

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COUNTY SOCIAL  
SERVICE REVENUES IN CALIFORNIA**

**April 2006**



## **Table of Contents**

Preface.....	i
Introduction.....	iii
Executive Summary and Key Findings.....	v
Section I	
California Proposition 63.....	1-1
Section II	
State revenues Per Capita for Selected Counties .....	2-1
Section III	
Federal Revenues Per Capita for Selected Counties.....	3-1
Section IV	
State Revenues Per Program Services Recipient for Selected Counties.....	4-1
Section V	
Federal Revenues Per Program Services Recipient for Selected Counties.....	5-1
Section VI	
Total Revenues Per Program Services Recipient Profiles of Los Angeles and Selected Counties .....	6-1
Glossary	



## **Preface**

The report was underwritten by the Center City Association of Los Angeles. The Rose Institute of State and Local Government was commissioned to analyze the revenues from state and federal sources to the County of Los Angeles relevant to providing services to homeless persons.

The support of the Rose Institute, including Dr. Ralph Rossum, Director, Dr. Florence Adams, Associate Director, Mr. David Huntoon, Fellow, and Mrs. Marionette Moore, Executive Assistant, is greatly appreciated. The superb work of various Rose Institute staff members was also of great value in producing this report.

The content of this report is the sole responsibility of the authors.

Steven B. Frates  
Allison C. Strother  
Kaci R. Farrell  
Joshua T. Schneider  
Elizabeth N. Lampe  
Adam C. Sherman  
Meredith B. Stechbart  
Tyler J. White  
Aseem Vyas

Claremont, California  
April 2006

**(This page intentionally left blank)**

## **Introduction**

This report analyzes certain revenue streams from the state and federal government to the County of Los Angeles. The revenue streams examined are primarily those that involve funding for social services of various types. In addition, selected law enforcement related revenue streams from the state and federal government are analyzed.

There are a significant number of social service revenue streams analyzed, and this was the case for several reasons. First, homeless populations are not a separate, discrete group. Many homeless people are recipients of assistance from a broad array of social service programs. This is because an individual homeless person may suffer from a number of social pathologies. An individual homeless person may, for example, receive benefits or assistance from an alcohol abuse program, a drug abuse program, a program designed to provide medical aid to the indigent, or any number of other social service programs. Second, in addressing the problem of homelessness a number of social service agencies will inevitably be involved. Third, because a number of agencies are involved, it is appropriate to give some sense of the overall social service funding streams from the state and federal government. Fourth, analyzing all these social service revenue streams affords a more comprehensive appreciation for the level of funding provided by the state and federal governments to the County of Los Angeles.

This report also analyzes select law enforcement revenue streams because law enforcement agencies are very frequently enmeshed in the issue of homelessness. Contact with law enforcement agencies often precipitates a homeless person's subsequent involvement with various social services providers. Indeed, there is a growing consensus that an integrated approach to homelessness issues should involve close interaction and cooperation between law enforcement, the larger criminal justice system, and social service program providers.

This report is divided into six sections:

- Section 1 analyzes the disposition of revenues from the recently enacted Proposition 63. This proposition taxes the wealthiest Californians to generate revenues for mental health services funding. Much of the intent of Proposition 63 was to specifically address the mental health problems associated with homelessness.
- Section 2 analyzes state revenues for social services on a per capita basis. The largest counties, and selected other counties in California, are examined.
- Section 3 analyzes federal revenues from various federal programs on a per capita basis.
- Section 4 analyzes state social service revenue streams and select law enforcement revenue streams to counties on a per program services recipient basis.
- Section 5 analyzes federal social service revenues and select law enforcement revenue streams to counties on per program services recipient basis.
- Section 6 presents the magnitude of Los Angeles County's shortfall in state funding for program services and law enforcement programs relevant to the issue of homelessness.

**(This page intentionally left blank)**



## **Executive Summary**

1. The county of Los Angeles received substantially less from Proposition 63 proceeds on a per capita basis than most counties in California (see p. 1-7 and 1-8).
2. Of the 15 most populous counties in California, Los Angeles County received less on a per capita basis than five of these counties (see p. 1-11 and 1-12).
3. Los Angeles County's estimated homeless population (88,345 in 2005) is orders of magnitude greater than the homeless population in any other California county (see p. 1-13 and 1-14).
4. Los Angeles County received less from Proposition 63 proceeds per homeless person (\$1,016.39) than all but three of the 15 most populous California counties (see p. 1-15 and 1-16).
5. Los Angeles County received substantially less in state social services related funding than most California counties analyzed (see p. 2-1).
6. Los Angeles County received substantially less in state public assistance related funding than all but two of the counties examined (see p. 2-3).
7. Even after receiving supplemental funds for social services from the state (referred to as "realignment" funds), Los Angeles county still received less on a per capita basis than all but 3 of the California counties analyzed (see p. 2-5).
8. Los Angeles County received less in state health care related funding than four of the California counties examined (and less than half the funding of three of the four counties) (see p. 2-8).
9. Los Angeles County received less in state mental health related services than two of the counties analyzed (see p. 2-11).
10. Los Angeles County received more federal funds for public assistance administration than all but one of the counties analyzed in the state of California (see p. 3-1).
11. Los Angeles County received more federal funds for public assistance programs per capita than all but three of the California counties examined (see p. 3-3).
12. Los Angeles County received more federal funds for health administration than all but one of the California counties analyzed (see p. 3-5).
13. Los Angeles County received more federal funds per capita for the Federal Job Training Partnership Act than all but five of the California counties analyzed; however, three of those counties receive well over five times as much revenue per capita as LA County (see p. 3-7).
14. Los Angeles County received only \$0.17 per capita in Federal Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). Only three counties received less than this amount, and almost every other county received much more than Los Angeles County (see p. 3-9).
15. For many federal law enforcement and drug enforcement related programs, Los Angeles County received nothing in fiscal years 2000-2003 (see p. 3-13 through 3-21).
16. Los Angeles County did much better in obtaining funding for federal programs oriented towards providing senior services (see p. 3-21 through 3-24).

**(This page intentionally left blank)**

17. Despite receiving comparatively little for law enforcement related funds, Los Angeles County does relatively well in terms of total federal funding per capita (see p. 3-29 and 3-30).
18. Los Angeles County received less than five of the 13 counties analyzed for state public assistance administration funding per program services recipient (including homeless social service recipients) (see p. 4-2).
19. Los Angeles County received less than any other county, by a substantial margin, for state public assistance program funding per program services recipient (including homeless social service recipients) (see p. 4-3).
20. Los Angeles County received nothing for state public assistance for medically indigent adults (including homeless social services recipients) (see p. 4-4).
21. Los Angeles County received less than two of the 13 counties analyzed in state aid for health services per program services recipient (including homeless social services recipients); LA County received orders of magnitude less than the top five counties in this category (see p. 4-5).
22. Los Angeles County received less than six of the 13 counties analyzed in federal health grants per program services recipient (including homeless social services recipients) (see p. 5-2).
23. While Los Angeles County received substantially less than the two highest counties analyzed (Santa Clara and San Bernardino) in federal health administration per program services recipient (including homeless social services recipients), it received almost twice as much as the next highest county (Sacramento) (see p. 5-3).

### **Key Findings**

1. Los Angeles County is receiving substantially less than a reasonable “fair share” amount of Proposition 63 funds. If Los Angeles received the median amount of Proposition 63 funding per homeless person, the County would receive more than \$67 million in additional funds per year.
2. If Los Angeles received the median amount of social service and relevant law enforcement funding per program services recipient from the State of California, the county would receive almost \$80 million more per year.

**Section 1**  
**California Proposition 63**


Table 1-1 and Chart 1-1 show estimated statewide tax revenues from Proposition 63. In Fiscal Year 2004-05, the tax proceeds were estimated to be approximately \$254 million. These revenues are estimated to increase sharply to \$683 million in 2005-06.

**Table 1-1**  
**Estimated Statewide Tax Revenues from Proposition 63**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Tax Proceeds</b>
2004-2005	\$254 Million
2005-2006	\$683 Million
2006-2007	\$690 Million

Source: California Secretary of State – Text of Proposed Laws

**Chart 1-1  
Estimated Statewide Tax Proceeds from Proposition 63**



Under the provisions of Proposition 63, the allocation of funds is prescribed as outlined in Table 1-2. In FY 2004-05, most of the money generated by Proposition 63 was allocated to education, training, and capital facilities. In FY 2005-06 the emphasis shifts to prevention (20%) and community support services (55%). This relative allocation is projected to continue in the ensuing fiscal years. Chart 1-2 shows these relative percentage allocations in graphic form.

**Table 1-2  
Mandated Allocation of Funds Under Provisions of Proposition 63**

<b>Component</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>
Education/ Training	45%	10%	10%	10%
Capital Facilities/Training	45%	10%	10%	10%
Local Planning	5%	0%	0%	0%
State Implementation/Administration	5%	5%	5%	5%
Prevention	0%	20%	20%	20%
Community Support and Services	0%	55%	55%	55%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: California Secretary of State – Text of Proposed Laws

Chart 1-2  
Mandated Allocation of Funds Under Provisions of Proposition 63






Chart 1-3 shows the allocation of funds under the provision of Proposition 63. Note that community support and services substantially exceeds \$350 million in FY 2005-06, and 2006-07. As is readily apparent from Chart 1-3, and as shown in Chart 1-1, the total amount of funding available grows substantially in FY 2005-06 and is projected to remain at the same level in ensuing years.

**Chart 1-3  
Mandated Allocation of Funds Under Provisions of Proposition 63**




Table 1-4 shows the estimated Proposition 63 funds for each county in FY 2005-06 on a per capita basis. Note that Los Angeles is towards the bottom of the chart with projected per capita revenue of \$8.78. Most of the counties that receive more money on a per capita basis than Los Angeles are in rural areas and have quite small populations. There are four notable exceptions to this situation, however. Ventura County receives \$12.20 per capita; Fresno County receives \$9.01 per capita; while Riverside and San Bernardino Counties receive slightly more per capita than Los Angeles County. There are some small counties, however, that receive less per capita than Los Angeles County—notably El Dorado (\$8.21) and Placer (\$7.40).

The far right column in Table 1-4 shows the percentage of state population in each county in California.

**Table 1-4  
Estimated Proposition 63 Funds for Each County: Fiscal Year 2005-2006  
(Community Supports and Services)**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Funding</b>	<b>% State Population</b>
Sierra	\$76.09	0.01%
Modoc	\$32.86	0.03%
Mono	\$26.04	0.04%
Trinity	\$25.58	0.04%
Mariposa	\$20.97	0.05%
Colusa	\$20.44	0.06%
Inyo	\$19.90	0.05%
Plumas	\$18.29	0.06%
Glenn	\$17.07	0.08%
Del Norte	\$16.29	0.08%
Calaveras	\$13.47	0.12%
Lassen	\$13.39	0.10%
Siskiyou	\$12.72	0.12%
San Benito	\$12.67	0.16%
Ventura	\$12.20	2.21%
Lake	\$11.90	0.17%
Tehama	\$11.82	0.16%
Sutter/Yuba	\$11.20	0.42%
Madera	\$10.63	0.38%
Imperial	\$10.50	0.44%
Merced	\$10.45	0.65%
Kings	\$10.34	0.39%
Mendocino	\$10.20	0.24%
Nevada	\$10.13	0.27%
Tulare	\$9.92	1.11%
Humboldt	\$9.76	0.36%
Yolo	\$9.69	0.51%
Shasta	\$9.51	0.48%
Kern	\$9.27	2.05%
Butte	\$9.25	0.58%
Santa Cruz	\$9.11	0.71%
Santa Barbara	\$9.10	1.14%
Monterey	\$9.05	1.15%
Fresno	\$9.01	2.40%
Riverside	\$8.90	5.10%
San Bernardino	\$8.82	5.29%
San Luis Obispo	\$8.80	0.71%
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$8.78</b>	<b>27.78%</b>
San Joaquin	\$8.56	1.77%
Napa	\$8.45	0.36%
Stanislaus	\$8.43	1.37%
Orange	\$8.34	8.30%
San Diego	\$8.33	8.29%
El Dorado	\$8.21	0.47%
Sonoma	\$7.74	1.30%
Solano	\$7.65	1.15%
Santa Clara	\$7.61	4.78%
Placer	\$7.40	0.83%
Alameda	\$7.32	4.10%
Sacramento	\$7.24	3.72%
Contra Costa	\$6.98	2.77%
San Mateo	\$6.87	1.97%
Marin	\$6.77	0.69%
San Francisco	\$6.67	2.17%

Table 1-5 shows estimated Proposition 63 funding in dollar terms for the fifteen most populous counties. By this measure, Los Angeles receives substantially more money than any other county, but it should be kept in mind that Los Angeles is far and away the most populous county in California. Chart 1-5 shows Table 1-5 in graphical form.

**Table 1-5  
Proposition 63 Funds: 15 Most Populous Counties**

County	Funding (6/01/05)
Los Angeles	\$89,792,800
Orange	\$25,502,200
San Diego	\$25,417,300
San Bernardino	\$17,168,200
Riverside	\$16,710,700
Santa Clara	\$13,387,600
Alameda	\$11,035,300
Sacramento	\$9,922,000
Contra Costa	\$7,121,500
Fresno	\$7,962,400
Ventura	\$9,922,000
San Francisco	\$5,332,900
Kern	\$6,978,700
San Mateo	\$4,972,600
San Joaquin	\$5,589,700

Source: California Secretary of State – Text of Proposed Laws

**Chart 1-5  
 Proposition 63 Funding: 15 Most Populous Counties**




Table 1-6 shows the estimated Proposition 63 funding per citizen in the fifteen most populous counties. Chart 1-6 shows the Proposition 63 funding per capita for the fifteen most populous counties in California. By this measure, Los Angeles is towards the middle of the pack.

**Table 1-6**  
**Estimated Proposition 63 per Citizen Funding for the 15 Most Populous**  
**Counties: Fiscal Year 2005-2006**

<b>County</b>	<b>Population (as of 2005)</b>	<b>Per Capita Funding</b>
Ventura	813,052	\$12.20
Kern	753,070	\$9.27
Fresno	883,537	\$9.01
Riverside	1,877,000	\$8.90
San Bernardino	1,946,202	\$8.82
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>10,226,506</b>	<b>\$8.78</b>
San Joaquin	653,333	\$8.56
Orange	3,056,865	\$8.34
San Diego	3,051,280	\$8.33
Santa Clara	1,759,585	\$7.61
Alameda	1,507,500	\$7.32
Sacramento	1,369,855	\$7.24
Contra Costa	1,020,898	\$6.98
San Mateo	723,453	\$6.87
San Francisco	799,263	\$6.67

Source: California Secretary of State – Text of Proposed Laws

**Chart 1-6  
Proposition 63 Per Citizen Funding: 15 Most Populous Counties**






Table 1-7 and Chart 1-7 show the estimated homeless population for each county as of 2005, except as noted for Orange, San Bernardino and Kern Counties. As is readily apparent, Los Angeles County has, by far, the largest homeless population.

**Table 1-7  
Estimated Homeless Population: 2005**

County	Homeless Population (Point-in-Time)
Los Angeles	88,345
Orange (2001)	19,740
Santa Clara	7,121
Contra Costa	6,271
San Francisco	6,248
Alameda	6,215
San Bernardino (2002)	5,270
San Diego	5,190
Riverside	4,785
Santa Cruz	3,371
Sonoma	2,232
Sacramento	2,229
Mendocino	1,947
Kern (2003)	1,814
Monterey	1,570

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. *Population Most Likely to Apply for Services*. 2003 California Health Interview Survey.



**Chart 1-7**  
**County Homeless Population: 15 Highest Homeless Populations (with available data)**


Table 1-8 shows the Proposition 63 funding per homeless person for the fifteen counties in California with the largest homeless populations in the state. By this measure, Los Angeles receives comparatively less Proposition 63 than almost all the other counties shown. Los Angeles receives \$1,016.39 per homeless person from Proposition 63 funding. Chart 1-8 shows the data from Table 1-8 in graphic form.

**Table 1-8  
 Proposition 63 Funding Per Homeless Person:  
 15 Highest Homeless Populations (Community Supports and Services)**

<b>County</b>	<b>Funding Per Homeless Population</b>
San Diego	\$4,897.36
Sacramento	\$4,451.32
Kern	\$3,847.13
Riverside	\$3,492.31
San Bernardino	\$3,257.72
Monterey	\$2,450.13
Santa Clara	\$1,880.02
Alameda	\$1,775.59
Sonoma	\$1,659.72
Orange	\$1,291.90
Contra Costa	\$1,135.62
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$1,016.39</b>
San Francisco	\$853.54
Santa Cruz	\$702.91
Mendocino	\$471.24

Source: California Secretary of State – Text of Proposed Laws and U.S. Census Bureau

**Chart 1-8**  
**Proposition 63 Funding Per Homeless Resident: 15 Highest Homeless Populations (with available data)**



The median amount of Proposition 63 per Homeless Funding in California (Community Supports and Services for the 15 Highest Homeless Populations) is represented by Alameda County, which is estimated to receive \$1,775.59. Thus, if Los Angeles received the median amount of Proposition 63 funding, the county would receive an extra \$759.20 for each homeless resident, or a total of \$67,071,524.

Added to Los Angeles' current estimated funding amount of \$89,792,800, Los Angeles County would receive a total of \$156,864,324 if raised to the median level.

**Section 2**  
**State Revenues Per Capita for Selected Counties**

Table 2-1 shows per capita revenues for social services related functions from the state to each of the counties listed. As is readily apparent from reviewing the table, Los Angeles County receives less on a per capita basis than most of the other counties listed. In FY 2002-03, Los Angeles County received \$281.66 per capita for social and health related functions.

While differences in these per capita numbers might appear, at first glance, to be relatively insignificant, it should be kept in mind that the population of Los Angeles County is very large and, hence, an increase of even a few dollars in per capita state funding involves significant funds. A \$10 increase in per capita revenues, for example, translates into almost \$100 million in additional revenues for Los Angeles County.

The social services and health services revenue streams summarized in Table 2-1 include the following categories: Public Assistance Administration, Medically Indigent Adults, Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Public Safety Fund, Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Fund (SLESF/COPS), Office of Criminal Justice and Planning Programs, District Attorney Programs and Law Enforcement.

**Table 2-1  
State Social Services – Related Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
San Francisco	\$154.53	San Francisco	\$256.83	San Francisco	\$334.04
Sacramento	\$470.57	Fresno	\$471.79	Fresno	\$459.43
Imperial	\$337.88	Imperial	\$385.56	Sacramento	\$419.13
Fresno	\$350.94	Sacramento	\$424.59	Stanislaus	\$358.45
Stanislaus	\$282.11	Kern	\$389.33	Kern	\$358.88
Alameda	\$313.31	Stanislaus	\$332.87	Alameda	\$343.83
Kern	\$309.82	San Bernardino	\$334.68	San Joaquin	\$292.24
San Joaquin	\$285.13	San Joaquin	\$317.47	San Bernardino	\$309.38
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$253.67</b>	Alameda	\$336.35	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$281.66</b>
San Bernardino	\$272.23	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$267.91</b>	San Diego	\$273.94
San Diego	\$255.71	Santa Clara	\$261.86	Santa Clara	\$272.24
Santa Clara	\$246.16	San Diego	\$265.77	Riverside	\$232.29
Riverside	\$226.85	Riverside	\$238.90	Orange	\$227.93
Orange	\$221.50	Orange	\$239.04	Imperial	\$78.32

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-2 shows the per capita state revenues received by each of the counties listed from the previous table (Table 2-1) plus the euphemistically referred to “Other State Revenues” category. Even when “Other State Revenues” are added to the revenues shown in Table 2-1, Los Angeles County still receives, on a per capita basis, substantially less money than most of the other counties shown.

Here again, a \$10 increase in per capita revenues would translate into almost \$100 million additional dollars for Los Angeles County.

**Table 2-2  
State Social Services – Related Revenue per Capita  
Including Other State Revenues**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
San Francisco	\$588.60	San Francisco	\$664.25	San Francisco	\$691.11
Sacramento	\$498.59	Fresno	\$499.00	Fresno	\$521.27
Imperial	\$395.00	Imperial	\$438.85	Sacramento	\$450.39
Fresno	\$391.91	Sacramento	\$458.17	Stanislaus	\$407.79
Stanislaus	\$355.14	Kern	\$403.86	Kern	\$381.96
Alameda	\$336.73	Stanislaus	\$391.52	Alameda	\$361.45
Kern	\$322.51	San Bernardino	\$381.18	San Joaquin	\$324.33
San Joaquin	\$322.71	San Joaquin	\$353.65	San Bernardino	\$348.08
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$285.27</b>	Alameda	\$349.20	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$322.24</b>
San Bernardino	\$310.80	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$308.40</b>	San Diego	\$305.02
San Diego	\$279.91	Santa Clara	\$294.10	Santa Clara	\$287.29
Santa Clara	\$276.29	San Diego	\$295.91	Riverside	\$246.32
Riverside	\$238.08	Riverside	\$255.75	Orange	\$240.87
Orange	\$236.55	Orange	\$256.28	Imperial	\$87.63

Source: California State Controller



Table 2-3a shows state revenues per capita to each county listed for public assistance programs. Los Angeles County received \$35.04 per capita in such revenues in FY 2002-03. This was substantially less than almost every other county.

**Table 2-3a  
State Public Assistance Programs Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Sacramento	\$176.59	Fresno	\$143.73	Sacramento	\$150.68
Fresno	\$149.48	Kern	\$138.42	Fresno	\$137.71
Imperial	\$102.55	Sacramento	\$111.00	Kern	\$114.10
San Joaquin	\$98.49	San Joaquin	\$100.46	San Joaquin	\$106.29
Kern	\$95.64	Imperial	\$96.35	San Bernardino	\$97.56
San Bernardino	\$83.51	San Bernardino	\$87.48	Stanislaus	\$83.25
Alameda	\$60.54	Stanislaus	\$78.60	San Francisco	\$69.27
San Diego	\$59.95	Alameda	\$66.07	Alameda	\$68.35
Stanislaus	\$52.28	San Diego	\$54.93	San Diego	\$65.64
Riverside	\$49.04	Riverside	\$50.36	Riverside	\$53.76
Orange	\$29.22	Orange	\$37.23	Santa Clara	\$37.93
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$27.47</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$33.54</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$35.04</b>
Santa Clara	\$26.23	Santa Clara	\$30.83	Orange	\$29.27
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	Imperial	\$18.33

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-3b shows state revenues per capita for each county listed for the so-called “Realignment for Social Services.” These so-called “realignment” funds were intended to supplement the funds shown in Table 2-3a. In this “realignment” process, Los Angeles fared somewhat better - relatively speaking. Nevertheless, Los Angeles was still substantially below several other counties with regard to such revenues.

**Table 2-3b**  
**State Realignment for Social Services Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Sacramento	\$48.33	Fresno	\$63.71	Fresno	\$58.02
Imperial	\$42.68	San Bernardino	\$47.24	Sacramento	\$40.59
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$30.75</b>	Sacramento	\$41.16	San Bernardino	\$37.87
San Joaquin	\$29.70	Alameda	\$34.35	Kern	\$32.00
Alameda	\$28.76	Kern	\$34.32	San Joaquin	\$31.20
San Bernardino	\$26.35	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$29.80</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$30.13</b>
San Diego	\$25.22	San Joaquin	\$29.17	Alameda	\$24.91
Stanislaus	\$24.46	Imperial	\$28.01	San Diego	\$24.42
Riverside	\$23.55	Stanislaus	\$24.50	Riverside	\$22.58
San Francisco	\$22.23	San Diego	\$24.39	Stanislaus	\$21.61
Kern	\$20.06	Riverside	\$23.54	Santa Clara	\$19.19
Santa Clara	\$19.61	Santa Clara	\$20.95	Orange	\$15.32
Orange	\$11.15	Orange	\$10.13	Imperial	\$6.56

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-3c shows the combined total per capita state revenues from Tables 2-3a and 2-3b. Note that when these revenues are combined, Los Angeles still falls to the bottom third of the counties shown, with combined revenues of \$65.16 per capita. As with every other category of revenue examined, an increase of even a few dollars in Los Angeles' per capita revenues translates to substantial funds. An increase of \$10 per capita in Los Angeles' revenue, for example, would mean an increase of almost \$100 million in county revenues.

**Table 2-3c  
Combined State Public Assistance Programs and Realignment  
for Social Services Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Fresno	\$149.48	Fresno	\$207.43	Fresno	\$195.73
Imperial	\$145.23	Kern	\$172.74	Sacramento	\$191.27
San Joaquin	\$128.18	Sacramento	\$152.15	Kern	\$146.10
Kern	\$115.71	San Bernardino	\$134.72	San Joaquin	\$137.49
San Bernardino	\$109.86	San Joaquin	\$129.63	San Bernardino	\$135.44
Alameda	\$89.30	Imperial	\$124.36	Stanislaus	\$104.86
San Diego	\$85.17	Stanislaus	\$103.10	Alameda	\$93.27
Stanislaus	\$76.74	Alameda	\$100.42	San Diego	\$90.06
Riverside	\$72.59	San Diego	\$79.32	Riverside	\$76.34
Sacramento	\$71.27	Riverside	\$73.90	San Francisco	\$69.27
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$58.22</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$63.35</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$65.16</b>
Santa Clara	\$45.83	Santa Clara	\$51.79	Santa Clara	\$57.12
Orange	\$40.37	Orange	\$47.36	Orange	\$44.59
San Francisco	\$22.23	San Francisco	\$0.00	Imperial	\$24.89

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-4a shows per capita state revenues for each of the counties listed for the euphemistically defined category of “Other Aid for Health.” Los Angeles ranks well towards the bottom in this category.

**Table 2-4a**  
**State Other Aid for Health Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
San Bernardino	\$37.58	Imperial	\$45.42	Alameda	\$45.57
Imperial	\$25.80	San Bernardino	\$39.37	San Bernardino	\$44.37
Sacramento	\$17.46	San Joaquin	\$15.26	San Francisco	\$11.97
San Joaquin	\$14.69	Alameda	\$14.52	Fresno	\$11.81
Alameda	\$14.63	Kern	\$12.29	Orange	\$10.69
Orange	\$8.91	Orange	\$11.35	Kern	\$10.45
Kern	\$8.83	Sacramento	\$9.34	Santa Clara	\$9.30
Santa Clara	\$6.61	Santa Clara	\$8.49	Sacramento	\$9.20
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$6.51</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$7.74</b>	San Joaquin	\$9.09
Stanislaus	\$4.39	Riverside	\$6.11	Riverside	\$8.96
Fresno	\$4.19	Fresno	\$3.58	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$7.97</b>
Riverside	\$3.25	San Diego	\$3.12	Imperial	\$5.69
San Diego	\$3.14	Stanislaus	\$2.66	Stanislaus	\$5.01
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$1.69	San Diego	\$2.97

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-4b shows per capita state revenues for each of the counties listed for “Realignment for Health Services.” In this regard, Los Angeles fared comparatively better, receiving \$12.91 per capita in FY 2002-03.

**Table 2-4b  
State Realignment for Health Services Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Sacramento	\$37.96	Sacramento	\$51.61	Fresno	\$31.33
Imperial	\$15.71	Fresno	\$49.19	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$12.91</b>
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$13.21</b>	Imperial	\$13.57	Kern	\$12.91
Fresno	\$12.93	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$13.12</b>	Alameda	\$11.71
Alameda	\$11.55	Stanislaus	\$13.02	San Diego	\$10.32
San Diego	\$10.10	Alameda	\$12.09	Stanislaus	\$9.96
Orange	\$8.76	San Diego	\$10.31	Sacramento	\$8.47
Kern	\$8.61	Kern	\$7.75	Orange	\$7.24
Stanislaus	\$3.69	Orange	\$7.57	San Bernardino	\$2.63
Santa Clara	\$2.21	San Bernardino	\$1.70	Riverside	\$2.61
San Bernardino	\$1.36	Santa Clara	\$1.49	Imperial	\$2.33
Riverside	\$0.69	Riverside	\$1.01	Santa Clara	\$1.50
San Joaquin	\$0.34	San Joaquin	\$0.37	San Joaquin	\$0.34
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-4c combines the revenues from Tables 2-4a and 2-4b. When these revenue sources are combined, Los Angeles County does somewhat better on a per capita basis, receiving \$20.88 from the state. This improvement notwithstanding, Los Angeles County still receives less than half as much on a per capita basis than Alameda County, San Bernardino County and Fresno County.

**Table 2-4c**  
**Combined Other Aid for Health and Realignment for Health per Capita County Revenue**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Sacramento	\$55.42	Sacramento	\$60.95	Alameda	\$57.28
Imperial	\$41.51	Imperial	\$58.99	San Bernardino	\$47.00
San Bernardino	\$38.94	Fresno	\$52.77	Fresno	\$43.14
Alameda	\$26.19	San Bernardino	\$41.08	Kern	\$23.36
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$19.73</b>	Alameda	\$26.60	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$20.88</b>
Orange	\$17.68	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$20.86</b>	Orange	\$17.93
Kern	\$17.44	Kern	\$20.04	Sacramento	\$17.67
Fresno	\$17.12	Orange	\$18.92	Stanislaus	\$14.96
San Joaquin	\$15.03	Stanislaus	\$15.68	San Diego	\$13.29
San Diego	\$13.25	San Joaquin	\$15.63	San Francisco	\$11.97
Santa Clara	\$8.81	San Diego	\$13.43	Riverside	\$11.57
Stanislaus	\$8.07	Santa Clara	\$9.97	Santa Clara	\$10.81
Riverside	\$3.94	Riverside	\$7.12	San Joaquin	\$9.43
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$1.69	Imperial	\$8.02

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-5a shows state per capita revenues for mental health for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category Los Angeles does comparatively well, receiving \$23.35 per capita.

**Table 2-5a  
State Realignment for Health Services Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Fresno	\$34.19	Kern	\$41.04	San Francisco	\$69.71
Kern	\$26.68	San Diego	\$23.76	Kern	\$40.18
San Diego	\$17.80	Stanislaus	\$19.31	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$23.35</b>
Orange	\$15.60	San Bernardino	\$18.06	Stanislaus	\$19.29
Riverside	\$14.10	Orange	\$16.52	San Joaquin	\$16.21
Santa Clara	\$13.44	San Joaquin	\$16.13	Alameda	\$15.53
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$13.26</b>	San Francisco	\$13.93	San Diego	\$15.01
Stanislaus	\$12.30	Fresno	\$13.87	Fresno	\$14.11
Alameda	\$11.85	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$13.85</b>	Orange	\$12.65
San Joaquin	\$11.73	Imperial	\$12.22	Riverside	\$11.47
San Bernardino	\$9.63	Alameda	\$12.13	Santa Clara	\$8.07
Imperial	\$6.62	Riverside	\$11.87	San Bernardino	\$7.47
San Francisco	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$9.91	Imperial	\$2.03
Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

Table 2-5b shows per capita revenues from the state for so-called “Realignment for Mental Health” for each county listed. Here again, Los Angeles County does comparatively well, and is among the top four counties listed.

**Table 2-5b**  
**State Realignment for Mental Health County Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Sacramento	\$37.11	Sacramento	\$43.15	Alameda	\$29.97
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$30.45</b>	San Bernardino	\$40.14	Fresno	\$25.52
Stanislaus	\$29.37	Alameda	\$34.49	San Bernardino	\$24.10
Alameda	\$28.97	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$28.81</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$23.16</b>
Kern	\$23.29	Fresno	\$28.57	Santa Clara	\$22.89
Santa Clara	\$22.56	Santa Clara	\$23.13	Stanislaus	\$20.46
San Joaquin	\$22.30	Stanislaus	\$21.67	Kern	\$19.89
San Bernardino	\$18.50	San Diego	\$19.73	San Diego	\$19.75
San Diego	\$16.85	Kern	\$19.44	San Joaquin	\$19.59
Orange	\$16.83	San Joaquin	\$19.32	Sacramento	\$18.62
Imperial	\$15.03	Riverside	\$17.58	Orange	\$15.55
Riverside	\$13.96	Orange	\$16.28	Riverside	\$14.96
San Francisco	\$0.00	Imperial	\$10.99	Imperial	\$4.20
Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller



Table 2-5c combines the per capita revenue streams from Tables 2-5a and 2-5b to provide a more comprehensive picture of state revenues to the counties listed to support mental health services. When these two categories are combined, Los Angeles County edges Alameda County by \$.01 per year to place third on the list of the counties analyzed.

**Table 2-5c  
State Combined Aid and Realignment for  
Mental Health County Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Kern	\$49.97	Kern	\$60.47	San Francisco	\$69.71
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$43.71</b>	San Bernardino	\$58.20	Kern	\$60.06
Stanislaus	\$41.68	Alameda	\$46.63	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$46.51</b>
Alameda	\$40.82	San Diego	\$43.49	Alameda	\$45.50
Sacramento	\$37.11	Sacramento	\$43.15	Stanislaus	\$39.75
Santa Clara	\$36.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$42.67</b>	Fresno	\$39.63
San Diego	\$34.65	Fresno	\$42.44	San Joaquin	\$35.81
Fresno	\$34.19	Stanislaus	\$40.98	San Diego	\$34.77
San Joaquin	\$34.03	San Joaquin	\$35.44	San Bernardino	\$31.56
Orange	\$32.42	Santa Clara	\$33.04	Santa Clara	\$30.96
San Bernardino	\$28.12	Orange	\$32.80	Orange	\$28.21
Riverside	\$28.06	Riverside	\$29.46	Riverside	\$26.43
Imperial	\$21.65	Imperial	\$23.21	Sacramento	\$18.62
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$13.93	Imperial	\$6.23

Source: California State Controller

**Section 3**  
**Federal Revenues per Capita for Selected Counties**

Table 3-1 shows federal revenues per capita for public assistance administration for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Certain federal public assistance programs allocate specific revenues for administrative purposes, which are reflected in the data in Table 3-1. Los Angeles County does quite well, relatively speaking, in obtaining such revenues. On a per capita basis received \$122.47 in FY 2002-03, the second highest amount for the counties listed. Chart 3-1 shows the data from Table 3-1.

**Table 3-1  
Federal Public Assistance Administration Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Kern	\$126.73	Sacramento	\$125.07	Sacramento	\$125.20
Fresno	\$121.02	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$119.69</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$122.47</b>
Sacramento	\$110.03	Stanislaus	\$117.46	Stanislaus	\$117.18
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$107.15</b>	Santa Clara	\$112.01	Santa Clara	\$110.39
Stanislaus	\$102.61	Alameda	\$110.54	Fresno	\$97.66
Imperial	\$100.79	Fresno	\$109.27	Alameda	\$96.39
Alameda	\$97.98	Kern	\$98.31	Riverside	\$95.45
Santa Clara	\$91.45	Imperial	\$97.89	Kern	\$92.86
Riverside	\$87.62	Riverside	\$96.67	San Bernardino	\$78.77
San Bernardino	\$77.55	San Bernardino	\$89.79	Orange	\$74.20
Orange	\$59.03	San Diego	\$73.59	San Diego	\$68.66
San Diego	\$52.84	Orange	\$64.40	San Francisco	\$35.81
San Joaquin	\$35.61	San Joaquin	\$41.10	Imperial	\$14.43
San Francisco	\$32.64	San Francisco	\$35.57	San Joaquin	\$10.69

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-1  
Federal Public Assistance Administration Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-2 shows federal revenues per capita for public assistance programs for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category, Los Angeles still did comparatively well on a per capita basis, receiving \$127.42 in FY 2002-03. It is interesting to note that the amount Los Angeles received for these program funds, as shown in Table 3-2, only slightly exceeded the amount Los Angeles received for administration of public assistance programs, as shown in Table 3-1. Chart 3-2 shows the data from Table 3-2.

**Table 3-2  
Federal Public Assistance Programs Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
San Joaquin	\$146.80	San Francisco	\$182.57	Sacramento	\$166.82
Fresno	\$135.82	Sacramento	\$182.56	San Francisco	\$166.09
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$134.32</b>	San Joaquin	\$162.27	San Joaquin	\$164.65
Kern	\$118.32	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$142.13</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$127.42</b>
San Bernardino	\$110.48	Fresno	\$132.53	Kern	\$124.80
Stanislaus	\$82.80	San Bernardino	\$124.00	Fresno	\$119.39
San Francisco	\$81.41	Kern	\$113.88	San Bernardino	\$105.80
San Diego	\$80.99	Stanislaus	\$109.51	San Diego	\$85.16
Riverside	\$75.14	Imperial	\$87.78	Riverside	\$81.26
Sacramento	\$72.63	San Diego	\$87.13	Stanislaus	\$67.47
Imperial	\$67.19	Riverside	\$82.19	Alameda	\$53.05
Alameda	\$61.91	Alameda	\$61.55	Santa Clara	\$44.32
Santa Clara	\$39.05	Santa Clara	\$48.41	Orange	\$37.32
Orange	\$38.67	Orange	\$36.45	Imperial	\$14.44

Source: California State Controller

Chart 3-2  
 Federal Public Assistance Programs Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003




Table 3-3 shows federal revenues per capita for health programs administration for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this regard, Los Angeles has done quite well, receiving \$29.16 per capita in FY 2002-03. Chart 3-3 shows the data from Table 3-3.

**Table 3-3  
Federal Health Administration Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Santa Clara	\$28.41	Santa Clara	\$27.79	Santa Clara	\$33.78
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$23.34</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$26.58</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$29.16</b>
San Bernardino	\$15.15	San Bernardino	\$15.42	Sacramento	\$16.41
Sacramento	\$9.59	Sacramento	\$13.36	San Bernardino	\$15.52
Alameda	\$5.70	Alameda	\$10.92	Alameda	\$10.38
Riverside	\$5.44	San Diego	\$6.07	San Joaquin	\$8.15
San Joaquin	\$4.85	Riverside	\$4.71	Riverside	\$6.34
San Diego	\$4.44	San Joaquin	\$4.38	San Diego	\$4.84
Stanislaus	\$3.77	Stanislaus	\$3.42	Stanislaus	\$3.85
Kern	\$1.13	Kern	\$1.01	Kern	\$0.84
Imperial	\$0.02	Imperial	\$0.32	Orange	\$0.11
San Francisco	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.02
Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-3  
Federal Health Administration Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**






Table 3-4 shows federal revenues per capita for the Job Training Partnership Act for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles received \$5.84 per capita in FY 2002-03. While this was substantially less than some of the other counties listed, it still put Los Angeles solidly in the second tier of the counties shown. Chart 3-4 shows the data from Table 3-4.

**Table 3-4  
Federal Job Training Partnership Act Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Kern	\$41.23	Kern	\$46.95	Kern	\$39.20
Stanislaus	\$19.09	Stanislaus	\$42.33	San Joaquin	\$31.69
San Joaquin	\$18.97	San Joaquin	\$29.62	Stanislaus	\$30.93
Imperial	\$14.21	Imperial	\$21.11	Riverside	\$12.98
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$8.12</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$5.66</b>	Imperial	\$7.64
Orange	\$3.29	Orange	\$5.62	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$5.84</b>
Alameda	\$1.54	Riverside	\$2.50	Alameda	\$5.66
Santa Clara	\$0.65	Santa Clara	\$0.22	Orange	\$3.96
Riverside	\$0.29	Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Fresno	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-4  
Federal Job Training Partnership Act Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-5 shows federal revenues per capita for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles County was not very successful in obtaining CDBG revenues and in FY 2002-03 only received \$0.17 per capita from the federal government in CDBG funds. Chart 3-5 shows the data from Table 3-5.

**Table 3-5  
Federal Community Development Block Grant Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
San Francisco	\$24.49	Kern	\$27.15	San Joaquin	\$13.44
San Bernardino	\$15.49	San Joaquin	\$10.09	Kern	\$12.18
Kern	\$14.46	Fresno	\$8.54	San Bernardino	\$9.45
Alameda	\$11.53	San Bernardino	\$7.51	Fresno	\$7.00
Fresno	\$8.20	Riverside	\$7.01	Riverside	\$2.89
San Joaquin	\$7.78	Santa Clara	\$4.10	Orange	\$2.75
Riverside	\$6.72	Orange	\$3.21	Santa Clara	\$1.98
Orange	\$2.59	Imperial	\$3.17	Alameda	\$1.91
Santa Clara	\$2.28	Alameda	\$1.74	Imperial	\$0.61
Stanislaus	\$1.54	Stanislaus	\$1.08	Stanislaus	\$0.60
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.65</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.74</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.17</b>
Imperial	\$0.39	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-5  
Federal Community Development Block Grant Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-6 shows federal revenues per capita for health grants for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category Los Angeles was solidly in the upper tier of the counties listed, receiving \$14.83 per capita in FY 2002-03. While this amount was greater than most of the counties listed, it was still notably less than the amount received by Sacramento County. Chart 3-6 shows the data from Table 3-6.

**Table 3-6  
Federal Health Grants Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Sacramento	\$48.69	Sacramento	\$52.28	Sacramento	\$53.39
Riverside	\$16.46	Riverside	\$20.91	Riverside	\$18.51
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$12.28</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$14.61</b>	San Diego	\$16.14
Orange	\$9.15	Alameda	\$13.57	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$14.83</b>
Santa Clara	\$8.69	Orange	\$9.61	Orange	\$10.18
San Bernardino	\$7.32	Santa Clara	\$8.42	Stanislaus	\$9.77
Kern	\$5.34	Kern	\$7.08	Santa Clara	\$8.84
San Joaquin	\$1.29	San Bernardino	\$7.05	San Bernardino	\$7.20
Imperial	\$0.75	San Joaquin	\$1.07	Alameda	\$5.96
Stanislaus	\$0.52	Imperial	\$0.70	Kern	\$2.78
San Diego	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.48	Imperial	\$0.13
Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.03	Fresno	\$0.01
Alameda	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-6  
Federal Health Grants Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-7 shows federal revenues per capita for the Citizens Option for Public Safety (COPS) program for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Only five counties received any revenue at all in this category, and Los Angeles was not among them. Chart 3-7 shows the data from Table 3-7.

**Table 3-7  
Federal Citizens Option for Public Safety Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
San Joaquin	\$3.18	Imperial	\$5.18	San Joaquin	\$1.77
San Diego	\$0.04	San Joaquin	\$2.82	Riverside	\$1.31
Fresno	\$0.00	Riverside	\$1.21	Alameda	\$0.54
Alameda	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.24	San Diego	\$0.41
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.02
Stanislaus	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Imperial	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Alameda	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.00
Riverside	\$0.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-7  
Federal Citizens Option for Public Safety Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**






Table 3-8 shows federal revenues per capita for the Office of Criminal Justice and Planning (OCJP) program for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Only two counties received revenues from this program and Los Angeles was not among them. Chart 3-8 shows the data from Table 3-8.

**Table 3-8**  
**Federal Office of Criminal Justice and Planning Programs**  
**Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
Riverside	\$5.63	Riverside	\$6.06	Riverside	\$2.16
Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.10
Alameda	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
Stanislaus	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00
Imperial	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00
San Joaquin	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-8  
 Federal Office of Criminal Justice and Planning Programs Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year  
 2002-2003**




Table 3-9 shows federal revenues per capita for the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) program for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Only six counties received revenues from this program and again Los Angeles was not among them. Chart 3-9 shows the data from Table 3-9.

**Table 3-9  
Federal DEA Programs Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
San Bernardino	\$7.56	Imperial	\$8.94	San Bernardino	\$6.62
Imperial	\$6.99	San Bernardino	\$6.79	Alameda	\$6.37
San Joaquin	\$4.55	San Joaquin	\$4.31	Imperial	\$1.70
San Diego	\$0.34	San Diego	\$0.38	Sacramento	\$1.48
Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.33
Alameda	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.01
San Francisco	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Stanislaus	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Orange	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
Riverside	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-9  
Federal DEA Programs Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-10 shows federal revenues per capita for the District Attorney Programs for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Only six counties received revenues from this program and again Los Angeles was not among them. Chart 3-10 shows the data from Table 3-10.

**Table 3-10  
Federal District Attorney Programs Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Kern	\$41.82	Kern	\$30.13	Kern	\$28.37
San Joaquin	\$13.41	San Joaquin	\$17.51	San Joaquin	\$17.16
Stanislaus	\$2.33	Stanislaus	\$12.88	Sacramento	\$6.57
Orange	\$1.60	Sacramento	\$2.86	Stanislaus	\$3.65
Sacramento	\$0.47	Orange	\$1.57	Orange	\$1.01
San Bernardino	\$0.10	San Bernardino	\$0.02	San Bernardino	\$0.05
Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Alameda	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Riverside	\$0.00
Riverside	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.00
Imperial	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-10  
Federal District Attorney Programs Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-11 shows federal revenues per capita for aging programs for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Of the counties that received money from this source, Los Angeles got the smallest amount per capita (\$0.59). Chart 3-11 shows the data from Table 3-11.

**Table 3-11  
Federal Aging Programs Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
San Diego	\$3.19	Imperial	\$3.70	San Diego	\$4.12
Imperial	\$3.07	San Diego	\$3.60	San Bernardino	\$3.43
Stanislaus	\$2.64	San Bernardino	\$3.04	Stanislaus	\$3.33
San Bernardino	\$2.54	Kern	\$2.82	San Joaquin	\$3.30
San Joaquin	\$1.48	Stanislaus	\$2.79	Kern	\$3.26
Orange	\$1.45	Orange	\$1.54	Orange	\$2.06
Fresno	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$1.31	Imperial	\$1.24
Alameda	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.59</b>
San Francisco	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Alameda	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00
Riverside	\$0.00	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Riverside	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-11  
Federal Aging Programs Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**






Table 3-12 shows federal revenues per capita for senior citizen programs for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Only three counties received revenue from this source in FY 2002-03, and Los Angeles got by far the largest amount per capita. Chart 3-12 shows the data from Table 3-12.

**Table 3-12  
Federal Senior Citizens Programs Revenue per Capita**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$3.07</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$3.69</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$3.40</b>
Fresno	\$0.00	San Diego	\$1.24	Orange	\$0.71
Alameda	\$0.00	Orange	\$0.75	Sacramento	\$0.30
San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
Riverside	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.00
San Joaquin	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.00
Stanislaus	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00
Imperial	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00	Imperial	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-12  
Federal Senior Citizens Programs Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-13 shows federal revenues per capita for law enforcement programs for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Seven counties received such revenues from this program in FY 2002-03, and Los Angeles was solidly in the middle of the pack on a per capita basis. Chart 3-13 shows the data from Table 3-13.

**Table 3-13  
Federal Law Enforcement Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
Imperial	\$3.64	Imperial	\$6.43	Orange	\$9.00
Santa Clara	\$2.29	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$6.21</b>	Sacramento	\$5.12
San Joaquin	\$0.76	San Diego	\$4.41	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$1.50</b>
Fresno	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$3.29	Santa Clara	\$1.43
San Francisco	\$0.00	Santa Clara	\$2.06	Stanislaus	\$0.39
Riverside	\$0.00	Orange	\$1.58	Imperial	\$0.20
Sacramento	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00	San Diego	\$0.11
Kern	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00	San Francisco	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00	Sacramento	\$0.00	Riverside	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00	San Joaquin	\$0.00
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	Fresno	\$0.00	Fresno	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00	Alameda	\$0.00
Alameda	\$0.00	Stanislaus	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00
Stanislaus	\$0.00	San Bernardino	\$0.00	Kern	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller

**Chart 3-13  
Federal Law Enforcement Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003**




Table 3-14 shows federal revenues per capita for the euphemistically described “other federal county revenue” for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles was in the bottom third of the counties shown, receiving only \$4.79 per capita. Chart 3-14 shows the data from Table 3-14.

**Table 3-14  
Federal Other Federal Revenue per Capita**

<b>2000-2001</b>		<b>2001-2002</b>		<b>2002-2003</b>	
<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Per Capita Revenue</b>
San Francisco	\$930.47	San Francisco	\$433.08	San Francisco	\$358.61
Sacramento	\$43.77	Imperial	\$70.79	Riverside	\$30.17
Imperial	\$43.77	Riverside	\$40.54	San Bernardino	\$21.26
Riverside	\$27.77	Sacramento	\$28.25	Stanislaus	\$12.77
Stanislaus	\$27.46	San Bernardino	\$21.32	Kern	\$12.68
San Bernardino	\$20.84	Stanislaus	\$20.02	Sacramento	\$10.74
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$11.63</b>	Alameda	\$12.98	Fresno	\$8.67
Kern	\$11.22	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$11.41</b>	Imperial	\$8.13
Alameda	\$8.83	Fresno	\$7.93	Alameda	\$7.07
Fresno	\$7.91	Kern	\$5.44	San Diego	\$6.22
San Joaquin	\$7.71	San Joaquin	\$5.26	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$4.79</b>
San Diego	\$5.79	Orange	\$4.44	Orange	\$4.52
Orange	\$5.56	San Diego	\$4.41	San Joaquin	\$3.73
Santa Clara	\$0.37	Santa Clara	\$0.12	Santa Clara	\$1.08

Source: California State Controller

Chart 3-14  
 Federal Other Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003





Table 3-15 shows the total federal revenues per capita from the previous thirteen tables for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. On this basis Los Angeles does quite well, with the fourth highest per capita revenues of the counties listed. Chart 3-15 shows the data from Table 3-15.

**Table 3-15  
Federal Total Revenue per Capita Excluding Road Projects**

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003	
County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue	County	Per Capita Revenue
San Francisco	\$1,069.01	San Francisco	\$651.22	San Francisco	\$560.51
Kern	\$360.24	Sacramento	\$404.38	Sacramento	\$386.04
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$300.55</b>	Kern	\$332.77	Kern	\$326.35
Sacramento	\$285.18	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$330.71</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$310.17</b>
Fresno	\$272.95	Stanislaus	\$311.36	San Joaquin	\$254.60
San Bernardino	\$257.02	Imperial	\$306.00	San Bernardino	\$251.38
San Joaquin	\$246.41	San Joaquin	\$283.03	Stanislaus	\$251.32
Stanislaus	\$245.55	San Bernardino	\$282.39	Riverside	\$251.08
Imperial	\$240.82	Riverside	\$261.80	Fresno	\$232.73
Riverside	\$225.06	Fresno	\$258.30	Santa Clara	\$202.81
Alameda	\$189.73	Alameda	\$211.71	Alameda	\$187.71
Santa Clara	\$173.95	Santa Clara	\$204.06	San Diego	\$185.98
San Diego	\$148.81	San Diego	\$176.66	Orange	\$145.80
Orange	\$121.35	Orange	\$129.17	Imperial	\$48.55

Source: California State Controller

Chart 3-15  
 Federal Total Revenue Per Capita: Fiscal Year 2002-2003





**Section 4**  
**State Revenues per Program Services Recipient for**  
**Selected Counties**

Section 4 examines state revenues to counties in much the same manner as Section 2. In this section, however, the amount received by each county is not calculated on a per capita basis (that is, the dollar amount for every citizen residing in a particular county). Rather, the calculations are based on the number of social service system recipients in each county. Unfortunately, it is not possible from available data precisely to define the population groups for each specific social service revenue category. This is so because the recipients of the services funded by these various programs are not separate, independent, discrete populations. That is to say, many of the recipients are afflicted by more than one of the social pathologies that these various programs are designed to address.

For the purposes of this analysis, the categories of recipients include the following:

- CalWORKs
- Welfare to Work (WTW)
- Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA)
- Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)
- Mental Health services recipients
- Social Services recipients

The number of recipients of these services in fiscal year 2002-2003 was utilized in this analysis to conform to the fiscal year financial data analyzed. The table below shows these populations for each of the counties analyzed.

**Social Service Related Program Recipients by County**

<b>County</b>	<b>Social Services Program Recipients</b>
Los Angeles	633,162
San Bernardino	124,609
Sacramento	106,696
San Diego	102,817
Orange	88,925
Riverside	84,697
Fresno	76,234
Alameda	75,282
Kern	59,060
San Francisco	50,751
Santa Clara	49,023
San Joaquin	45,256
Imperial	14,534

Table 4-1 shows state public assistance administration funding per program services recipient (including homeless social service recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was solidly in the middle of the pack, with \$1,292.90 received per social service recipient.

**Table 4-1**  
**State Public Assistance Administration Revenue per Total Recipients**  
**Including Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$1,978.70
Santa Clara	\$1,921.28
San Diego	\$1,731.70
Orange	\$1,472.33
Sacramento	\$1,367.68
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$1,292.90</b>
Alameda	\$1,194.22
Fresno	\$1,183.43
Riverside	\$1,089.36
Imperial	\$955.93
San Francisco	\$902.04
Kern	\$846.29
San Joaquin	\$514.19

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-2 shows state public assistance program funding per program services recipient (including homeless social service recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles received much less money from the state than any other county shown, and only a little more than one tenth of what San Bernardino County received.

**Table 4-2  
State Public Assistance Programs Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$5,164.81
Sacramento	\$2,125.57
San Diego	\$1,951.30
Fresno	\$1,599.78
Kern	\$1,400.92
San Joaquin	\$1,382.93
Alameda	\$1,304.62
Santa Clara	\$1,134.03
Riverside	\$1,038.34
Imperial	\$992.35
San Francisco	\$909.55
Orange	\$852.14
Los Angeles	\$540.15

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-3 shows state medically indigent adult funding per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Only three counties received such funds in FY 2002-03, and Los Angeles was not among them.

**Table 4-3**  
**Medically Indigent Adults Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless**  
**Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

County	Per Total Recipients
Imperial	\$293.46
Riverside	\$43.12
Orange	\$1.00
Alameda	\$0.00
Fresno	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00
Los Angeles	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00
San Joaquin	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-4 shows state funding euphemistically referred to as “other aid for health services per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles was third from the bottom of the list, with \$122.84 received per recipient.

**Table 4-4  
State Other Aid for Health Services Revenue per Total Recipients Including  
Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$2,348.70
Alameda	\$869.80
Orange	\$311.37
Imperial	\$308.09
Santa Clara	\$278.14
Riverside	\$173.08
San Francisco	\$157.17
Fresno	\$137.18
Sacramento	\$129.71
Kern	\$128.33
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$122.84</b>
San Joaquin	\$118.26
San Diego	\$88.22

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-5 shows state for public safety per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was in the bottom half of the list, with \$776.00 received per recipient.

**Table 4-5  
State Public Safety Fund Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$2,720.76
Santa Clara	\$2,687.51
Orange	\$2,136.70
San Diego	\$1,831.29
Alameda	\$1,396.54
San Francisco	\$1,066.29
Riverside	\$1,032.42
Sacramento	\$946.73
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$776.00</b>
San Joaquin	\$668.04
Kern	\$660.36
Fresno	\$583.32
Imperial	\$470.95

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-6 shows state mental health funding per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was in the middle of the pack, with \$360.01 received per recipient.

**Table 4-6**  
**Aid for Mental Health Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless Fiscal**  
**Year 2002-2003**

County	Per Total Recipients
San Francisco	\$915.37
Kern	\$493.29
San Diego	\$446.33
San Bernardino	\$395.29
Orange	\$368.39
Los Angeles	\$360.01
Alameda	\$296.39
Santa Clara	\$241.31
Riverside	\$221.58
San Joaquin	\$210.92
Fresno	\$163.94
Imperial	\$109.90
Sacramento	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services



Table 4-7 shows state funding for the euphemistically titled “Realignment for Social Services” per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was solidly in the middle of the pack, with \$464.00 received per social service recipient.

**Table 4-7  
State Realignment for Social Services Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$2,004.87
San Diego	\$725.99
Fresno	\$674.06
Santa Clara	\$573.84
Sacramento	\$572.50
Alameda	\$475.47
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$464.46</b>
Orange	\$446.08
Riverside	\$436.12
San Joaquin	\$405.92
Kern	\$392.92
Imperial	\$355.21
San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-8 shows state funding euphemistically titled “Realignment for Mental Health” per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was again in the middle of the pack, with \$357.03 received per recipient.

**Table 4-8**  
**State Public Realignment for Mental Health Revenue per Total Recipients**  
**Including Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$1,275.65
Santa Clara	\$684.26
San Diego	\$587.20
Alameda	\$572.01
Orange	\$452.82
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$357.03</b>
Fresno	\$296.49
Riverside	\$288.93
Sacramento	\$262.59
San Joaquin	\$254.93
Kern	\$244.16
Imperial	\$227.29
San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-9 shows state alcohol and drug funding per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was toward the bottom of the list, with \$47.00 received per recipient.

**Table 4-9  
Alcohol and Drug Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless Fiscal  
Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Diego	\$338.78
San Francisco	\$336.27
Santa Clara	\$251.18
Alameda	\$181.69
Imperial	\$137.89
Fresno	\$85.78
San Bernardino	\$82.82
San Joaquin	\$75.11
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$46.59</b>
Orange	\$25.24
Riverside	\$13.94
Sacramento	\$8.90
Kern	\$4.12

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-10 shows state the euphemistically titled “realignment for health services” funding per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles was fifth highest on the list, with \$199.06 received per recipient.

**Table 4-10**  
**State Realignment for Health Services Revenue per Total Recipients Including Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
Fresno	\$364.01
San Diego	\$306.86
Alameda	\$223.54
Orange	\$210.72
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$199.06</b>
Kern	\$158.48
San Bernardino	\$139.37
Imperial	\$126.03
Sacramento	\$119.52
Riverside	\$50.43
Santa Clara	\$44.94
San Joaquin	\$4.38
San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 4-11 shows state supplemental law enforcement services funding per program services recipient (including homeless social services system recipients) for each of the counties listed in FY 2002-03. In this category of funding, Los Angeles was one of the three lowest counties, receiving only \$13.87 per recipient.

**Table 4-11  
State Supplemental Law Enforcement Services Fund (SLESF/COPS) Revenue  
per Total Recipients Including Homeless Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
Imperial	\$135.88
San Diego	\$135.88
Orange	\$119.63
Alameda	\$84.26
Sacramento	\$84.26
Riverside	\$83.25
San Joaquin	\$57.59
Fresno	\$52.01
San Bernardino	\$52.01
Santa Clara	\$29.19
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$13.87</b>
Kern	\$0.06
San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Tables 4-12a and 4-12b show the per capita program revenue for the categories of programs analyzed in this report. Note that in terms of actual program revenues (Table 4-12a) Los Angeles County receives the lowest amount per program recipient of the counties analyzed.

**Table 4-12a**  
**Total State Program Revenue per Program Recipient**  
**Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

County	Per Total Recipients
San Bernardino	\$14,184.28
San Diego	\$6,411.86
Santa Clara	\$5,924.40
Alameda	\$5,404.33
Orange	\$4,924.09
Sacramento	\$4,249.79
Fresno	\$3,956.56
Kern	\$3,482.64
San Francisco	\$3,384.66
Riverside	\$3,381.19
San Joaquin	\$3,178.07
Imperial	\$3,157.05
Los Angeles	\$2,880.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

On the other hand, Table 4-12b shows that Los Angeles County receives close to the median amount of state administrative revenues per program recipient in relation to the other counties analyzed.

**Table 4-12b**  
**Total State Administration Revenue per Program Recipient**  
**Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

County	Per Total Recipients
San Bernardino	\$1,978.70
Santa Clara	\$1,921.28
San Diego	\$1,731.70
Orange	\$1,472.33
Sacramento	\$1,367.68
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$1,292.90</b>
Alameda	\$1,194.22
Fresno	\$1,183.43
Riverside	\$1,089.36
Imperial	\$955.93
San Francisco	\$902.04
Kern	\$846.29
San Joaquin	\$514.19

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

**Section 5**  
**Federal Revenues per Program Services Recipient**  
**for Selected Counties**



Section 5 examines federal revenues to counties in much the same manner as did Section 3. In this section, however, the amount received by each county is not calculated on a per capita basis (that is, the dollar amount for every citizen residing in a particular county). Rather, the calculations are based on the number of program services recipients in each county. Unfortunately, as with the prior section, it is not possible from available data to precisely define the population groups for each specific social service revenue category. This is because the recipients of the services funded by these various programs are not separate, independent, discrete populations. That is to say, many of the recipients are afflicted by more than one of the social pathologies that these various programs are designed to address.

Table 5-1 shows federal health grants per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles is in the middle of the pack, with \$228.63 per recipient.

**Table 5-1  
Health Grants Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
Sacramento	\$753.12
San Diego	\$479.66
San Bernardino	\$381.25
Riverside	\$357.59
Orange	\$296.35
Santa Clara	\$264.38
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$228.63</b>
Alameda	\$113.77
Kern	\$34.12
Imperial	\$7.14
Fresno	\$0.07
San Francisco	\$0.00
San Joaquin	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-2 shows federal health administration funding per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles is third highest, with \$450.00 per recipient.

**Table 5-2  
Health Administration Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

County	Per Total Recipients
Santa Clara	\$1,009.88
San Bernardino	\$822.00
Los Angeles	\$450.00
Sacramento	\$231.00
Alameda	\$198.17
San Diego	\$144.00
Riverside	\$122.00
San Joaquin	\$106.06
Kern	\$10.00
Orange	\$3.00
Imperial	\$1.00
Fresno	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-3 shows federal Job Training Partnership Act funds per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles received the lowest amount of any of the listed counties which received such funds in FY 2002-03, with \$90.02 per recipient. Six counties, however, did not receive any such revenues in FY 2002-03.

**Table 5-3  
Job Training Partnership Act Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
Kern	\$481.28
Imperial	\$413.46
San Joaquin	\$412.36
Riverside	\$250.70
Orange	\$115.31
Alameda	\$108.01
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$90.02</b>
Fresno	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00
San Bernardino	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-4 shows federal public assistance program funds per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles is in the middle of the pack, with \$1,964.49 per recipient.

**Table 5-4  
Public Assistance Programs Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$5,600.63
San Diego	\$2,531.51
Sacramento	\$2,353.12
San Francisco	\$2,180.77
San Joaquin	\$2,142.15
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$1,964.49</b>
Riverside	\$1,569.59
Kern	\$1,532.30
Fresno	\$1,387.00
Santa Clara	\$1,325.11
Orange	\$1,086.55
Alameda	\$1,012.00
Imperial	\$782.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-5 shows federal Drug Enforcement Administration program funds per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles, like most counties, received no revenue from this source in FY 2002-03.

**Table 5-5  
DEA Programs/Drug and Alcohol Programs Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$350.26
Alameda	\$121.61
Imperial	\$91.89
Sacramento	\$20.94
Fresno	\$0.00
Kern	\$0.00
Los Angeles	\$0.00
Orange	\$0.00
Riverside	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00
San Joaquin	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-6 shows federal Community Development Block Grant funds per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles got a miniscule \$3.00 per recipient. This was the lowest amount, by far, of any of the counties receiving such funds in FY 2002-03.

**Table 5-6  
Community Development Block Grant Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$500.00
San Joaquin	\$175.00
Kern	\$150.00
Fresno	\$81.00
Orange	\$80.00
Santa Clara	\$59.00
Riverside	\$56.00
Alameda	\$36.00
Imperial	\$33.00
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$3.00</b>
Sacramento	\$0.00
San Diego	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-7 shows federal public assistance administration funds per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles was fifth highest, with \$1,888.14 per recipient.

**Table 5-7  
Public Assistance Administration Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$4,169.83
Santa Clara	\$3,300.64
Orange	\$2,160.20
San Diego	\$2,041.10
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$1,888.14</b>
Riverside	\$1,843.68
Alameda	\$1,839.66
Sacramento	\$1,766.15
Kern	\$1,140.15
Fresno	\$1,134.56
Imperial	\$781.25
San Francisco	\$470.18
San Joaquin	\$139.09

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services



Table 5-8 shows federal aging program funds per program services recipient (including homeless social service system recipients) for the counties listed in FY 2002-03. Los Angeles only received \$9.16 per recipient, the lowest amount by far of any of the counties that received funding from this source.

**Table 5-8  
Aging Programs Federal  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$181.62
San Diego	\$122.43
Imperial	\$67.26
Orange	\$59.99
San Joaquin	\$42.93
Kern	\$40.06
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$9.16</b>
Alameda	\$0.00
Fresno	\$0.00
Riverside	\$0.00
Sacramento	\$0.00
San Francisco	\$0.00
Santa Clara	\$0.00

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Tables 5-9a and 5-9b show the per capita program revenue for the categories of programs analyzed in this report. Note that in terms of actual revenue, Los Angeles County receives more than the median amount per program recipient of the counties analyzed (Table 5-9a).

**Table 5-9a**  
**Total Federal Program Revenue per Program Recipient Fiscal Year**  
**2002-2003**

County	Total Program
San Bernardino	\$7,013.77
San Diego	\$3,133.61
Sacramento	\$3,127.18
San Joaquin	\$2,772.43
Los Angeles	\$2,295.31
Kern	\$2,237.76
Riverside	\$2,233.87
San Francisco	\$2,180.77
Santa Clara	\$1,648.49
Orange	\$1,638.21
Fresno	\$1,468.07
Imperial	\$1,394.74
Alameda	\$1,391.39

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 5-9b shows that Los Angeles County also receives more than the median amount of federal administrative revenue per program recipient in relation to the other counties analyzed.

**Table 5-9b  
Total Federal Administration Revenue per Program Recipient  
Fiscal Year 2002-2003**

<b>County</b>	<b>Total Administration</b>
San Bernardino	\$4,991.83
Santa Clara	\$4,310.52
Los Angeles	\$2,338.14
San Diego	\$2,185.10
Orange	\$2,163.20
Alameda	\$2,037.83
Sacramento	\$1,997.15
Riverside	\$1,965.68
Kern	\$1,150.15
Fresno	\$1,134.56
Imperial	\$782.25
San Francisco	\$470.18
San Joaquin	\$245.15

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

**Section 6**  
**Total State Revenues per Program Services**  
**Recipient Profiles of Los Angeles and Selected**  
**Counties**

Table 6-1 shows the total social service revenue per program services recipient for the counties analyzed. Los Angeles is substantially below the median amount of \$4,140.09. If Los Angeles received the median amount of revenue per program services recipient, Los Angeles County would receive an additional \$62,151,800.30 per year.

**Table 6-1  
Total State Social Service Revenue per Social Service Recipients**

<b>County</b>	<b>Per Total Recipients</b>
San Bernardino	\$13,390.20
San Diego	\$6,176.39
Santa Clara	\$5,128.98
Alameda	\$5,117.75
Sacramento	\$4,586.48
Fresno	\$4,504.67
Orange	\$4,140.09
Kern	\$3,668.52
Imperial	\$3,506.15
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$3,383.03</b>
Riverside	\$3,354.89
San Francisco	\$3,220.41
San Joaquin	\$2,966.63
Median	\$4,140.09
Difference	\$757.06
Amount LA Should be Receiving	\$62,151,788.74

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services

Table 6-2 shows the same data as Table 6-1, but also includes the law enforcement revenue per program services recipient. Again, Los Angeles County is well below the median amount of \$5,133.99 per year. If Los Angeles received the median amount of revenue per program services recipient, Los Angeles County would receive an additional \$79,394,603.15 per year.

**Table 6-2**  
**Total State Social Service and Law Enforcement Revenue**  
**per Social Service Recipients**

County	Per Total Recipients
San Bernardino	\$16,162.97
San Diego	\$8,143.56
Santa Clara	\$7,845.69
Alameda	\$6,598.55
Orange	\$6,396.42
Sacramento	\$5,617.47
Fresno	\$5,139.99
Riverside	\$4,470.55
Kern	\$4,328.93
San Francisco	\$4,286.70
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>\$4,172.90</b>
Imperial	\$4,112.98
San Joaquin	\$3,692.25
Median	\$5,139.99
Difference	\$967.09
Amount LA should be receiving	\$79,394,603.15

Source: California State Controller Reports & California Department of Social Services