CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES
820 First Street, NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-408-1080   Fax: 202-408-1056   center@cbpp.org   http://www.cbpp.org

September 28, 2001

ANALYSIS OF TANF SPENDING THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2001

by Zoë Neuberger and Ed Lazere

In the five years since the 1996 welfare law created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant, the nature and rate of state spending on low-income families has changed dramatically. In federal fiscal years 1997 and 1998 many states left a significant portion of their TANF funds unspent. The accumulation of unspent funds was largely a result of decreasing cash assistance caseloads and initial uncertainty states had about the extent of flexibility to use TANF funds to establish or expand programs to serve low-income families. Since the release of the final TANF regulations in 1999, states have generally been spending close to their full TANF grant amount each year. Many states have taken advantage of the TANF funds freed up by cash assistance caseload declines to invest in a wide range of benefits and services for low-income families, such as transportation, child care, job training, services for parents with disabilities, and substance abuse treatment.

New TANF financial data indicate that spending trends that began to appear in federal fiscal years 1999 and 2000 have continued in fiscal year 2001. Midway through the fiscal year, many states have spent an amount equal or nearly equal to half of their fiscal year 2001 TANF grant. While some states still have substantial balances of unspent funds from the early years of the program, TANF spending has increased in many states to a level that is beginning to draw down those balances in some states.

- Nationally, the use of TANF funds in the first half of fiscal year 2001 — that is, TANF expenditures and TANF funds transferred to either the Social Services Block Grant or the Child Care and Development Fund — equaled 93 percent of half of the fiscal year 2001 TANF allocation.

- Twenty-two states used TANF funds amounting to 95 percent or more of half of their fiscal year 2001 TANF allocation.

- Sixteen states used TANF funds exceeding half the state's fiscal year 2001 allocation plus bonuses, which means that if spending continued at the same rate throughout the year, these states would draw on balances from earlier years to strengthen programs serving low-income families.

Under the 1996 welfare law, funds that a state leaves unspent in a given year are reserved by the federal government and can be accessed by the state in future years. As a result, states that are spending their entire grant amount may still have unspent balances from prior years. Most states still have some unspent balances that are available to implement investments that help needy families overcome barriers to work and provide supports that help low-income working families remain employed.

This paper analyzes TANF spending through the middle of federal fiscal year 2001 — March 31, 2001 — based on expenditure data states have prepared for federal reporting purposes. (The federal fiscal year runs from October through September.) It also includes information on the amount of funds states have transferred from TANF to the Child Care and Development Fund and the Social Services Block Grant, as well as the level of expenditures states have made from their own funds as part of the TANF maintenance-of-effort requirement. This paper is an update of earlier Center reports on TANF spending.[1] While mid-year spending trends are generally indicative of spending over the course of the entire fiscal year, it is important to bear in mind that states do not necessarily spend or transfer funds at a uniform rate throughout the year.

Data Source

Each state is required to report quarterly to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services on its expenditures of TANF funds, using the "ACF-196" federal reporting form. These reports identify expenditures of TANF funds by major category — assistance and non-assistance — and also by more specific uses of the funds, such as education and training, child care, or transportation. The reports also show the extent to which states transferred TANF funds to the Social Services Block Grant and the Child Care and Development Fund, the amount of TANF funds that remain unspent, and expenditures states made from their own funds as a condition of receiving the TANF block grant — known as state maintenance-of-effort (MOE) funds.

The ACF-196 reports for the quarter ending on March 31, 2001 were collected from May 2001 through July 2001 by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities from the state agencies responsible for preparing the ACF-196 reports — typically the budget, accounting, or federal reporting division of the state's welfare agency. These data have not been verified by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and thus should be considered preliminary. In addition, some states may have revised their ACF-196 reports since the time they obtained for this analysis. With the exception of Table IV, analyses involving spending or grant amounts for prior fiscal years are based on ACF-196 forms collected by the Center on Budget and Policy

[1] See, for example, Ed Lazere, *Unspent TANF Funds at the End of Federal Fiscal Year 2000*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, February 23, 2001, http://www.cbpp.org/1-22-01sfp00surplus.htm, or Ed Lazere, *Unspent TANF Funds in the Middle of Federal Fiscal Year 2000*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, August 2, 2000 http://www.cbpp.org/8-2-00wel.htm.

Priorities for fiscal year 2001 and on data for prior fiscal years that HHS has made available.[2] Data on unspent funds and analyses in Table IV, rely on ACF-196 forms collected by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. The tables in this paper use rounding, and therefore rows and columns do not always appear to add to the total amount shown.

Unliquidated Obligations and Unobligated Funds

TANF funds that a state has not spent or transferred are reported in two categories on the ACF-196 reports, following traditional budgeting methods: "unliquidated obligations" and "unobligated" funds.

"Unliquidated obligations" refer to amounts that a state has committed to spend but has not yet spent.[3] For example, this could include funds a state has contracted to pay a private service provider, such as a child care agency, but has not yet paid out because the service has not yet been provided. Unliquidated obligations also could include payments that a state is processing, but has not finalized, for services that already have been provided. "Unobligated" TANF funds refer to the funds states have neither spent nor committed to spend as of a given date.

Because unliquidated obligations generally reflect an intent to make expenditures, these funds may not be available for spending the way that unobligated funds are. For two reasons described below, however, it is worthwhile to examine the amount of unliquidated obligations in each state when examining unspent TANF balances.

Some funds reported as unliquidated obligations could be considered unobligated funds. The reporting of unliquidated obligations has varied from state to state. Some states report *all* TANF funds that have not been expended as unliquidated obligations, while a number of other states report all unspent TANF funds as unobligated and report no unliquidated obligations. (This is illustrated in Table III.)

In states with substantial amounts of unliquidated obligations and little or no unobligated funds, it seems likely that at least a portion of unliquidated obligations reflect funds that generally would be considered unobligated funds. Some state officials have acknowledged in phone conversations with Center on Budget and Policy Priorities staff that all unspent TANF funds are reported as unliquidated obligations, whether the funds have been committed for a specific purpose or not.

---

[2] See http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/index.html.

[3] HHS regulations, which are referenced in the instructions for completing the unliquidated obligations line of the ACF-196, define obligations as "the amounts of orders placed, contracts and subgrants awarded, goods and services received, and similar transactions during a given period that will require payment by the grantee during the same or a future period." 45 C.F.R. § 92.3.

No systematic analysis of unliquidated TANF obligations has been conducted, but it is likely that in many states at least a significant share of the obligated funds are or will become available for new uses. In some cases, TANF funds that have been reported as obligated reflect funds for which spending authority has been granted to counties or other local entities. Although such funds should not be reported as obligated unless the county or locality obligates them, it appears that some states report these funds as unliquidated obligations as soon as they are allocated for a county's use. In other states that have obligated large amounts of TANF funds for specific activities, such as child care, it may take a long period to actually expend the large amount of newly obligated funds. In these states, policy makers may decide at a future date to alter the planned use of those funds. This means that a portion of the unliquidated obligations in some states, while reflecting a real obligation of funds, ultimately may be available for other uses that assist low-income families.

The final TANF regulations have given states an incentive to report unspent funds as being obligated. The TANF regulations that went into effect on October 1, 1999 include a provision that restricts a state's use of unspent funds from prior years. The regulations prohibit states from spending carryover funds on activities other than cash assistance or other forms of ongoing assistance intended to meet a family's basic needs, such as housing.[4] The federal regulations thus do not allow states to use unspent TANF funds from previous years on many otherwise allowable activities, such as work supports for employed families. These kinds of activities represent a growing share of the use of TANF funds.

The regulations provide one exception to the restriction on use of prior-year TANF funds. Funds that a state *obligates* from its current-year TANF allocation for activities other than ongoing basic assistance can be spent in that year or the following year. If, for example, a state obligated $10 million in TANF funds for transportation services in fiscal year 2000, it would have until the end of fiscal year 2001 to spend those funds on transportation. (Any of those funds not spent by the end of fiscal year 2001 would have to be spent in future years on ongoing basic assistance.) By contrast, if the state did not obligate TANF funds in fiscal year 2000, none of its funds carried forward could be spent on transportation for employed families in fiscal year 2001.

It is likely that this restriction on the use of carryover TANF funds does not greatly limit a state's ability to use TANF funds. States can retain flexibility by using carryover funds to provide cash assistance and using their current-year TANF allocation for other services and benefits. Nevertheless, it appears that some state officials believe this provision limits their

---

[4] The preamble to the final TANF regulations indicates that states can spend funds carried forward from prior years only on activities considered "assistance." 64 Fed. Reg. 17840-41 (April 12, 1999). The term "assistance" is defined in the regulations to include benefits and services that help families meet ongoing basic needs such as shelter or food, with some exceptions. The regulations specify that many uses of TANF funds are not considered "assistance, " including short-term assistance; child care, transportation, and other work supports for employed families; wage subsidies; state earned income tax credits; and services such as counseling that do not provide basic income support. 64 Fed. Reg. 17880 (April 12, 1999).

flexibility, and this appears to lead some states to obligate a substantial amount of their unspent funds before the end of fiscal year.[5]

Rainy Day Funds

One of the tenets of the 1996 welfare legislation was to devolve many welfare policy and spending decisions to states. In combination with greater state flexibility and authority, annual federal funds were capped so that states bear more of the risk of unanticipated increases in program costs. Under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, the federal government shared with states some of the increased costs of providing cash assistance during recessions, when poverty rises and more families qualify for cash assistance. Under TANF, however, annual grants do not increase in the event of a recession. Thus, one of the more difficult spending decisions facing a state is whether to set aside — to cover potential future cost increases in a recession — federal TANF funds that could otherwise be used to serve families with immediate needs.

It is important to understand that even if a state has set aside federal TANF funds to meet potential future costs, sometimes known as a "rainy day fund," the actual dollars remain in the federal treasury and are reported as unobligated funds. Under federal cash management policies, TANF block grant funds are transferred to states only as reimbursement for actual expenditures on TANF programs. Because establishment of a "rainy day fund" does not entail an expenditure on benefits and services, such funds remain classified as unspent TANF funds until the state taps into the reserve fund.

The point of examining funds that remain unspent is not to suggest that all funds should have been spent, but rather to illustrate the variety of spending decisions that have been made by states. There is a range of reasonable policy options a state may choose in allocating resources between meeting current needs and reserving them for potential future needs. At the extremes, however, poor families are not well served. Spending TANF funds quickly but unwisely does not serve poor families well. Nor does accumulating large reserves of unspent TANF funds while inadequately serving families. Reserving some TANF funds to guard against recessionary pressures increases the TANF funds that remain unspent by states, but maintaining reserves is a legitimate use of TANF funds.

---

[5] In addition, a number of states obligated a substantial amount of unspent TANF funds prior to October 1, 1999 — when the new regulations went into effect — from their fiscal year 1997, 1998, and 1999 allocations. Because the restrictions were not applicable before October 1, 1999, states that obligated funds before then could spend those funds on non-assistance and were not required to spend them within a year.

Table I: Unobligated TANF Funds in the Middle of Federal Fiscal Year 2001

Table I identifies the level of unobligated TANF funds in each state as of March 31, 2001, the middle of federal fiscal year 2001. These are the most recent data available.

The first column identifies unobligated TANF amounts that remain unspent from each state's TANF allocations for fiscal years 1997 through 2000 plus the unobligated funds from half of the fiscal year 2001 TANF grant. The second column of Table I measures the accumulated unobligated TANF balance as a percentage of the cumulative amount of TANF funding available to each state from fiscal year 1997 through the middle of fiscal year 2001. It thus reflects the portion of all TANF funds available to the state since the inception of the TANF block grant that has not been obligated. (Each state's annual TANF allocation is included in Table VII of this report.)

> EXAMPLE: As of March 31, 2001, Arizona had $101.8 million in unobligated TANF funds. This amount equals 9 percent of the TANF funds that have been available to Arizona in the period from fiscal year 1997, when TANF was implemented, through the middle of fiscal year 2001.

The figures presented here differ from those presented in the ACF-196 financial reports states submitted to HHS in one key way. To determine the amount of unobligated TANF funds from the first half of the fiscal year 2001 TANF allocation, Table I subtracts the amount of TANF funds that were spent, transferred, or obligated in the first half of fiscal year 2001 from an amount equal to half of the state's fiscal year 2001 TANF grant. By contrast, the unobligated funds identified in the state TANF ACF-196 financial reports reflect the difference between a state's use of TANF funds and the amount of TANF funds "awarded" to the state in the first half of fiscal year 2001. The amount "awarded" in essence reflects the amount the state has reported to HHS that it may need and would like to have access to during a given period.[6] In some states, the awarded amount is significantly more or less than half of its annual TANF allocation. Because the amount awarded is somewhat arbitrary, it is more instructive to compare uses of TANF funds in the first six months of the year with half of the year's grant, as is done in Table I.

[6] The federal government sets limits on the portion of the TANF block grant a state can be awarded for a given calendar quarter. The awarded amount represents the maximum amount for which a state can claim reimbursement in a given period.

Table I
Unobligated TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001
(middle of federal fiscal year 2001)

	Unobligated TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001* (in millions)	Unobligated Funds as a Percent of TANF Funds Available**
Alabama	$85.9	18%
Alaska	$17.6	7%
Arizona	$101.8	9%
Arkansas	$19.6	8%
California	$1,151.3	7%
Colorado	$0.0	0%
Connecticut	$0.0	0%
Delaware	$0.0	0%
District of Columbia	$39.6	9%
Florida	$345.9	13%
Georgia	$182.6	12%
Hawaii	$24.4	6%
Idaho	$24.2	19%
Illinois	$18.3	1%
Indiana	$25.2	3%
Iowa	$21.5	4%
Kansas	$19.0	4%
Kentucky	$0.0	0%
Louisiana	$196.4	26%
Maine	$10.2	3%
Maryland	$109.4	11%
Massachusetts	$22.8	1%
Michigan	$129.7	4%
Minnesota	$115.2	11%
Mississippi	$80.5	20%
Missouri	$0.0	0%
Montana	$23.0	12%
Nebraska	$16.0	6%
Nevada	$35.4	18%
New Hampshire	$7.5	4%
New Jersey	$0.0	0%
New Mexico	$20.9	4%
New York	$732.3	7%
North Carolina	$33.6	2%
North Dakota	$13.0	13%
Ohio	$481.6	15%
Oklahoma	$122.6	18%
Oregon	$0.4	0%
Pennsylvania	$185.0	6%
Rhode Island	$6.6	2%
South Carolina	$11.3	3%
South Dakota	$20.1	22%
Tennessee	$93.1	10%
Texas	$136.7	6%
Utah	$47.5	13%
Vermont	$5.4	3%
Virginia	$0.0	0%
Washington	$137.6	8%
West Virginia	$121.4	26%
Wisconsin	$67.7	5%
Wyoming	$50.9	55%
U.S. Total	$5,110.8	7%

* Reflects unobligated TANF amounts from TANF allocations prior to fiscal year 2001 plus unobligated funds from the first half of the fiscal year 2001 TANF allocation (funds transferred, spent, or obligated are subtracted from half of the FY 2001 allocation, regardless of how much the state has actually drawn down).
** Unobligated balances as a percent of TANF funds awarded from FY 1997 through FY 2000 plus half of the FY 2001 allocation.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Table II: Unliquidated Obligations in the Middle of Federal Fiscal Year 2001

The figures in Table I do not reflect amounts reported as unliquidated obligations, because such funds generally are not available for new spending initiatives. Unliquidated obligations typically are amounts a state has committed to spend — through contracts that have been established or for goods and services that have been received — but has not yet paid out.

Yet, as noted earlier, a number of states report substantial unliquidated obligations of TANF funds. In some states with substantial unliquidated obligations and little or no unobligated funds, at least some of the unliquidated obligations generally would be considered unobligated funds. Some of the states obligated a substantial amount of TANF funds by giving increased spending authority to local welfare agencies. In such states, at least some of these funds may remain unobligated at the local level. In other states where unliquidated obligations increased significantly in recent months, it may be difficult to spend such large amounts over the next year. As a result, policy makers may have the opportunity to re-direct some of those obligated funds to help low-income families in other ways. For both of these reasons, it is important to assess the amounts of TANF funds reported as unliquidated obligations.

Table II identifies the unliquidated TANF obligations in each state as of March 31, 2001. The table also calculates the amount of each state's unliquidated obligations as a percentage of the cumulative amount of TANF funds made available to each state through the middle of fiscal year 2001.

> EXAMPLE: Midway through federal fiscal year 2001, Minnesota reported $42.0 million in federal TANF funds as unliquidated obligations. The amount of unliquidated obligations is equivalent to four percent of the TANF funds that have been available to the state from the inception of its TANF program.

Table II
Unliquidated Obligations of TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001 (middle of federal fiscal year 2001)

	Unliquidated Obligations of TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001* (in millions)	Unliquidated Obligations as a Percent of TANF Funds Available**
Alabama	$1.1	0%
Alaska	$2.0	1%
Arizona	$35.0	3%
Arkansas	$0.0	0%
California	$206.8	1%
Colorado	$121.3	22%
Connecticut	$11.0	1%
Delaware	$1.9	1%
District of Columbia	$67.1	15%
Florida	$217.4	8%
Georgia	$79.0	5%
Hawaii	$4.0	1%
Idaho	$0.0	0%
Illinois	$0.0	0%
Indiana	$60.6	6%
Iowa	$5.3	1%
Kansas	$0.0	0%
Kentucky	$40.4	5%
Louisiana	$0.0	0%
Maine	$11.6	3%
Maryland	$17.8	2%
Massachusetts	$94.2	4%
Michigan	$20.0	1%
Minnesota	$42.0	4%
Mississippi	$38.5	9%
Missouri	$0.0	0%
Montana	$0.0	0%
Nebraska	$0.0	0%
Nevada	$0.0	0%
New Hampshire	$0.0	0%
New Jersey	$145.7	8%
New Mexico	$31.3	6%
New York	$609.7	6%
North Carolina	$36.4	3%
North Dakota	$0.2	0%
Ohio	$278.1	8%
Oklahoma	$0.0	0%
Oregon	$2.8	0%
Pennsylvania	$348.4	12%
Rhode Island	$0.0	0%
South Carolina	$25.9	6%
South Dakota	$1.0	1%
Tennessee	$44.4	5%
Texas	$111.3	5%
Utah	$0.0	0%
Vermont	$0.0	0%
Virginia	$64.9	10%
Washington	$95.5	6%
West Virginia	$9.9	2%
Wisconsin	$249.3	17%
Wyoming	$11.2	12%
U.S. Total	$3,143	4%

* Reflects unliquidatedTANF obligations from TANF allocations prior to fiscal year 2001 plus unliquidated obligations from the first half of the fiscal year 2001 TANF allocation.

** Unliquidated obligations as a percent of TANF funds awarded from FY 1997 through FY 2000 plus half of the FY 2001 allocation.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Table III: Total Unspent TANF Funds in the Middle of Federal Fiscal Year 2001

As noted in the discussion of Table II, an examination of unspent TANF funds in any state should consider amounts of unliquidated obligations. To get a fuller picture of the amount of unspent TANF funds in a given state, it may be appropriate to examine the combined amounts of unobligated funds and unliquidated obligations, even though a portion of the unliquidated obligations may be committed for a specific purpose and may soon be spent.

Table III identifies the accumulated amount of unobligated TANF funds in each state as of March 31, 2001 as shown in Table I, and the accumulated amount of unliquidated obligations, as shown in Table II. This table then shows the combined amount of the two types of unspent TANF funds and presents the combined amount as a percentage of the cumulative amount of TANF funds made available to each state through the middle of federal fiscal year 2001.

> EXAMPLE: Indiana reported $25.2 million in unobligated federal TANF funds and $60.6 million in unliquidated obligations in the middle of federal fiscal year 2001. The total amount of unspent TANF funds was $85.7 million, and this equaled nine percent of the TANF funds that have been available to the state from the inception of its TANF program.

Table III
Total Unspent TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001
(middle of federal fiscal year 2001)

	Unobligated TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001 (in millions)	Unliquidated Obligations of TANF Funds as of March 31, 2001 (in millions)	Total Unspent Funds as of March 31, 2001 (in millions)	Unspent Funds as a Percent of TANF Funds Available*
Alabama	$85.9	$1.1	$87.1	18%
Alaska	$17.6	$2.0	$19.6	8%
Arizona	$101.8	$35.0	$136.8	13%
Arkansas	$19.6	$0.0	$19.6	8%
California	$1,151.3	$206.8	$1,358.1	8%
Colorado	$0.0	$121.3	$121.3	22%
Connecticut	$0.0	$11.0	$11.0	1%
Delaware	$0.0	$1.9	$1.9	1%
District of Columbia	$39.6	$67.1	$106.8	24%
Florida	$345.9	$217.4	$563.3	21%
Georgia	$182.6	$79.0	$261.7	18%
Hawaii	$24.4	$4.0	$28.5	8%
Idaho	$24.2	$0.0	$24.2	19%
Illinois	$18.3	$0.0	$18.3	1%
Indiana	$25.2	$60.6	$85.7	9%
Iowa	$21.5	$5.3	$26.8	5%
Kansas	$19.0	$0.0	$19.0	4%
Kentucky	$0.0	$40.4	$40.4	5%
Louisiana	$196.4	$0.0	$196.4	26%
Maine	$10.2	$11.6	$21.8	6%
Maryland	$109.4	$17.8	$127.2	13%
Massachusetts	$22.8	$94.2	$117.0	6%
Michigan	$129.7	$20.0	$149.8	4%
Minnesota	$115.2	$42.0	$157.3	15%
Mississippi	$80.5	$38.5	$119.0	29%
Missouri	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	0%
Montana	$23.0	$0.0	$23.0	12%
Nebraska	$16.0	$0.0	$16.0	6%
Nevada	$35.4	$0.0	$35.4	18%
New Hampshire	$7.5	$0.0	$7.5	4%
New Jersey	$0.0	$145.7	$145.7	8%
New Mexico	$20.9	$31.3	$52.2	10%
New York	$732.3	$609.7	$1,342.0	13%
North Carolina	$33.6	$36.4	$69.9	5%
North Dakota	$13.0	$0.2	$13.3	13%
Ohio	$481.6	$278.1	$759.7	23%
Oklahoma	$122.6	$0.0	$122.6	18%
Oregon	$0.4	$2.8	$3.2	0%
Pennsylvania	$185.0	$348.4	$533.4	18%
Rhode Island	$6.6	$0.0	$6.6	2%
South Carolina	$11.3	$25.9	$37.2	8%
South Dakota	$20.1	$1.0	$21.1	23%
Tennessee	$93.1	$44.4	$137.5	15%
Texas	$136.7	$111.3	$248.0	11%
Utah	$47.5	$0.0	$47.5	13%
Vermont	$5.4	$0.0	$5.4	3%
Virginia	$0.0	$64.9	$64.9	10%
Washington	$137.6	$95.5	$233.1	14%
West Virginia	$121.4	$9.9	$131.2	28%
Wisconsin	$67.7	$249.3	$317.0	22%
Wyoming	$50.9	$11.2	$62.1	67%
U.S. Total	$5,110.8	$3,143.3	$8,254.1	11%

* Unspent funds as a percent of TANF funds awarded from FY 1997 through FY 2000 plus half of the FY 2001 allocation.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Table IV: Use of TANF Funds in Federal Fiscal Year 2001 as a Percent of Federal Fiscal Year 2001 TANF Grants

The new data for fiscal year 2001 reveal that states on average are continuing to spend most of their TANF grants. In some states, the use of TANF funds in the first half of fiscal year 2001 exceeded their TANF grant, which means that if they continued spending at the same level in the second half of the year they would need to draw on TANF reserves to fund their program. In states that did not spend more than their grants, balances continued to accumulate, but nationwide the balance of unspent TANF funds increased only modestly in the first half of fiscal year 2001.

Table IV compares the use of TANF funds in the first half of federal fiscal year 2001 — TANF expenditures and TANF funds transferred to either the Social Services Block Grant or the Child Care and Development Fund — with half of the state's fiscal year 2001 TANF grant. The table presents each state's use of TANF funds in FY 2001 as a percent of half of its fiscal year 2001 award. Although most tables in this paper include analyses based on annual TANF grants plus bonuses, this table includes an analysis of spending as a portion of grants without bonuses, but including Supplemental Grants. Because states could not anticipate receiving these bonuses — and because there is no guarantee of future receipt of bonuses — excluding these bonuses when comparing the use of TANF funds with the annual TANF grant provides a useful indication of the extent to which states are using TANF funds they can expect to receive each year.

The table also presents each state's use of TANF funds as a percent of half its fiscal year 2001 TANF award plus half of any bonuses awarded during the fiscal year to allow for comparison with Tables I, II, and III, which include bonuses in the cumulative total of funds received by states. During the year five states were awarded bonuses of $20 million each for reductions in out-of-wedlock births, and 28 states received High Performance Bonus awards that totaled $200 million.

> <u>EXAMPLE</u>: In the first half of fiscal year 2001, TANF expenditures and transfers in Alabama totaled $49.3 million. The state's TANF grant for half the year equaled $52.2 million, and Alabama received two bonuses, half of which totaled $12.3 million. TANF funds used equaled 95 percent of half its annual TANF grant and 76 percent of half of its annual grant plus bonuses.

Table IV
Use of TANF Funds in FY 2001 Relative to FY 2001 TANF Grants as of March 31, 2001*
(middle of federal fiscal year 2001)

	Federal Funds Used in First Half of FY 2001** (in millions)	Mid-Year FY 2001 TANF Grant*** (in millions)	Federal Funds Used as a Percent of Mid-Year TANF Grant	Mid-Year FY 2001 TANF Grant Plus Bonuses**** (in millions)	Federal Funds Used as a Percent of Mid-Year TANF Grant Plus Bonuses
Alabama	$49.3	$52.2	95%	$64.5	76%
Alaska	$23.0	$32.8	70%	$32.8	70%
Arizona	$98.1	$121.1	81%	$134.3	73%
Arkansas	$34.4	$31.5	109%	$32.9	105%
California	$1,775.4	$1,865.1	95%	$1,883.1	94%
Colorado	$43.0	$74.8	57%	$74.8	57%
Connecticut	$111.4	$133.4	83%	$134.7	83%
Delaware	$17.4	$16.1	108%	$16.4	106%
District of Columbia	$48.4	$46.3	105%	$57.2	85%
Florida	$305.2	$311.4	98%	$321.8	95%
Georgia	$119.6	$184.0	65%	$184.0	65%
Hawaii	$43.6	$49.5	88%	$51.9	84%
Idaho	$20.0	$17.0	117%	$17.8	112%
Illinois	$292.5	$292.5	100%	$310.9	94%
Indiana	$150.7	$103.4	146%	$104.4	144%
Iowa	$56.1	$65.8	85%	$65.8	85%
Kansas	$32.0	$51.0	63%	$51.0	63%
Kentucky	$62.3	$90.6	69%	$90.6	69%
Louisiana	$63.2	$90.5	70%	$90.5	70%
Maine	$29.3	$39.1	75%	$39.1	75%
Maryland	$122.4	$114.5	107%	$114.5	107%
Massachusetts	$215.3	$229.7	94%	$229.7	94%
Michigan	$452.9	$387.7	117%	$397.7	114%
Minnesota	$146.0	$133.6	109%	$134.9	108%
Mississippi	$51.1	$47.9	107%	$49.1	104%
Missouri	$111.5	$108.5	103%	$111.5	100%
Montana	$29.6	$22.5	131%	$23.7	125%
Nebraska	$13.1	$29.0	45%	$29.0	45%
Nevada	$11.8	$23.9	49%	$25.0	47%
New Hampshire	$20.1	$19.3	104%	$19.3	104%
New Jersey	$60.1	$202.0	30%	$205.8	29%
New Mexico	$75.4	$66.3	114%	$66.3	114%
New York	$1,187.2	$1,221.5	97%	$1,221.5	97%
North Carolina	$189.4	$169.2	112%	$173.3	109%
North Dakota	$11.4	$13.2	86%	$13.9	82%
Ohio	$325.9	$364.0	90%	$364.0	90%
Oklahoma	$45.1	$73.8	61%	$75.8	59%
Oregon	$101.6	$83.4	122%	$83.4	122%
Pennsylvania	$263.7	$359.7	73%	$359.7	73%
Rhode Island	$40.9	$47.5	86%	$47.5	86%
South Carolina	$46.6	$50.0	93%	$50.0	93%
South Dakota	$6.3	$10.7	59%	$10.7	59%
Tennessee	$94.6	$106.5	89%	$111.3	85%
Texas	$217.3	$269.5	81%	$281.6	77%
Utah	$29.4	$42.8	69%	$43.5	68%
Vermont	$18.2	$23.7	77%	$23.7	77%
Virginia	$55.1	$79.1	70%	$83.1	66%
Washington	$185.5	$201.7	92%	$201.7	92%
West Virginia	$85.7	$55.1	156%	$56.1	153%
Wisconsin	$174.8	$158.5	110%	$166.5	105%
Wyoming	$5.8	$10.4	56%	$11.0	53%
U.S. Total	$7,768.4	$8,393.2	93%	$8,543.2	91%

* The data in this table is drawn from the ACF-196 reports that the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities collected in the middle of FY 2001 and at the end of FY 2000. HHS has recently made available on its web site spending data from the end of FY 2000, which is different for many states than the data collected by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Some discrepencies may represent revisions that states made to their spending reports. This table relies on the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities' data because other differences have not yet been explained.

** Includes all expenditures of federal TANF funds in FY 2001 and TANF funds transferred to either the Social Services Block Grant or the Child Care and Development Fund in FY 2001. Funds transferred to these block grants may be spent in the year received, but they also may be reserved for spending in the subsequent year (in the case of SSBG) or the subsequent two years (in the case of CCDF).

*** Grants shown equal 50 percent of each state's basic TANF grant plus any Supplemental Grant, but does not include bonuses.

**** Grants shown equal 50 percent of each state's basic TANF grant plus any Supplemental Grant plus any High Performance or Out-of-Wedlock Birth reduction bonus received after September 30, 2000.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Table V: Transfers from TANF to the Child Care Development Fund and the Social Services Block Grant in the Middle of Federal Fiscal Year 2001

States have the authority to transfer a portion of their current fiscal year's TANF grant to the Child Care and Development Fund and the Social Services Block Grant. When TANF funds are transferred to CCDF or SSBG, the rules of those block grants, not TANF rules, govern the use of the funds.

The amount transferred to SSBG has been limited to 10 percent of the state's annual TANF grant, and the combined CCDF/SSBG transfer limit is 30 percent of the annual TANF grant. Federal law enacted in 1999 would have limited transfers to SSBG to 4.25 percent of a state's TANF allocation starting in fiscal year 2000, but federal appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 allowed the SSBG transfer amount to remain at 10 percent of the TANF grant.

If funds transferred to CCDF are not obligated within two years, they may be returned to TANF as unobligated funds from the original grant year. If funds are neither obligated nor returned within two years, or are not expended within three years, they revert to the U.S. Treasury. If funds transferred to SSBG are not expended by the end of the year subsequent to the fiscal year in which they were transferred, they may be returned to TANF as unobligated funds from the original grant year. If funds are not expended within two years they revert to the U.S. Treasury.

TANF funds transferred to CCDF can be used to strengthen a state's child care system and expand access to child care assistance. While states can spend TANF funds directly on child care, transferring these funds to CCDF may be advantageous because it can help states maintain a unified child care system serving families who receive TANF and work as well as those low-income families who do not receive TANF cash assistance. In addition, TANF funds spent directly on child care for non-working families would have time limit and work requirement implications while use of CCDF funds transferred from TANF would not affect TANF time limits or work requirements for these families. Thus, it may be advantageous to use TANF funds transferred to CCDF to provide child care to some families, particularly families that are neither employed nor receiving a welfare check — for example, those in post-secondary education.

SSBG funds a wide array of social services for families with children as well as single individuals and childless couples, especially the elderly. TANF funds transferred to SSBG can be used for any allowable SSBG service, but only for families with children that have incomes below 200 percent of the poverty threshold. Transferring TANF funds may be advantageous because using SSBG funds to provide services to needy families does not have TANF time limit or work requirement implications and because some services for needy families allowable under SSBG, such as residential treatment or child protective services, are not allowable under TANF.

Table V identifies the amount of TANF funds transferred by each state to CCDF and SSBG in the first half of federal fiscal year 2001, and it presents those amounts as a share of half the state's fiscal year 2001 TANF grant. Analyses conducted during past years show that many states make transfers during the second half of the fiscal year whether or not they made transfers during the first half. Therefore, the percentages transferred as shown in this table are quite likely to change by the end of the fiscal year.

> EXAMPLE: In the first half of fiscal year 2001, Idaho transferred $2.7 million of TANF funds — 14.9 percent of half its fiscal year 2001 TANF grant plus bonuses — to the Child Care and Development Fund. The state also transferred $0.6 million of TANF funds — 3.4 percent of half its fiscal year 2001 TANF grant plus bonuses — to the Social Services Block Grant.

Table V

TANF Funds Transferred to the Child Care and Development Fund and the Social Services Block Grant in the First Half of Federal Fiscal Year 2001

	Transferred to CCDF* (in millions)	Percent of Mid-Year TANF Grant Plus Bonuses**	Transferred to SSBG* (in millions)	Percent of Mid-Year TANF Grant Plus Bonuses**	Total Transfer Amount* (in millions)	Percent of Mid-Year TANF Grant Plus Bonuses**
Alabama	$10.9	16.9%	$6.0	9.2%	$16.9	26.1%
Alaska	$4.1	12.5%	$3.0	9.1%	$7.1	21.7%
Arizona	$0.5	0.4%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.5	0.4%
Arkansas	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
California	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Colorado	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Connecticut	$0.0	0.0%	$11.4	8.5%	$11.4	8.5%
Delaware	$1.8	10.9%	$0.0	0.0%	$1.8	10.9%
District of Columbia	$9.4	16.5%	$2.0	3.4%	$11.4	19.9%
Florida	$19.9	6.2%	$72.2	22.4%	$92.1	28.6%
Georgia	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Hawaii	$0.0	0.0%	$1.0	1.9%	$1.0	1.9%
Idaho	$2.7	14.9%	$0.6	3.4%	$3.3	18.3%
Illinois	$30.1	9.7%	$30.1	9.7%	$60.2	19.4%
Indiana	$53.3	51.0%	$8.8	8.4%	$62.0	59.4%
Iowa	$12.6	19.1%	$0.0	0.0%	$12.6	19.1%
Kansas	$1.0	1.9%	$0.0	0.0%	$1.0	1.9%
Kentucky	$2.4	2.6%	$0.0	0.0%	$2.4	2.6%
Louisiana	$25.5	28.1%	$0.0	0.0%	$25.5	28.1%
Maine	$0.0	0.0%	$1.9	4.8%	$1.9	4.8%
Maryland	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Massachusetts	$47.3	20.6%	$0.0	0.0%	$47.3	20.6%
Michigan	$0.0	0.0%	$7.0	1.8%	$7.0	1.8%
Minnesota	$16.9	12.5%	$13.8	10.2%	$30.6	22.7%
Mississippi	$14.5	29.5%	$0.0	0.0%	$14.5	29.5%
Missouri	$0.0	0.0%	$4.4	3.9%	$4.4	3.9%
Montana	$7.6	32.2%	$4.3	18.0%	$11.9	50.1%
Nebraska	$2.5	8.6%	$0.0	0.0%	$2.5	8.6%
Nevada	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
New Hampshire	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
New Jersey	$39.9	19.4%	$20.2	9.8%	$60.1	29.2%
New Mexico	$13.5	20.4%	$0.0	0.0%	$13.5	20.4%
New York	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
North Carolina	$44.1	25.5%	$2.9	1.7%	$47.0	27.1%
North Dakota	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Ohio	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Oklahoma	$15.2	20.1%	$7.6	10.0%	$22.8	30.1%
Oregon	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Pennsylvania	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Rhode Island	$0.0	0.1%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.1%
South Carolina	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
South Dakota	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Tennessee	$19.6	17.6%	$0.0	0.0%	$19.6	17.6%
Texas	$0.0	0.0%	$3.6	1.3%	$3.6	1.3%
Utah	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Vermont	$3.0	12.7%	$2.4	10.0%	$5.4	22.7%
Virginia	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Washington	$57.5	28.5%	$0.0	0.0%	$57.5	28.5%
West Virginia	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
Wisconsin	$42.3	25.4%	$3.4	2.0%	$45.7	27.5%
Wyoming	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%	$0.0	0.0%
U.S. Total	$498.0	5.8%	$206.3	2.4%	$704.3	8.2%

* Funds transferred to these block grants may be spent in the year received, but they also may be reserved for spending in the subsequent year (in the case of SSBG) or the subsequent two years (in the case of CCDF).

** Grants shown equal 50 percent of each state's basic TANF grant plus any Supplemental Grant plus any High Performance or Out-of-Wedlock Birth reduction bonus received after September 30, 2000.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

TABLE VI: MOE Spending in the First Half of Federal Fiscal Year 2001

In order to receive federal TANF funds, states must spend specified amounts of their own funds on activities that meet one of the purposes of the welfare law. The maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement under TANF requires states to spend an amount equal to at least 75 percent of the amount spent on AFDC programs in federal fiscal year 1994 if they meet the work participation requirements in the federal law. States that do not meet the work participation requirements must meet a state MOE spending requirement of 80 percent of the fiscal year 1994 baseline.

Because states face fiscal penalties for not meeting the MOE requirement and also must make up for any MOE shortfall through additional expenditures in the following year, state officials generally attempt to meet their MOE requirement each year. Nevertheless, information on the level of MOE expenditures in each state can be useful to understanding a state's use of funds, and the full amount of resources available to the state under TANF and MOE.

- States that met a substantial share of their MOE requirement in the first half of federal fiscal year 2001 could reduce MOE spending in the last half of the fiscal year and still meet the minimum requirement. In these cases, the state may rely more on TANF funds in the last half of the fiscal year than in the first half, and thus its unspent TANF balance in the second half of the year may be smaller than in the first half of the year.

- By contrast, a state that spent less than half of its MOE requirement in the first two quarters of the fiscal year would have to increase MOE spending in the last half of the fiscal year in order to meet the minimum MOE requirement. In these cases, states may rely less on TANF funds in the last half of the year than in the first, thereby resulting in more unspent TANF funds than the state had for the first half of the year.

- Under the provisions of the Cash Management Improvement Act, a state may only draw down federal TANF funds if it can demonstrate that it is spending a proportional amount of state MOE. For example, if a state's MOE requirement represented 44 percent of the total of federal TANF and state MOE funds available to the state that year, in order to draw down federal funds before it fulfilled its entire MOE requirement, the state would need to be able to demonstrate that it had covered 44 percent of that expenditure with state funds.

Table VI presents each state's MOE spending level in the first half of fiscal year 2001 and measures the MOE spending as a percentage of the MOE baseline. Because states must spend at either the 75 percent level or the 80 percent level to meet the minimum *annual* MOE requirement, states would have to have spent 37.5 percent of its baseline (or 40 percent) as of March 31, 2001 to have met at least half of the annual MOE requirement.

Table VI shows that 21 states had not spent 37.5 percent of their annual MOE level by the middle of federal fiscal year 2001. For comparison, by the midpoint of federal fiscal year 2000 there were 25 states that had not spent at least 37.5 percent of their MOE amount but went on to meet their annual MOE requirement by the end of the fiscal year.

> EXAMPLE: Connecticut reported MOE spending in the first half of federal fiscal year 2001 that totaled $91.7 million, which is equal to 37.5 percent of the MOE baseline. If the state ultimately needs to spend at the 75 percent of baseline, it is right on target. Meanwhile, if another state needs to spend at the 80 percent level for the year, a 37.5 percent spending rate would not be adequate; the state would need to spend more state MOE funds in the second half of the year.

Table VI
State MOE Spending in Federal Fiscal Year 2001

	Annual MOE Baseline (in millions)	Mid-Year FY 2001 MOE Expenditures (in millions)	Mid-Year Spending as a Percent of the MOE Baseline*
Alabama	$52.3	$20.5	39.2%
Alaska	$65.3	$27.9	42.7%
Arizona	$125.7	$37.4	29.7%
Arkansas	$27.8	$14.2	51.0%
California	$3,634.7	$1,512.7	41.6%
Colorado	$110.5	$41.3	37.4%
Connecticut	$244.6	$91.7	37.5%
Delaware	$29.0	$11.0	37.8%
District of Columbia	$93.9	$29.4	31.3%
Florida	$491.2	$174.4	35.5%
Georgia	$231.2	$85.8	37.1%
Hawaii	$94.9	$27.0	28.5%
Idaho	$18.2	$6.5	35.7%
Illinois	$573.5	$153.0	26.7%
Indiana	$151.4	$39.0	25.7%
Iowa	$82.6	$35.6	43.1%
Kansas	$82.3	$40.5	49.2%
Kentucky	$89.9	$46.2	51.4%
Louisiana	$73.9	$32.9	44.6%
Maine	$50.0	$25.7	51.3%
Maryland	$236.0	$64.3	27.3%
Massachusetts	$478.6	$164.1	34.3%
Michigan	$624.7	$129.6	20.7%
Minnesota	$239.7	$95.6	39.9%
Mississippi	$29.0	$15.1	52.1%
Missouri	$160.2	$70.5	44.0%
Montana	$21.0	$6.9	32.9%
Nebraska	$38.2	$17.8	46.8%
Nevada	$34.0	$13.6	40.0%
New Hampshire	$42.8	$16.1	37.6%
New Jersey	$400.2	$106.6	26.6%
New Mexico	$49.8	$20.8	41.8%
New York	$2,291.4	$912.3	39.8%
North Carolina	$205.6	$85.5	41.6%
North Dakota	$12.1	$6.5	54.0%
Ohio	$521.1	$255.3	49.0%
Oklahoma	$81.6	$30.5	37.4%
Oregon	$122.2	$53.4	43.7%
Pennsylvania	$542.8	$173.9	32.0%
Rhode Island	$80.5	$32.6	40.6%
South Carolina	$47.9	$15.9	33.1%
South Dakota	$11.4	$4.1	35.8%
Tennessee	$110.4	$36.5	33.0%
Texas	$314.3	$138.2	44.0%
Utah	$33.7	$12.3	36.6%
Vermont	$34.1	$12.7	37.2%
Virginia	$170.9	$52.1	30.5%
Washington	$362.7	$154.9	42.7%
West Virginia	$43.1	$16.4	38.0%
Wisconsin	$225.2	$112.3	49.9%
Wyoming	$14.1	$7.0	49.5%
U.S. Total	$13,901.6	$5,286.1	38.0%

* States must spend at least 75 percent of the MOE baseline (80 percent in some cases) during each fiscal year.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Table VII: Basic Information on TANF and MOE Funds in Federal Fiscal Year 2001

This table provides the amount of each state's fiscal year 2001 TANF allocation. This includes a basic grant in all states and one or more additional grants in some states. The additional grants include the supplemental grants for states with historically low levels of spending per poor person or high rates of population growth and the bonuses to states with the highest rankings on various performance measures — such as the percentage of cash assistance recipients that go to work in a given year — which total $300 million a year nationally. The cumulative grant for each year equals the basic grant plus the additional grants if the state receives any.

Table VII also provides MOE spending amounts at the 75 percent, 80 percent, and 100 percent of the baseline level (state spending under AFDC in Fiscal year 1994). These figures are presented for background purposes.

> EXAMPLE: Florida's basic annual TANF grant equals $562.3 million. The state is eligible for a supplemental TANF grant, and the fiscal year 2001 supplemental grant totals $60.4 million. The state also received a bonus for high performance of $20.9 million. That results in total TANF funding of $643.6 million in federal fiscal year 2001. The state would have to spend $368.4 million in state funds to meet the 75 percent MOE level or $392.9 million to meet the 80 percent MOE level. The MOE baseline of $491.2 million is the level of state spending under AFDC in fiscal year 1994.

Table VII
FY 2001 TANF Allocations and MOE Requirements

	Basic Grant*	Supplemental Grant	High Performance Bonus**	Out-of-Wedlock Birth Reduction Bonus***	Total Grant	MOE Requirement		
						75% Level	80% Level	100% Level
Alabama	$93.3	$11.1	$4.7	$20.0	$129.1	$39.2	$41.8	$52.3
Alaska	$58.8	$6.9	$0.0	$0.0	$65.7	$48.9	$52.2	$65.3
Arizona	$218.2	$23.9	$6.3	$20.0	$268.5	$94.3	$100.6	$125.7
Arkansas	$56.7	$6.2	$2.8	$0.0	$65.8	$20.8	$22.2	$27.8
California	$3,730.2	$0.0	$36.1	$0.0	$3,766.3	$2,726.1	$2,907.8	$3,634.7
Colorado	$136.1	$13.6	$0.0	$0.0	$149.6	$82.9	$88.4	$110.5
Connecticut	$266.8	$0.0	$2.6	$0.0	$269.4	$183.4	$195.6	$244.6
Delaware	$32.3	$0.0	$0.6	$0.0	$32.9	$21.8	$23.2	$29.0
District of Columbia	$92.6	$0.0	$1.7	$20.0	$114.4	$70.4	$75.1	$93.9
Florida	$562.3	$60.4	$20.9	$0.0	$643.6	$368.4	$392.9	$491.2
Georgia	$330.7	$37.3	$0.0	$0.0	$368.0	$173.4	$184.9	$231.2
Hawaii	$98.9	$0.0	$4.9	$0.0	$103.9	$71.1	$75.9	$94.9
Idaho	$30.6	$3.5	$1.6	$0.0	$35.7	$13.7	$14.6	$18.2
Illinois	$585.1	$0.0	$16.7	$20.0	$621.8	$430.1	$458.8	$573.5
Indiana	$206.8	$0.0	$2.0	$0.0	$208.8	$113.5	$121.1	$151.4
Iowa	$131.5	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$131.5	$62.0	$66.1	$82.6
Kansas	$101.9	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$101.9	$61.7	$65.9	$82.3
Kentucky	$181.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$181.3	$67.4	$71.9	$89.9
Louisiana	$164.0	$17.0	$0.0	$0.0	$181.0	$55.4	$59.1	$73.9
Maine	$78.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$78.1	$37.5	$40.0	$50.0
Maryland	$229.1	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$229.1	$177.0	$188.8	$236.0
Massachusetts	$459.4	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$459.4	$358.9	$382.9	$478.6
Michigan	$775.4	$0.0	$0.0	$20.0	$795.4	$468.5	$499.8	$624.7
Minnesota	$267.2	$0.0	$2.6	$0.0	$269.8	$179.7	$191.7	$239.7
Mississippi	$86.8	$9.0	$2.4	$0.0	$98.2	$21.7	$23.2	$29.0
Missouri	$217.1	$0.0	$5.9	$0.0	$223.0	$120.1	$128.1	$160.2
Montana	$43.9	$1.1	$2.3	$0.0	$47.3	$15.7	$16.8	$21.0
Nebraska	$58.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$58.0	$28.6	$30.5	$38.2
Nevada	$44.0	$3.7	$2.2	$0.0	$49.9	$25.5	$27.2	$34.0
New Hampshire	$38.5	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$38.5	$32.1	$34.3	$42.8
New Jersey	$404.0	$0.0	$7.6	$0.0	$411.7	$300.2	$320.2	$400.2
New Mexico	$126.1	$6.6	$0.0	$0.0	$132.7	$37.3	$39.8	$49.8
New York	$2,442.9	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$2,442.9	$1,718.6	$1,833.2	$2,291.4
North Carolina	$302.2	$36.1	$8.3	$0.0	$346.6	$154.2	$164.5	$205.6
North Dakota	$26.4	$0.0	$1.3	$0.0	$27.7	$9.1	$9.7	$12.1
Ohio	$728.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$728.0	$390.8	$416.9	$521.1
Oklahoma	$147.6	$0.0	$4.1	$0.0	$151.7	$61.2	$65.3	$81.6
Oregon	$166.8	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$166.8	$91.6	$97.7	$122.2
Pennsylvania	$719.5	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$719.5	$407.1	$434.3	$542.8
Rhode Island	$95.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$95.0	$60.4	$64.4	$80.5
South Carolina	$100.0	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$100.0	$35.9	$38.3	$47.9
South Dakota	$21.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$21.3	$8.5	$9.1	$11.4
Tennessee	$191.5	$21.6	$9.6	$0.0	$222.7	$82.8	$88.3	$110.4
Texas	$486.3	$52.7	$24.3	$0.0	$563.3	$235.7	$251.4	$314.3
Utah	$76.8	$8.7	$1.4	$0.0	$87.0	$25.3	$27.0	$33.7
Vermont	$47.4	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$47.4	$25.5	$27.3	$34.1
Virginia	$158.3	$0.0	$7.9	$0.0	$166.2	$128.2	$136.7	$170.9
Washington	$403.3	$0.0	$0.0	$0.0	$403.3	$272.0	$290.1	$362.7
West Virginia	$110.2	$0.0	$2.1	$0.0	$112.3	$32.3	$34.4	$43.1
Wisconsin	$317.0	$0.0	$15.9	$0.0	$333.0	$168.9	$180.1	$225.2
Wyoming	$20.8	$0.0	$1.1	$0.0	$21.9	$10.5	$11.2	$14.1
U.S. Total	$16,467.0	$319.5	$200.0	$100.0	$17,086.4	$10,426.2	$11,121.3	$13,901.6

* These represent State Family Assistance Grants minus tribal allocations.

** These represent bonuses awarded for performance in FY 1999, which were awarded after September 30, 2000.

*** These represent bonuses awarded for performance in 1995-1998, which were awarded in September 2000.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities