	836	1,531	7,206	1,346	518	1,812
B	178	320	1,456	268	92	330
C	+11.94	-6.56	+1.31	+0.00	+11.40	+3.20
D	935	1,431	7,300	1,346	577	1,869
E	199	300	1,475	268	102	340
F	1	16	86	3	8	10
G	0	3	15	2	5	2
H	0	0	2	0	0	0
I	0	0	35	2	0	0
J	0.50%	5.33%	5.83%	1.11%	7.84%	2.94%
K	0.00%	1.00%	1.01%	0.74%	4.90%	0.58%
L	0.00%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
M	0.00%	0.00%	2.37%	0.74%	0.00%	0.00%
N	358	540	2,655	482	184	612
O	210	316	1,553	282	107	358
P	6	9	45	8	4	11
Q	5	7	35	6	2	8
R	\$43,897	\$66,214	\$325,556	\$59,102	\$22,562	\$75,043
S	\$9,492	\$14,283	\$70,196	\$12,746	\$4,836	\$16,182
T	\$1,753	\$2,629	\$13,146	\$2,337	\$1,169	\$3,213
U	\$157	\$220	\$1,098	\$188	\$62	\$251
V	\$55,299	\$83,346	\$409,996	\$74,373	\$28,629	\$94,689

C I T I E S

	<u>Fredericks- burg</u>	<u>Galax</u>	<u>Hampton</u>	<u>Harrisonburg</u>	<u>Hopewell</u>	<u>Lexington</u>
A	1,511	994	12,491	2,044	2,500	1,305
B	315	224	2,619	396	563	184
C	+12.11	+ .35	+4.99	+17.08	-1.15	-3.91
D	1,693	997	13,114	2,393	2,472	1,254
E	353	224	2,749	463	557	177
F	11	9	255	25	13	4
G	12	1	64	1	4	0
H	3	1	0	1	2	0
I	43	3	0	0	0	1
J	3.11%	4.01%	9.27%	5.39%	2.33%	2.25%
K	3.39%	0.44%	2.32%	0.21%	0.71%	0.00%
L	0.17%	0.10%	0.00%	0.04%	0.08%	0.00%
M	12.18%	1.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.56%
N	635	403	4,948	833	1,003	319
O	372	236	2,895	488	587	186
P	10	6	80	15	15	8
Q	8	5	65	11	13	4
R	\$77,863	\$49,416	\$606,723	\$102,142	\$122,987	\$39,115
S	\$16,184	\$10,667	\$130,854	\$22,058	\$26,532	\$8,407
T	\$2,921	\$1,753	\$23,370	\$4,382	\$4,382	\$2,337
U	\$251	\$157	\$2,039	\$345	\$408	\$125
V	\$97,849	\$61,993	\$762,986	\$128,927	\$154,309	\$49,984
	<u>Lynchburg</u>	<u>Martinsville</u>	<u>Newport News</u>	<u>Norfolk</u>	<u>Norton</u>	<u>Petersburg</u>
A	7,812	2,431	19,034	53,474	991	8,151
B	1,548	465	3,978	11,077	204	1,498
C	-.89	-3.83	-1.30	-6.09	+ .67	+18.55
D	7,743	2,338	18,787	50,218	997	9,663
E	1,535	448	3,927	10,403	205	1,775
F	40	44	441	1,812	1	1
G	0	16	22	0	0	0
H	5	0	5	0	0	0
I	0	1	0	38	4	0
J	2.60%	9.82%	11.22%	17.41%	0.48%	0.05%
K	0.00%	3.57%	0.56%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
L	0.06%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
M	0.00%	0.22%	0.00%	0.36%	1.95%	0.00%
N	2,763	806	7,069	18,725	369	3,195
O	1,617	472	4,136	10,956	216	1,869
P	47	14	115	306	6	59
Q	36	11	93	247	5	42
R	\$338,779	\$98,831	\$866,800	\$2,296,060	\$45,246	\$391,770
S	\$73,088	\$21,334	\$186,947	\$495,211	\$9,763	\$84,479
T	\$13,730	\$4,090	\$33,595	\$89,391	\$1,753	\$17,236
U	\$1,129	\$345	\$2,917	\$7,748	\$157	\$1,318
V	\$426,726	\$124,600	\$1,090,259	\$2,888,410	\$56,919	\$494,803

C I T I E S

	<u>Portsmouth</u>	<u>Radford</u>	<u>Richmond</u>	<u>Roanoke</u>	<u>Staunton</u>	<u>Suffolk</u>
A	20,713	965	43,355	15,008	2,128	11,444
B	4,234	188	8,130	3,019	467	2,074
C	-1.32	-.83	-6.55	-3.49	-7.77	+6.17
D	20,440	957	40,516	14,485	1,963	12,150
E	4,179	187	7,598	2,914	431	2,201
F	267	14	2,621	415	18	32
G	0	8	0	0	0	3
H	6	3	0	0	12	0
I	0	0	0	0	29	0
J	6.38%	7.48%	34.53%	14.24%	4.17%	1.45%
	0.00%	4.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.13%
L	0.02%	0.31%	0.00%	0.00%	0.61%	0.00%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.72%	0.00%
N	7,522	337	13,676	5,245	776	3,962
O	4,401	197	8,002	3,069	454	2,318
P	125	6	247	88	12	74
Q	99	4	180	69	10	52
R	\$922,347	\$41,323	\$1,676,951	\$643,141	\$95,153	\$485,820
S	\$198,925	\$8,904	\$361,690	\$138,718	\$20,521	\$104,773
T	\$36,516	\$1,753	\$72,156	\$25,707	\$3,506	\$21,618
U	\$3,106	\$125	\$5,647	\$2,165	\$314	\$1,631
V	\$1,160,894	\$52,105	\$2,116,444	\$809,731	\$119,494	\$613,842

	<u>Virginia Beach</u>	<u>Waynesboro</u>	<u>Williamsburg</u>	<u>Winchester</u>
A	16,837	1,174	892	2,119
B	3,719	258	132	451
C	+21.55	-.64	+11.37	+31.13
D	20,465	1,167	993	2,778
E	4,520	257	147	591
F	321	67	17	41
G	10	0	1	6
H	8	0	1	5
I	0	0	0	14
J	7.10%	26.07%	11.56%	6.93%
K	0.22%	0.00%	0.68%	1.01%
L	0.03%	0.00%	0.10%	0.17%
M	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.36%
N	8,136	463	265	1,064
O	4,760	271	155	622
P	125	7	6	17
Q	107	6	3	14
R	\$997,636	\$56,773	\$32,494	\$130,467
S	\$215,152	\$12,249	\$7,006	\$28,114
T	\$36,156	\$2,045	\$1,753	\$4,966
U	\$3,357	\$188	\$94	\$439
V	\$1,252,301	\$71,255	\$44,905	\$163,986

T O T A L S

	Total Counties	Total Cities	State Totals
A			
B			
C			
D	445,346	276,320	721,666
E	94,635	55,318	149,953
F			
G			
H			
I			
J			
K			
L			
M			
N	170,345	99,573	269,918
O	99,664	58,260	157,924
P	2,714	1,688	4,402
Q	2,249	1,307	3,556
R	\$20,887,465	\$12,209,740	\$33,097,205
S	\$4,504,810	\$2,633,348	\$7,138,158
T	\$792,837	\$492,756	\$1,285,593
U	\$70,549	\$41,001	\$111,550
V	\$26,255,660	\$ 15,380,403	\$41,636,063

APPENDIX IX - COST PROJECTIONS FOR A UNIFORM  
STATEWIDE GENERAL RELIEF PROGRAM  
WITH VARYING PERCENTAGES OF NEED  
AND STATE/LOCAL SHARES

The cost projections for a uniform statewide general relief program may vary considerably depending upon the application of two factors - percentage of need and State/local share.

The current general relief program has no fixed percentage of need which the maintenance category must meet. Each locality may set its own standard. The higher the percentage of need met by general relief maintenance payments, the greater the cost of the program. The current ADC program in Virginia meets 90% of need, and it is this percentage which is recommended by the task force due to its judgement that general relief payments should equal that of the ADC program.

The breakdown of costs for the general relief program is currently 62.5% State and 37.5% local funding. While the task force recommends instead a State share of 75% and a local share of 25%, the State and local costs would vary considerably depending upon which share is adopted.

Considering the substantial impact of these two variables, following is a table which indicates State, local, and total costs for general relief program depending upon which standards are applicable:

State/Local Share	Percentage of Need				
	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
State (62.5%)	\$19,125,685	\$21,423,362	\$23,722,726	\$26,020,403	\$28,319,767
Local (37.5%)	11,475,412	12,854,018	14,233,637	15,612,243	16,991,861
Total (100%)	\$30,601,097	\$34,277,380	\$37,956,363	\$41,632,646	\$45,311,628
State (70%)	\$21,420,767	\$23,994,166	\$26,569,454	\$29,142,852	\$31,718,139
Local (30%)	9,180,330	10,283,214	11,386,909	12,489,794	13,593,489
Total (100%)	\$30,601,097	\$34,277,380	\$37,956,363	\$41,632,646	\$45,311,628
State (75%)	\$22,950,822	\$25,708,035	\$28,467,272	\$31,224,484	\$33,983,721
Local (25%)	7,650,275	8,569,345	9,489,091	10,408,162	11,327,907
Total (100%)	\$30,601,097	\$34,277,380	\$37,956,363	\$41,632,646	\$45,311,628
State (80%)	\$24,480,877	\$27,421,904	\$30,365,090	\$33,306,116	\$36,249,302
Local (20%)	6,120,220	6,855,476	7,591,273	8,326,530	9,062,326
Total (100%)	\$30,601,097	\$34,277,380	\$37,956,363	\$41,632,646	\$45,311,628
State (90%)	\$27,540,987	\$30,849,642	\$34,160,726	\$37,469,381	\$40,780,465
Local (10%)	3,060,110	3,427,738	3,795,637	4,163,265	4,531,163
Total (100%)	\$30,601,097	\$34,277,380	\$37,956,363	\$41,632,646	\$45,311,628

The task force recommends that GR-maintenance payments meet the ADC standard, which is 90% of need and that the State/local share be 75% and 25% respectively.



APPENDIX X - MINORITY REPORT SUBMITTED BY JUDITH L. CRITTENDEN  
OF THE VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

As a representative of the Virginia Municipal League, I cannot conscientiously concur with all the opinions and recommendations set forth by the General Relief task force as presented in the draft copy of the Report of the Department of Welfare to the Governor and the General Assembly pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 213.

As indicated in the results of the cost study, "if the general relief program were made uniform statewide, the costs to both the State and local jurisdictions would increase dramatically. It is the opinion of the task force that the increased costs of the GR program would create difficult hardships on both the State local governing bodies, but that it is essential for the well-being of thousands of Virginians that such hardships be endured."

Inherent in the above statement and opinion are two important issues with which the League must contend as representatives of local governments.

For one, municipalities are presently faced with complex financial difficulties caused in large part by a fiscal imbalance in the intergovernmental system which limits the financial resources available to meet the expenditure demand necessary to provide various services expected by the public.

With respect to general relief, the financial burden for the administration of a uniform statewide program will again fall disproportionately heavy on the side of local government.

The VML recognizes the merits of a uniform, statewide, general relief program which in effect would provide program uniformity for all GR clients in localities throughout the State. However, we in the League are more critically cognizant of the reality that local governments are in no position to bear the additional costs of implementing such a program from their own, strained, resources.

Therefore, we would go beyond the recommendation of the task force "that given the increased administrative and financial demands being placed upon localities with respect to a uniform, statewide, program, it should be the State's responsibility to increase its financial commitment to the program," and further recommend that, if statewide uniformity in the general relief program is determined to be feasible, then the State should increase its share to absorb the additional cost, to the extent that localities cannot without jeopardizing the viability of municipal government.

Secondly and relatedly, when expanding the responsibilities of local governments, financial or otherwise, it is essential that both Federal and State governments recognize the varying conditions which exist between localities and therewith also expand the authority, flexibility and financial resources available to local governments.

With respect to general relief, the local flexibility in determining the "percentage of need" which is a component of the current GR program is exemplary of a program which was designed to allow localities the necessary flexibility to structure an assistance program to meet their specific needs.

"Local flexibility within a predetermined range" as recommended by the task force, will act to minimize the control of localities over their programs and does not reflect acknowledgement by the State of the varying conditions which exist between localities which must be taken into consideration when determining appropriations and expenses for programs which are jointly funded by the State and local governments.

The VML urges the General Assembly to carefully weight our concern with the additional unfeasible cost to be borne by the localities in implementing a statewide, uniform, general relief program, (if determined feasible), as well as our concern for the loss of local autonomy and flexibility in meeting specific community needs.



