# Notes and Brief Reports

Concurrent Receipt of Public Assistance and Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, Early 1962\*

SINCE 1948 the Bureau of Family Services has collected annually from the States information on the extent to which recipients of public assistance also have income from the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program. Data from the State reports are available for the programs of old-age assistance and aid to families with dependent children for the entire period June 1948–February 1962 (tables 1 and 2). In 1962 the States that then had in operation a program of medical assistance for the aged included in their reports information on concurrent receipt of aid under that program and of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.

Similar data were collected for the programs of aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled in 1960 (for the first time) and again in 1961. Information for late 1962 will soon become available from the State reports on the characteristics of the recipients under these two programs.

In addition to information on the number of persons or families having income from both the assistance and the insurance programs, annual data have been obtained from the States on the total amounts of payments made under these programs to or in behalf of the persons covered in the report. The purpose to be served by the data was to show expected changes in the relationship of public assistance and old-age, survivors, and disability insurance as income-maintenance programs for the aged, for survivor families, and for individuals and their families who are in need of aid because of disability.

The following note relates only to (1) the incidence of concurrent receipt of old-age, survivors, and disability benefits among recipients of old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged, (2) the average old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefit paid to these recipients, and (3) the average levels of assistance payments and benefits to old-age assistance recipient-beneficiaries. The

discussion of medical assistance for the aged is based on data for the 12 States shown in table 3. Of the 26 States with such programs in February 1962, only 12 made payments in behalf of approximately 500 or more recipients in that month. In 12 other States¹ the recipient loads (17–469 persons) were considered too small for analysis. Two States, Guam and Puerto Rico, did not submit a report.

### INCIDENCE OF CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF OASDI AND OAA OR MAA

Continued liberalizations of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, especially those affecting eligibility requirements and coverage, have obviously contributed significantly to the decline since 1950 in the number of persons aged 65 and over who receive public assistance. Despite the great increase in the number of the aged to whom the insurance benefits are available, there remain many whose financial needs for daily living expenses or special expenses, or both, exceed their income from old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and other sources. These aged men and women therefore need supplementary aid from the public assistance programs.

In some States, receipt of even a relatively low insurance benefit makes the beneficiary ineligible for public assistance as long as his expenses are for current living only. He might, however, become eligible if high medical costs, for example, were to increase his financial need—especially if he had no income other than his benefit from the Federal insurance program.

The extent to which public assistance supplements the income maintenance provided for the aged by the insurance program is reflected in the growing number and proportion of old-age assistance recipients who are old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries (table 1). In early 1962, this proportion was, for the first time, more than one-third of all the aged having income from old-age assistance. Whether the proportion will continue to grow at the same rate may depend, to some extent, on developments under the federally aided program of medical assistance for the aged. This program, designed to provide medical care

16 SOCIAL SECURITY

<sup>\*</sup> Prepared by Gertrude B. Morton, Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Alabama, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and the Virgin Islands.

for medically indigent persons aged 65 and over, went into effect in October 1960.

The financial eligibility requirements for medical assistance for the aged vary from State to State, but they are generally more liberal than those for old-age assistance. Consequently, it was expected that old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries would be more heavily represented among recipients of medical assistance for the aged than of old-age assistance—an assumption borne out by data reported by 10 of the 12 States shown in table 3. The two exceptions were California and Massachusetts.

In California the proportion of beneficiaries was substantially lower among recipients of medical assistance for the aged (40.3 percent) than among recipients of old-age assistance (51.3 percent). Program operations started in January 1962, and both in that month and in February—the month for which data were reported by California—almost four-fifths of the persons whose applications were approved were transferred to medical assistance for the aged after having received long-term nursing care under old-age assistance, mostly in county nursing homes. It seems likely that there would be proportionately fewer persons with income from old-age, survivors, and disability insurance among long-term patients in public institutions than among

Table 1.—Aged persons and families with dependent children receiving both public assistance payments and OASDI benefits, 1948-62

| Month and<br>year  | Aged I<br>both O  | persons rec  | eiving<br>DASDI   | Families with children<br>receiving AFDC<br>and OASDI  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  |   | Percer   | nt of-  |  | Percent of—  |  |  |
|  | Num-<br>ber   | OAA<br>recip-<br>ients   | OASDI<br>benefi-<br>ciaries<br>aged 65<br>and<br>over                                 | Num-<br>ber  | AFDC families  | OASDI<br>benefi-<br>ciary<br>families<br>with<br>children<br>under<br>age 18 |  |
| June 1948. September 1950. August 1951. February 1952. February 1953. February 1955. February 1955. February 1956. February 1957. February 1957. February 1958. March 1959. February 1960. February 1961. February 1962. | 146,000<br>276,200<br>376,500<br>406,000<br>426,500<br>463,000<br>488,800<br>516,300<br>596,500<br>647,900<br>675,600<br>715,400<br>753,800 | 6.1<br>9.8<br>13.8<br>15.1<br>16.3<br>18.0<br>19.2<br>20.4<br>22.2<br>24.2<br>26.7<br>28.5<br>31.0<br>33.7 | 10.0<br>12.6<br>11.9<br>12.0<br>10.7<br>8.7<br>8.0<br>7.8<br>7.1<br>6.9<br>6.7<br>6.6 | 21,600<br>32,300<br>30,700<br>30,000<br>30,600<br>31,900<br>32,100<br>32,600<br>41,900<br>41,900<br>41,000<br>43,900<br>50,200 | 4.8<br>4.9<br>5.0<br>5.3<br>5.9<br>5.2<br>5.3<br>5.1<br>5.4<br>5.4<br>5.2<br>5.3 | 6.7<br>8.3<br>6.7<br>6.1<br>5.7<br>5.4<br>4.9<br>4.6<br>4.2<br>4.2<br>4.2    |  |

all old-age assistance recipients, including those able to purchase more expensive nursing-home care in privately sponsored or commercial institutions. In Massachusetts the medical assistance for the aged program is also characterized by a high proportion (three-fifths) of transfer cases that had been receiving nursing-home care under old-age assistance.

Data presented in table 3 show that the proportion of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance

Table 2.—Concurrent receipt of OASDI benefits by recipients of OAA, February 1962, and by families receiving AFDC, late 1961,2 by State

|   | Aged persons r<br>and OASDI a  | Families receiving   |   |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| State   | OAA<br>recipients  | OASDI<br>beneficiaries<br>aged 65<br>and over                                  | OASDI as percent of AFDC families   |  |
| Total 3   | 33.7   | 6.5  | 5.7   |  |
| Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida Georgia                       | 29. 2<br>38. 6<br>34. 2<br>21. 2<br>51. 3<br>43. 1<br>50. 5<br>33. 8<br>41. 2<br>20. 8 | 18.5<br>14.3<br>7.4<br>9.7<br>13.5<br>20.0<br>3.6<br>1.5<br>2.6<br>7.1<br>11.5 | 7.2<br>11.4<br>6.8<br>6.9<br>6.1<br>6.1<br>4.3<br>2.4<br>4.2<br>9.2<br>10.3 |  |
| Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisiana Maine Maryland Massachusetts   | 27.0<br>36.5<br>31.3<br>30.6<br>33.1<br>28.0<br>26.3<br>33.9<br>41.7<br>27.1<br>57.5   | 1.4<br>4.9<br>3.1<br>2.3<br>4.6<br>4.6<br>4.6<br>33.9<br>5.7<br>1.7<br>8.4     | 3.3<br>6.7<br>2.8<br>8.2<br>7.1<br>6.8<br>13.4<br>7.6<br>12.0<br>• 2.3      |  |
| Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Mississippi Missouri Montana Nebraska Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey New Mexico New Mexico New York | 36.6 4<br>34.8<br>31.0<br>40.1<br>36.4<br>30.0<br>55.7<br>39.0<br>40.2<br>222.2        | 4.0<br>6.2<br>21.7<br>13.4<br>5.0<br>3.6<br>11.5<br>3.5<br>1.7<br>7.8          | 5.9<br>8.3<br>9.7<br>9.2<br>8.9<br>8.9<br>5.1<br>8.7<br>3.0<br>7.0<br>3.5   |  |
| North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Puerto Rico Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota                  | 18.1<br>25.8<br>36.4<br>29.5<br>45.1<br>33.7<br>48.0<br>9.1<br>28.3                    | 3.8<br>3.9<br>4.9<br>17.7<br>5.0<br>1.9<br>.1<br>4.4<br>2.8<br>4.8             | 5.6<br>9.0<br>5.0<br>6.6<br>3.0<br>2.1<br>2.3<br>4.0                        |  |
| Tennessee Texas Utah Vermont Virgin Islands Virginia. Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming                                    | 12.4<br>29.0<br>29.4<br>41.6<br>.4<br>14.6<br>44.7<br>11.3<br>35.0<br>39.8             | 3.2<br>14.1<br>4.7<br>7.3<br>.3<br>1.1<br>10.0<br>1.6<br>3.6<br>6.1            | 7.7<br>6.6<br>5.6<br>12.7<br>2.8<br>5.1<br>4.7<br>4.6<br>9.4<br>8.7         |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> January 1962 data for 3 States and New York City.

November 1953 data for AFDC families.
 October-December 1961 data for AFDC families.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Includes data on unemployed-parent families receiving payments under AFDC, authorized by P. L. 87-31, effective May 1961. If families with unemployed parents were excluded this figure would be 6 percent.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> October 1961 data for 1 State, November 1961 data for 20 States, and December data for 30 States.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes Guam for OAA and AFDC, Massachusetts and Oregon for AFDC; data not reported.

beneficiaries among the recipients of medical assistance for the aged within a State was strongly related to the manner in which the State used the assistance program. In those States where substantial proportions of the recipient load consisted of persons previously receiving aid under other public assistance programs, there were proportionately fewer beneficiaries among recipients of medical assistance for the aged than in the States that did not make such transfers. This finding suggests that in February 1962 the recipients of medical assistance for the aged in the 12 States were not a homogeneous group of persons only medically indigent but included, in six of these States, a substantial number whose financial indigence (often related, however, to need for high-cost medical care) had made them eligible for public assistance before their States established a program of medical assistance for the aged.

### AVERAGE OASDI BENEFITS OF OAA AND MAA RECIPIENTS

Medical assistance for the aged is designed, of course, to provide aid to the aged who are medically indigent. It was therefore expected that the program would affect a group of beneficiaries who have higher old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits than do the insurance beneficiaries among old-age assistance recipients and who, ther fore, also are less likely to be eligible for old-age assist-

Table 3.—Concurrent receipt of OASDI by MAA recipients, February 1962, and percent of persons approved for MAA who were transferred from other assistance programs, cumulative through February 1962, by State <sup>1</sup>

| State<br>(ranked by percent of<br>recipients receiving<br>OASDI)                | Recipient                    | s of MAA   | Percent of MAA<br>approvals transferred<br>(cumulative through<br>February 1962) from— |  |  |  |
|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Total<br>number              | Percent<br>receiving<br>OASDI                                | OAA  | APTD                                   |  |  |
| Washington<br>Arkansas<br>Kentucky<br>West Virginia                             | 496<br>833<br>1,708<br>9,110 | 85.1<br>84.6<br>79.4<br>74.9                                 | 0.8  | (2)                                    |  |  |
| Maryland. Michigan Massachusetts. New York Utah. Idaho California. North Dakota | 5,350                        | 72.2<br>57.0<br>55.5<br>51.9<br>48.6<br>40.4<br>40.3<br>38.3 | 17.2<br>60.5<br>37.0<br>52.8<br>79.1<br>72.2   | 0.4<br>1.5<br>.5<br>39.2<br>2.7<br>4.2 |  |  |

Of the 26 States having a program of MAA in February 1962, only the 12 States with recipient loads of approximately 500 or more are included in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Less than 0.05 percent.

ance. Data reported for February 1962 show that in each of the 12 States in table 3 the average oldage, survivors, and disability insurance benefits going to recipients of medical assistance for the aged were higher than those paid to recipients of old-age assistance, with the difference for the individual States ranging from \$6 to \$22. The difference tended to be greater in the States with recipient loads for medical assistance for the aged composed almost entirely of persons not previously receiving aid under another federally aided assistance program than it was in the States that transferred recipients from other programs to medical assistance for the aged. This finding also suggests that the financial characteristics of aged persons being assisted under medical assistance for the aged varies with the State's use of the program.

## AVERAGE LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS AND BENEFITS TO OAA RECIPIENT-BENEFICIARIES

The average assistance payment (including vendor payments for medical care) for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries among recipients of old-age assistance was slightly lower in February 1962 (\$55.48) than in February The average old-age assistance 1961 (\$55.75). payment to nonbeneficiaries went up during the 12 months from \$74.21 to \$78.87. The average assistance payment to insurance beneficiaries in February 1962 thus represented a smaller proportion of the average payment to nonbeneficiaries than in February 1961—70 percent compared with 75 percent. The difference between the two average assistance payments in February 1962 was \$23, substantially greater than the \$18 difference a year earlier.

The average insurance benefit received by beneficiaries on the old-age assistance rolls was \$47.28—\$3.20 more than in 1961, an increase that probably reflects, at least in part, the increase in the minimum insurance benefit from \$33 to \$40 (effective in late 1961). In 1962 the average benefit of recipient-beneficiaries represented almost the same proportion (about two-thirds) of the average benefit paid to all beneficiaries aged 65 and over as in February 1961.

The combined monthly income from both programs for recipient-beneficiaries—an average of \$102.76—was larger in February 1962 than it had (Continued on page 32)

Table 17.—General assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, November 1962

[Excludes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

|   | Number of—  |  | Payments to recipients  |   |  | Percentage change from—   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| State   | Cases Re  |  | Total<br>amount   | Average per—  |  | October 1962 in—  |  | November 1961 in—  |   |
|   |   | Recipients   |   | . Case  | Recipient  | Number of recipients  | Amount   | Number of recipients   | Amount  |
| Total 2   | 333,000   | 821,000  | \$22,534,000  | \$67.69   | \$27.44  | +4.0  | +2.4   | -11.7  | -13.5   |
| Alabama<br>Alaska¹<br>Arizona<br>Arizonsas  | 81<br>204<br>2,831<br>312   | 84<br>545<br>5,697<br>1,160  | 1,046<br>12,645<br>173,074<br>4,585   | 12.91<br>61.99<br>61.14<br>14.70  | 12.45<br>23.20<br>30.38<br>3.95  | (3)<br>-8.1<br>-10.4  | (3)<br>-5.9<br>-12.6   | (3)<br>-8.2<br>+17.2   | $ \begin{array}{r}                                     $  |
| California. Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia  | 31,273<br>1,606<br>5 4,373<br>1,193<br>948  | 71,598<br>5,759<br>5 11,384<br>2,119<br>1,010  | 1,876,943<br>77,278<br>5 310,919<br>62,844<br>70,925  | $egin{array}{c} 60.02 \\ 48.12 \\ 71.10 \\ 52.68 \\ 74.82 \\ \hline \end{array}$        | 26. 22<br>13. 42<br>27. 31<br>29. 66<br>70. 22   | $\begin{array}{r} +6.4 \\ +20.0 \\ +4.9 \\ +5.0 \\ -1.4 \end{array}$  | $ \begin{array}{r}2 \\ +30.8 \\ +5.2 \\ +1.7 \\4 \end{array} $   | $\begin{array}{c c} -18.1 \\ +13.2 \\ +1.0 \\ -12.5 \\ -41.4 \end{array}$                                      | $     \begin{array}{r}       -22.2 \\       +24.4 \\       +8.9 \\       -21.6 \\       -40.6     \end{array} $ |
| Florida <sup>6</sup><br>Georgia   | 8,800<br>2,364  | (7)<br>6,028   | 272,000<br>76,977   | 32.56   | 12.77  | +3.4  | +2.3   | +5.6   | +8.1  |
| Guam <sup>8</sup>   | $\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ 1,061 \\ 27,046 \\ 3,900 \end{array}$                      | 4<br>1,445<br>54,877<br>9,000  | $\begin{array}{c} 122\\ 72,042\\2,220,315\\146,000\end{array}$  | $67.90 \\ 82.09$  | (8)<br>49.86<br>40.46  | +.7<br>-3.8   | $^{+2.0}_{-2.1}$   | +9.2<br>-47.6  | $^{+16.3}_{-48.6}$  |
| KansasKentucky  | 2,761<br>1,893  | 8,068<br>5,782<br>8,099<br>9,077<br>5,313<br>13,663<br>114,108                         | 195,055<br>71,387<br>389,433<br>120,749<br>329,677<br>448,664<br>3,294,041  | 70.65<br>37.71  | 24.18<br>12.35   | +3.3<br>-5.5  | $^{+3.4}_{3}$  | $-7.1 \\ -10.4$  | -2.6 $-11.5$  |
| Louisiana' Maine Maryland Massachusetts Massachusetts   | 2,664<br>4,680<br>6,620   |  |   | 52.64<br>45.33<br>70.44<br>67.77<br>104.16  | 48.08<br>13.30<br>62.05<br>32.84<br>28.87  | $+8.6 \\ +3.8 \\ +2.2 \\ +.6$   | $^{+27.6}_{-2.6}$ $^{-1.6}_{5}$  | $\begin{array}{r} +.6 \\ +22.8 \\ -6.2 \\ -19.3 \end{array}$   | +14.0 $+30.7$ $-8.2$ $-17.5$  |
| Minnesota. Mississtppi Missouri Montana. Nebraska. Nevada. New Hampshire. New Jersey <sup>9</sup> New Mexico. New Mexico. | 8,624<br>1,026<br>9,241<br>1,176<br>1,057<br>213<br>818<br>8,366<br>471<br>30,693 | 24,882<br>1,367<br>12,136<br>3,791<br>3,031<br>342<br>2,556<br>26,753<br>824<br>73,823 | 704, 370<br>15, 549<br>526, 314<br>53, 252<br>53, 052<br>10, 157<br>44, 520<br>999, 542<br>18, 886<br>2, 670, 567 | 81.68<br>15.15<br>56.95<br>45.28<br>50.19<br>47.69<br>54.43<br>119.48<br>40.10<br>87.01 | 28.31<br>11.37<br>43.37<br>14.05<br>17.50<br>29.70<br>17.42<br>37.36<br>22.92<br>36.18 | $\begin{array}{c} +10.4 \\ +.9 \\ -2.3 \\ +31.9 \\ +10.0 \\ +9.3 \\ +5.9 \\ +4.0 \\ -4.4 \\ +2.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} +10.3 \\ +2.3 \\5 \\ +12.5 \\ +14.5 \\ +5.0 \\ +7.5 \\ +9.3 \\ +2.8 \\ +3.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} -7.3 \\ +14.7 \\ -1.2 \\ -8.4 \\ +11.6 \\ -26.6 \\ -1.8 \\ +4.1 \\ -13.8 \\ +.2 \end{array}$ | $egin{array}{c} +1.2 \\ +9.6 \\ -13.8 \\ -24.6 \\ +2.3 \\ -16.1 \\ +.5 \\ +7.8 \\ +7.8 \\ +7.8 \end{array}$     |
| North Carolina  | 1,863<br>337<br>35,594<br>7,590<br>3,952  | 5,408<br>1,324<br>132,324<br>(7)<br>(7)  | 48,116<br>18,197<br>2,794,027<br>100,643<br>212,512   | 25.83<br>54.00<br>78.50<br>13.26<br>53.77   | 8.90<br>13.74<br>21.12   | $^{+15.6}_{+23.9}_{+6.3}$   | $+8.1 \\ +15.0 \\ +2.8 \\ -3.7 \\ +2.8$  | +17.4<br>-37.2<br>-7.5   | $   \begin{array}{r}     +20.1 \\     -31.8 \\     -9.9 \\     +7.0 \\     -6.1    \end{array} $                |
| Pennsylvania Puerto Rico Rhode Island South Carolina South Dakota.  | 37,584<br>1,375<br>2,340<br>1,405   | 45,825<br>1,375<br>5,379<br>1,646  | 5 2,235,532<br>5 10,550<br>149,991<br>44,727  | 59.48<br>7.67<br>64.10<br>31.83<br>32.36  | 48.78<br>7.67<br>27.88<br>27.17<br>10.95   | $\begin{array}{r} +.8 \\ +7.1 \\ +8.3 \\ +2.0 \\ -2.0 \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{c} +1.6 \\ +11.0 \\ +26.2 \\7 \\ -1.2 \end{array}$  | +8.5<br>+3.5<br>8<br>-34.9-<br>-3.6  | +11.5<br>+9.5<br>+15.5<br>-5.5<br>6   |
| Tennessee   | 2,038   | 6,346  | 38,670<br>221,000   | 18.97   | 6.09   | +4.8  | +11.1  | +1.7   | +5.1  |
| Texas 11Utah  | 1.096   | 6 2,445  | 80,955<br>26,000  | 73.86   | 33.11  | -4.2  | +19.2  | +26.4  | -15.7   |
| Vermont <sup>11</sup> Virgin Islands <sup>4</sup> Virginia  | 159<br>2,229<br>9,039<br>1,333<br>7,501<br>376                                    | 168<br>5,409<br>22,397<br>2,365<br>23,592<br>1,576                                     | 5,154<br>100,104<br>682,602   | 32.42<br>44.91<br>75.52<br>31.93<br>90.22<br>81.74                                      | 30.68<br>18.51<br>30.48<br>18.00<br>28.68<br>19.50                                     | $\begin{array}{r} +21.8 \\ +37.0 \\ +11.7 \\ +5.7 \\ +28.5 \end{array}$                                       | $\begin{array}{r} +6.7 \\ +25.7 \\ +4.6 \\ +3.0 \\ +20.9 \end{array}$                                      | $\begin{array}{c} +15.2 \\ +7.8 \\ -39.1 \\ -14.8 \\ +10.9 \end{array}$  | +3.8<br>-25.6<br>-47.4<br>-15.6<br>+31.2  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For definition of terms see the Bulletin, October 1957, p. 18. All data sub-

5 About 9 percent of this total is estimated.

6 Partly estimated.

Data not available.
 Data for September; data for October and November not available

cal care.  $^{\rm 11}$  Estimated on basis of reports from a sample of local jurisdictions.

#### CONCURRENT RECEIPT

(Continued from page 18)

been a year earlier. The combined amount, however, was only \$24 more than the average monthly income of nonbeneficiaries from assistance payments in 1962. It had been \$26 more in 1961. Two reasons may account for the fact that the combined amount is, in general, higher than the old-age assistance payment going to nonbeneficiaries: (1) the relatively high need among recipient-beneficiaries, and (2) the limiting effect on assistance payments, particularly for nonbeneficiaries, of maximums and/or percentage reductions from determined need that are applied by many States.

ject to revision.

2 Partly estimated; does not represent sum of State figures because totals exclude for New Jersey an estimated number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial and payments for such ing only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burns and payments to sach services; recipient count also includes an estimate for States not reporting such data. Excludes Idaho and Indiana; data not available.

3 Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change, on fewer than 100 recipients.

4 Data for October; data for November not available.

<sup>9</sup> Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial, and total payments for such services. Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medi-