An analysis of welfare caseloads in the 89 urban counties that contain the
100 largest US cities between 1994 and 1999 found that:

- In 1999, ten states, including California, accounted for nearly
  70 percent of the nation's welfare caseloads, up significantly from
  42.5 percent in 1994. The bulk of the national welfare population can
  be found in: California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New
  York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. These ten states
  contained 53 percent of the overall national population in 1999.
  California contained more than a quarter (26.1 percent) of all
  welfare cases in the nation.

- While urban welfare caseloads are declining rapidly, they are shrinking
  more slowly than national caseloads. California and twelve of its
  largest urban counties also all lagged behind the national declines.
  While the nation's welfare caseloads dropped by 51.5 percent between
  1994 and 1999, the state reduced its caseload by only 28.7 percent, to
  640,989 cases. Urban county declines ranged from a low of 12.0
  percent in Kern County (Bakersfield) to a high of 51.1 percent in
  Santa Clara County (San Jose). Los Angeles County, the county with the
  largest caseload in California and the nation, saw its welfare cases
decline by only 23.8 percent, to 235,321 cases in 1999.

- The share of state welfare caseloads stayed stable in the majority of
  urban counties in California. Los Angeles County experienced a slight
  increase in its share of the state caseload, growing from 34.4 percent
  in 1994 to 36.7 percent in 1999. Two counties—San Diego and
  Santa Clara—experienced small decreases in their shares of Califor-
nia's welfare rolls (1.1 percentage points). The remaining nine
  counties' shares did not fluctuate by more than 1.0 percent in that
  five year period.

- Half of California's large urban counties are shouldering a dispro-
  portionate share of their state's welfare cases when compared to their
  share of the state's total population. Six out of the twelve counties sur-
 veyed contained caseloads proportionate to or less than their
  "fair share," relative to their shares of the total state population.

- Racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately represented on the
  California welfare rolls compared to their numbers in the total popu-
  lation. In all four counties where data was available, whites comprise at
  least half of the total population, but in no counties do they represent
  more than 30 percent of the welfare rolls. Blacks are seriously over-rep-
  resented on the welfare rools in all four counties, and Hispanics are
  over-represented in all counties except San Francisco County.
### California Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Welfare Cases 1999</th>
<th>% Decline in Welfare Cases 1994-1999</th>
<th>% of State Caseload 1994</th>
<th>% of State Caseload 1999</th>
<th>% of Total State Population 1999</th>
<th>Fair Share Index¹</th>
<th>City Concentrated Poverty Rate 1990²</th>
<th>% of County Population Central City 1998³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Co. (Fremont, Oakland)</td>
<td>25,584</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Co. (Fresno)</td>
<td>26,040</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern Co. (Bakersfield)</td>
<td>19,191</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Co. (Glendale, Long Beach, Los Angeles)</td>
<td>235,321</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Co. (Anaheim, Huntington Beach, Santa Ana)</td>
<td>23,301</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Co. (Riverside)</td>
<td>25,369</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Co. (Sacramento)</td>
<td>36,550</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernadino Co. (San Bernadino)</td>
<td>43,458</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Co. (San Diego)</td>
<td>40,466</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Co. (San Francisco)</td>
<td>7,710</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Co. (Stockton)</td>
<td>16,363</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Co. (San Jose)</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Fair Share Index: Fair Share Index is a measure of economic segregation in California. It is calculated by dividing the percentage of households in a given county that are poor by the percentage of households in the state that are poor. A higher index indicates greater economic segregation. ² City Concentrated Poverty Rate: City Concentrated Poverty Rate is the percentage of people living in poverty in a county that live in a city. ³ % of County Population Central City: Percentage of the county’s population that lives in the central city.
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Endnotes

i The caseload data reflect the number of welfare cases, not individual recipients. Welfare cases may include a two-parent household with children, a single-parent household with children, or cases where there is no adult in the assistance unit (child-only cases). The data also reflect the number of cases that received cash assistance under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and its successor, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

ii Because welfare programs, both AFDC and TANF, are typically administered at the county-level, the caseload data reflect the county caseloads, not the number of cases within the central cities. For the most part, the use of county-level caseload data may underestimate the central city welfare trends because of the inclusion of welfare cases from suburbs.

iii The Fair Share Index conveys the share of the state welfare population contained in a county, compared with the county’s share of the overall state population. The Fair Share Index is a ratio of two figures: the county’s percentage of the state welfare caseload in 1999 divided by the county’s percentage of the state total population in 1999.

iv Percentages may not add up to 100 percent, since the ethnic category "Hispanic" may overlap with other racial categories.

v The concentrated poverty rate reflects the percentage of the city population that lived in census tracts where 40 percent of the residents were poor in 1990 (the most recent year for which concentrated poverty data is available). Concentrated poverty is associated with the social characteristics and behaviors that define the so-called “hard-to-serve” welfare population: illiteracy, chronic unemployment, poor work history, no high school diploma, low skills, teenage pregnancy and out-of-wedlock births.

vi The percentage of the county population that lives in the central city indicates how “urban” the county and, by extension, the welfare caseload actually is. Counties in the Southwest and West are relatively larger than the Northeastern and Midwestern counties and contain larger suburban populations. We would expect that the welfare population is more urban even in relatively more suburban counties. The indicator serves as a rough estimate of how well the county welfare data captures city-specific welfare trends.