

WR-STATE MATCH

MEMO

TO: Performance Measures Working Group
FROM: Wendell Primus
DATE: 5-3-94
RE: Performance Measures

I want to comment on the April 25th (7:40 PM version) specs document on **Performance Measures**. The direction and tone of the proposal is on the mark, particularly in the long run. However, I've had a chance to think about this some more and want to suggest some additions and modifications. Hopefully, these comments anticipate some of the issues that might generate contentious debate on the Hill or with the states.

My major concern is that we are not quite ready to "sell" an outcome-based performance system. I'm concerned for several reasons. First, we haven't really talked through how our broad program goals might be operationalized and how those detailed measures would effect program operations for good or bad. Second, there is potentially a lot at stake for the states and we should think through the outcomes upon which we will exercise our sanctions and incentives. Congress and the states will. Third, using someone else's measures may be too easy an out. For example, taking Labor's JTPA self-sufficiency outcomes has great appeal for several reasons (inter-agency collaboration being one) and might be the direction in which we will eventually head, but we have not rigorously analyzed these standards to determine if there is a downside that should be considered before adopting their measures for a program that is different both in terms of the population served and how they are served. Fourth, I strongly suspect that both Congress and the states will be concerned about the "level playing field" issue. Again, while JTPA's methods for adjusting for relevant inter-jurisdictional differences might work, we would want to evaluate that methodology with our stakeholders.

I agree that the legislative language must have some specificity. The failure to meet legislative intent to develop outcome-based performance measures for the JOBS program as expressed in the Family Support Act was unfortunate. Some in Congress may see vague or dilatory language in our proposal as an attempt to avoid building meaningful standards and expectations into the law. At the same time, however, we do not want to unnecessarily constrain ourselves. We are walking a fine political line here.

I suggest a fourfold strategy: (1) Articulate a few preliminary program accountability measures -- designed to ensure that the program is operated in a competent manner -- which will accompany the introduction of the new law. This includes introducing federal match rates that send clear signals about which outcomes are desirable. (2) Develop measures that are specific to the WORK program. (3) Provide financial incentives for motivating states to invest adequate resources JOBS, WORK, and child care. (4) Clearly specify that the Secretary will be accountable for moving from a performance system that is based on accountability measures to one based on outcomes. A key aspect of this is to delineate a general process for accomplishing this transition that will both guarantee a substantive role for key stakeholders and provide some protections for them.

I comment on each of these strategies below:

1. The program accountability measures we build in from the start should be relatively few in number. However, they are very important because they will show how this new program operates and whether it is being operated as intended.
 - First, the language must indicate that we will continue to assess the accuracy of eligibility determinations and the accuracy of payments, but that this is no longer the most important measure of how well the new program is working. In regard to financial incentives for payment accuracy, I would use a system based on current policies.
 - Second, we must specify a participation rate, but I am in favor of one that would more usefully measure the performance of the system than the current rate. I think we should suggest the concept of a coverage measure, which measures the extent to which the program works with the entire mandatory caseload.¹ This rate would measure the proportion of individuals who either participated, became employed, left AFDC, or were sanctioned within a specified period -- I would recommend twelve months. As part of the regulatory process, it would be specified that a minimum level of services would have to be received to be counted as a participant.

Using a coverage concept, close to 100 percent coverage is both feasible and desirable. I would recommend that financial penalties (a decrease in FFP) be applied to JOBS money if states did not meet a very high coverage rate. The penalties would work as follows:

1. Coverage measures are used to assess the extent to which programs are involving or "covering" all eligibles in ways deemed appropriate by legislation or regulation. A program is said to "cover" all individuals, who within a specified time (such as six months), either participate in program activities, are sanctioned, find employment, or are exempted from activities. There are two primary advantages of this type of longitudinal rate. First, it drives states to work with their entire caseload and only rewards "acceptable" behavior. Second, this approach enables one to set a higher participation rate -- the SWIM coverage rate was 97 percent within a 12 month follow-up period (where participation was defined as receiving at least one day of services) -- which is politically appealing. This rate also avoids several problems of the current monthly participation rate: (1) it cannot be a high rate -- 50 percent is considered to be the maximum rate, (2) it does not indicate whether the same individuals were participating month after month or whether the program served the entire mandatory caseload, and (3) the data required is very difficult for states to collect and the quality is poor.

good
↓
but why
have one
at all?

No penalty:	Coverage rate between 96-100 percent
1 percent reduction in FFP:	Coverage rate between 90-95 percent
3 percent reduction in FFP:	Coverage rate between 85-89 percent
5 percent reduction in FFP:	Coverage rate less than 85 percent

- Third, given that we are also concerned with the dosage of services received before the time limit is reached, I think we might consider stating that service "intensity" also would be a performance measure. For this measure, I would propose a measure that required a specified proportion of the caseload to participate at least half the time their "clock" was running within a specified period. To be consistent, this rate could be calculated over a 12 month period -- at the same time and for the same sample as the coverage rate. The expected rate would be that 25 percent of the population "participate" at least half the time.²

NO

I would recommend that positive financial incentives (an increase in FFP) be applied to JOBS money if states exceeded the base rate. The incentives would work as follows:

1 percent increase in FFP:	30 percent participate at least half of their eligible time
3 percent increase in FFP:	35 percent participate at least half of their eligible time
5 percent increase in FFP:	40 percent participate at least half of their eligible time

- Fourth, we might well need some way of measuring how accurately the clock is being calculated. If we don't, we might see wholesale appeals when the time limit begins to expire. There may be other similar measures which I hope you will suggest. I recommend that states forfeit all incentive payments if it is found that the clock is not running accurately.
2. As a performance measure for the WORK program, I recommend tilting the federal match schedule in favor of WORK slot placements for those who hit the wall. I would tentatively suggest cutting the federal match rate for benefits in half for those who are in the WORK program but have not been assigned a WORK slot. For any month where a state had less than 90 percent of their WORK eligible clients participating in a WORK slot, I would lower the match rate on benefits for those not in an assignment. This would create a strong incentive for states both to get as many

?

2. The exact definition of this rate -- particularly how "participation" would be defined (for example in terms of number of days or number of hours) -- would be determined through the regulatory process.

people as possible off the rolls before hitting the time limit and to ensure individuals were in a WORK slot once they reached the limit.

3. Finally, I would like to build in incentives for states to use all the federal money being made available. That is, states would receive an enhanced match rate if they spent their entire JOBS, WORK, and child care allocations. The attached analysis shows this could be a strong incentive for many states to spend their entire allocation. It is critical that this incentive be coupled with requirements on participation, possibly service intensity, and WORK requirements (described above) to ensure the money was spent appropriately.

NO

I would recommend that states receive a 5 percentage point increase in FFP for JOBS, WORK, and child care if they spent the state share of their entire allocation for all programs. In addition, states would receive the bonus, even if they did not spend their entire allocation, if they met all the performance measures discussed above and also did not have any unmet working poor child care needs.

4. This brings me to the last point, specifying a strategy for developing outcome standards. We are specifying some accountability measures that are designed to ensure that the new program is, in fact, being implemented in a competent fashion. It would be consistent with our overall rhetoric to argue that this is a dramatically "new" system with a substantially different mission and culture. It would only be prudent policy making to develop the outcome standards against which states will be judged in very considered manner.

What do we mean by "considered manner" and how do we ensure states they will be fairly treated as we transition from a system that primarily measures how well the program is running to measures how well the program is working, as assessed by changes in client-based outcomes. I believe the specs ought to make the following points:

- * We ought to keep some general language in about the kinds of things that will be used as outcome measures of performance. Clearly, diminished reliance on welfare or subsidized employment and increased labor market participation and earnings are two factors that will be considered as fundamental to a successful program. We may also reference including some measure of economic well-being if it proves to be a feasible measure.
- * The Secretary, after careful consultation with other Departments and stakeholders, will develop a set of outcome standards, including how they will be operationalized and the data collected. To be implemented, the Secretary will show that the measures meet the objectives of the act and demonstrate the effects of these measures by publishing them for a year prior to implementation to show their impact on states. The specs could also include a time frame for developing the measures.

- * The states will be assured that whatever financial parameters are established with reference to the accountability measures will not be changed as outcome measures become more prominent as standards of performance. That is, if variation in performance can result in a 15 percent variance in FFP, that same scale will persist when the new measures are introduced.

Will Congress buy this? I think yes, if we at least provide some general sense of what factors will be tapped.

Naturally, this strategy begs a lot of questions. The hard work of developing measures and standards, as well as setting up the kinds of information systems essential to running the new system and providing essential management information remain to be worked out. As soon as the legislation is out, we ought to sit down and plan next steps to ensure that progress is made in this area.

Prepared by: Tom Corbett, Karin Martinson, John Wolff, Audrey Mirsky

Impact of a Proposed Enhanced Match Rate "Bonus" and Investment Spending Returns on State Share of Spending

Summary Conclusion: If one assumes a higher investment return, it appears that States would have an incentive to draw down the enhanced match, regardless of which a 5 or 10 percent bonus level is used and whether or not they are a high or low FMAP State. If one assumes a lower investment return (e.g. 15 percent), the 10 percent bonus would be the more effective incentive to encourage States to draw down their entire allotment.

Discussion: A principle guiding the development of match rates is that States should be expected to spend their entire JOBS/WORK allotment. One way to encourage States to do this is to provide an enhanced match (or additional "bonus") if the total allocation is expended.

Two match rate strategies are considered for JOBS/WORK/Child Care: (1) the current JOBS FMAP match with a 10 percent bonus, and (2) a JOBS FMAP + 5 percent match with a 5 percent bonus. In this analysis, we also examine a range of "investment program spending" returns and their impact on the overall proportion States would have to spend to qualify for either the 5 percent or the 10 percent enhanced bonus match.

The attached table summarizes how much States will need to spend, under a few different scenarios, in order for the higher match rate to take effect and the total allotment to be spent. Two examples are shown: States with a 60/40 JOBS FMAP (e.g., New York, California) and States with a 75/25 JOBS FMAP (e.g., Arkansas, North Carolina, West Virginia).

The break point (that is, the point at which States will draw down the enhanced match) for each type of JOBS FMAP State is shown using two bonus match rates--one at 5 percent and one at 10 percent. For example, under a 10 percent bonus, States which currently receive a 60/40 JOBS match would draw down this additional proportion of Federal dollars if the total allotment were spent. Given that there will be AFDC savings as a result of spending on "investment" programs (i.e., JOBS/WORK/child care), the impact of a 15 percent/25 percent/40 percent return on investment dollars on the break point was also examined.

In general, depending on their original JOBS FMAP and the percentage of investment dollars returned, States must put up between 45 percent and 75 percent of their own dollars in order for the 10 percent federal bonus to kick in. Under a 5 percent bonus, States would have to put up between 50 and 90 percent of their own dollars to reach a point where the total allotment would be spent (again, the percent of investment return assumed and the JOBS FMAP level causes the variation).

Note that high FMAP States will need to spend somewhat less than lower FMAP States in order to get the bonus. However, the difference diminishes as the percent share of investment return increases. For example, if there were no investment return, there is a 15 percent difference between what a 75/25 JOBS FMAP State needs to spend to get the bonus compared to a 60/40 JOBS FMAP State. Assuming a 40 percent investment return, there would only be a 5 percent difference between the high and low FMAP States. This general pattern occurs using either the 5 percent or 10 percent bonus levels.

In the absence of an investment return, the 10 percent bonus level clearly provides a more effective incentive to States. With a 5 percent bonus, assuming no investment return, States would have to spend somewhere between 75 percent and 90 percent of their own State dollars before reaching the breakpoint--which is not much of an incentive.

However, whether the bonus is 5 percent or 10 percent becomes less important if a 40 percent investment return, or even a 25 percent investment return, is factored in. For example, at the 40 percent return level, there is only a five percentage point difference in the break-even point for the two bonus levels; the break point ranges from 50 to 55 percent for 60/40 JOBS FMAP States and from 45 to 50 percent for 75/25 JOBS FMAP. It seems reasonable to assume that most States will choose to spend their total allotment with either a 5 or 10 percent bonus at high investment return levels. A 10 percent bonus is preferable only if these investment return levels seem too optimistic or if there is concern that States won't buy into the investment return argument.

PERCENT OF ALLOCATION AFTER WHICH STATE RECEIVES BONUS
(I.E. ENHANCED MATCH RATE) AND DOES SPEND ANY ADDITIONAL DOLLARS,
BY JOBS FMAP, INVESTMENT RETURN RATE, AND BONUS LEVEL

Match Rate Bonus State Receives For Spending Entire Allocation/AFDC Savings from Investment Returns	Percent of Allocation After Which State Does Not Spend Any Additional Dollars	
	State At 60/40 JOBS FMAP	State At 75/25 JOBS FMAP
10 Percent Bonus		
No Investment Return	75%	60%
15 Percent Return	65%	55%
25 Percent Return	60%	50%
40 Percent Return	50%	45%
5 Percent Bonus		
No Investment Return	90%	75%
15 Percent Return	75%	65%
25 Percent Return	65%	60%
40 Percent Return	55%	50%

Note: An interpretation of the shaded box would be as follows.
Assuming a 40 percent investment return on JOBS, WORK, and Child Care,
a 60/40 JOBS FMAP state would draw down the enhanced match
after they spent 55 percent of their allocation. This would result in
the total allotment being expended through the extra federal dollars
provided through the enhanced match. After states reached this point,
they would draw down the total amount of money available to them.

5/3/94
5:30 PM
WR - State
Match

PERFORMANCE MEASURES PROPOSAL

MOVING TOWARDS RESULTS-ORIENTED PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND STANDARDS.

To measure the quality of State efforts in administering the JOBS and WORK programs a limited set of process and results-oriented measures will be set out in the statute. Three possible sets of measures have been identified: 1) JOBS outcomes; 2) participation in the JOBS and WORK components; and 3) percent of cases reaching the time limit. Statutory language on outcome measures for JOBS would, in part, be based on language on performance measures in Section 106 of the Job Training Partnership Act as amended. JOBS outcomes could thus be measured by such factors as placement in unsubsidized employment and increases in earnings.

A modified QC system would remain in effect. Payment accuracy would still be a performance measure, but it would no longer be the principal measure, and fewer resources would be devoted to that aspect of performance. (Under consideration for incorporation into the QC system are other measures of performance; one option is to treat as erroneous payments excess cases of non-participation in JOBS and WORK.)

Transitioning to an Outcome-Based System

Option: *A Transition Period for Developing Outcome-Based Performance Measures*

It is important for the legislative language to have some specificity. Some in Congress may see vague language in our proposal as an attempt to avoid building meaningful standards and expectations into law. At the same time, we do not want to unnecessarily constrain ourselves. Thus, one option is a strategy where, first, we articulate a few preliminary program accountability measures – designed to ensure that the program is operated in a competent manner – which will accompany the introduction of the new law. This includes introducing federal match rates that send clear signals about which outcomes are desirable. In addition, however, the legislative language should clearly specify that the Secretary will be accountable for moving from a performance system that is based on accountability measures to one based on outcomes. A key aspect of this is to delineate a general process and time-frame for accomplishing this transition that will both guarantee a substantive role for key stakeholders and provide some protections for them.

It would only be prudent policy making to develop the outcome standards against which states will be judged in very considered manner. To ensure states will be fairly treated as we transition from a system that primarily measures how well the program is running to measures how well the program is working, as assessed by changes in client-based outcomes, we propose the specs ought to make the following points:

- * We ought to keep some general language in about the kinds of things that will be used as outcome measures of performance. General language saying the system will build on JTPA, to the extent appropriate, will also be included. Clearly, diminished reliance on welfare or subsidized employment and increased labor market participation and earnings are two factors that will be considered as fundamental to a successful program. We may also reference including some measure of economic well-being if it proves to be a feasible measure.

- * The Secretary, after careful consultation with other Departments and stakeholders, will develop a set of outcome standards, including how they will be operationalized and the data collected. To be implemented, the Secretary will show that the measures meet the objectives of the act and demonstrate the effects of these measures by publishing them for a year prior to implementation to show their impact on states. The specs could also include a time frame for developing the measures.
- * The states will be assured that whatever financial parameters are established with reference to the accountability measures will not be changed as outcome measures become more prominent as standards of performance. That is, if variation in performance can result in a 15 percent variance in FFP, that same scale will persist when the new measures are introduced.

Option 2: (Is there another proposal with stronger emphasis on JTPA?)

Implementation Schedule

During the transition, revisions to JOBS participation measures and new AFDC QC procedures could be implemented. The performance measures related to JOBS participation would be established and published by the Secretary within one year of legislative enactment. Also, during the transitional period, automated systems would be developed which could capture longitudinal information on welfare receipt and status, participation in JOBS Prep, JOBS, and WORK. Using a consultation process, additional performance measures would be developed related to outcomes of those in the transitional support system. As described above, performance standards based on these measures would also be developed through a consultation process involving other Federal agencies, various State and local groups and other interested parties. Specific standards would be established based on State experience in implementing the programs. All measures and standards would be periodically reviewed and modified as appropriate.

ISSUE I:

How much time should be allowed for development of new outcome-based performance measures?

While it might be possible to develop new participation measures and standards in a relatively short period of time, many of the new measures under consideration are measures with which we have no experience or data. Also, we are committed to involving important stakeholders in the development of such standards. Thus, it will be difficult to proceed very fast. At the same time, it is important to establish the general framework for the performance system so that we and the States can proceed on the development of the computer systems and data collection needed to support the performance system.

ISSUE II:

How much time should be allowed for development of systems to report State performance against these measures (and for validation of data or systems certification)?

There must be simultaneous development of the national registry system and of new State systems which will feed the national system and permit longitudinal tracking. Based on JOBS experience, even with a substantially improved technical assistance effort, we might need at least two years for the hardware and software development and an additional year to work at

the bugs in reporting at the State and local level. Even then, we could expect a few stragglers.

ISSUE III:

How much time should be allowed between implementation of a measure and specification of standards?

The assumption is that there should be an adequate length of time for States to report on a measure (and to validate reporting on that measure), to compile information on State performance against that measure, and to set a standard which is sensitive to State performance.

ISSUE IV:

How much time should be allowed before States are subject to incentives and sanctions based on their performance on the new outcome measures?

The assumption is that States should be given some warning about where the standards are set prior to their use for reward and sanction purposes.

ISSUE V:

If a subset of the performance standards (e.g., participation measures) are implemented earlier than the rest, should the fiscal consequences be higher for failing those standards than they would be in the future when additional measures come into play?

OPTIONS:

- a. The penalty for failure to meet JOBS participation standards would be set early on (probably as a percent deviation from a baseline match rate) and would be maintained as additional performance standards and fiscal reward/sanction policies were put in place.
- b. While JOBS participation standards stands alone as the performance measure, failure to meet them would have bigger fiscal consequences for States than later when outcome measures were in place.

ISSUE VI:

Should there be a period of time in the transition during which the State is not subject to any potential penalties or bonuses?

If we adapt new JOBS participation measures, we must allow some period of time for States to set up the systems and begin collecting useable data. Unless we require duplicate reporting if "old participation rate" and new participation rate data during this period, we will not have a basis for assessing penalties during the transition.

ISSUE VII:

Should there be penalties for inadequate data collection or reporting efforts?

OPTIONS:

- a. Fixed sanctions
- b. Ability to step in, collect data, and charge costs to State (//QC)
- c. Ability to deem that State failed to meet standards

ISSUE VIII:

What, if any, performance measures apply to those who are not phased in?

OPTIONS

- a. Maintain QC look at payment accuracy
- b. Apply new procedures for measuring payment accuracy
- c. Keep existing JOBS participation standards (minus UP rates?)
- d. Require maintenance of effort in terms of expenditures on volunteers

PERFORMANCE-BASED INCENTIVES AND PENALTIES.

Performance standards in JOBS/WORK would be set in three areas:

1) Service delivery. Measures may be participation rates or other measures such as timeliness of employability plans and services in JOBS. For WORK the measures may be participation rates and the number of WORK slots created relative to the number needed.

2) Achievement of self-sufficiency. Measures would be developed with a goal of compatibility with those used in the JTPA program.

3) Percent of cases reaching the time limit. Measure would be percent reaching time limits. (ISSUE: Additional work needs to be done on defining the denominator).

Over time, there would be a system of rewards and penalties phased in associated with performance vis-a-vis these standards.

ISSUE I:

Should child care expenditures be subject to any standards or potential disallowances based on performance?

ISSUE II:

Which program failures, if any, should be subject to the largest potential fiscal consequences (in the form of sanctions/penalties or bonuses)? Child support, AFDC, JOBS, or WORK? [see separate analysis of the relative effects of some of the current options]

→ NO

Job Placement Bonus

Options for JOBS Rewards and Penalties

ISSUE I:

Should JOBS participation standards be substantially altered? Do we continue to ask States to monitor attendance?

There seems to be some level of agreement that the existing standards should be revised, in part to get a longitudinal rather than a cross-sectional look at participation. That decision aside, there are still many ways that participation can be measured. All of these measures are open to criticism that the system is too process-focused. Further all simple, one-dimensional measures can be easily gamed and create perverse incentives for the programs.

OPTIONS:

- a. Measure coverage (percent served by program over time)
- b. Measure intensity (percent receiving services at least half of their eligible time)
- c. Measure conformity (relationship between plan and services received)
- d. Measure depth (hours of service)

ISSUE II:

Should failure to meet expectations for JOBS be assessed as a penalty against AFDC payments, JOBS payments, or both?

OPTIONS:

- a. Impose penalties (and rewards) for failure (or success) in meeting JOBS service measures against JOBS funding, but impose penalties for failure to achieve outcomes against AFDC payments (i.e., item #1 measures vs. Item #2 and #3 measures).
- b. Link performance of JOBS service measures to JOBS funding. Specify penalties for failure to meet outcome measures at later point, although penalizing benefits could remain an option.

Considerations:

- o JOBS is a much smaller pool of funds. To take penalties only against JOBS funds would make it difficult for JOBS performance to get the same level of attention as payment accuracy and child support enforcement.
- o Penalties against JOBS funds could be self-defeating.
- o Dual system might create a muddled message—might be difficult to play factors off against each other.
- o The existing JOBS penalties are only against the JOBS funds, but the potential penalty is still sizeable because the cut in matching rates is so large.

Option 1: Performance standards would be established in each of the above three areas. Exceeding the performance standard by x% would result in an increase in the FFP rate by 2 percent. Failure to meet the performance standard by x% would result in a decrease in the FFP rate by 2 percent. Each performance standard would be considered separately. Thus, a State that exceeded all three performance standards by x% would be eligible for an additional 6% in their FFP rates. Likewise, a State that failed in all three performance standards by x% would get 6% points less in FFP. If a State exceeded two and met (but did not exceed) one, it would be eligible for 4% higher FFP. (Issue: In the case of achievement of self-sufficiency where there might be more than one measure, should we accord either more points or divide the two points up among the different measures?)

Example: Assume that FFP for JOBS/WORK is set at 65%. The range then would be from 59% to 71% FFP. A State that exceeded one standard, just achieved one, and failed one beyond the tolerance would get 65% FFP. A State that exceeded two of the performance standards would get 69% FFP.

Option 2: The following set of JOBS performance standards have also been proposed:

- (1) Using a coverage concept, close to 100 percent coverage is both feasible and desirable. Financial penalties (a decrease in FFP) be applied to JOBS money if states did not meet a very high coverage rate. The penalties would works follows:

No penalty:	Coverage rate between 96-100 percent
1 percent reduction in FFP:	Coverage rate between 90-95 percent
3 percent reduction in FFP:	Coverage rate between 85-89 percent
5 percent reduction in FFP:	Coverage rate less than 85 percent

- (2) Positive financial incentives (an increase in FFP) be applied to JOBS money if states exceeded a rate measuring service intensity. The incentives would work as follows:

1 percent increase in FFP:	30 percent participate at least half of their eligible time
3 percent increase in FFP:	35 percent participate at least half of their eligible time
5 percent increase in FFP:	40 percent participate at least half of their eligible time

- (3) We also may need some way of measuring how accurately the clock is being calculated. If we don't, we might see wholesale appeals when the time limit begins to expire. There may be other similar measures which I hope you will suggest. One proposal is that states forfeit all incentive payments if it is found that the clock is not running accurately.

ISSUE III:

Should State expenditure levels be a basis for JOBS incentive funds (e.g., higher match rates)? One proposal is that states receive a 5 percentage point increase in FFP for JOBS, WORK, and child care if they spent the state share of their entire allocation for all programs. In addition, states would receive the bonus, even if they did not spend their entire allocation, if they met all the performance measures discussed above and also did not have any unmet working poor child care needs.

NO

Options on WORK Rewards and Sanctions

ISSUE I:

What form should WORK sanctions take?

OPTIONS:

- a. Reduce AFDC payments by treating these cases as QC cases and by treating any payments to families who exceed the threshold number of post-transition families not in WORK slots as payments to ineligible.
- b. Reduce FFP for cash assistance payments to any individual who has been in WORK longer than x months by x%. However, States would be required to pay benefits at the same payment level as provided in AFDC. ok
- c. Substantially cut (i.e., by 50 percent) the FFP rate for benefits to families who exceed a threshold number for post-transition families not in a work slot.

STATE UNIFORM DATA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Meaningful reporting requirements would be developed to ensure that the data necessary to measure program performance and evaluate the program are maintained and readily accessible. Section 487(b) of the Social Security Act would be amended to permit the Secretary to establish in regulations requirements for uniform reporting of information. In adopting the performance standards, the statute would allow the Secretary to use appropriate methods to obtain data as necessary and could parallel the methods used by JTPA. For example, data collection mechanisms may include earnings records, State employment security and FICA records, statistical sampling techniques, etc. Appropriate safeguards to protect the confidentiality of records would be required. States would be expected to maintain automated case management systems that would ensure accurate tracking of time-limits and participation levels and such other data necessary to validate delivery of services. Support from the Federal government will be essential to encourage States to make the maximum use of available technology to enhance systems capability. Funding at enhanced FFP levels will be provided.

FEDERAL AND STATE REVIEWS.

This proposal envisions a redesigned Quality Control system with expanded monitoring and review functions of JOBS and WORK program elements in addition to payment accuracy in the AFDC program.

The Quality Control system would be the mechanism used to validate the data to determine State's performance in achieving self-sufficiency and measures of provision of services and percent of cases reaching the time limit. Section 408(a) of the Social Security Act would be amended to require the Secretary to determine, under the Quality Control system, disallowances required to be repaid due to erroneous payments made by the State in operating the JOBS and WORK program. Erroneous payments in the JOBS and WORK programs would include AFDC payments made to a family not participating in JOBS or WORK because of an incorrect deferral, grant of extension, or failure of the State to provide JOBS services or a WORK slot as required. (Note: Should we also include in the calculation erroneous expenditures made from JOBS and WORK funds). The Secretary shall establish, by regulation, criteria for determining and establishing national tolerance levels for erroneous expenditures in JOBS and WORK components. The Quality Control system would begin measuring State performance in JOBS and WORK in ?. Disallowances would be imposed on States for failure to reach specified performance levels in JOBS and WORK beginning in ?.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PLANNING AND EVALUATION



WR - State
Match

PHONE: (202) 690-6805 FAX: (202) 690-6562

Date: 5/3/94

From: John Wolff

To: Bruce Reed, Kathi Way

Division: ASPE/HSP

Division: _____

City & State: WDC

City & State: _____

Office Number: 690-7507

Office Number: _____

Fax Number: 690-6562

Fax Number: 456-7431

Number of Pages + cover 14

REMARKS: _____

**CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT
ASSUMPTIONS FOR ALLOCATING STATE COSTS AND COLLECTIONS**

STATE SHARE SUMMARY

	CURRENT LAW	HYPOTHETICAL
Expenditures	34% regular 10% enhanced	25% regular 10% enhanced
Incentives		
% of collections (NAFDC limited to 115% of AFDC collections)	6% to 10%	
% of expenditures		10% to 20%
AFDC Collections (FMAP)	21% to 50%	21% to 50%
NAFDC Collections (cost avoidance assumption)	8%	8%

OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS

There are several basic assumption which affect all of the child support estimates:

- o State expenditures are constrained by total program size, rather than the state's net program costs. It is assumed that FTE limitations are as much a constraint on program spending as is the state share of program expenditures.
- o It is also assumed that like the federal budget, state do consider AFDC offsets (and incentives) that directly accrue from child support collections but that most states do not use non-AFDC cost avoidance as part of its budget negotiations.
- o Specific state behavior was not accounted for in developing these estimates. It was assumed that state improvements would be better captured by current trends than by guesses of state behavioral response to specific provisions.
- o Enhance ADP funding under current law and new ADP expenditures under the hypothetical are not included in these estimates. Child support ADP expenditures have been developed separately.

EXPENDITURES

Total Expenditures: Total expenditures for each state were estimated by developing a trend line based on total expenditures in each state from FY 1989 through FY 1992. Expenditures were then adjusted for the difference in the trend line total for that year and the estimated aggregate expenditures for that year under current law (as projected in the President's budget) and the hypothetical estimates. The difference was allocated using each state's proportionate share of expenditures for that year based on the trend line projections. The

same methodology was used for allocating the estimated expenditures under current law and under the child support hypothetical, except for the expansion of services to all families with child support awards. Four states that already run a "universal" child support program were not included in the state allocations. These states are Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. States like California, New York, Illinois and Texas definitely do not run universal systems. Many other states are somewhere in between.

State's Share of Cost: A state's share of total expenditures was determined by applying the applicable match rate for that state.

Under current law the basic federal matching rate for child support is 66 percent of expenditures. States may also receive 90 percent FFP for certain paternity establishment activities. The current law the match rate was determined by taking the average of the state's share of expenditures in FY 1992 and FY 1993. This was done to account for differential state spending under the 90 percent enhanced matching for paternity establishment testing. The States share of expenditures was reduced by the state's incentive payment to derive an adjusted state share of expenditure under the program, even though in many states the state and local CSE directors do not directly control use of the incentive payments in their budgets.

Under the hypothetical, the state share is estimated at 75 percent (the base matching rate) plus a standard 10 or 20 percent allocation for incentive payments. No attempt was made to determine the level of incentives that a state might receive based on its current level of performance or its behavioral response to the proposal.

AFDC COLLECTIONS

Total AFDC Collections: Total collections were allocated by developing a trend line for each state based on the state's total AFDC collections from FY 1989 through FY 1992. Collections were then adjusted to account for the difference in the trend line totals and the projected and the estimated national totals under current law and the hypothetical. As with total expenditures, the difference was allocated using each state's proportionate share of expenditures for that year based on the trend line projections.

Payments to Families: Payment to AFDC families were estimated in the aggregate and then subtracted from the total AFDC collections. The proportionate state share of payments to families (average of FYs 1992-1993) was used to distribute payments to families for both the current law estimate and the child support hypothetical.

State Share of AFDC Collections: Matching rates, using the FY 1995 FMAP, were applied to each state's share of total AFDC collections, less payments to families.

Incentive Payments to States: Incentive payments under current law were taken from the President's budget projections and then allocated to states based on the average of each states proportionate share of incentive payments in FY 1992 and FY 1993. Incentive payments under the hypothetical were assigned at 0%, 10% and 20% to provide a range depending on state performance.

NAFDC COLLECTIONS

Total NAFDC Collections: Total non-AFDC collections (for the existing non-AFDC caseload) were allocated by developing a trend line for each state based on the state's total non-AFDC collections from FY 1989 through FY 1992. NAFDC collections were then adjusted to account for the difference in the trend line totals and the projected and the estimated national totals under current law and the hypothetical. As with total expenditures, the difference was allocated using each state's proportionate share of expenditures for that year based on the trend line projections. This methodology was applied to the estimate of non-AFDC collections under current law and under the child support hypothetical.

New NAFDC Collections: For new non-AFDC collections from the expansion of child support services to all cases with child support awards, additional collections were distributed to less than 100 percent of the states. Four states which currently provide IV-D services to all award cases were excluded.

NAFDC Collections Eligible for Cost Avoidance: Only collections that would not have been paid in the absence of the proposal were considered available for cost avoidance. All regular non-AFDC collections were considered eligible for cost avoidance because NAFDC clients typically come into the system because child support is not being paid. Only 15 percent of the new NAFDC collections (under the expansion to all child support awards) were considered eligible for cost avoidance. This is based on census data which reflects an 85 percent compliance rate for new awards outside the CSE system.

Cost Avoidance Savings: Based on an OCSE study, cost avoidance savings are estimated at 20 percent of non-AFDC collections. These savings are attributable to costs avoided in the AFDC, Food Stamp and Medicaid programs. Cost avoidance savings are low because the majority of non-AFDC women eligible to receive CSE services are not poor. For non-AFDC women, CPS-CSS data indicates that over three-quarters of women with child support awards and almost two-thirds of CSE clients without awards have incomes above 150 percent of poverty.

State Share of Cost Avoidance: State share of cost avoidance is estimated at 8 percent of non-AFDC collection, while the Federal share is estimated at 12 percent. (For a combined Federal-State rate of 20 percent.) The federal share of cost avoidance is estimated at a slightly higher rate than the federal rate under FMAP calculations because all the Food Stamp benefit cost avoidance is attributable to the Federal government. The 8 and 12 percent split was developed by CBO. No state specific cost avoidance rates have been developed.

FY 1999
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1A

Current Law Savings

	(Baseline with Cost Avoidance) 1			(Baseline without Cost Avoidance) 2		
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings
Alabama	(\$10.2)	(\$13.8)	\$3.4	(\$43.6)	(\$32.7)	(\$9.9)
Alaska	7.6	(2.6)	10.1	(1.2)	(7.9)	6.6
Arizona	(19.0)	(18.1)	(0.9)	(35.7)	(28.1)	(7.6)
Arkansas	5.7	(0.1)	5.8	(7.2)	(7.9)	0.7
California	111.7	(92.1)	203.9	(11.0)	(165.6)	154.6
Colorado	9.7	(6.9)	16.6	(5.1)	(15.8)	10.7
Connecticut	29.4	(0.5)	29.9	15.0	(9.1)	24.1
Delaware	(4.8)	(7.0)	2.2	(10.6)	(10.5)	(0.1)
D.C.	6.0	0.8	5.3	(0.6)	(3.2)	2.6
Florida	77.4	13.1	64.3	2.6	(21.8)	24.4
Georgia	88.4	9.8	53.6	21.8	(16.4)	38.1
Guam	(1.0)	(2.1)	1.0	(2.2)	(2.8)	0.6
Hawaii	4.0	(2.1)	6.1	(5.2)	(8.2)	2.0
Idaho	4.9	0.5	4.4	(2.4)	(2.8)	1.5
Illinois	(21.7)	(43.8)	22.2	(64.1)	(69.3)	5.2
Indiana	72.9	23.1	49.7	41.5	4.3	37.2
Iowa	42.3	12.6	29.7	17.5	(2.3)	19.8
Kansas	17.8	2.8	15.0	3.1	(6.0)	9.1
Kentucky	26.7	9.2	17.6	2.8	(5.2)	8.0
Louisiana	(1.5)	(7.7)	6.2	(28.5)	(23.9)	(4.6)
Maine	6.2	(1.0)	8.2	2.5	(4.4)	6.9
Maryland	67.1	18.5	48.6	12.3	(14.3)	26.7
Massachusetts	67.5	9.1	58.4	38.6	(8.2)	46.8
Michigan	239.4	90.9	158.5	35.1	(41.7)	76.8
Minnesota	42.4	2.5	39.9	(12.2)	(30.2)	18.0
Mississippi	3.7	0.4	3.3	(8.4)	(6.9)	(1.5)
Missouri	46.9	9.2	37.6	1.0	(18.9)	19.3
Montana	3.1	0.4	2.7	(2.8)	(3.2)	0.4
Nebraska	1.4	(3.5)	4.9	(17.0)	(14.6)	(2.4)
Nevada	(2.1)	(7.5)	5.4	(14.5)	(14.9)	0.5
New Hampshire	3.0	(2.5)	5.5	(4.7)	(7.1)	2.4
New Jersey	43.3	(17.0)	60.4	(55.5)	(76.3)	20.8
New Mexico	14.0	7.7	6.3	9.3	4.9	4.4
New York	111.7	(19.2)	130.9	(0.5)	(86.5)	86.1
North Carolina	32.2	0.9	31.2	(11.2)	(25.1)	13.9
North Dakota	5.6	1.8	3.8	0.6	(1.1)	1.9
Ohio	78.1	5.8	72.3	(130.9)	(119.6)	(11.3)
Oklahoma	14.4	5.3	9.1	2.7	(1.8)	4.5
Oregon	34.8	10.9	23.9	2.6	(8.4)	11.0
Pennsylvania	212.5	77.5	134.9	4.0	(47.0)	51.9
Puerto Rico	15.7	7.9	7.8	(10.4)	(7.7)	(2.7)
Rhode Island	15.0	3.4	11.6	11.6	1.4	10.3
South Carolina	22.3	9.3	13.0	5.0	(1.1)	6.1
South Dakota	5.1	1.5	3.6	0.6	(1.2)	1.8
Tennessee	32.6	11.9	20.8	5.4	(4.4)	9.6
Texas	(85.9)	(71.2)	5.3	(164.5)	(130.3)	(34.2)
Utah	7.1	1.0	6.0	(5.8)	(6.7)	0.9
Vermont	2.2	(1.2)	3.4	(0.9)	(3.1)	2.2
Virgin Islands	0.2	(0.1)	0.3	(1.2)	(1.0)	(0.2)
Virginia	21.1	(8.6)	29.7	(13.8)	(29.5)	15.7
Washington	75.2	(3.7)	78.9	(5.6)	(52.1)	46.5
West Virginia	13.4	7.5	5.9	2.0	0.7	1.3
Wisconsin	71.1	21.5	49.6	(12.1)	(28.4)	16.3
Wyoming	2.2	(0.4)	2.7	(1.3)	(2.6)	1.2
Total	\$1,668.2	\$34.6	\$1,633.6	(\$453.0)	(\$1,238.1)	\$785.1

Note 1: Savings = AFDC Collections plus Non-AFDC Cost Avoidance minus Expenditures.

Note 2: Savings = AFDC Collections minus Expenditures (no credit for Cost Avoidance).

FY 1998
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1B

Child Support Enforcement Expenditures
(Baseline)

	Total Exp.	Fed. Share Exp.	State Share Exp.	State Share (-) Incent.	Eff. FFP
Alabama	\$68.4	\$46.8	\$22.8	\$17.3	75%
Alaska	20.3	13.4	6.0	2.9	86%
Arizona	72.8	48.1	24.6	20.0	72%
Arkansas	27.5	18.3	9.2	4.7	83%
California	465.4	321.6	163.9	82.4	83%
Colorado	47.8	31.6	16.0	9.2	81%
Connecticut	44.0	29.1	14.9	5.4	88%
Delaware	21.1	14.0	7.1	3.3	75%
D.C.	7.4	4.9	2.5	0.6	89%
Florida	124.7	82.9	41.8	21.3	83%
Georgia	81.1	54.0	27.1	0.7	99%
Guam	6.8	4.5	2.3	1.7	75%
Hawaii	18.1	11.9	6.2	4.0	78%
Idaho	14.6	9.7	4.9	2.2	85%
Illinois	138.3	91.8	46.5	31.9	77%
Indiana	29.4	19.6	9.8	(11.0)	137%
Iowa	33.3	22.1	11.2	(0.8)	102%
Kansas	31.5	20.9	10.6	5.1	84%
Kentucky	56.6	37.8	18.8	10.1	82%
Louisiana	59.3	39.7	19.6	13.1	78%
Maine	14.6	9.7	4.9	(0.7)	105%
Maryland	53.0	35.1	17.9	6.0	89%
Massachusetts	35.5	23.5	12.0	(9.8)	128%
Michigan	152.2	100.7	51.6	4.0	97%
Minnesota	85.3	56.6	28.7	13.4	82%
Mississippi	41.7	27.7	13.9	8.6	79%
Missouri	75.5	50.4	25.2	11.4	85%
Montana	12.9	8.6	4.3	2.6	80%
Nebraska	29.9	19.9	10.1	7.6	75%
Nevada	28.1	18.7	9.4	6.3	77%
New Hampshire	18.1	12.0	6.1	4.3	76%
New Jersey	175.7	116.1	59.8	39.3	78%
New Mexico	12.9	8.6	4.3	1.5	88%
New York	272.6	180.2	92.2	49.9	82%
North Carolina	110.3	73.0	37.3	21.1	81%
North Dakota	7.5	5.0	2.5	0.7	90%
Ohio	278.6	183.3	93.9	68.5	75%
Oklahoma	29.8	19.9	10.0	5.3	82%
Oregon	38.9	25.9	13.0	4.6	88%
Pennsylvania	147.1	97.7	49.5	17.6	88%
Puerto Rico	10.1	6.7	3.4	2.3	75%
Rhode Island	12.2	8.1	4.1	0.3	97%
South Carolina	28.5	19.0	9.5	3.7	87%
South Dakota	6.2	4.1	2.0	0.4	94%
Tennessee	35.5	23.6	11.9	3.9	89%
Texas	274.4	182.7	91.7	74.5	73%
Utah	33.4	22.2	11.2	6.4	81%
Vermont	10.8	7.2	3.6	1.7	84%
Virgin Islands	1.6	1.1	0.5	0.5	72%
Virginia	74.9	49.8	25.1	14.8	80%
Washington	172.6	114.7	58.0	33.7	80%
West Virginia	28.5	18.9	9.6	6.4	77%
Wisconsin	74.1	43.2	24.9	8.6	88%
Wyoming	9.0	6.0	3.0	1.6	82%
Total	\$3,778.0	\$2,587.2	\$1,270.8	\$649.8	83%

Note: Eff. FFP is the States share of expenditures reduced by the State's
incentive payments over total expenditures.

FY 1999
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1C

	AFDC Collections and Cost Avoidance							
	AFDC Collections					Cost Avoidance		
	Total AFDC Coll.	Payment to Families	Federal Share (Net)	(State Incentive)	State Share	Total NAFDC Coll.	Fed. Share @ 12%	State Share @ 8%
Alabama	\$33.4	\$8.6	\$11.8	\$6.6	\$7.3	\$187.1	\$20.1	\$13.4
Alaska	21.4	2.4	5.6	3.0	9.5	43.6	6.2	3.5
Arizona	42.1	5.3	20.0	4.5	12.4	83.8	19.0	6.7
Arkansas	28.9	6.6	10.4	4.5	5.3	64.6	7.8	5.2
California	539.9	85.5	155.8	81.4	237.2	813.5	73.6	49.1
Colorado	48.1	8.7	15.8	6.8	19.9	74.4	8.9	6.0
Connecticut	66.5	7.6	19.9	9.5	29.5	72.4	8.7	5.8
Delaware	13.0	2.4	3.5	1.8	5.3	29.0	3.5	2.3
D.C.	8.4	1.6	1.7	1.7	3.4	32.8	4.0	2.6
Florida	148.8	21.5	51.1	20.8	55.7	374.3	44.9	29.8
Georgia	177.2	74.3	37.8	26.4	38.9	217.9	26.2	17.4
Guam	7.0	2.4	1.7	0.6	2.3	6.0	0.7	0.5
Hawaii	13.7	1.8	3.8	2.2	6.0	50.7	6.1	4.1
Idaho	13.9	1.7	8.9	2.7	3.6	36.5	4.4	2.9
Illinois	95.2	21.1	22.5	14.5	37.1	212.5	25.6	17.0
Indiana	65.6	14.7	23.9	20.7	26.2	156.4	18.8	12.5
Iowa	58.9	8.1	19.8	12.0	19.0	124.2	14.9	9.9
Kansas	39.5	4.9	14.9	5.5	14.2	73.6	8.8	5.9
Kentucky	72.2	12.8	32.6	8.8	18.1	119.7	14.4	9.6
Louisiana	41.2	12.4	15.8	6.5	8.4	135.1	16.2	10.8
Maine	31.5	14.4	5.3	5.5	6.3	28.5	3.4	2.3
Maryland	80.2	14.9	20.8	11.9	32.7	273.8	32.9	21.9
Massachusetts	92.4	18.3	15.3	21.8	37.0	144.3	17.3	11.5
Michigan	250.3	83.0	59.0	47.4	80.8	1,021.5	122.6	81.7
Minnesota	85.6	12.7	26.4	13.3	33.4	273.2	32.8	21.8
Mississippi	43.4	10.1	20.9	5.3	7.1	80.4	7.3	4.8
Missouri	82.3	15.8	32.1	13.7	30.7	229.4	27.6	18.4
Montana	11.7	1.7	5.4	1.7	2.9	29.9	3.6	2.4
Nebraska	16.0	3.1	5.3	2.5	5.1	91.8	11.0	7.3
Nevada	15.2	1.6	3.7	3.1	6.8	81.6	7.4	4.9
New Hampshire	15.8	2.6	4.9	1.8	6.7	38.8	4.7	3.1
New Jersey	140.9	20.7	39.8	20.3	60.1	494.0	58.3	39.5
New Mexico	24.3	2.0	13.5	2.8	6.0	23.4	2.8	1.9
New York	321.8	49.9	93.7	42.3	136.0	561.0	67.3	44.9
North Carolina	128.4	29.3	47.9	16.2	35.0	217.0	26.0	17.4
North Dakota	8.8	1.6	3.9	1.8	2.6	24.2	2.9	1.9
Ohio	179.4	33.8	63.6	24.7	57.2	1,045.4	125.4	83.6
Oklahoma	36.6	4.1	18.1	4.7	8.7	50.7	7.0	4.7
Oregon	49.7	8.3	17.4	8.4	15.6	161.3	19.4	12.8
Pennsylvania	198.2	46.2	60.7	31.8	69.5	1,037.9	124.5	83.0
Puerto Rico	1.1	1.3	(1.0)	0.9	(0.1)	130.4	16.7	10.4
Rhode Island	28.3	4.5	9.4	3.8	10.6	16.6	2.0	1.3
South Carolina	43.5	10.0	17.9	5.8	9.8	87.0	10.4	7.0
South Dakota	8.0	1.2	2.9	1.7	2.2	22.6	2.7	1.8
Tennessee	51.4	10.5	19.3	7.9	13.7	135.8	16.3	10.8
Texas	127.8	17.7	52.4	17.2	40.3	493.1	59.2	39.4
Utah	31.7	4.1	15.5	4.8	7.3	64.2	7.7	5.1
Vermont	12.3	2.3	4.1	1.9	3.9	15.4	1.8	1.2
Virgin Islands	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	6.9	0.8	0.6
Virginia	73.7	12.0	20.3	10.3	30.5	174.5	20.9	14.0
Washington	188.9	21.8	62.5	24.3	80.2	404.0	48.5	32.3
West Virginia	34.1	3.7	12.5	3.2	7.7	57.2	6.9	4.5
Wisconsin	80.7	18.7	20.9	16.2	24.9	415.9	49.9	33.3
Wyoming	9.0	1.3	3.4	1.4	2.9	17.7	2.1	1.4
Total	\$4,070.0	\$745.0	\$1,269.1	\$621.0	\$1,434.9	\$10,506.0	\$1,272.7	\$848.5

FY 1999
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 2A

Savings Under the Hypothetical
(FFP @ 75%; 10% Incentives)

	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Change In State Savings	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	(\$7.8)	(\$20.0)	\$12.2	58.8	71.9%
Alaska	10.4	(1.4)	11.8	1.7	14.1%
Arizona	(15.4)	(25.7)	10.3	11.2	108.7%
Arkansas	8.0	0.5	7.4	1.5	20.9%
California	174.4	(79.6)	254.0	50.1	19.7%
Colorado	15.5	(6.6)	22.3	5.5	25.3%
Connecticut	38.2	4.3	33.9	4.0	11.8%
Delaware	(3.9)	(9.1)	5.3	3.0	67.1%
D.C.	7.2	1.6	5.7	0.4	7.1%
Florida	97.8	19.8	78.0	13.8	17.5%
Georgia	70.2	22.8	47.3	(8.3)	-17.5%
Guam	(0.9)	(2.8)	2.0	0.9	48.7%
Hawaii	5.8	(2.7)	8.6	2.5	29.3%
Idaho	6.8	1.8	5.2	0.8	15.0%
Illinois	(15.3)	(54.4)	39.1	16.9	43.3%
Indiana	84.8	45.4	39.4	(10.3)	-26.1%
Iowa	51.0	23.2	27.8	(1.9)	-6.9%
Kansas	23.1	5.0	18.1	3.1	17.3%
Kentucky	34.7	12.3	22.4	4.9	21.7%
Louisiana	1.2	(10.7)	12.0	5.8	48.4%
Maine	5.4	1.7	3.7	(2.5)	-38.0%
Maryland	78.9	25.5	53.4	4.8	9.0%
Massachusetts	78.8	29.2	49.6	(5.8)	-17.6%
Michigan	274.4	117.6	156.6	(1.9)	-1.2%
Minnesota	54.4	4.9	49.4	9.5	19.3%
Mississippi	6.9	0.1	6.8	3.5	51.1%
Missouri	56.6	14.8	43.8	6.1	14.0%
Montana	4.6	0.6	4.0	1.9	31.3%
Nebraska	3.3	(6.0)	9.3	4.4	47.1%
Nevada	(0.3)	(9.2)	8.0	3.6	39.7%
New Hampshire	4.8	(3.5)	8.3	2.8	34.2%
New Jersey	61.8	(23.9)	85.7	25.4	29.6%
New Mexico	17.8	10.8	7.0	0.7	8.7%
New York	140.5	(14.5)	163.9	33.0	20.1%
North Carolina	43.4	2.0	41.4	10.2	24.6%
North Dakota	6.9	3.0	3.9	0.1	3.4%
Ohio	104.4	(9.2)	113.6	41.3	38.3%
Oklahoma	19.3	7.4	11.9	2.7	22.8%
Oregon	42.0	15.9	26.2	2.9	8.6%
Pennsylvania	244.7	98.1	146.6	11.5	7.9%
Puerto Rico	17.3	7.5	9.7	2.0	20.1%
Rhode Island	18.3	6.5	11.8	0.2	1.6%
South Carolina	28.9	12.5	14.3	1.3	9.1%
South Dakota	6.3	2.7	3.6	(0.1)	-2.5%
Tennessee	39.0	16.9	22.1	1.4	6.5%
Texas	(54.3)	(101.3)	47.0	41.7	88.8%
Utah	10.9	2.0	8.9	2.9	32.6%
Vermont	3.3	(0.8)	4.1	0.7	16.5%
Virgin Islands	0.3	(0.3)	0.6	0.3	47.3%
Virginia	29.4	(9.4)	38.8	9.1	23.5%
Washington	101.0	(1.1)	102.0	23.2	22.7%
West Virginia	18.0	8.4	9.6	3.7	38.7%
Wisconsin	83.2	30.3	53.0	3.5	6.5%
Wyoming	3.3	(0.2)	3.4	0.8	22.8%
Total	\$2,151.4	\$162.5	\$1,988.9	\$355.3	17.9%

FY 1999
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 2B

Savings Under the Hypothetical

	(FFP @ 75%; No Incentives)					(FFP @ 75%; 20% Incentives)				
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Change In State Savings	% Change From Baseline	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Change In State Savings	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	(\$7.8)	(\$12.7)	\$4.9	\$1.5	30.2%	(\$7.8)	(\$27.3)	\$19.5	\$16.1	82.4%
Alaska	10.4	0.8	0.6	(0.5)	-5.2%	10.4	(3.6)	13.9	3.8	27.4%
Arizona	(15.4)	(18.0)	2.6	3.5	133.8%	(15.4)	(33.4)	18.0	18.9	105.0%
Arkansas	8.0	3.6	4.5	(1.4)	-31.1%	8.0	(2.3)	10.3	4.6	43.3%
California	174.4	(28.1)	202.4	(1.6)	-0.7%	174.4	(131.2)	305.6	101.7	33.3%
Colorado	15.5	(1.7)	17.2	0.6	3.4%	15.5	(11.8)	27.3	10.7	39.2%
Connecticut	38.2	9.0	29.2	(0.7)	-2.4%	38.2	(0.4)	38.6	0.7	22.5%
Delaware	(3.9)	(6.9)	3.0	0.8	25.4%	(3.9)	(11.4)	7.5	5.3	69.8%
D.C.	7.2	2.4	4.8	(0.4)	-8.1%	7.2	0.8	8.5	1.2	18.6%
Florida	97.8	30.1	64.8	0.3	0.4%	97.8	6.4	91.3	27.0	29.5%
Georgia	70.2	31.5	38.7	(16.9)	-43.8%	70.2	14.2	56.0	0.4	0.7%
Guam	(0.9)	(2.1)	1.2	0.2	15.5%	(0.9)	(3.8)	2.7	1.6	61.1%
Hawaii	5.8	(0.6)	6.6	0.6	8.7%	5.8	(4.7)	10.5	4.4	42.3%
Idaho	6.8	3.2	3.6	(0.8)	-21.5%	6.8	0.1	6.7	2.3	34.6%
Illinois	(15.3)	(39.7)	24.4	2.2	9.1%	(15.3)	(83.1)	53.8	31.6	58.8%
Indiana	84.8	48.6	36.2	(13.5)	-37.2%	84.8	42.3	42.6	(7.1)	-16.7%
Iowa	51.0	26.8	24.2	(5.5)	-22.7%	51.0	19.6	31.4	1.7	5.3%
Kansas	23.1	8.4	14.6	(0.2)	-1.6%	23.1	1.6	21.5	6.5	30.2%
Kentucky	34.7	18.3	16.4	(1.2)	-7.1%	34.7	6.3	28.5	10.9	38.3%
Louisiana	1.2	(4.4)	5.8	(0.5)	-9.5%	1.2	(17.0)	18.3	12.1	66.2%
Maine	8.4	3.3	5.1	(4.1)	-80.0%	8.4	0.2	8.2	(1.0)	-11.9%
Maryland	78.9	31.3	47.7	(0.8)	-1.9%	78.9	19.8	59.2	10.6	17.8%
Massachusetts	78.8	33.0	45.5	(12.6)	-27.5%	78.8	29.3	53.5	(4.9)	-9.2%
Michigan	274.4	133.9	140.5	(18.0)	-12.8%	274.4	101.7	172.7	14.2	8.2%
Minnesota	54.4	14.1	40.3	0.4	1.0%	54.4	(4.2)	58.6	18.7	31.9%
Mississippi	6.9	4.5	2.4	(0.9)	-38.7%	6.9	(4.3)	11.3	7.9	70.3%
Missouri	58.6	22.9	35.7	(1.9)	-5.4%	58.6	6.7	51.9	14.2	27.4%
Montana	4.6	2.0	2.6	(0.1)	-4.5%	4.6	(0.8)	5.4	2.6	48.8%
Nebraska	3.3	(2.8)	6.1	1.2	19.2%	3.3	(8.2)	12.5	7.6	60.7%
Nevada	(0.3)	(6.2)	6.0	0.6	9.5%	(0.3)	(12.2)	11.9	6.5	64.8%
New Hampshire	4.8	(1.6)	6.4	0.9	14.2%	4.8	(5.4)	10.3	4.8	46.6%
New Jersey	61.8	(5.1)	68.9	6.5	9.8%	61.8	(42.8)	104.6	44.2	42.3%
New Mexico	17.6	12.0	5.6	(0.7)	-12.3%	17.6	9.2	8.4	2.1	24.6%
New York	149.5	14.6	134.8	3.9	2.9%	149.5	(43.5)	193.0	62.0	32.1%
North Carolina	43.4	13.7	29.7	(1.6)	-5.2%	43.4	(9.9)	53.2	21.9	41.3%
North Dakota	6.9	3.8	3.1	(0.7)	-21.3%	6.9	2.2	4.7	0.9	19.7%
Ohio	104.4	20.0	84.4	12.1	14.3%	104.4	(38.4)	142.8	70.5	48.4%
Oklahoma	19.3	10.6	8.7	(0.5)	-5.5%	19.3	4.2	15.0	5.9	39.2%
Oregon	42.0	20.1	22.0	(1.9)	-8.8%	42.0	11.7	30.3	6.4	21.2%
Pennsylvania	244.7	113.6	131.0	(3.8)	-3.0%	244.7	82.6	162.1	27.2	16.8%
Puerto Rico	17.3	8.7	8.6	0.8	9.4%	17.3	6.4	10.9	3.1	28.6%
Rhode Island	18.3	7.8	10.5	(1.1)	-10.5%	18.3	5.2	13.1	1.9	11.4%
South Carolina	26.9	15.6	11.3	(1.8)	-15.6%	26.9	9.5	17.4	4.4	25.1%
South Dakota	6.3	3.4	2.9	(0.8)	-26.1%	6.3	2.1	4.2	0.6	13.7%
Tennessee	39.0	20.7	18.3	(2.4)	-13.1%	39.0	13.1	25.9	5.2	20.2%
Texas	(54.3)	(72.1)	17.8	12.6	70.4%	(54.3)	(130.5)	76.2	70.9	93.1%
Utah	10.8	5.5	5.4	(0.6)	-12.1%	10.8	(1.6)	12.5	6.5	51.8%
Vermont	3.3	0.4	3.0	(0.5)	-15.8%	3.3	(1.8)	5.3	1.8	34.8%
Virgin Islands	0.3	(0.1)	0.4	0.1	25.0%	0.3	(0.5)	0.8	0.5	59.2%
Virginia	29.4	(1.4)	30.8	1.1	3.7%	29.4	(17.4)	46.8	17.1	36.8%
Washington	101.0	17.3	83.6	4.8	5.7%	101.0	(19.5)	120.5	41.6	34.5%
West Virginia	18.0	11.5	6.6	0.7	10.4%	18.0	5.4	12.6	6.7	53.6%
Wisconsin	83.3	38.1	45.2	(4.4)	-8.6%	83.3	22.5	60.8	11.3	18.5%
Wyoming	3.3	0.8	2.5	(0.2)	-8.9%	3.3	(1.1)	4.4	1.7	39.6%
Total	\$2,151.4	\$565.0	\$1,586.4	(\$47.2)	-3.0%	\$2,151.4	(\$240.0)	\$2,391.4	\$757.8	31.7%

FY 1990
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 3A

CSE Expenditures
(FFP @ 75%; 10% Incentives)

	Total Expend. (HYPO)	Fed Share @ 85%	State Share @ 15%	Change In State Dollars	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	\$73.0	\$62.0	\$10.9	(\$6.3)	-36.8%
Alaska	21.6	18.4	3.2	0.4	12.3%
Arizona	77.0	65.3	11.6	(8.4)	-42.2%
Arkansas	29.3	24.9	4.4	(0.3)	-5.6%
California	515.9	438.5	77.4	(5.0)	-8.1%
Colorado	50.6	43.0	7.6	(1.8)	-17.8%
Connecticut	66.8	39.9	7.0	1.7	30.9%
Delaware	22.5	19.1	3.4	(2.0)	-36.8%
D.C.	8.0	6.8	1.2	0.4	51.5%
Florida	133.5	113.5	20.0	(1.2)	-5.8%
Georgia	58.7	73.7	13.0	12.3	1701.9%
Guam	7.2	8.1	1.1	(0.7)	-37.7%
Hawaii	19.4	16.5	2.9	(1.1)	-26.7%
Idaho	15.6	13.2	2.3	0.2	8.1%
Illinois	147.2	125.1	22.1	(9.8)	-30.8%
Indiana	31.7	27.0	4.8	15.7	143.4%
Iowa	35.8	30.4	5.4	6.1	791.1%
Kansas	33.7	28.6	5.1	(0.1)	-1.6%
Kentucky	60.3	51.3	9.0	(1.0)	-10.3%
Louisiana	63.2	53.7	9.5	(3.6)	-27.4%
Maine	15.6	13.3	2.3	3.0	455.4%
Maryland	57.4	48.8	8.6	2.6	43.8%
Massachusetts	38.5	32.7	5.8	15.8	158.9%
Michigan	160.8	136.7	24.1	20.1	405.6%
Minnesota	91.4	77.7	13.7	(1.7)	-10.9%
Mississippi	44.3	37.8	6.6	(2.0)	-23.0%
Missouri	60.9	68.6	12.1	0.7	6.1%
Montana	19.7	11.8	2.1	(0.5)	-20.1%
Nebraska	32.1	27.3	4.8	(2.7)	-36.2%
Nevada	29.9	25.4	4.5	(1.8)	-29.1%
New Hampshire	19.4	16.5	2.9	(1.4)	-32.9%
New Jersey	188.3	160.1	28.2	(11.1)	-28.1%
New Mexico	13.7	11.7	2.1	0.6	38.5%
New York	290.7	247.1	43.6	(6.3)	-12.7%
North Carolina	117.3	99.9	17.4	(3.5)	-15.8%
North Dakota	8.0	6.8	1.2	0.6	66.0%
Ohio	292.1	248.3	43.8	(24.7)	-38.1%
Oklahoma	31.6	27.1	4.5	(0.5)	-9.8%
Oregon	41.9	35.6	6.3	1.7	36.3%
Pennsylvania	155.4	132.1	23.3	6.7	32.3%
Puerto Rico	11.5	9.8	1.7	(0.8)	-32.1%
Rhode Island	12.9	11.0	1.9	1.6	495.2%
South Carolina	30.6	26.0	4.6	0.8	22.5%
South Dakota	6.6	5.6	1.0	0.6	182.5%
Tennessee	38.1	32.4	5.7	1.8	45.9%
Texas	291.6	248.0	43.6	(30.7)	-41.3%
Utah	35.8	30.2	5.3	(1.1)	-17.2%
Vermont	11.5	9.8	1.7	0.0	1.9%
Virgin Islands	1.8	1.5	0.3	(0.2)	-41.8%
Virginia	80.1	68.0	12.0	(2.8)	-19.0%
Washington	184.0	158.4	27.6	(6.1)	-18.1%
West Virginia	30.3	25.8	4.5	(1.9)	-29.2%
Wisconsin	78.3	66.5	11.7	3.1	35.8%
Wyoming	9.8	8.2	1.4	(0.2)	-10.7%
Total	\$4,025.0	\$3,421.2	\$603.7	(\$46.0)	-7.1%

FY 1989
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 3B

CSE Expenditures

	(FFP @ 75%; No Incentives)					(FFP @ 75%; 20% Incentives)				
	Total Exp. (HYPO)	Fed. Share @ 75%	State Share @ 25%	Change In State Dollars	% Change From Baseline	Total Expend. (HYPO)	Fed Share @ 95%	State Share @ 5%	Change in State Dollars	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	\$73.0	\$54.7	\$18.2	\$1.0	5.7%	\$73.0	\$69.3	\$3.6	(\$13.6)	-78.9%
Alaska	21.6	16.2	5.4	2.5	87.2%	21.6	20.5	1.1	(1.8)	-82.5%
Arizona	77.0	57.8	19.3	(0.7)	-3.7%	77.0	73.2	3.8	(16.1)	-80.7%
Arkansas	29.3	22.0	7.3	2.7	57.3%	28.3	27.8	1.5	(3.2)	-68.5%
California	515.9	386.9	129.0	46.6	56.5%	515.9	490.1	25.8	(58.6)	-68.7%
Colorado	50.8	37.9	12.6	3.4	37.0%	50.6	48.1	2.5	(6.7)	-72.8%
Connecticut	46.9	35.2	11.7	6.4	116.2%	46.9	44.6	2.3	(3.0)	-56.4%
Delaware	22.5	16.9	6.6	0.3	5.4%	22.5	21.4	1.1	(4.2)	-78.9%
D.C.	8.0	6.0	2.0	1.2	152.5%	8.0	7.6	0.4	(0.4)	-49.5%
Florida	133.5	100.1	33.4	12.1	56.9%	133.5	126.8	6.7	(14.6)	-68.6%
Georgia	86.7	65.0	21.7	20.8	2903.1%	86.7	82.3	4.3	3.6	500.5%
Guam	7.2	5.4	1.8	0.1	3.9%	7.2	6.8	0.4	(1.4)	-78.2%
Hawaii	19.4	14.5	4.8	0.9	22.1%	19.4	18.4	1.0	(3.0)	-75.6%
Idaho	15.6	11.7	3.9	1.7	60.1%	15.6	14.8	0.8	(1.4)	-68.0%
Illinois	147.2	110.4	36.8	4.9	15.3%	147.2	139.9	7.4	(24.9)	-76.9%
Indiana	31.7	23.8	7.9	18.9	172.4%	31.7	30.2	1.6	12.6	114.5%
Iowa	35.8	26.8	8.9	8.7	1251.9%	35.8	34.0	1.8	2.8	330.4%
Kansas	33.7	25.3	8.4	3.3	64.0%	33.7	32.0	1.7	(3.5)	-67.2%
Kentucky	60.3	45.2	15.1	5.0	49.5%	60.3	57.3	3.0	(7.1)	-70.1%
Louisiana	63.2	47.4	15.8	2.7	21.1%	63.2	60.1	3.2	(9.9)	-75.8%
Maine	15.6	11.7	3.9	4.6	692.3%	15.6	14.8	0.8	1.4	218.5%
Maryland	57.4	43.0	14.3	8.4	139.7%	57.4	64.6	2.9	(3.1)	-52.1%
Massachusetts	86.5	28.9	9.6	19.4	188.2%	86.5	36.6	1.9	11.7	119.6%
Michigan	160.8	120.6	40.2	38.1	892.7%	160.8	152.7	8.0	4.0	98.5%
Minnesota	91.4	68.5	22.8	7.5	48.5%	91.4	86.8	4.6	(10.8)	-70.3%
Mississippi	44.3	33.2	11.1	2.4	28.3%	44.3	42.1	2.2	(6.4)	-74.3%
Missouri	80.8	60.7	20.2	8.8	76.8%	80.8	78.9	4.0	(7.4)	-64.6%
Montana	13.7	10.3	3.4	0.9	33.2%	13.7	13.0	0.7	(1.9)	-73.4%
Nebraska	32.1	24.1	8.0	0.5	6.3%	32.1	30.5	1.6	(6.0)	-78.7%
Nevada	29.9	22.4	7.5	1.1	18.1%	29.9	28.4	1.5	(4.8)	-76.4%
New Hampshire	19.4	14.5	4.8	0.5	11.8%	19.4	18.4	1.0	(3.4)	-77.8%
New Jersey	188.3	141.2	47.1	7.8	19.8%	188.3	178.8	9.4	(29.9)	-76.0%
New Mexico	13.7	10.3	3.4	1.9	130.8%	13.7	13.1	0.7	(0.8)	-53.8%
New York	290.7	218.0	72.7	22.8	45.6%	290.7	276.2	14.5	(35.4)	-78.9%
North Carolina	117.5	88.1	29.4	8.3	39.4%	117.5	111.6	5.9	(15.2)	-72.1%
North Dakota	8.0	6.0	2.0	1.3	180.1%	8.0	7.6	0.4	(0.3)	-44.0%
Ohio	292.1	219.1	73.0	4.6	6.5%	292.1	277.5	14.6	(53.8)	-78.7%
Oklahoma	31.8	23.9	8.0	2.7	50.4%	31.8	30.2	1.6	(3.7)	-69.9%
Oregon	41.9	31.4	10.5	5.9	127.2%	41.9	39.8	2.1	(2.6)	-54.6%
Pennsylvania	155.4	116.6	38.8	21.2	120.6%	155.4	147.6	7.8	(9.8)	-55.9%
Puerto Rico	11.5	6.6	2.9	0.3	13.1%	11.5	10.9	0.6	(2.0)	-77.4%
Rhode Island	12.8	9.7	3.2	2.9	892.1%	12.8	12.3	0.6	0.3	98.4%
South Carolina	30.6	22.8	7.8	3.9	104.2%	30.6	29.0	1.5	(2.2)	-59.2%
South Dakota	6.6	5.0	1.7	1.3	370.8%	6.6	6.3	0.3	(0.8)	-3.8%
Tennessee	38.1	28.6	9.5	5.6	143.1%	38.1	36.2	1.9	(2.0)	-51.4%
Texas	291.8	218.8	72.9	(1.8)	-2.1%	291.8	277.2	14.6	(59.2)	-80.4%
Utah	35.8	26.7	8.9	2.5	38.1%	35.6	33.8	1.8	(4.7)	-72.4%
Vermont	11.5	8.6	2.9	1.2	69.8%	11.5	10.9	0.6	(1.1)	-66.0%
Virgin Islands	1.8	1.3	0.4	(0.0)	-3.0%	1.8	1.7	0.1	(0.4)	-80.6%
Virginia	80.1	60.0	20.0	5.2	35.1%	80.1	78.1	4.0	(10.8)	-73.0%
Washington	184.0	138.0	46.0	12.3	36.6%	184.0	174.8	9.2	(24.5)	-72.7%
West Virginia	30.3	22.7	7.6	1.2	18.0%	30.3	28.8	1.5	(4.9)	-76.4%
Wisconsin	78.3	58.7	19.6	10.9	126.4%	78.3	74.6	3.9	(4.7)	-54.7%
Wyoming	9.6	7.2	2.4	0.8	48.9%	9.6	9.1	0.5	(1.1)	-70.2%
Total	\$4,025.0	\$3,018.7	\$1,006.2	\$354.5	54.9%	\$4,025.0	\$3,523.7	\$201.2	(\$448.5)	-69.0%

FY 1999
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 4

AFDC Collections and Cost Avoidance

	AFDC Collections						Cost Avoidance					
	Total AFDC Coll.	Pmts to Families	Fed. Share	State Share	Change in State Share	% Change From Baseline	Total NAFDC Coll.	Total Elig. for CA	Fed. Share @ 12%	State Share @ 8%	Change in State Share	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	\$41.1	\$13.2	\$19.7	\$8.2	\$0.9	12.3%	\$224.6	\$198.6	\$22.4	\$14.9	\$1.8	11.6%
Alaska	28.4	4.2	11.1	11.1	1.5	16.6%	60.8	48.8	5.9	3.9	0.4	12.0%
Arizona	51.8	8.0	28.5	14.4	2.0	16.4%	112.1	53.4	11.2	7.6	0.8	11.6%
Arkansas	33.1	10.3	18.0	6.0	0.7	12.8%	85.7	72.1	8.6	5.8	0.6	11.5%
California	685.2	112.4	276.4	278.4	39.2	19.5%	858.5	687.6	62.0	55.0	5.9	12.1%
Colorado	59.3	9.8	26.3	23.3	3.3	16.6%	100.7	83.1	10.0	6.7	0.7	11.7%
Connecticut	82.0	13.2	34.4	34.4	4.9	16.7%	104.1	81.3	9.8	6.5	0.7	12.4%
Delaware	16.0	2.9	8.1	6.1	0.8	14.7%	41.3	32.8	3.9	2.6	0.3	12.2%
D.C.	10.4	2.5	3.9	3.9	0.6	14.7%	44.0	36.8	4.4	2.9	0.3	11.6%
Florida	183.6	35.6	83.0	84.8	8.8	18.9%	599.5	418.4	50.2	33.6	3.5	11.8%
Georgia	210.3	110.2	67.3	40.8	2.0	6.1%	294.4	243.4	29.2	19.5	2.9	11.7%
Guam	8.6	3.6	2.5	2.5	0.2	8.9%	7.8	6.7	0.6	0.6	0.1	11.0%
Hawaii	16.8	3.0	8.9	8.9	1.0	16.0%	63.3	56.7	6.8	4.5	0.6	11.8%
Idaho	17.2	2.9	10.0	4.3	0.6	16.5%	50.7	40.9	4.9	3.3	0.4	12.6%
Illinois	117.3	23.1	62.1	42.1	5.1	13.7%	296.6	238.0	28.6	19.0	2.0	12.0%
Indiana	105.5	23.8	51.4	30.2	4.0	13.2%	212.8	174.6	21.0	14.0	1.5	11.8%
Iowa	72.9	13.6	36.9	22.9	3.1	16.1%	165.8	138.9	16.7	11.1	1.2	11.8%
Kansas	48.7	8.4	23.8	16.6	2.3	18.5%	101.6	82.3	9.9	6.6	0.7	11.9%
Kentucky	89.0	20.7	47.5	20.6	2.7	15.0%	183.0	133.6	16.1	10.7	1.1	11.8%
Louisiana	53.2	18.9	24.9	8.4	1.0	11.0%	181.6	150.9	18.1	12.1	1.3	11.7%
Maine	38.8	21.2	11.2	6.5	0.2	2.8%	40.3	32.0	3.8	2.6	0.3	12.2%
Maryland	90.9	23.6	37.6	37.5	4.8	14.8%	379.5	308.7	36.8	24.6	2.6	12.0%
Massachusetts	113.8	29.1	42.4	42.4	6.3	14.4%	216.6	182.8	19.3	13.0	1.6	12.6%
Michigan	308.4	97.4	118.8	81.1	19.2	12.8%	1,121.1	1,121.1	134.5	89.7	8.0	8.8%
Minnesota	105.7	21.1	45.0	38.7	3.3	16.8%	373.6	305.6	30.7	24.4	2.6	11.8%
Mississippi	59.5	10.7	29.6	9.1	0.9	13.3%	81.0	67.4	6.1	5.4	0.6	11.6%
Missouri	113.7	26.6	22.6	18.4	4.7	15.2%	313.5	256.7	30.6	20.5	2.2	11.9%
Montana	14.5	2.9	8.2	3.4	0.5	16.0%	59.0	33.9	4.0	2.7	0.3	11.3%
Nbraska	19.7	4.8	8.9	5.9	0.7	14.5%	130.5	103.1	12.4	8.2	0.9	12.2%
Nevada	18.8	3.8	7.9	7.9	1.1	16.9%	81.6	68.7	8.2	5.3	0.6	11.5%
New Hampshire	19.5	4.0	7.7	7.7	1.0	15.6%	53.8	43.4	5.2	3.6	0.4	12.0%
New Jersey	173.7	34.3	80.7	69.7	9.6	16.8%	695.8	553.8	66.6	44.3	4.8	12.1%
New Mexico	29.9	3.8	19.1	7.0	1.0	17.4%	32.0	26.1	3.1	2.1	0.2	11.8%
New York	386.6	82.2	137.2	157.2	21.3	15.6%	782.3	628.5	75.4	50.0	5.4	12.0%
North Carolina	158.2	45.9	72.7	39.7	4.7	13.4%	295.6	242.8	29.1	19.4	2.0	11.8%
North Dakota	12.1	2.8	6.5	0.0	0.4	15.4%	32.1	27.0	3.2	2.2	0.2	11.5%
Ohio	221.0	54.0	101.4	65.7	8.4	14.7%	1,147.4	1,147.4	137.7	81.8	8.2	9.8%
Oklahoma	45.1	7.1	26.6	11.4	1.6	10.8%	80.0	65.6	7.9	5.2	0.6	11.8%
Oregon	81.3	13.4	29.8	18.0	2.4	16.3%	221.6	180.4	21.7	14.4	1.5	11.9%
Pennsylvania	244.3	72.0	93.5	78.8	9.2	13.3%	1,139.1	1,139.1	130.7	81.1	6.1	9.8%
Puerto Rico	1.3	1.3	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.2)	122.0%	187.9	146.6	17.8	11.7	1.3	12.6%
Rhode Island	34.9	7.4	16.3	12.2	1.8	15.5%	24.0	18.8	2.2	1.6	0.2	12.4%
South Carolina	83.8	15.6	36.8	11.1	1.3	13.4%	131.1	97.4	11.7	7.8	0.8	12.0%
South Dakota	8.8	2.9	8.3	2.6	0.3	16.7%	30.8	25.3	3.0	2.0	0.2	11.8%
Tennessee	63.3	18.7	31.1	15.6	1.9	14.2%	166.2	151.9	16.2	12.2	1.3	11.8%
Texas	157.2	28.6	80.8	46.8	8.8	16.1%	649.7	549.9	65.8	44.0	4.3	11.4%
Utah	39.1	7.0	23.6	8.5	1.2	16.3%	98.1	71.8	8.6	6.7	0.6	11.9%
Vermont	16.1	3.7	7.0	4.9	0.6	14.7%	20.6	17.1	2.1	1.4	0.1	11.6%
Virgin Islands	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.0	14.0%	8.7	7.8	0.9	0.6	0.1	12.1%
Virginia	90.8	20.3	35.2	36.2	4.6	15.2%	245.5	195.7	23.5	16.7	1.7	12.2%
Washington	232.7	37.9	101.0	93.6	13.4	16.7%	539.3	450.8	54.1	36.1	3.7	11.6%
West Virginia	42.1	6.8	26.5	9.0	1.3	16.9%	77.3	63.6	7.7	5.1	0.8	11.7%
Wisconsin	99.4	29.1	42.1	28.3	3.3	13.3%	458.5	466.6	54.8	36.3	3.2	9.8%
Wyoming	11.1	2.2	5.6	3.3	0.5	16.8%	23.7	18.8	2.4	1.6	0.2	11.4%
Total	\$5,015.0	\$1,198.8	\$2,168.8	\$1,649.4	\$214.6	14.9%	\$13,608.0	\$11,791.0	\$1,414.9	\$943.3	\$54.6	11.2%

FY 1999
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 5A

Net Effect
(FFP @ 75%; 10% Incentives)

	With Cost Avoidance			Without Cost Avoidance		
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings
Alabama	2.4	(6.4)	8.8	(1.5)	(8.7)	7.2
Alaska	2.8	1.2	1.7	1.8	0.8	1.2
Arizona	3.6	(7.7)	11.2	1.6	(8.8)	10.5
Arkansas	2.3	0.7	1.5	0.8	(0.1)	0.9
California	62.6	12.5	50.1	47.8	3.6	44.2
Colorado	5.0	0.1	5.6	4.0	(0.9)	4.9
Connecticut	8.7	4.8	4.0	6.9	3.7	3.3
Delaware	0.9	(2.1)	3.0	0.2	(2.5)	2.7
D.C.	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.1
Florida	20.3	6.7	13.6	11.5	1.4	10.1
Georgia	4.8	15.1	(8.3)	(0.3)	10.0	(10.3)
Guam	0.1	(0.8)	0.9	0.0	(0.9)	0.9
Hawaii	1.9	(0.6)	2.6	0.7	(1.3)	2.0
Idaho	1.9	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.4
Illinois	6.3	(10.6)	16.9	1.2	(13.7)	14.9
Indiana	12.0	22.3	(10.3)	8.4	20.1	(11.6)
Iowa	8.6	10.6	(1.9)	5.7	8.8	(3.1)
Kansas	5.3	2.2	3.1	3.6	1.1	2.4
Kentucky	8.0	3.1	4.8	5.2	1.4	3.7
Louisiana	2.7	(3.1)	5.8	(0.4)	(6.0)	4.5
Maine	0.2	2.7	(2.5)	(0.5)	2.3	(2.8)
Maryland	11.8	7.0	4.8	5.3	3.1	2.2
Massachusetts	11.3	20.1	(8.8)	7.6	17.9	(10.2)
Michigan	36.1	36.9	(1.9)	15.1	25.0	(8.8)
Minnesota	11.8	2.4	9.5	5.5	(1.5)	7.0
Mississippi	3.2	(0.3)	3.5	1.8	(1.1)	2.9
Missouri	11.7	3.6	6.1	8.3	2.3	4.0
Montana	1.4	0.2	1.3	0.9	(0.2)	1.0
Nebraska	1.9	(2.5)	4.4	(0.3)	(3.8)	3.5
Nevada	1.8	(1.7)	3.6	0.5	(2.5)	3.0
New Hampshire	1.8	(1.0)	2.8	0.9	(1.6)	2.5
New Jersey	18.6	(6.9)	25.4	6.6	(14.1)	20.6
New Mexico	3.6	2.9	0.7	3.0	2.6	0.5
New York	37.7	4.8	33.0	24.2	(3.3)	27.6
North Carolina	11.2	1.0	10.2	6.1	(2.1)	8.1
North Dakota	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.7	0.8	(0.1)
Ohio	28.3	(15.0)	41.3	5.9	(27.3)	33.1
Oklahoma	4.9	2.2	2.7	3.5	1.4	2.2
Oregon	7.2	5.0	2.3	3.4	2.7	0.7
Pennsylvania	32.2	20.5	11.6	11.9	8.4	3.5
Puerto Rico	1.6	(0.4)	2.0	(1.7)	(2.3)	0.7
Rhode Island	3.3	3.1	0.2	2.9	2.9	0.0
South Carolina	4.5	3.2	1.3	2.4	1.9	0.5
South Dakota	1.1	1.2	(0.1)	0.6	0.9	(0.3)
Tennessee	0.4	4.9	1.4	3.2	3.0	0.1
Texas	11.6	(30.1)	41.7	0.3	(36.9)	37.2
Utah	3.8	0.8	2.9	2.3	0.0	2.3
Vermont	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.5
Virgin Islands	0.1	(0.2)	0.3	(0.1)	(0.3)	0.2
Virginia	8.3	(0.8)	9.1	4.1	(3.4)	7.4
Washington	25.8	2.8	23.2	16.4	(3.0)	19.5
West Virginia	4.8	0.9	3.7	3.3	0.1	3.2
Wisconsin	12.2	0.8	3.5	4.1	3.9	0.2
Wyoming	1.0	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.6
Total	\$483.2	\$127.9	\$355.3	\$246.2	(\$14.3)	\$260.5

FY 1999
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 50

Net Effect

	(FFP @ 75%; No Incentives)			(FFP @ 75%; 20% Incentives)		
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings
Alabama	2.4	0.9	1.5	2.4	(13.7)	16.1
Alaska	2.9	3.4	(0.5)	2.9	(1.9)	3.8
Arizona	3.6	0.9	3.5	3.6	(15.4)	18.8
Arkansas	2.3	3.7	(1.4)	2.3	(2.2)	4.5
California	62.5	64.1	(1.5)	62.6	(39.1)	101.7
Colorado	5.8	5.2	0.6	5.8	(4.9)	10.7
Connecticut	0.7	9.4	(0.7)	0.7	0.1	0.7
Delaware	0.9	0.1	0.8	0.9	(4.4)	5.3
D.C.	1.2	1.6	(0.4)	1.2	0.0	1.2
Florida	20.3	20.0	0.3	20.3	(5.7)	27.0
Georgia	4.8	21.7	(16.9)	4.8	4.4	5.4
Hawaii	0.1	(0.0)	0.2	0.1	(1.5)	1.6
Idaho	1.9	1.3	0.6	1.9	(2.5)	4.4
Idaho	1.9	2.7	(0.8)	1.9	(0.5)	2.3
Illinois	6.3	4.1	2.2	6.3	(25.3)	31.6
Indiana	12.0	25.5	(13.5)	12.0	19.2	(7.1)
Iowa	8.8	14.1	(5.3)	8.8	7.0	1.7
Kansas	5.3	5.6	(0.2)	5.3	(1.2)	6.5
Kentucky	8.0	9.1	(1.2)	8.0	(2.9)	10.9
Louisiana	2.7	3.3	(0.5)	2.7	(9.4)	12.1
Maine	0.2	4.3	(4.1)	0.2	1.2	(1.0)
Maryland	11.8	12.7	(0.9)	11.8	1.3	10.6
Massachusetts	11.3	23.9	(12.6)	11.3	16.2	(4.9)
Michigan	35.1	53.0	(18.0)	35.1	20.9	14.2
Minnesota	11.9	11.5	0.4	11.9	(6.9)	18.7
Mississippi	3.2	4.2	(0.9)	3.2	(4.7)	7.9
Missouri	11.7	13.6	(1.9)	11.7	(2.5)	14.2
Montana	1.4	1.6	(0.1)	1.4	(1.2)	2.6
Nebraska	1.9	0.8	1.2	1.9	(5.7)	7.8
Nevada	1.9	1.3	0.6	1.9	(4.7)	6.5
New Hampshire	1.8	0.9	0.9	1.8	(3.0)	4.8
New Jersey	16.5	11.9	6.5	16.5	(25.7)	44.2
New Mexico	3.6	4.3	(0.7)	3.6	1.5	2.1
New York	37.7	33.8	3.9	37.7	(24.3)	62.0
North Carolina	11.2	12.8	(1.6)	11.2	(10.7)	21.9
North Dakota	1.3	2.0	(0.7)	1.3	0.4	0.9
Ohio	26.3	14.2	12.1	26.3	(44.2)	70.5
Oklahoma	4.9	5.4	(0.5)	4.9	(1.0)	5.9
Oregon	7.2	9.1	(1.9)	7.2	0.8	6.4
Pennsylvania	32.2	36.1	(3.9)	32.2	5.0	27.2
Puerto Rico	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.6	(1.5)	3.1
Rhode Island	3.3	4.4	(1.1)	3.3	1.8	1.5
South Carolina	4.5	6.3	(1.8)	4.5	0.1	4.4
South Dakota	1.1	1.9	(0.8)	1.1	0.6	0.6
Tennessee	8.4	8.8	(2.4)	8.4	1.1	5.2
Texas	11.8	(0.9)	12.4	11.8	(59.3)	70.9
Utah	3.8	4.5	(0.6)	3.8	(2.6)	6.5
Vermont	1.1	1.6	(0.5)	1.1	(0.7)	1.8
Virgin Islands	0.1	(0.0)	0.1	0.1	(0.4)	0.5
Virginia	8.3	7.2	1.1	8.3	(8.8)	17.1
Washington	25.8	21.0	4.8	25.8	(15.8)	41.6
West Virginia	4.6	3.9	0.7	4.6	(2.1)	6.7
Wisconsin	12.2	16.6	(4.4)	12.2	0.9	11.3
Wyoming	1.0	1.2	(0.2)	1.0	(0.7)	1.7
Total	\$483.2	\$530.4	(\$47.2)	\$483.2	(\$274.6)	\$757.8

WR -
State
Match

**CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT
ASSUMPTIONS FOR ALLOCATING STATE COSTS AND COLLECTIONS**

STATE SHARE SUMMARY

	CURRENT LAW	HYPOTHETICAL
Expenditures	34% regular 10% enhanced	25% regular 10% enhanced
Incentives		
% of collections (NAFDC limited to 115% of AFDC collections)	6% to 10%	
% of expenditures		10% to 20%
AFDC Collections (FMAP)	21% to 50%	21% to 50%
NAFDC Collections (cost avoidance assumption)	8%	8%

OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS

There are several basic assumption which affect all of the child support estimates:

- o State expenditures are constrained by total program size, rather than the state's net program costs. It is assumed that FTE limitations are as much a constraint on program spending as is the state share of program expenditures.
- o It is also assumed that like the federal budget, state do consider AFDC offsets (and incentives) that directly accrue from child support collections but that most states do not use non-AFDC cost avoidance as part of its budget negotiations.
- o Specific state behavior was not accounted for in developing these estimates. It was assumed that state improvements would be better captured by current trends than by guess-timates of state behavioral response to specific provisions.
- o Enhance ADP funding under current law and new ADP expenditures under the hypothetical are not included in these estimates. Child support ADP expenditures have been developed separately.

EXPENDITURES

Total Expenditures: Total expenditures for each state were estimated by developing a trend line based on total expenditures in each state from FY 1989 through FY 1992. Expenditures were then adjusted for the difference in the trend line total for that year and the estimated aggregate expenditures for that year under current law (as projected in the President's budget) and the hypothetical estimates. The difference was allocated using each state's proportionate share of expenditures for that year based on the trend line projections. The

same methodology was used for allocating the estimated expenditures under current law and under the child support hypothetical, except for the expansion of services to all families with child support awards. Four states that already run a "universal" child support program were not included in the state allocations. These states are Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. States like California, New York, Illinois and Texas definitely do not run universal systems. Many other states are somewhere in between.

State's Share of Cost: A state's share of total expenditures was determined by applying the applicable match rate for that state.

Under current law the basic federal matching rate for child support is 66 percent of expenditures. States may also receive 90 percent FFP for certain paternity establishment activities. The current law the match rate was determining by taking the average of the state's share of expenditures in FY 1992 and FY 1993. This was done to account for differential state spending under the 90 percent enhanced matching for paternity establishment testing. The States share of expenditures was reduced by the state's incentive payment to derive an adjusted state share of expenditure under the program, even though in many states the state and local CSE directors do not directly control use of the incentive payments in their budgets.

Under the hypothetical, the state share is estimated at 75 percent (the base matching rate) plus a standard 10 or 20 percent allocation for incentive payments. No attempt was made to determine the level of incentives that a state might receive based on its current level of performance or its behavioral response to the proposal.

AFDC COLLECTIONS

Total AFDC Collections: Total collections were allocated by developing a trend line for each state based on the state's total AFDC collections from FY 1989 through FY 1992. Collections were then adjusted to account for the difference in the trend line totals and the projected and the estimated national totals under current law and the hypothetical. As with total expenditures, the difference was allocated using each state's proportionate share of expenditures for that year based on the trend line projections.

Payments to Families: Payment to AFDC families were estimated in the aggregate and then subtracted from the total AFDC collections. The proportionate state share of payments to families (average of FYs 1992-1993) was used to distribute payments to families for both the current law estimate and the child support hypothetical.

State Share of AFDC Collections: Matching rates, using the FY 1995 FMAP, were applied to each state's share of total AFDC collections, less payments to families.

Incentive Payments to States: Incentive payments under current law were taken from the President's budget projections and then allocated to states based on the average of each states proportionate share of incentive payments in FY 1992 and FY 1993. Incentive payments under the hypothetical were assigned at 0%, 10% and 20% to provide a range depending on state performance.

NAFDC COLLECTIONS

Total NAFDC Collections: Total non-AFDC collections (for the existing non-AFDC caseload) were allocated by developing a trend line for each state based on the state's total non-AFDC collections from FY 1989 through FY 1992. NAFDC collections were then adjusted to account for the difference in the trend line totals and the projected and the estimated national totals under current law and the hypothetical. As with total expenditures, the difference was allocated using each state's proportionate share of expenditures for that year based on the trend line projections. This methodology was applied to the estimate of non-AFDC collections under current law and under the child support hypothetical.

New NAFDC Collections: For new non-AFDC collections from the expansion of child support services to all cases with child support awards, additional collections were distributed to less than 100 percent of the states. Four states which currently provide IV-D services to all award cases were excluded.

NAFDC Collections Eligible for Cost Avoidance: Only collections that would not have been paid in the absence of the proposal were considered available for cost avoidance. All regular non-AFDC collections were considered eligible for cost avoidance because NAFDC clients typically come into the system because child support is not being paid. Only 15 percent of the new NAFDC collections (under the expansion to all child support awards) were considered eligible for cost avoidance. This is based on census data which reflects an 85 percent compliance rate for new awards outside the CSE system.

Cost Avoidance Savings: Based on an OCSE study, cost avoidance savings are estimated at 20 percent of non-AFDC collections. These savings are attributable to costs avoided in the AFDC, Food Stamp and Medicaid programs. Cost avoidance savings are low because the majority of non-AFDC women eligible to receive CSE services are not poor. For non-AFDC women, CPS-CSS data indicates that over three-quarters of women with child support awards and almost two-thirds of CSE clients without awards have incomes above 150 percent of poverty.

State Share of Cost Avoidance: State share of cost avoidance is estimated at 8 percent of non-AFDC collection, while the Federal share is estimated at 12 percent. (For a combined Federal-State rate of 20 percent.) The federal share of cost avoidance is estimated at a slightly higher rate than the federal rate under FMAP calculations because all the Food Stamp benefit cost avoidance is attributable to the Federal government. The 8 and 12 percent split was developed by CBO. No state specific cost avoidance rates have been developed.

FY 1992
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1A

Current Law Savings

	(Baseline with Cost Avoidance) 1			(Baseline without Cost Avoidance) 2		
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings
Alabama	(\$10.2)	(\$13.6)	\$3.4	(\$43.6)	(\$33.7)	(\$9.9)
Alaska	7.5	(2.6)	10.1	(1.2)	(7.9)	6.6
Arizona	(19.0)	(18.1)	(0.9)	(35.7)	(28.1)	(7.6)
Arkansas	5.7	(0.1)	5.8	(7.2)	(7.9)	0.7
California	111.7	(92.1)	203.8	(11.0)	(165.8)	154.8
Colorado	9.7	(6.9)	16.6	(5.1)	(15.8)	10.7
Connecticut	29.4	(0.5)	29.9	15.0	(9.1)	24.1
Delaware	(4.8)	(7.0)	2.3	(10.6)	(10.6)	(0.1)
D.C.	6.0	0.6	5.3	(0.6)	(3.2)	2.6
Florida	77.4	13.1	64.3	2.6	(31.8)	34.4
Georgia	65.4	9.8	55.6	21.8	(16.4)	38.1
Guam	(1.0)	(2.1)	1.0	(2.2)	(2.8)	0.6
Hawaii	4.0	(2.1)	6.1	(6.2)	(6.2)	2.0
Idaho	4.9	0.5	4.4	(2.4)	(3.8)	1.5
Illinois	(21.7)	(43.8)	22.2	(64.1)	(69.3)	5.2
Indiana	72.8	23.1	49.7	41.5	4.3	37.2
Iowa	42.3	12.6	29.7	17.5	(2.3)	19.8
Kansas	17.6	2.8	15.0	3.1	(6.0)	9.1
Kentucky	26.7	9.2	17.6	2.8	(5.2)	8.0
Louisiana	(1.5)	(7.7)	6.2	(28.5)	(23.9)	(4.6)
Maine	8.2	(1.0)	9.2	2.5	(4.4)	6.9
Maryland	67.1	18.5	48.6	12.3	(14.3)	26.7
Massachusetts	67.5	9.1	58.4	38.6	(6.2)	46.6
Michigan	239.4	80.9	158.5	35.1	(41.7)	76.8
Minnesota	42.4	2.5	39.9	(12.2)	(30.2)	18.0
Mississippi	3.7	0.4	3.3	(6.4)	(6.9)	(1.5)
Missouri	46.9	9.2	37.6	1.0	(18.3)	19.3
Montana	3.1	0.4	2.7	(2.6)	(3.2)	0.6
Nebraska	1.4	(3.5)	4.9	(17.0)	(14.6)	(2.4)
Nevada	(2.1)	(7.5)	5.4	(14.5)	(14.3)	0.5
New Hampshire	3.0	(2.5)	5.5	(4.7)	(7.1)	2.4
New Jersey	43.3	(17.0)	60.4	(55.5)	(76.3)	20.8
New Mexico	14.0	7.7	6.3	9.3	4.9	4.4
New York	111.7	(19.2)	130.9	(9.5)	(86.6)	66.1
North Carolina	32.2	0.9	31.2	(11.2)	(25.1)	13.9
North Dakota	5.6	1.8	3.8	6.8	(1.1)	1.9
Ohio	78.1	5.8	72.3	(130.9)	(119.6)	(11.3)
Oklahoma	14.4	5.3	9.1	2.7	(1.8)	4.5
Oregon	34.8	10.9	23.9	2.6	(8.4)	11.0
Pennsylvania	212.5	77.5	134.9	4.9	(47.0)	51.9
Puerto Rico	15.7	7.9	7.8	(10.4)	(7.7)	(2.7)
Rhode Island	15.0	3.4	11.6	11.6	1.4	10.3
South Carolina	22.3	9.3	13.0	5.0	(1.1)	6.1
South Dakota	5.1	1.5	3.6	0.6	(1.2)	1.8
Tennessee	32.6	11.9	20.6	5.4	(4.4)	9.8
Texas	(65.9)	(71.2)	5.3	(164.5)	(130.3)	(34.2)
Utah	7.1	1.0	6.0	(5.8)	(6.7)	0.9
Vermont	2.2	(1.2)	3.4	(0.9)	(3.1)	2.2
Virgin Islands	0.2	(0.1)	0.3	(1.2)	(1.0)	(0.2)
Virginia	21.1	(8.6)	29.7	(13.8)	(29.5)	15.7
Washington	75.2	(3.7)	78.9	(5.6)	(52.1)	46.5
West Virginia	13.4	7.5	5.9	2.0	0.7	1.3
Wisconsin	71.1	21.5	49.6	(12.1)	(28.4)	16.3
Wyoming	2.2	(0.4)	2.7	(1.3)	(2.6)	1.2
Total	\$1,668.2	\$34.6	\$1,633.6	(\$453.0)	(\$1,238.1)	\$785.1

Note 1: Savings = AFDC Collections plus Non-AFDC Cost Avoidance minus Expenditures.
Note 2: Savings = AFDC Collections minus Expenditures (no credit for Cost Avoidance).

FY 1999
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1B

Child Support Enforcement Expenditures
(Baseline)

F-8

	Total Exp.	Fed. Share Exp.	State Share Exp.	State Share (-) Incent.	Eff. FFP
Alabama	\$68.4	\$45.6	\$22.8	\$17.3	75%
Alaska	20.3	13.4	6.8	2.9	86%
Arizona	72.6	48.1	24.5	20.0	72%
Arkansas	27.5	18.3	9.2	4.7	83%
California	485.4	321.5	163.9	82.4	83%
Colorado	47.6	31.8	16.0	8.2	81%
Connecticut	44.0	29.1	14.9	5.4	88%
Delaware	21.1	14.0	7.1	5.3	75%
D.C.	7.4	4.9	2.5	0.8	89%
Florida	124.7	82.9	41.8	21.3	83%
Georgia	81.1	54.0	27.1	0.7	89%
Guam	6.8	4.5	2.3	1.7	75%
Hawaii	18.1	11.9	6.2	4.0	78%
Idaho	14.6	9.7	4.9	2.2	85%
Illinois	138.3	91.8	46.5	31.9	77%
Indiana	29.4	19.8	9.8	(11.0)	137%
Iowa	33.3	22.1	11.2	(0.8)	102%
Kansas	31.5	20.9	10.6	5.1	84%
Kentucky	56.6	37.8	18.8	10.1	82%
Louisiana	59.3	39.7	19.6	13.1	78%
Maine	14.6	9.7	4.9	(0.7)	105%
Maryland	53.0	35.1	17.9	8.0	89%
Massachusetts	35.5	23.5	12.0	(8.8)	128%
Michigan	152.2	100.7	51.5	4.0	97%
Minnesota	85.3	56.8	28.7	15.4	82%
Mississippi	41.7	27.7	13.9	8.8	79%
Missouri	75.5	50.4	25.2	11.4	85%
Montana	12.9	8.8	4.3	2.6	80%
Nebraska	29.9	19.9	10.1	7.6	75%
Nevada	28.1	18.7	9.4	6.3	77%
New Hampshire	18.1	12.0	6.1	4.3	76%
New Jersey	175.7	116.1	59.6	39.3	78%
New Mexico	12.9	8.8	4.3	1.5	88%
New York	272.5	180.2	92.2	49.9	82%
North Carolina	110.3	73.0	37.3	21.1	81%
North Dakota	7.5	5.0	2.5	0.7	90%
Ohio	276.6	183.3	93.3	68.5	75%
Oklahoma	29.9	19.9	10.0	5.3	82%
Oregon	38.9	25.9	13.0	4.6	88%
Pennsylvania	147.1	97.7	49.5	17.6	88%
Puerto Rico	10.1	6.7	3.4	2.5	75%
Rhode Island	12.2	8.1	4.1	0.3	97%
South Carolina	28.5	19.0	9.5	3.7	87%
South Dakota	6.2	4.1	2.0	0.4	94%
Tennessee	35.5	23.6	11.9	3.9	89%
Texas	274.4	182.7	91.7	74.5	73%
Utah	33.4	22.2	11.2	6.4	81%
Vermont	10.8	7.2	3.6	1.7	84%
Virgin Islands	1.6	1.1	0.5	0.5	72%
Virginia	74.9	49.8	25.1	14.8	80%
Washington	172.8	114.7	58.0	33.7	80%
West Virginia	29.5	18.9	9.6	6.4	77%
Wisconsin	74.1	49.2	24.9	8.8	88%
Wyoming	9.0	6.0	3.0	1.6	82%
Total	\$3,778.0	\$2,507.2	\$1,270.8	\$649.8	83%

Note: Eff. FFP is the States share of expenditures reduced by the State's incentive payments over total expenditures.

FY 1999
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1C

	AFDC Collections and Cost Avoidance (Baseline) ²					Cost Avoidance		
	AFDC Collections		(Baseline) ²			Total	Fed.	State
	Total AFDC Coll.	Payment to Families	Federal Share (Net)	State Share (State Incentive)	State Share	NAFDC Coll.	Share @ 12%	Share @ 8%
Alabama	\$33.4	\$8.6	\$11.9	\$5.6	\$7.3	\$167.1	\$20.1	\$13.4
Alaska	21.4	2.4	5.6	3.9	9.5	43.0	5.2	3.5
Arizona	42.1	5.3	20.0	4.5	12.4	63.6	10.0	6.7
Arkansas	26.9	6.6	10.4	4.5	5.3	64.6	7.8	5.2
California	539.9	65.5	155.6	61.4	237.2	613.5	73.6	49.1
Colorado	48.1	5.7	15.0	6.8	19.9	74.4	8.9	6.0
Connecticut	66.5	7.8	19.9	9.5	29.5	72.4	8.7	5.8
Delaware	13.0	2.4	3.5	1.8	6.3	29.0	3.5	2.3
D.C.	8.4	1.6	1.7	1.7	3.4	32.9	4.0	2.6
Florida	148.8	21.5	51.1	20.6	55.7	374.3	44.9	29.9
Georgia	177.2	74.3	37.6	26.4	38.9	217.9	26.2	17.4
Guam	7.0	2.4	1.7	0.6	2.3	6.0	0.7	0.5
Hawaii	13.7	1.8	3.8	2.2	6.0	50.7	6.1	4.1
Idaho	13.9	1.7	5.9	2.7	3.8	36.5	4.4	2.9
Illinois	95.2	21.1	22.5	14.6	37.1	212.5	25.5	17.0
Indiana	85.6	14.7	23.9	20.7	26.2	166.4	18.8	12.5
Iowa	58.9	8.1	19.8	12.0	19.0	124.2	14.9	9.9
Kansas	39.5	4.9	14.9	5.5	14.2	73.6	8.8	5.9
Kentucky	72.2	12.8	32.6	8.8	18.1	119.7	14.4	9.6
Louisiana	43.2	12.4	15.0	6.5	8.4	135.1	16.2	10.8
Maine	31.5	14.4	6.3	5.5	6.3	28.5	3.4	2.3
Maryland	60.2	14.9	20.8	11.9	32.7	273.9	32.9	21.9
Massachusetts	92.4	18.3	15.3	21.8	37.0	144.3	17.3	11.5
Michigan	250.3	63.0	59.0	47.4	60.8	1,021.5	122.6	81.7
Minnesota	65.8	12.7	26.4	13.3	33.4	273.2	32.8	21.9
Mississippi	43.4	10.1	20.9	6.3	7.1	60.4	7.3	4.8
Missouri	92.3	15.8	32.1	13.7	30.7	229.4	27.5	18.4
Montana	11.7	1.7	5.4	1.7	2.9	29.9	3.6	2.4
Nebraska	18.0	3.1	5.3	2.5	5.1	91.8	11.0	7.3
Nevada	15.2	1.6	3.7	3.1	6.8	61.6	7.4	4.9
New Hampshire	15.6	2.4	4.9	1.8	6.7	38.8	4.7	3.1
New Jersey	140.9	20.7	39.8	20.3	60.1	494.0	59.3	39.5
New Mexico	24.3	2.0	13.5	2.6	5.9	23.4	2.6	1.9
New York	321.9	49.9	93.7	42.3	136.0	561.0	67.3	44.9
North Carolina	128.4	29.3	47.9	16.2	35.0	217.0	26.0	17.4
North Dakota	9.8	1.6	3.9	1.8	2.6	24.2	2.9	1.9
Ohio	179.4	33.6	63.6	24.7	57.2	1,045.4	125.4	83.6
Oklahoma	36.6	4.1	16.1	4.7	9.7	58.7	7.0	4.7
Oregon	49.7	6.3	17.4	8.4	15.6	161.3	19.4	12.9
Pennsylvania	198.2	46.2	50.7	31.6	69.5	1,037.8	124.5	83.0
Puerto Rico	1.1	1.3	(1.0)	0.9	(0.1)	130.4	15.7	10.4
Rhode Island	28.3	4.5	9.4	3.8	10.6	16.6	2.0	1.3
South Carolina	43.5	10.0	17.9	5.8	9.8	87.0	10.4	7.0
South Dakota	8.0	1.2	2.9	1.7	2.2	22.6	2.7	1.8
Tennessee	51.4	10.5	19.3	7.9	13.7	135.9	16.3	10.9
Texas	127.5	17.7	82.4	17.2	40.3	493.1	59.2	39.4
Utah	31.7	4.1	15.5	4.8	7.3	64.2	7.7	5.1
Vermont	12.3	2.3	4.1	1.9	3.9	15.4	1.8	1.2
Virgin Islands	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	6.9	0.8	0.6
Virginia	73.7	12.6	20.3	10.3	30.5	174.5	20.9	14.0
Washington	189.9	21.8	62.5	24.3	60.2	404.0	48.5	32.3
West Virginia	34.1	3.7	19.6	3.2	7.7	57.2	6.9	4.6
Wisconsin	60.7	18.7	20.9	16.2	24.9	415.9	49.9	33.3
Wyoming	9.0	1.3	3.4	1.4	2.9	17.7	2.1	1.4
Total	\$4,070.0	\$745.0	\$1,269.1	\$621.0	\$1,434.9	\$10,606.0	\$1,272.7	\$848.5

FY 1999
 HYPOTHETICAL
 (\$ Millions)

Chart 2A

Savings Under the Hypothetical
 (FFP @ 75%; 10% Incentives)

	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Change in State Savings	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	(\$7.8)	(\$20.0)	\$12.2	\$8.8	71.9%
Alaska	10.4	(1.4)	11.8	1.7	14.1%
Arizona	(15.4)	(25.7)	10.3	11.2	108.7%
Arkansas	8.0	0.8	7.4	1.5	20.9%
California	174.4	(79.6)	254.0	50.1	19.7%
Colorado	15.5	(6.8)	22.3	6.6	25.3%
Connecticut	38.2	4.3	33.9	4.0	11.8%
Delaware	(3.9)	(9.1)	5.3	3.0	57.1%
D.C.	7.2	1.6	5.7	0.4	7.1%
Florida	97.8	19.8	78.0	13.6	17.5%
Georgia	70.2	22.8	47.3	(8.3)	-17.5%
Guam	(0.9)	(2.8)	2.0	0.9	46.7%
Hawaii	6.8	(2.7)	8.6	2.5	29.3%
Idaho	6.8	1.6	5.2	0.8	15.0%
Illinois	(15.3)	(54.4)	39.1	16.9	43.3%
Indiana	84.8	45.4	39.4	(10.3)	-26.1%
Iowa	51.0	23.2	27.8	(1.9)	-6.9%
Kansas	23.1	5.0	18.1	3.1	17.3%
Kentucky	34.7	12.3	22.4	4.9	21.7%
Louisiana	1.2	(10.7)	12.0	5.8	48.4%
Maine	8.4	1.7	6.7	(2.5)	-38.0%
Maryland	76.9	25.5	53.4	4.8	9.0%
Massachusetts	78.8	29.2	49.6	(8.8)	-17.6%
Michigan	274.4	117.8	156.6	(1.9)	-1.2%
Minnesota	54.4	4.9	49.4	9.5	19.3%
Mississippi	8.9	0.1	6.8	3.5	51.1%
Missouri	58.6	14.8	43.8	6.1	14.0%
Montana	4.8	0.6	4.0	1.3	31.3%
Nebraska	3.3	(6.0)	9.3	4.4	47.1%
Nevada	(0.3)	(9.2)	9.0	3.6	39.7%
New Hampshire	4.8	(3.5)	6.3	2.8	34.2%
New Jersey	61.8	(23.9)	85.7	25.4	29.6%
New Mexico	17.8	10.8	7.0	0.7	9.7%
New York	149.5	(14.5)	163.9	33.0	20.1%
North Carolina	43.4	2.0	41.4	10.2	24.6%
North Dakota	6.9	3.0	3.9	0.1	3.4%
Ohio	104.4	(9.2)	113.6	41.3	36.3%
Oklahoma	19.3	7.4	11.9	2.7	22.8%
Oregon	42.0	15.9	26.2	2.3	8.6%
Pennsylvania	244.7	95.1	149.6	11.6	7.9%
Puerto Rico	17.3	7.5	9.7	2.0	20.1%
Rhode Island	18.3	6.5	11.8	0.2	1.6%
South Carolina	26.9	12.5	14.3	1.3	9.1%
South Dakota	6.1	2.7	3.5	(0.1)	-2.5%
Tennessee	39.0	16.9	22.1	1.4	6.5%
Texas	(54.3)	(101.3)	47.0	41.7	88.6%
Utah	10.9	2.0	8.9	2.9	32.6%
Vermont	3.3	(0.8)	4.1	0.7	16.6%
Virgin Islands	0.3	(0.3)	0.6	0.3	47.3%
Virginia	29.4	(9.4)	38.8	9.1	23.5%
Washington	101.0	(1.1)	102.0	23.2	22.7%
West Virginia	18.0	8.4	9.6	3.7	38.7%
Wisconsin	63.3	30.3	33.0	3.5	6.5%
Wyoming	3.3	(0.2)	3.4	0.8	22.0%
Total	\$2,151.4	\$162.5	\$1,988.9	\$355.3	17.9%

Savings Under the Hypothetical

	(FFP @ 75%; No Incentives)					(FFP @ 75%; 20% Incentives)				
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Change in State Savings	% Change From Baseline	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Change in State Savings	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	(\$7.8)	(\$12.7)	\$4.9	\$1.5	30.2%	(\$7.8)	(\$27.3)	\$19.5	\$16.1	62.4%
Alaska	10.4	0.8	9.6	(0.5)	-5.2%	10.4	(3.6)	13.9	3.8	27.4%
Arizona	(15.4)	(18.0)	2.6	3.5	133.8%	(15.4)	(33.4)	18.0	18.9	105.0%
Arkansas	8.0	3.8	4.5	(1.4)	-31.1%	8.0	(2.3)	10.3	4.5	43.3%
California	174.4	(26.1)	202.4	(1.5)	-0.7%	174.4	(131.2)	305.6	101.7	33.3%
Colorado	15.5	(1.7)	17.2	0.8	3.4%	15.5	(11.8)	27.3	10.7	39.2%
Connecticut	38.2	9.0	29.2	(0.7)	-2.4%	38.2	(0.4)	38.6	8.7	22.5%
Delaware	(3.9)	(6.9)	3.0	0.8	25.4%	(3.9)	(11.4)	7.5	5.3	69.9%
D.C.	7.2	2.4	4.9	(0.4)	-8.1%	7.2	0.8	6.5	1.2	18.8%
Florida	97.8	33.1	64.6	0.3	0.4%	97.8	6.4	91.3	27.0	29.5%
Georgia	70.2	31.5	38.7	(16.9)	-43.8%	70.2	14.2	56.0	0.4	0.7%
Guam	(0.9)	(2.1)	1.2	0.2	15.5%	(0.9)	(3.6)	2.7	1.6	61.1%
Hawaii	5.9	(0.8)	6.6	0.6	6.7%	5.8	(4.7)	10.5	4.4	42.3%
Idaho	8.8	3.2	3.6	(0.6)	-21.5%	8.8	0.1	6.7	2.3	34.6%
Illinois	(15.3)	(39.7)	24.4	2.2	9.1%	(15.3)	(69.1)	53.8	31.6	58.8%
Indiana	84.8	48.6	36.2	(13.5)	-37.2%	84.8	42.3	42.6	(7.1)	-18.7%
Iowa	51.0	26.8	24.2	(5.5)	-22.7%	51.0	19.8	31.4	1.7	5.3%
Kansas	23.1	8.4	14.8	(0.2)	-1.6%	23.1	1.6	21.5	6.5	30.2%
Kentucky	34.7	18.3	16.4	(1.2)	-7.1%	34.7	6.3	28.5	10.9	38.3%
Louisiana	1.2	(4.4)	5.6	(0.5)	-9.5%	1.2	(17.0)	18.3	12.1	66.2%
Maine	8.4	3.3	5.1	(4.1)	-80.0%	8.4	0.2	8.2	(1.0)	-11.9%
Maryland	78.9	31.3	47.7	(0.9)	-1.9%	78.9	18.8	59.2	10.6	17.8%
Massachusetts	78.8	33.0	45.8	(12.6)	-27.5%	78.8	25.3	53.5	(4.9)	-9.2%
Michigan	274.4	133.9	140.6	(18.0)	-12.8%	274.4	101.7	172.7	14.2	8.2%
Minnesota	54.4	14.1	40.3	0.4	1.0%	54.4	(4.2)	58.6	18.7	31.9%
Mississippi	6.9	4.5	2.4	(0.9)	-38.7%	6.9	(4.3)	11.3	7.9	70.3%
Missouri	58.6	22.9	35.7	(1.9)	-5.4%	58.6	6.7	51.9	14.2	27.4%
Montana	4.8	2.0	2.6	(0.1)	-4.5%	4.8	(0.8)	5.4	2.6	48.8%
Nebraska	3.3	(2.8)	6.1	1.2	19.2%	3.3	(9.2)	12.5	7.6	60.7%
Nevada	(0.3)	(6.2)	6.0	0.6	9.5%	(0.3)	(12.2)	11.9	6.5	54.8%
New Hampshire	4.8	(1.6)	6.4	0.9	14.2%	4.8	(5.4)	10.3	4.9	46.6%
New Jersey	61.8	(5.1)	66.9	6.5	9.8%	61.8	(42.8)	104.6	44.2	42.3%
New Mexico	17.6	12.0	5.6	(0.7)	-12.3%	17.6	9.2	8.4	2.1	24.6%
New York	149.5	14.6	134.8	3.9	2.9%	149.5	(43.5)	193.0	62.0	32.1%
North Carolina	43.4	13.7	29.7	(1.6)	-5.2%	43.4	(9.8)	53.2	21.9	41.3%
North Dakota	6.9	3.8	3.1	(0.7)	-21.3%	6.9	2.2	4.7	0.9	19.7%
Ohio	104.4	20.0	84.4	12.1	14.3%	104.4	(38.4)	142.8	70.5	49.4%
Oklahoma	19.3	10.6	8.7	(0.5)	-5.5%	19.3	4.2	15.0	5.9	39.2%
Oregon	42.0	20.1	22.0	(1.9)	-8.8%	42.0	11.7	30.3	6.4	21.2%
Pennsylvania	244.7	113.6	131.0	(3.9)	-3.0%	244.7	82.5	162.1	27.2	16.8%
Puerto Rico	17.3	8.7	8.6	0.8	9.4%	17.3	6.4	10.9	3.1	28.6%
Rhode Island	18.3	7.8	10.5	(1.1)	-10.5%	18.3	5.2	13.1	1.5	11.4%
South Carolina	26.9	15.8	11.3	(1.8)	-15.6%	26.9	9.5	17.4	4.4	25.1%
South Dakota	6.3	3.4	2.9	(0.8)	-26.1%	6.3	2.1	4.2	0.6	13.7%
Tennessee	39.0	20.7	18.3	(2.4)	-13.1%	39.0	13.1	25.9	5.2	20.2%
Texas	(54.3)	(72.1)	17.8	12.6	70.4%	(54.3)	(130.5)	76.2	70.9	93.1%
Utah	10.9	5.5	5.4	(0.6)	-12.1%	10.9	(1.6)	12.5	6.5	51.8%
Vermont	3.3	0.4	3.0	(0.5)	-15.8%	3.3	(1.9)	5.3	1.8	34.8%
Virgin Islands	0.3	(0.1)	0.4	0.1	25.8%	0.3	(0.5)	0.8	0.5	59.2%
Virginia	29.4	(1.4)	30.8	1.1	3.7%	29.4	(17.4)	46.8	17.1	36.6%
Washington	101.0	17.3	83.6	4.8	5.7%	101.0	(18.5)	120.5	41.6	34.5%
West Virginia	18.0	11.5	6.6	0.7	10.4%	18.0	5.4	12.6	6.7	53.4%
Wisconsin	83.3	38.1	45.2	(4.4)	-9.6%	83.3	22.5	60.9	11.3	18.6%
Wyoming	3.3	0.8	2.5	(0.2)	-6.9%	3.3	(1.1)	4.4	1.7	39.8%
Total	\$2,151.4	\$565.0	\$1,586.4	(\$47.2)	-3.0%	\$2,151.4	(\$240.0)	\$2,391.4	\$757.8	31.7%

FY 1999
 HYPOTHETICAL
 (\$ Millions)

Chart 3A

CSE Expenditures
 (FFP @ 75%; 10% Incentives)

	Total Expend. (HYPO)	Fed Share @ 85%	State Share @ 15%	Change in State Dollars	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	\$73.0	\$62.0	\$10.9	(\$8.3)	-38.6%
Alaska	21.6	18.4	3.2	0.4	12.3%
Arizona	77.0	65.5	11.6	(8.4)	-42.2%
Arkansas	29.3	24.9	4.4	(0.3)	-5.6%
California	515.9	436.5	77.4	(5.0)	-6.1%
Colorado	50.6	43.0	7.8	(1.6)	-17.8%
Connecticut	46.9	39.9	7.0	1.7	30.9%
Delaware	22.5	19.1	3.4	(2.0)	-36.8%
D.C.	8.0	6.8	1.2	0.4	51.5%
Florida	133.5	113.5	20.0	(1.2)	-5.8%
Georgia	86.7	73.7	13.0	12.3	1701.9%
Guam	7.2	6.1	1.1	(0.7)	-37.7%
Hawaii	19.4	16.5	2.9	(1.1)	-26.7%
Idaho	15.8	13.2	2.3	0.2	8.1%
Illinois	147.2	125.1	22.1	(9.8)	-30.8%
Indiana	31.7	27.0	4.8	15.7	143.4%
Iowa	35.8	30.4	5.4	6.1	791.1%
Kansas	33.7	28.6	5.1	(0.1)	-1.6%
Kentucky	60.3	51.3	9.0	(1.0)	-10.3%
Louisiana	63.2	53.7	9.5	(3.6)	-27.4%
Maine	15.6	13.3	2.3	3.0	455.4%
Maryland	57.4	48.8	8.6	2.6	43.8%
Massachusetts	38.5	32.7	5.8	15.6	158.9%
Michigan	160.8	136.7	24.1	20.1	495.6%
Minnesota	91.4	77.7	13.7	(1.7)	-10.9%
Mississippi	44.3	37.6	6.6	(2.0)	-23.0%
Missouri	80.9	68.8	12.1	0.7	6.1%
Montana	13.7	11.6	2.1	(0.5)	-20.1%
Nebraska	32.1	27.3	4.8	(2.7)	-36.2%
Nevada	29.9	25.4	4.5	(1.8)	-29.1%
New Hampshire	19.4	16.5	2.9	(1.4)	-32.9%
New Jersey	188.3	160.1	28.2	(11.1)	-28.1%
New Mexico	13.7	11.7	2.1	0.6	38.5%
New York	290.7	247.1	43.6	(6.3)	-12.7%
North Carolina	117.5	99.9	17.6	(3.5)	-16.4%
North Dakota	8.0	6.8	1.2	0.5	68.0%
Ohio	292.1	248.3	43.8	(24.7)	-36.1%
Oklahoma	31.8	27.1	4.8	(0.5)	-9.6%
Oregon	41.9	35.6	6.3	1.7	36.3%
Pennsylvania	155.4	132.1	23.3	5.7	32.3%
Puerto Rico	11.5	9.8	1.7	(0.8)	-32.1%
Rhode Island	12.9	11.0	1.9	1.6	495.2%
South Carolina	30.6	26.0	4.6	0.8	22.5%
South Dakota	6.6	5.6	1.0	0.6	182.5%
Tennessee	38.1	32.4	5.7	1.8	45.9%
Texas	291.8	248.0	43.8	(30.7)	-41.3%
Utah	35.6	30.2	5.3	(1.1)	-17.2%
Vermont	11.5	9.8	1.7	0.0	1.9%
Virgin Islands	1.8	1.5	0.3	(0.2)	-41.8%
Virginia	80.1	68.0	12.0	(2.8)	-19.0%
Washington	184.0	156.4	27.6	(6.1)	-18.1%
West Virginia	30.3	25.8	4.5	(1.9)	-29.2%
Wisconsin	78.3	68.5	11.7	3.1	35.8%
Wyoming	9.6	8.2	1.4	(0.2)	-10.7%
Total	\$4,025.0	\$3,421.2	\$603.7	(\$46.0)	-7.1%

FY 1996
HYPOTHETICAL
(\$ Millions)

Chart 3B

CSE Expenditures

	(FFP @ 75%; No Incentives)					(FFP @ 75%; 20% Incentives)				
	Total Exp. (HYPO)	Fed. Share @ 75%	State Share @ 25%	Change In State Dollars	% Change From Baseline	Total Expend. (HYPO)	Fed Share @ 95%	State Share @ 5%	Change in State Dollars	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	\$73.0	\$54.7	\$18.2	\$1.0	5.7%	\$73.0	\$69.3	\$3.6	(\$13.6)	-78.9%
Alaska	21.6	16.2	5.4	2.5	87.2%	21.6	20.5	1.1	(1.8)	-62.8%
Arizona	77.0	57.8	19.3	(0.7)	-3.7%	77.0	73.2	3.9	(16.1)	-80.7%
Arkansas	29.3	22.0	7.3	2.7	57.3%	29.3	27.8	1.5	(3.2)	-68.5%
California	515.9	386.9	129.0	48.6	56.5%	515.9	490.1	25.8	(56.6)	-68.7%
Colorado	50.6	37.9	12.6	3.4	37.0%	50.6	48.1	2.5	(6.7)	-72.6%
Connecticut	46.9	35.2	11.7	6.4	118.2%	46.9	44.6	2.3	(3.0)	-58.4%
Delaware	22.5	18.9	5.6	0.3	5.4%	22.5	21.4	1.1	(4.2)	-78.9%
D.C.	8.0	6.0	2.0	1.2	152.5%	8.0	7.5	0.4	(0.4)	-49.5%
Florida	133.5	100.1	33.4	12.1	58.9%	133.5	125.8	6.7	(14.6)	-68.6%
Georgia	88.7	65.0	21.7	20.9	2903.1%	88.7	82.3	4.3	3.6	500.6%
Guam	7.2	5.4	1.8	0.1	3.9%	7.2	6.8	0.4	(1.4)	-79.2%
Hawaii	19.4	14.5	4.8	0.9	22.1%	19.4	18.4	1.0	(3.0)	-75.6%
Idaho	15.6	11.7	3.9	1.7	80.1%	15.6	14.8	0.8	(1.4)	-64.0%
Illinois	147.2	110.4	36.8	4.9	15.3%	147.2	139.8	7.4	(24.5)	-76.9%
Indiana	31.7	23.8	7.9	18.9	172.4%	31.7	30.2	1.6	12.6	114.5%
Iowa	35.8	26.8	8.9	9.7	1251.9%	35.8	34.0	1.8	2.6	330.4%
Kansas	33.7	25.3	8.4	3.3	64.0%	33.7	32.0	1.7	(3.5)	-67.2%
Kentucky	60.3	45.2	15.1	5.0	49.5%	60.3	57.3	3.0	(7.1)	-70.1%
Louisiana	63.2	47.4	15.8	2.7	21.1%	63.2	60.1	3.2	(9.9)	-75.8%
Maine	15.6	11.7	3.9	4.6	692.3%	15.6	14.8	0.8	1.4	218.5%
Maryland	57.4	43.0	14.3	8.4	139.7%	57.4	54.5	2.9	(3.1)	-52.1%
Massachusetts	38.5	28.8	9.6	19.4	199.2%	38.5	36.6	1.9	11.7	119.6%
Michigan	160.8	120.6	40.2	36.1	892.7%	160.8	152.7	8.0	4.0	98.5%
Minnesota	91.4	68.5	22.8	7.5	48.5%	91.4	86.8	4.6	(10.8)	-70.3%
Mississippi	44.3	33.2	11.1	2.4	28.3%	44.3	42.1	2.2	(6.4)	-74.3%
Missouri	80.9	60.7	20.2	8.8	76.8%	80.9	76.9	4.0	(7.4)	-64.6%
Montana	13.7	10.3	3.4	0.9	33.2%	13.7	13.0	0.7	(1.9)	-73.4%
Nebraska	32.1	24.1	8.0	0.5	6.3%	32.1	30.5	1.6	(6.0)	-78.7%
Nevada	29.9	22.4	7.5	1.1	18.1%	29.9	28.4	1.5	(4.8)	-76.4%
New Hampshire	19.4	14.5	4.8	0.5	11.8%	19.4	18.4	1.0	(3.4)	-77.6%
New Jersey	188.3	141.2	47.1	7.8	18.8%	188.3	178.9	9.4	(29.8)	-76.0%
New Mexico	13.7	10.3	3.4	1.9	130.8%	13.7	13.1	0.7	(0.8)	-53.8%
New York	290.7	218.0	72.7	22.8	45.6%	290.7	276.2	14.5	(35.4)	-70.9%
North Carolina	117.5	88.1	29.4	8.3	39.4%	117.5	111.6	5.9	(15.2)	-72.1%
North Dakota	8.0	6.0	2.0	1.3	180.1%	8.0	7.6	0.4	(0.3)	-44.0%
Ohio	292.1	219.1	73.0	4.5	6.5%	292.1	277.5	14.6	(53.9)	-78.7%
Oklahoma	31.8	23.9	8.0	2.7	50.4%	31.8	30.2	1.6	(3.7)	-69.9%
Oregon	41.9	31.4	10.5	5.9	127.2%	41.9	39.8	2.1	(2.5)	-54.6%
Pennsylvania	155.4	116.6	38.9	21.2	120.6%	155.4	147.6	7.8	(9.8)	-55.9%
Puerto Rico	11.5	8.6	2.9	0.3	13.1%	11.5	10.9	0.6	(2.0)	-77.4%
Rhode Island	12.9	9.7	3.2	2.9	892.1%	12.9	12.3	0.6	0.3	98.4%
South Carolina	30.6	22.9	7.6	3.9	104.2%	30.6	29.0	1.5	(2.2)	-59.2%
South Dakota	8.6	5.0	1.7	1.3	370.8%	8.6	6.3	0.3	(0.0)	-5.8%
Tennessee	38.1	28.6	9.5	5.6	143.1%	38.1	36.2	1.9	(2.0)	-51.4%
Texas	291.8	218.8	72.9	(1.8)	-2.1%	291.8	277.2	14.6	(59.9)	-80.4%
Utah	35.6	26.7	8.9	2.5	38.1%	35.6	33.8	1.8	(4.7)	-72.4%
Vermont	11.5	8.6	2.9	1.2	69.8%	11.5	10.9	0.6	(1.1)	-66.0%
Virgin Islands	1.8	1.3	0.4	(0.0)	-3.0%	1.8	1.7	0.1	(0.4)	-80.6%
Virginia	80.1	60.0	20.0	5.2	35.1%	80.1	76.1	4.0	(10.8)	-73.0%
Washington	184.0	138.0	46.0	12.3	36.6%	184.0	174.8	9.2	(24.5)	-72.7%
West Virginia	30.3	22.7	7.6	1.2	18.0%	30.3	28.8	1.5	(4.9)	-76.4%
Wisconsin	78.3	58.7	19.6	10.9	126.4%	78.3	74.4	3.9	(4.7)	-54.7%
Wyoming	8.6	7.2	2.4	0.8	48.9%	8.6	8.1	0.5	(1.1)	-70.2%
Total	\$4,025.0	\$3,018.7	\$1,006.2	\$356.5	54.9%	\$4,025.0	\$3,823.7	\$201.2	(\$449.5)	-69.0%

AFDC Collections and Cost Avoidance

	AFDC Collections						Cost Avoidance					
	Total AFDC Coll.	Pmts to Families	Fed. Share	State Share	Change In State Share	% Change From Baseline	Total NAFDC Coll.	Total Elig. for CA	Fed. Share @ 12%	State Share @ 8%	Change In State Share	% Change From Baseline
Alabama	\$41.1	\$13.2	\$19.7	\$8.2	\$0.9	12.5%	\$224.8	\$166.6	\$22.4	\$14.8	\$1.6	11.8%
Alaska	26.4	4.2	11.1	11.1	1.6	18.8%	60.8	46.8	5.9	3.9	0.4	12.0%
Arizona	51.9	8.0	28.5	14.4	2.0	18.4%	112.1	83.4	11.2	7.5	0.8	11.6%
Arkansas	33.1	10.3	18.9	6.0	0.7	12.8%	85.7	72.1	8.6	5.8	0.6	11.5%
California	665.2	112.4	276.4	276.4	39.2	15.5%	858.5	897.5	82.5	55.0	5.9	12.1%
Colorado	59.3	8.8	29.3	23.2	3.3	15.6%	100.7	83.1	10.0	6.7	0.7	11.7%
Connecticut	82.0	13.2	34.4	34.4	4.9	15.7%	104.1	81.3	9.8	6.5	0.7	12.4%
Delaware	16.0	3.9	6.1	6.1	0.8	14.7%	41.3	32.6	3.9	2.6	0.3	12.2%
D.C.	10.4	2.8	3.9	3.9	0.8	14.7%	44.0	36.8	4.4	2.9	0.3	11.6%
Florida	183.4	35.8	83.0	64.5	8.8	15.9%	609.5	415.4	50.2	33.5	3.6	11.8%
Georgia	216.3	110.2	67.3	40.8	2.0	8.1%	294.4	243.4	29.2	19.5	2.0	11.7%
Guam	6.6	3.5	2.5	2.5	0.2	8.9%	7.8	6.7	0.8	0.6	0.1	11.3%
Hawaii	18.9	3.8	8.9	8.9	1.0	18.3%	49.3	36.7	8.8	4.5	0.5	11.8%
Idaho	17.2	2.9	10.0	4.2	0.6	15.5%	50.7	40.9	4.9	3.3	0.4	12.0%
Illinois	117.3	33.1	42.1	42.1	5.1	13.7%	296.6	238.0	28.6	19.0	2.0	12.0%
Indiana	105.5	23.6	51.4	30.2	4.0	15.2%	212.8	174.8	21.0	14.0	1.5	11.8%
Iowa	72.6	13.6	36.9	22.0	3.1	18.1%	169.8	138.9	16.7	11.1	1.2	11.8%
Kansas	48.7	6.4	23.8	16.6	2.3	18.5%	101.6	82.3	9.9	6.6	0.7	11.9%
Kentucky	89.0	29.7	47.5	20.8	2.7	15.0%	163.0	133.8	16.1	10.7	1.1	11.8%
Louisiana	83.2	19.8	24.9	9.4	1.9	11.3%	181.8	150.8	18.1	12.1	1.3	11.7%
Maine	38.6	21.2	11.2	8.5	0.2	2.8%	40.3	32.0	3.8	2.6	0.3	12.2%
Maryland	96.8	23.9	37.5	37.5	4.8	14.8%	379.6	306.7	36.9	24.5	2.6	12.0%
Massachusetts	113.8	29.1	42.4	42.4	5.3	14.4%	216.5	162.8	19.8	13.0	1.5	12.8%
Michigan	308.4	97.4	118.8	91.1	10.2	12.8%	1,121.1	1,121.1	134.5	89.7	8.0	9.8%
Minnesota	105.7	21.1	45.8	38.7	8.3	15.8%	373.6	305.5	36.7	24.4	2.6	11.8%
Mississippi	53.5	15.7	29.8	5.1	0.9	13.3%	81.0	67.4	8.1	5.4	0.6	11.6%
Missouri	113.7	25.6	52.8	35.4	4.7	15.2%	315.5	256.7	30.8	20.5	2.2	11.9%
Montana	14.5	2.9	6.2	3.4	0.5	15.9%	39.0	33.3	4.0	2.7	0.3	11.3%
Nebraska	19.7	4.9	8.9	5.9	0.7	14.5%	130.6	103.1	12.4	8.2	0.9	12.2%
Nevada	16.8	2.9	7.9	7.9	1.1	18.9%	81.6	68.7	6.2	6.5	0.8	11.5%
New Hampshire	19.5	4.0	7.7	7.7	1.0	15.6%	63.8	43.4	6.2	3.5	0.4	12.0%
New Jersey	173.7	34.3	89.7	69.7	8.8	15.9%	695.6	553.9	66.5	44.3	4.8	12.1%
New Mexico	23.9	3.8	19.1	7.0	1.0	17.4%	32.0	26.1	3.1	2.1	0.2	11.8%
New York	396.6	82.2	157.2	157.2	21.3	15.8%	782.3	628.5	75.4	50.3	5.4	12.0%
North Carolina	166.2	45.6	72.7	39.7	4.7	13.4%	295.8	242.6	29.1	19.4	2.0	11.8%
North Dakota	12.1	2.6	6.5	3.0	0.4	15.4%	32.1	27.0	3.2	2.2	0.2	11.5%
Ohio	221.0	54.0	101.4	65.7	8.4	14.7%	1,147.4	1,147.4	137.7	91.8	6.2	9.8%
Oklahoma	45.1	7.1	26.6	11.4	1.8	10.8%	80.0	65.8	7.9	5.2	0.6	11.8%
Oregon	81.3	13.4	29.8	18.0	2.4	15.3%	221.6	180.4	21.7	14.4	1.5	11.9%
Pennsylvania	244.3	72.0	93.5	78.8	9.2	13.3%	1,139.1	1,139.1	138.7	91.1	8.1	9.8%
Puerto Rico	1.3	1.9	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.2)	122.0%	187.9	146.6	17.8	11.7	1.3	12.4%
Rhode Island	34.9	7.4	15.3	12.2	1.6	15.5%	24.0	16.6	2.2	1.5	0.2	12.4%
South Carolina	53.6	15.6	26.6	11.1	1.3	13.4%	121.1	97.4	11.7	7.8	0.8	12.0%
South Dakota	6.8	2.0	5.3	2.5	0.3	15.7%	30.8	25.3	3.0	2.0	0.2	11.8%
Tennessee	63.3	16.7	31.1	15.6	1.9	14.2%	185.2	151.9	18.2	12.2	1.3	11.8%
Texas	157.2	29.6	80.8	48.8	6.5	12.1%	649.7	548.5	65.9	44.0	4.8	11.4%
Utah	36.1	7.0	23.6	8.5	1.2	16.3%	88.1	71.8	8.6	5.7	0.6	11.9%
Vermont	15.1	3.7	7.0	4.5	0.8	14.7%	20.6	17.1	2.1	1.4	0.1	11.5%
Virgin Islands	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.0	14.0%	9.7	7.6	0.9	0.6	0.1	12.1%
Virginia	90.8	20.5	35.2	35.2	4.8	15.2%	246.5	195.7	23.5	15.7	1.7	12.2%
Washington	232.7	37.9	101.3	83.8	13.4	16.7%	539.3	450.8	54.1	36.1	3.7	11.6%
West Virginia	42.1	8.5	26.5	9.0	1.3	19.9%	77.3	63.9	7.7	5.1	0.5	11.7%
Wisconsin	99.4	29.1	42.1	28.3	3.3	13.3%	458.5	458.5	64.8	36.5	3.2	9.8%
Wyoming	11.1	2.2	5.6	3.3	0.5	15.8%	23.7	19.6	2.4	1.6	0.2	11.6%
Total	\$5,015.0	\$1,106.8	\$2,168.8	\$1,649.4	\$214.5	14.9%	\$13,608.0	\$11,781.0	\$1,414.9	\$943.3	\$94.6	11.2%

FY 1999
 HYPOTHETICAL
 (\$ Millions)

Chart 5A

Net Effect
 (FFP @ 75%; 10% Incentives)

	With Cost Avoidance			Without Cost Avoidance		
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings
Alabama	2.4	(6.4)	8.8	(1.5)	(8.7)	7.2
Alaska	2.9	1.2	1.7	1.8	0.6	1.2
Arizona	3.6	(7.7)	11.2	1.8	(8.8)	10.5
Arkansas	2.3	0.7	1.5	0.6	(0.1)	0.9
California	62.6	12.5	50.1	47.8	3.6	44.2
Colorado	5.8	0.1	5.6	4.0	(0.9)	4.9
Connecticut	8.7	4.8	4.0	6.9	3.7	3.3
Delaware	0.9	(2.1)	3.0	0.2	(2.5)	2.7
D.C.	1.2	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.1
Florida	20.3	6.7	13.6	11.5	1.4	10.1
Georgia	4.8	13.1	(8.3)	(0.3)	10.0	(10.3)
Guam	0.1	(0.9)	0.9	0.0	(0.9)	0.9
Hawaii	1.9	(0.6)	2.5	0.7	(1.3)	2.0
Idaho	1.9	1.1	0.6	1.0	0.6	0.4
Illinois	6.3	(10.6)	16.9	1.2	(13.7)	14.9
Indiana	12.0	22.3	(10.3)	8.4	20.1	(11.8)
Iowa	8.6	10.6	(1.9)	5.7	8.9	(3.1)
Kansas	5.3	2.2	3.1	3.6	1.1	2.4
Kentucky	8.0	3.1	4.9	5.2	1.4	3.7
Louisiana	2.7	(3.1)	5.8	(0.4)	(5.0)	4.5
Maine	0.2	2.7	(2.5)	(0.5)	2.3	(2.8)
Maryland	11.8	7.0	4.8	5.3	3.1	2.2
Massachusetts	11.3	20.1	(8.8)	7.6	17.9	(10.2)
Michigan	35.1	36.9	(1.9)	15.1	25.0	(9.8)
Minnesota	11.9	2.4	9.5	5.5	(1.5)	7.0
Mississippi	3.2	(0.3)	3.5	1.8	(1.1)	2.9
Missouri	11.7	5.6	6.1	6.3	2.3	4.0
Montana	1.4	0.2	1.3	0.8	(0.2)	1.0
Nebraska	1.9	(2.5)	4.4	(0.3)	(3.8)	3.5
Nevada	1.9	(1.7)	3.6	0.5	(2.5)	3.0
New Hampshire	1.8	(1.0)	2.8	0.9	(1.6)	2.5
New Jersey	18.5	(6.9)	25.4	6.5	(14.1)	20.8
New Mexico	3.6	2.9	0.7	3.0	2.6	0.5
New York	37.7	4.6	33.0	24.2	(3.3)	27.6
North Carolina	11.2	1.0	10.2	6.1	(2.1)	8.1
North Dakota	1.3	1.2	0.1	0.7	0.6	(0.1)
Ohio	26.3	(15.0)	41.3	5.9	(27.3)	33.1
Oklahoma	4.9	2.2	2.7	3.5	1.4	2.2
Oregon	7.2	5.0	2.3	3.4	2.7	0.7
Pennsylvania	32.2	20.5	11.6	11.9	8.4	3.5
Puerto Rico	1.6	(0.4)	2.0	(1.7)	(2.3)	0.7
Rhode Island	3.3	3.1	0.2	2.9	2.9	0.0
South Carolina	4.5	3.2	1.3	2.4	1.8	0.5
South Dakota	1.1	1.2	(0.1)	0.6	0.9	(0.3)
Tennessee	6.4	4.9	1.4	3.2	3.0	0.1
Texas	11.6	(30.1)	41.7	0.3	(38.9)	37.2
Utah	3.8	0.9	2.9	2.3	0.0	2.3
Vermont	1.1	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.5
Virgin Islands	0.1	(0.2)	0.3	(0.1)	(0.3)	0.2
Virginia	8.3	(0.8)	9.1	4.1	(3.4)	7.4
Washington	25.8	2.6	23.2	18.4	(3.0)	19.5
West Virginia	4.6	0.9	3.7	3.3	0.1	3.2
Wisconsin	12.2	8.8	3.5	4.1	3.9	0.2
Wyoming	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.6
Total	\$483.2	\$127.9	\$355.3	\$246.2	(\$14.3)	\$260.5

FY 1999
 HYPOTHETICAL
 (\$ Millions)

Chart 5B

Net Effect

	(FFP @ 75%; No Incentives)			(FFP @ 75%; 20% Incentives)		
	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings	Total Savings	Fed. Savings	State Savings
Alabama	2.4	0.9	1.5	2.4	(13.7)	16.1
Alaska	2.9	3.4	(0.5)	2.9	(1.0)	3.8
Arizona	3.6	0.0	3.5	3.6	(16.4)	18.9
Arkansas	2.3	3.7	(1.4)	2.3	(2.2)	4.5
California	62.6	64.1	(1.5)	62.6	(39.1)	101.7
Colorado	5.6	5.2	0.6	5.5	(4.9)	10.7
Connecticut	6.7	9.4	(0.7)	6.7	0.1	8.7
Delaware	0.9	0.1	0.8	0.9	(4.4)	5.3
D.C.	1.2	1.6	(0.4)	1.2	0.0	1.2
Florida	20.3	20.0	0.3	20.3	(6.7)	27.0
Georgia	4.8	21.7	(16.9)	4.8	4.4	0.4
Guam	0.1	(0.0)	0.2	0.1	(1.5)	1.6
Hawaii	1.9	1.3	0.6	1.9	(2.6)	4.4
Idaho	1.9	2.7	(0.8)	1.9	(0.5)	2.3
Illinois	6.3	4.1	2.2	6.3	(25.3)	31.6
Indiana	12.0	25.5	(13.5)	12.0	19.2	(7.1)
Iowa	8.6	14.1	(5.5)	8.6	7.0	1.7
Kansas	5.3	5.6	(0.2)	5.3	(1.2)	6.5
Kentucky	8.0	9.1	(1.2)	8.0	(2.9)	10.9
Louisiana	2.7	3.3	(0.5)	2.7	(9.4)	12.1
Maine	0.2	4.3	(4.1)	0.2	1.2	(1.0)
Maryland	11.8	12.7	(0.9)	11.8	1.3	10.6
Massachusetts	11.3	23.9	(12.6)	11.3	16.2	(4.9)
Michigan	35.1	53.0	(18.0)	35.1	20.9	14.2
Minnesota	11.9	11.5	0.4	11.9	(6.8)	18.7
Mississippi	3.2	4.2	(0.9)	3.2	(4.7)	7.9
Missouri	11.7	13.6	(1.9)	11.7	(2.5)	14.2
Montana	1.4	1.6	(0.1)	1.4	(1.2)	2.6
Nebraska	1.9	0.8	1.2	1.9	(5.7)	7.6
Nevada	1.9	1.3	0.6	1.9	(4.7)	6.5
New Hampshire	1.8	0.9	0.9	1.8	(3.0)	4.8
New Jersey	18.5	11.9	6.5	18.5	(25.7)	44.2
New Mexico	3.6	4.3	(0.7)	3.6	1.5	2.1
New York	37.7	33.8	3.9	37.7	(24.3)	62.0
North Carolina	11.2	12.8	(1.6)	11.2	(10.7)	21.9
North Dakota	1.3	2.0	(0.7)	1.3	0.4	0.9
Ohio	26.3	14.2	12.1	26.3	(44.2)	70.5
Oklahoma	4.9	5.4	(0.5)	4.9	(1.0)	5.9
Oregon	7.2	9.1	(1.9)	7.2	0.8	6.4
Pennsylvania	32.2	36.1	(3.9)	32.2	5.0	27.2
Puerto Rico	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.6	(1.5)	3.1
Rhode Island	3.3	4.4	(1.1)	3.3	1.8	1.5
South Carolina	4.5	6.3	(1.8)	4.5	0.1	4.4
South Dakota	1.1	1.9	(0.8)	1.1	0.6	0.6
Tennessee	6.4	8.8	(2.4)	6.4	1.1	5.2
Texas	11.6	(0.9)	12.6	11.6	(59.3)	70.9
Utah	3.8	4.5	(0.6)	3.8	(2.6)	6.5
Vermont	1.1	1.6	(0.5)	1.1	(0.7)	1.8
Virgin Islands	0.1	(0.0)	0.1	0.1	(0.4)	0.5
Virginia	8.3	7.2	1.1	8.3	(8.8)	17.1
Washington	25.8	21.0	4.8	25.8	(15.6)	41.6
West Virginia	4.8	3.9	0.7	4.8	(2.1)	6.7
Wisconsin	12.2	16.6	(4.4)	12.2	0.8	11.3
Wyoming	1.0	1.2	(0.2)	1.0	(0.7)	1.7
Total	\$483.2	\$530.4	(\$47.2)	\$483.2	(\$274.6)	\$757.8

PROJECTED BASELINE - FY 1999

	Projected Expenditures FY 1999 BASELINE	Projected Federal Share FY 1999	Projected State Share FY 1999	Effective Federal Match Rat
Alabama	185.20	126.12	59.08	68
Alaska	158.23	79.58	78.65	50
Arizona	409.33	262.21	147.12	64
Arkansas	95.65	66.45	29.21	69
California	7920.65	3984.86	3935.79	50
Colorado	266.25	142.54	123.71	54
Connecticut	527.98	265.89	262.09	50
Delaware	67.96	34.40	33.55	51
District of Columbia	173.61	88.02	85.60	51
Florida	1244.37	695.27	549.10	56
Georgia	698.85	425.93	272.92	61
Hawaii	191.81	96.62	95.19	50
Idaho	48.71	32.12	16.58	66
Illinois	1262.11	639.88	622.23	51
Indiana	402.24	244.91	157.33	61
Iowa	244.47	150.57	93.90	62
Kansas	205.87	119.08	86.79	58
Kentucky	363.78	239.83	123.95	66
Louisiana	289.16	205.50	83.66	71
Maine	159.50	99.25	60.25	62
Maryland	524.58	265.47	259.11	51
Massachusetts	1097.24	553.28	543.96	50
Michigan	1731.67	972.48	759.19	56
Minnesota	618.70	334.65	284.05	54
Mississippi	141.97	105.62	36.35	74
Missouri	447.74	264.23	183.51	59
Montana	75.61	51.89	23.72	69
Nebraska	140.86	83.37	57.49	59
Nevada	79.05	39.83	39.22	50
New Hampshire	85.04	42.79	42.25	50
New Jersey	927.42	472.81	454.61	51
New Mexico	173.03	123.09	49.94	71
New York	4239.73	2132.56	2107.17	50
North Carolina	621.71	389.99	231.72	63
North Dakota	47.41	31.63	15.78	67
Ohio	1458.86	866.32	592.54	59
Oklahoma	324.05	216.53	107.52	67
Oregon	319.84	195.06	124.78	61
Pennsylvania	1387.85	752.20	635.65	54
Rhode Island	177.58	98.51	79.07	55
South Carolina	189.94	129.31	60.63	68
South Dakota	40.89	27.25	13.65	67
Tennessee	401.59	258.35	143.24	64
Texas	924.84	570.35	354.49	62
Utah	132.87	93.60	39.27	70
Vermont	91.93	55.40	36.53	60
Virginia	371.04	187.67	183.37	51
Washington	974.25	508.56	465.68	52
West Virginia	184.08	135.41	48.66	74
Wisconsin	685.90	406.37	279.53	59
Wyoming	46.71	28.94	17.77	62
TOTAL	\$33,579.69	\$18,392.55	\$15,187.14	55

PROPOSAL 1
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
75% Federal Match
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	159.15	70.10	11.03	19%	25%	69
Alaska	89.03	79.54	0.89	1%	9%	53
Arizona	308.01	154.58	7.47	5%	14%	67
Arkansas	84.87	34.52	5.32	18%	22%	71
California	4552.47	4021.47	85.68	2%	13%	53
Colorado	179.68	128.41	4.70	4%	11%	58
Connecticut	314.14	266.23	4.14	2%	8%	54
Delaware	44.25	33.29	-0.27	-1%	-3%	57
District of Columbia	102.25	88.00	2.40	3%	14%	54
Florida	851.79	575.49	26.39	5%	14%	60
Georgia	521.14	287.78	14.86	5%	14%	64
Hawaii	109.75	97.77	2.59	3%	16%	53
Idaho	38.90	18.62	2.03	12%	23%	68
Illinois	807.72	651.09	28.86	5%	15%	55
Indiana	299.78	165.61	8.29	5%	13%	64
Iowa	177.90	100.24	6.33	7%	19%	64
Kansas	144.53	89.31	2.52	3%	9%	62
Kentucky	292.42	136.86	12.91	10%	20%	68
Louisiana	259.43	101.95	18.29	22%	25%	72
Maine	116.28	63.21	2.95	5%	15%	65
Maryland	333.44	262.52	3.40	1%	5%	56
Massachusetts	646.71	545.63	1.68	0%	2%	54
Michigan	1130.71	788.26	29.07	4%	16%	59
Minnesota	390.44	288.66	4.60	2%	8%	57
Mississippi	139.60	48.69	12.34	34%	27%	74
Missouri	328.71	192.98	9.46	5%	13%	63
Montana	59.40	26.23	2.51	11%	25%	69
Nebraska	99.05	58.34	0.86	1%	5%	63
Nevada	51.43	40.57	1.35	3%	10%	56
New Hampshire	54.09	42.22	-0.02	-0%	-0%	56
New Jersey	570.11	468.57	13.97	3%	13%	55
New Mexico	141.77	55.72	5.78	12%	24%	72
New York	2443.41	2125.46	18.30	1%	6%	53
North Carolina	475.02	244.38	12.65	5%	13%	66
North Dakota	36.63	17.13	1.36	9%	21%	68
Ohio	1051.55	618.97	26.43	4%	12%	63
Oklahoma	249.13	114.81	7.29	7%	18%	68
Oregon	227.43	130.88	6.11	5%	16%	63
Pennsylvania	909.59	651.62	15.96	3%	9%	58
Rhode Island	114.72	80.31	1.24	2%	7%	59
South Carolina	160.86	71.07	10.44	17%	25%	69
South Dakota	32.82	15.26	1.61	12%	22%	68
Tennessee	320.42	157.23	13.99	10%	18%	67
Texas	763.62	393.20	38.71	11%	17%	66
Utah	108.02	43.92	4.65	12%	24%	71
Vermont	63.32	37.73	1.21	3%	13%	63
Virginia	250.78	189.66	6.29	3%	9%	57
Washington	591.40	468.79	3.11	1%	4%	56
West Virginia	158.77	58.03	9.37	19%	29%	73
Wisconsin	468.18	290.74	11.21	4%	15%	62
Wyoming	34.29	18.55	0.77	4%	13%	65
TOTAL	\$21,858.90	\$15,710.21	\$523.07	3%	13%	58
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,466.35					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,569.11				

PROPOSAL 1 - Working Poor/At-Risk Child Care at 100% Federal Match
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
75% Federal Match
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	163.60	65.65	6.58	11%	15%	71
Alaska	90.18	78.38	-0.27	-0%	-3%	54
Arizona	312.82	149.78	2.66	2%	5%	68
Arkansas	87.36	32.04	2.83	10%	12%	73
California	4604.70	3969.23	33.44	1%	5%	54
Colorado	184.86	123.23	-0.48	-0%	-1%	60
Connecticut	320.34	260.03	-2.06	-1%	-4%	55
Delaware	45.30	32.24	-1.32	-4%	-14%	58
District of Columbia	102.98	87.27	1.67	2%	10%	54
Florida	868.53	558.75	9.65	2%	5%	61
Georgia	529.79	279.13	6.21	2%	6%	65
Hawaii	111.54	95.98	0.80	1%	5%	54
Idaho	40.23	17.28	0.70	4%	8%	70
Illinois	825.92	632.89	10.66	2%	5%	57
Indiana	306.58	158.81	1.48	1%	2%	66
Iowa	181.34	96.80	2.90	3%	9%	65
Kansas	147.98	85.86	-0.93	-1%	-3%	63
Kentucky	296.43	132.86	8.91	7%	14%	69
Louisiana	264.48	96.91	13.25	16%	18%	73
Maine	117.71	61.78	1.52	3%	8%	66
Maryland	340.98	254.98	-4.14	-2%	-6%	57
Massachusetts	655.17	537.18	-6.78	-1%	-7%	55
Michigan	1143.87	775.10	15.90	2%	8%	60
Minnesota	397.14	281.96	-2.09	-1%	-3%	58
Mississippi	142.37	45.92	9.57	26%	21%	76
Missouri	335.42	186.26	2.75	1%	4%	64
Montana	60.33	25.30	1.58	7%	16%	70
Nebraska	101.21	56.18	-1.31	-2%	-8%	64
Nevada	53.51	38.49	-0.73	-2%	-6%	58
New Hampshire	55.80	40.51	-1.73	-4%	-15%	58
New Jersey	581.32	457.36	2.75	1%	2%	56
New Mexico	143.69	53.81	3.86	8%	16%	73
New York	2470.04	2098.83	-8.34	-0%	-3%	54
North Carolina	482.64	236.76	5.04	2%	5%	67
North Dakota	37.37	16.40	0.62	4%	10%	70
Ohio	1065.33	605.19	12.66	2%	6%	64
Oklahoma	252.74	111.20	3.68	3%	9%	69
Oregon	231.07	127.24	2.46	2%	6%	64
Pennsylvania	925.21	636.00	0.35	0%	0%	59
Rhode Island	115.99	79.04	-0.03	-0%	-0%	59
South Carolina	164.81	67.11	6.49	11%	15%	71
South Dakota	33.70	14.37	0.72	5%	10%	70
Tennessee	325.92	151.72	8.48	6%	11%	68
Texas	787.77	369.05	14.56	4%	6%	68
Utah	110.63	41.91	2.05	5%	11%	73
Vermont	64.03	37.02	0.50	1%	5%	63
Virginia	260.20	180.24	-3.13	-2%	-5%	59
Washington	599.27	460.92	-4.77	-1%	-6%	57
West Virginia	160.40	56.39	7.73	16%	24%	74
Wisconsin	474.79	284.14	4.61	2%	6%	63
Wyoming	34.93	17.91	0.13	1%	2%	66
TOTAL	\$22,210.34	\$15,358.77	\$171.64	1%	4%	59
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,817.79					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,569.11				

PROPOSAL 1 - With Net Effect of Child Support (75% FFP, 10% Incentive)
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
75% Federal Match
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	165.55	61.30	2.23	4%	5%	73
Alaska	87.83	77.84	-0.81	-1%	-11%	53
Arizona	315.71	143.38	-3.73	-3%	-7%	69
Arkansas	84.17	33.02	3.82	13%	18%	72
California	4539.97	3971.37	35.58	1%	6%	53
Colorado	179.58	122.81	-0.90	-1%	-2%	59
Connecticut	309.34	262.23	0.14	0%	0%	54
Delaware	46.35	30.29	-3.27	-10%	-38%	60
District of Columbia	101.45	87.60	2.00	2%	13%	54
Florida	845.09	561.89	12.79	2%	8%	60
Georgia	508.04	296.08	23.16	8%	22%	63
Hawaii	110.35	95.27	0.09	0%	1%	54
Idaho	37.80	17.82	1.23	7%	18%	68
Illinois	818.32	634.19	11.96	2%	6%	56
Indiana	277.48	175.91	18.59	12%	36%	61
Iowa	167.30	102.14	8.23	9%	33%	62
Kansas	142.33	86.21	-0.58	-1%	-3%	62
Kentucky	289.32	131.96	8.01	6%	14%	69
Louisiana	262.53	96.15	12.49	15%	18%	73
Maine	113.58	65.71	5.45	9%	28%	63
Maryland	326.44	257.72	-1.40	-1%	-2%	56
Massachusetts	626.61	554.43	10.48	2%	13%	53
Michigan	1093.81	790.16	30.97	4%	20%	58
Minnesota	388.04	279.16	-4.90	-2%	-10%	58
Mississippi	139.90	45.19	8.84	24%	20%	76
Missouri	323.11	186.88	3.36	2%	5%	63
Montana	59.20	24.93	1.21	5%	14%	70
Nebraska	101.55	53.94	-3.54	-6%	-24%	65
Nevada	53.13	36.97	-2.25	-6%	-20%	59
New Hampshire	55.09	39.42	-2.82	-7%	-30%	58
New Jersey	577.01	443.17	-11.43	-3%	-12%	57
New Mexico	138.87	55.02	5.08	10%	24%	72
New York	2438.61	2092.46	-14.70	-1%	-5%	54
North Carolina	474.02	234.18	2.45	1%	3%	67
North Dakota	35.43	17.03	1.26	8%	25%	68
Ohio	1066.55	577.67	-14.87	-3%	-8%	65
Oklahoma	246.93	112.11	4.59	4%	13%	69
Oregon	222.43	128.58	3.81	3%	12%	63
Pennsylvania	889.09	640.02	4.36	1%	3%	58
Rhode Island	111.62	80.11	1.04	1%	7%	58
South Carolina	157.66	69.77	9.14	15%	24%	69
South Dakota	31.62	15.36	1.71	13%	28%	67
Tennessee	315.52	155.83	12.59	9%	18%	67
Texas	793.72	351.50	-2.99	-1%	-1%	69
Utah	107.12	41.02	1.75	4%	11%	72
Vermont	62.82	37.03	0.51	1%	6%	63
Virginia	251.58	180.56	-2.81	-2%	-5%	58
Washington	588.80	445.59	-20.09	-4%	-33%	57
West Virginia	157.87	54.33	5.67	12%	20%	74
Wisconsin	459.38	287.24	7.71	3%	13%	62
Wyoming	33.99	17.75	-0.03	-0%	-1%	66
TOTAL	\$21,729.60	\$15,358.31	\$171.17	1%	5%	59
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,337.05					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,087.91				
=====		=====				

PROPOSAL 2d
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
JOBS FMAP plus 10% Federal Match
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	163.38	65.87	6.79	12%	15%	71
Alaska	88.05	80.52	1.87	2%	18%	52
Arizona	309.36	153.23	6.12	4%	11%	67
Arkansas	88.04	31.35	2.15	7%	9%	74
California	4499.42	4074.52	138.73	4%	21%	52
Colorado	175.78	132.31	8.60	7%	21%	57
Connecticut	309.22	271.15	9.06	3%	17%	53
Delaware	43.14	34.40	0.85	3%	9%	56
District of Columbia	100.81	89.44	3.84	4%	23%	53
Florida	836.34	590.95	41.85	8%	23%	59
Georgia	515.20	293.73	20.81	8%	19%	64
Hawaii	108.51	99.01	3.83	4%	24%	52
Idaho	39.71	17.80	1.21	7%	14%	69
Illinois	791.51	667.29	45.06	7%	23%	54
Indiana	297.56	167.83	10.50	7%	17%	64
Iowa	176.58	101.56	7.65	8%	23%	63
Kansas	141.62	92.22	5.43	6%	19%	61
Kentucky	297.73	131.56	7.60	6%	12%	69
Louisiana	269.10	92.29	8.63	10%	12%	74
Maine	115.71	63.78	3.53	6%	18%	64
Maryland	326.22	269.73	10.62	4%	15%	55
Massachusetts	636.33	556.01	12.05	2%	13%	53
Michigan	1114.70	804.26	45.07	6%	24%	58
Minnesota	384.22	294.88	10.82	4%	18%	57
Mississippi	148.77	39.53	3.18	9%	7%	79
Missouri	321.53	200.16	16.65	9%	23%	62
Montana	60.48	25.15	1.43	6%	14%	71
Nebraska	97.13	60.27	2.78	5%	17%	62
Nevada	50.31	41.68	2.46	6%	19%	55
New Hampshire	52.88	43.44	1.19	3%	11%	55
New Jersey	560.55	478.13	23.52	5%	21%	54
New Mexico	145.36	52.14	2.19	4%	9%	74
New York	2410.76	2158.12	50.95	2%	15%	53
North Carolina	474.40	245.00	13.28	6%	14%	66
North Dakota	37.11	16.65	0.87	6%	14%	69
Ohio	1034.39	636.13	43.59	7%	21%	62
Oklahoma	254.28	109.66	2.14	2%	5%	70
Oregon	225.36	132.95	8.18	7%	21%	63
Pennsylvania	892.61	668.59	32.94	5%	19%	57
Rhode Island	112.87	82.15	3.08	4%	18%	58
South Carolina	164.59	67.33	6.70	11%	16%	71
South Dakota	33.25	14.83	1.18	9%	16%	69
Tennessee	322.64	155.00	11.77	8%	15%	68
Texas	756.76	400.06	45.56	13%	20%	65
Utah	111.91	40.04	0.77	2%	4%	74
Vermont	62.51	38.54	2.01	6%	22%	62
Virginia	244.52	195.92	12.56	7%	18%	56
Washington	581.97	478.21	12.53	3%	15%	55
West Virginia	164.08	52.71	4.05	8%	12%	76
Wisconsin	461.23	297.70	18.17	7%	25%	61
Wyoming	34.00	18.84	1.07	6%	17%	64
TOTAL	\$21,644.50	\$15,924.61	\$737.48	5%	18%	58
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,251.95					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,569.11				

PROPOSAL 2d - Working Poor/At-Risk Child Care at 100% Federal Match
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
JOBS FMAP plus 10% Federal Match
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	166.86	62.39	3.31	6%	8%	73
Alaska	89.44	79.13	0.48	1%	5%	53
Arizona	313.90	148.70	1.58	1%	3%	68
Arkansas	89.66	29.74	0.53	2%	2%	75
California	4562.10	4011.84	76.05	2%	12%	53
Colorado	182.00	126.09	2.38	2%	6%	59
Connecticut	316.66	263.71	1.62	1%	3%	55
Delaware	44.39	33.15	-0.41	-1%	-4%	57
District of Columbia	101.68	88.57	2.97	3%	18%	53
Florida	856.43	570.85	21.75	4%	12%	60
Georgia	524.81	284.12	11.20	4%	10%	65
Hawaii	110.65	96.67	1.68	2%	11%	53
Idaho	40.78	16.74	0.15	1%	2%	71
Illinois	813.36	645.45	23.22	4%	12%	56
Indiana	304.90	160.49	3.16	2%	5%	66
Iowa	180.35	97.79	3.89	4%	12%	65
Kansas	145.76	88.08	1.29	1%	5%	62
Kentucky	301.00	128.29	4.33	3%	7%	70
Louisiana	272.60	88.78	5.13	6%	7%	75
Maine	117.24	62.25	2.00	3%	10%	65
Maryland	335.27	260.68	1.57	1%	2%	56
Massachusetts	646.48	545.86	1.90	0%	2%	54
Michigan	1130.50	788.47	29.27	4%	16%	59
Minnesota	392.26	286.84	2.79	1%	5%	58
Mississippi	150.03	38.26	1.91	5%	4%	80
Missouri	329.58	192.10	8.59	5%	12%	63
Montana	61.19	24.44	0.72	3%	7%	71
Nebraska	99.69	57.70	0.22	0%	1%	63
Nevada	52.81	39.18	-0.04	-0%	-0%	57
New Hampshire	54.93	41.38	-0.86	-2%	-8%	57
New Jersey	574.01	464.67	10.07	2%	9%	55
New Mexico	146.64	50.86	0.91	2%	4%	74
New York	2442.72	2126.16	18.99	1%	6%	53
North Carolina	482.11	237.29	5.57	2%	6%	67
North Dakota	37.74	16.02	0.25	2%	4%	70
Ohio	1050.54	619.98	27.44	5%	13%	63
Oklahoma	257.16	106.78	-0.74	-1%	-2%	71
Oregon	229.39	128.93	4.15	3%	11%	64
Pennsylvania	911.35	649.86	14.21	2%	8%	58
Rhode Island	114.40	80.63	1.56	2%	9%	59
South Carolina	167.64	64.28	3.65	6%	9%	72
South Dakota	34.03	14.05	0.40	3%	6%	71
Tennessee	327.81	149.84	6.60	5%	9%	69
Texas	782.55	374.28	19.78	6%	9%	68
Utah	113.63	38.31	-0.95	-2%	-5%	75
Vermont	63.34	37.71	1.19	3%	13%	63
Virginia	255.82	184.62	1.25	1%	2%	58
Washington	591.42	468.77	3.08	1%	4%	56
West Virginia	165.09	51.70	3.04	6%	9%	76
Wisconsin	469.15	289.77	10.24	4%	14%	62
Wyoming	34.69	18.15	0.37	2%	6%	66
TOTAL	\$22,038.54	\$15,530.57	\$343.44	2%	9%	59
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,645.99					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,569.11				

PROPOSAL 2d - With Net Effect of Child Support (75% FFP, 10% Incentive)
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
JOBS FMAP plus 10% Federal Match
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	169.78	57.07	-2.01	-3%	-5%	75
Alaska	86.85	78.82	0.17	0%	2%	52
Arizona	317.06	142.03	-5.08	-3%	-10%	69
Arkansas	87.34	29.85	0.65	2%	3%	75
California	4486.92	4024.42	88.63	2%	15%	53
Colorado	175.68	126.71	3.00	2%	8%	58
Connecticut	304.42	267.15	5.06	2%	12%	53
Delaware	45.24	31.40	-2.15	-6%	-25%	59
District of Columbia	100.01	89.04	3.44	4%	22%	53
Florida	829.64	577.35	28.25	5%	17%	59
Georgia	502.10	302.03	29.11	11%	28%	62
Hawaii	109.11	96.51	1.33	1%	10%	53
Idaho	38.61	17.00	0.41	2%	6%	69
Illinois	802.11	650.39	28.16	5%	15%	55
Indiana	275.26	178.13	20.80	13%	41%	61
Iowa	165.98	103.46	9.55	10%	38%	62
Kansas	139.42	89.12	2.33	3%	10%	61
Kentucky	294.63	126.66	2.70	2%	5%	70
Louisiana	272.20	86.49	2.83	3%	4%	76
Maine	113.01	66.28	6.03	10%	30%	63
Maryland	319.22	264.93	5.82	2%	10%	55
Massachusetts	616.23	564.81	20.85	4%	25%	52
Michigan	1077.80	806.16	46.97	6%	31%	57
Minnesota	381.82	285.38	1.32	0%	3%	57
Mississippi	149.07	36.03	-0.32	-1%	-1%	81
Missouri	315.93	194.06	10.55	6%	17%	62
Montana	60.28	23.85	0.13	1%	2%	72
Nebraska	99.63	55.87	-1.62	-3%	-11%	64
Nevada	52.01	38.08	-1.14	-3%	-10%	58
New Hampshire	53.88	40.64	-1.61	-4%	-17%	57
New Jersey	567.45	452.73	-1.88	-0%	-2%	56
New Mexico	142.46	51.44	1.49	3%	7%	73
New York	2405.96	2125.12	17.95	1%	6%	53
North Carolina	473.40	234.80	3.08	1%	4%	67
North Dakota	35.91	16.55	0.77	5%	15%	68
Ohio	1049.39	594.83	2.29	0%	1%	64
Oklahoma	252.08	106.96	-0.56	-1%	-2%	70
Oregon	220.36	130.65	5.88	5%	19%	63
Pennsylvania	872.11	656.99	21.34	3%	15%	57
Rhode Island	109.77	81.95	2.88	4%	20%	57
South Carolina	161.39	68.03	5.40	9%	14%	71
South Dakota	32.05	14.93	1.28	9%	21%	68
Tennessee	317.74	153.60	10.37	7%	15%	67
Texas	786.86	358.36	3.86	1%	2%	69
Utah	111.01	37.14	-2.13	-5%	-14%	75
Vermont	62.01	37.84	1.31	4%	17%	62
Virginia	245.32	186.82	3.46	2%	6%	57
Washington	579.37	455.01	-10.67	-2%	-18%	56
West Virginia	163.18	49.01	0.35	1%	1%	77
Wisconsin	452.43	294.20	14.67	5%	24%	61
Wyoming	33.70	18.04	0.27	1%	5%	65

TOTAL \$21,515.20 \$15,572.71 \$385.58 3% 11% 58

Increase in Federal Expenditures \$3,122.65

TOTAL EXPENDITURES \$37,087.91

Proposal 3
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
State portion of JOBS FMAP reduced by 30%
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	162.50	66.75	7.68	13%	17%	71
Alaska	88.44	80.13	1.48	2%	14%	52
Arizona	309.44	153.16	6.04	4%	11%	67
Arkansas	87.27	32.12	2.92	10%	12%	73
California	4520.64	4053.30	117.51	3%	18%	53
Colorado	177.34	130.75	7.04	6%	17%	58
Connecticut	311.19	269.18	7.09	3%	14%	54
Delaware	43.58	33.96	0.40	1%	4%	56
District of Columbia	101.39	88.86	3.27	4%	20%	53
Florida	842.52	584.77	35.66	6%	19%	59
Georgia	518.06	290.87	17.95	7%	16%	64
Hawaii	109.01	98.52	3.33	4%	21%	53
Idaho	39.55	17.96	1.38	8%	16%	69
Illinois	797.99	660.81	38.58	6%	20%	55
Indiana	298.79	166.60	9.27	6%	15%	64
Iowa	177.25	100.88	6.98	7%	21%	64
Kansas	142.78	91.06	4.27	5%	15%	61
Kentucky	296.72	132.57	8.62	7%	13%	69
Louisiana	266.83	94.55	10.90	13%	15%	74
Maine	116.05	63.44	3.18	5%	16%	65
Maryland	329.11	266.84	7.73	3%	11%	55
Massachusetts	640.48	551.86	7.90	1%	8%	54
Michigan	1121.11	797.86	38.67	5%	21%	58
Minnesota	386.71	292.39	8.33	3%	14%	57
Mississippi	146.36	41.94	5.59	15%	12%	78
Missouri	324.40	197.28	13.77	8%	19%	62
Montana	60.25	25.38	1.66	7%	17%	70
Nebraska	97.91	59.48	1.99	3%	12%	62
Nevada	50.76	41.23	2.01	5%	16%	55
New Hampshire	53.37	42.95	0.70	2%	6%	55
New Jersey	564.38	474.31	19.70	4%	18%	54
New Mexico	144.50	52.99	3.05	6%	12%	73
New York	2423.82	2145.06	37.89	2%	12%	53
North Carolina	475.66	243.74	12.02	5%	12%	66
North Dakota	37.03	16.73	0.95	6%	15%	69
Ohio	1041.53	628.99	36.45	6%	17%	62
Oklahoma	253.25	110.70	3.18	3%	8%	70
Oregon	226.37	131.94	7.16	6%	19%	63
Pennsylvania	899.41	661.80	26.15	4%	15%	58
Rhode Island	113.61	81.41	2.35	3%	13%	58
South Carolina	163.80	68.12	7.50	12%	18%	71
South Dakota	33.19	14.88	1.24	9%	17%	69
Tennessee	322.70	154.94	11.70	8%	15%	68
Texas	760.85	395.97	41.48	12%	18%	66
Utah	110.97	40.97	1.70	4%	9%	73
Vermont	62.85	38.20	1.68	5%	18%	62
Virginia	247.02	193.42	10.05	5%	14%	56
Washington	585.74	474.45	8.76	2%	10%	55
West Virginia	162.76	54.03	5.37	11%	16%	75
Wisconsin	464.01	294.92	15.39	6%	21%	61
Wyoming	34.15	18.68	0.91	5%	15%	65
TOTAL	\$21,745.38	\$15,823.73	\$636.60	4%	16%	58
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,352.83					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,569.11				

Proposal 3 - Working Poor/At Risk Child Care at 100% Federal Match
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
State portion of JOBS FMAP reduced by 30%
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	166.18	63.07	3.99	7%	9%	72
Alaska	89.74	78.83	0.18	0%	2%	53
Arizona	313.96	148.63	1.52	1%	3%	68
Arkansas	89.10	30.30	1.09	4%	5%	75
California	4579.14	3994.80	59.00	1%	9%	53
Colorado	183.15	124.95	1.24	1%	3%	59
Connecticut	318.13	262.24	0.15	0%	0%	55
Delaware	44.75	32.78	-0.77	-2%	-8%	58
District of Columbia	102.20	88.05	2.45	3%	15%	54
Florida	861.27	566.01	16.91	3%	9%	60
Georgia	527.20	281.72	8.80	3%	8%	65
Hawaii	111.01	96.52	1.33	1%	8%	53
Idaho	40.67	16.85	0.26	2%	3%	71
Illinois	818.38	640.43	18.20	3%	9%	56
Indiana	305.83	159.56	2.23	1%	4%	66
Iowa	180.85	97.28	3.38	4%	10%	65
Kansas	146.65	87.19	0.40	0%	1%	63
Kentucky	300.13	129.16	5.21	4%	8%	70
Louisiana	270.69	90.69	7.03	8%	10%	75
Maine	117.52	61.97	1.72	3%	9%	65
Maryland	337.55	258.40	-0.71	-0%	-1%	57
Massachusetts	649.96	542.39	-1.57	-0%	-2%	55
Michigan	1135.85	783.12	23.93	3%	13%	59
Minnesota	394.21	284.89	0.84	0%	1%	58
Mississippi	148.02	40.28	3.93	11%	8%	79
Missouri	331.92	189.77	6.26	3%	8%	64
Montana	61.01	24.62	0.90	4%	9%	71
Nebraska	100.31	57.08	-0.41	-1%	-2%	64
Nevada	53.09	38.90	-0.32	-1%	-2%	58
New Hampshire	55.28	41.04	-1.21	-3%	-11%	57
New Jersey	576.94	461.75	7.14	2%	6%	56
New Mexico	145.93	51.56	1.62	3%	7%	74
New York	2453.65	2115.23	8.06	0%	2%	54
North Carolina	483.19	236.21	4.49	2%	5%	67
North Dakota	37.68	16.08	0.31	2%	5%	70
Ohio	1056.70	613.83	21.29	4%	10%	63
Oklahoma	256.28	107.67	0.15	0%	0%	70
Oregon	230.21	128.10	3.33	3%	9%	64
Pennsylvania	916.89	644.31	8.66	1%	5%	59
Rhode Island	115.03	79.99	0.92	1%	5%	59
South Carolina	167.04	64.88	4.25	7%	10%	72
South Dakota	33.98	14.09	0.44	3%	6%	71
Tennessee	327.86	149.78	6.54	5%	9%	69
Texas	785.66	371.16	16.67	5%	7%	68
Utah	112.90	39.04	-0.23	-1%	-1%	74
Vermont	63.63	37.42	0.90	2%	10%	63
Virginia	257.57	182.87	-0.50	-0%	-1%	58
Washington	594.56	465.63	-0.06	-0%	-0%	56
West Virginia	163.93	52.87	4.20	9%	13%	76
Wisconsin	471.41	287.52	7.99	3%	11%	62
Wyoming	34.82	18.02	0.25	1%	4%	66
TOTAL	\$22,119.61	\$15,449.50	\$262.37	2%	7%	59
Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,727.06					
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$37,569.11				

Proposal 3 - With Net Effect of Child Support (75% FFP, 10% Incentive)
Investments (JOBS, WORK Operating Costs, and Child Care) at
State portion of JOBS FMAP reduced by 30%
Benefits (AFDC and WORK) at FMAP
Administration (AFDC and Child Care) at 50% Federal Match

	Federal Share FY 1999	State Share	Change in State Dollars Spent	Percent Change from Baseline	State Share of New Expenditures	Effective Federal Match Rate
Alabama	168.90	57.95	-1.12	-2%	-3%	74
Alaska	87.24	78.43	-0.22	-0%	-3%	53
Arizona	317.14	141.96	-5.16	-4%	-10%	69
Arkansas	86.57	30.62	1.42	5%	7%	74
California	4508.14	4003.20	67.41	2%	11%	53
Colorado	177.24	125.15	1.44	1%	4%	59
Connecticut	306.39	265.18	3.09	1%	7%	54
Delaware	45.68	30.96	-2.60	-8%	-30%	60
District of Columbia	100.59	88.46	2.87	3%	19%	53
Florida	835.82	571.17	22.06	4%	14%	59
Georgia	504.96	299.17	26.25	10%	25%	63
Hawaii	109.61	96.02	0.83	1%	6%	53
Idaho	38.45	17.16	0.58	3%	8%	69
Illinois	808.59	643.91	21.68	3%	11%	56
Indiana	276.49	176.90	19.57	12%	38%	61
Iowa	166.65	102.78	8.88	9%	36%	62
Kansas	140.58	87.96	1.17	1%	5%	62
Kentucky	293.62	127.67	3.72	3%	6%	70
Louisiana	269.93	88.75	5.10	6%	7%	75
Maine	113.35	65.94	5.68	9%	29%	63
Maryland	322.11	262.04	2.93	1%	5%	55
Massachusetts	620.38	560.66	16.70	3%	20%	53
Michigan	1084.21	799.76	40.57	5%	27%	58
Minnesota	384.31	282.89	-1.17	-0%	-2%	58
Mississippi	146.66	38.44	2.09	6%	5%	79
Missouri	318.80	191.18	7.67	4%	12%	63
Montana	60.05	24.08	0.36	2%	4%	71
Nebraska	100.41	55.08	-2.41	-4%	-16%	65
Nevada	52.46	37.63	-1.59	-4%	-14%	58
New Hampshire	54.37	40.15	-2.10	-5%	-22%	58
New Jersey	571.28	448.91	-5.70	-1%	-6%	56
New Mexico	141.60	52.29	2.35	5%	11%	73
New York	2419.02	2112.06	4.89	0%	2%	53
North Carolina	474.66	233.54	1.82	1%	2%	67
North Dakota	35.83	16.63	0.85	5%	17%	68
Ohio	1056.53	587.69	-4.85	-1%	-3%	64
Oklahoma	251.05	108.00	0.48	0%	1%	70
Oregon	221.37	129.64	4.86	4%	16%	63
Pennsylvania	878.91	650.20	14.55	2%	10%	57
Rhode Island	110.51	81.21	2.15	3%	15%	58
South Carolina	160.60	66.82	6.20	10%	17%	71
South Dakota	31.99	14.98	1.34	10%	22%	68
Tennessee	317.80	153.54	10.30	7%	15%	67
Texas	790.95	354.27	-0.22	-0%	-0%	69
Utah	110.07	38.07	-1.20	-3%	-8%	74
Vermont	62.35	37.50	0.98	3%	12%	62
Virginia	247.82	184.32	0.95	1%	2%	57
Washington	583.14	451.25	-14.44	-3%	-24%	56
West Virginia	161.86	50.33	1.67	3%	6%	76
Wisconsin	455.21	291.42	11.89	4%	20%	61
Wyoming	33.85	17.88	0.11	1%	2%	65

TOTAL	\$21,616.08	\$15,471.83	\$284.70	2%	8%	58
--------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Increase in Federal Expenditures	\$3,223.53
----------------------------------	------------

TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$37,087.91
---------------------------	--------------------

FY 1999
CURRENT LAW
(\$ Millions)

Chart 1D

Comparison Actual and Projected State Performance

	Total Collections		AFDC Collections		Total Expenditures	
	1992	1999	1992	1999	1992	1999
Alabama	98	200	23	33	31	68
Alaska	38	85	11	21	9	20
Arizona	48	126	13	42	24	73
Arkansas	42	92	16	27	12	27
California	650	1,153	311	540	247	485
Colorado	58	123	23	48	20	48
Connecticut	84	139	38	67	28	44
Delaware	28	42	7	13	9	21
D.C.	20	41	5	8	8	7
Florida	252	523	70	149	74	125
Georgia	174	395	74	177	41	81
Guam	5	13	3	7	2	7
Hawaii	34	64	8	14	9	18
Idaho	28	50	8	14	7	15
Illinois	183	308	59	95	61	138
Indiana	124	242	49	86	18	29
Iowa	96	183	35	59	16	33
Kansas	65	113	20	40	17	32
Kentucky	94	192	35	72	29	57
Louisiana	84	178	26	43	30	59
Maine	38	60	21	32	9	15
Maryland	194	354	46	80	40	53
Massachusetts	185	237	72	92	44	35
Michigan	783	1,272	168	250	84	152
Minnesota	189	359	53	86	44	85
Mississippi	48	104	21	43	21	42
Missouri	168	322	49	92	33	76
Montana	17	42	6	12	5	13
Nebraska	68	108	9	16	17	30
Nevada	32	77	7	15	10	28
New Hampshire	27	55	6	16	6	18
New Jersey	372	635	83	141	92	176
New Mexico	19	48	8	24	8	13
New York	485	883	172	322	148	272
North Carolina	168	345	64	128	51	110
North Dakota	16	34	6	10	4	7
Ohio	665	1,225	100	179	123	277
Oklahoma	47	95	18	37	16	30
Oregon	107	211	25	50	21	39
Pennsylvania	773	1,236	121	198	82	147
Puerto Rico	84	132	1	1	7	10
Rhode Island	25	45	13	28	8	12
South Carolina	69	130	21	43	19	28
South Dakota	16	31	5	8	3	6
Tennessee	85	187	23	51	22	35
Texas	251	621	59	128	97	274
Utah	53	96	19	32	16	33
Vermont	13	28	7	12	5	11
Virgin Islands	4	7	0	1	1	2
Virginia	145	248	38	74	47	75
Washington	287	593	91	189	81	173
West Virginia	36	91	9	34	12	28
Wisconsin	293	497	63	81	42	74
Wyoming	11	27	4	9	2	9
Total	7,948	14,676	2,243	4,070	1,913	3,778

State Matching

Several principles have guided the deliberations of the working group in formulating our policies. All cost numbers reported in this memo refer to a total change in federal and state costs of welfare relative to current law. The principles are:

1. In the aggregate, states should not bear any additional costs. 7

2. There will be state matching for all programs in the welfare system - AFDC, child care, JOBS, WORK, administrative costs, and child support. The state matching rate should not be zero for entities with no investment of their own funds are likely to be less vested in the outcome of the program.

3. If the state bears no additional cost relative to current law, there should be significant penalties for not spending all federal monies allocated to the state provided there was significant need in the state.

4. To the extent possible, administrative matching rates should be standardized across programs within a given state.

5. Poor performance by a state relative to other state as measured by a well defined performance measure should be reflected in reduced funds allocated to the poor-performing state.

6. To the maximum extent possible, principle number one which is our most important principle should also apply to each individual state. However, that will not always be possible especially if under current law not all funds allocated to the state for child care or JOBS were not utilized.

As the overall policies in this proposal are finalized, the working group intends to work closely with the states in ascertaining the fiscal impact upon each state.

multi-state tax