

# FISCAL POLICY INSTITUTE

1 LEAR JET LANE / LATHAM, NEW YORK 12110

(518) 786-3156 - [www.fiscalpolicy.org](http://www.fiscalpolicy.org)

Testimony

of

Trudi Renwick, Ph.D.  
Senior Economist  
Fiscal Policy Institute

before the

**Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committees**

Joint Public Hearing on

**Human Services**

February 4, 2002

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today. This testimony will consist of four major parts.

- The first part presents an analysis of the ways in which the 2002-2003 Executive Budget proposes to utilize New York State's federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant and its related Maintenance of Effort (MOE) resources. In order to help balance this year's budget, the Governor proposes to spend all of our state's so-called "TANF surplus" and deplete the TANF reserve funds that New York State has built up over the last several years. This testimony will outline the disadvantages of such an approach and suggests that federal disaster relief in the form of restoration of tax revenues lost due to the direct impact of the World Trade Center attacks would be a better way to close this year's budget gap.
- Second, I will summarize the results of an FPI analysis of the relationship between the minimum wage and government safety net expenditures. This analysis indicates that increasing the federal and/or state minimum wage is an effective and responsible way to decrease TANF expenditures for cash assistance and the cost of other safety net programs (like the EITC and Food Stamps) while enhancing living standards for many low-income families.
- Third, I will discuss some ways in which the Unemployment Insurance system could be reformed to better serve the needs of former welfare recipients and other low-income workers.
- Finally, I will show how state and local reporting on TANF and related Maintenance of Effort spending could be greatly improved by piggybacking on the quarterly reports that the state is currently required to file with the federal government.

## **Background**

Over the last six years, the interaction of two major developments – dramatic reductions in the number of needy families receiving governmental cash assistance and major changes in the way that the federal government shares in the costs incurred by the states in providing such assistance and related services – have given the states an unprecedented level of resources that can be used with an unprecedented degree of flexibility in meeting the needs of families that continue to receive cash assistance and families that need additional supports to successfully remain working.<sup>1</sup>

In New York State, the number of people receiving family assistance has declined by more than 650,000, or almost 50 percent, from its January 1995 level of 1.2 million to 600,000 in October 2001. Despite this precipitous decline in the welfare rolls, since December 1996 New York has received a fixed amount of money from the federal government (\$2.44 billion per year) for "temporary assistance to needy families (TANF)." This combination of fixed funding and falling caseloads has resulted in the so-called "TANF surplus." In its simplest formulation, this surplus is the difference between (a) the \$2.44 billion in federal aid that New York receives in a particular federal fiscal year under the TANF Block Grant and (b) the amount that it needs to cover the federal portion of cash assistance to needy families.

New York can then use these "additional" resources to (1) invest in programs and services that assist needy families in becoming and remaining self sufficient and/or, (2) subject to some restrictions imposed by federal guidelines, fund certain existing programs of assistance to needy families, thus providing fiscal relief to the state by allowing it to reduce the amount of General Fund resources necessary to continue those programs and/or (3) to build up reserve (or "rainy day") funds for use during economic downturns when caseloads (and therefore, cash assistance expenditures) are likely to increase.

As cash assistance caseloads have declined, New York has divided its growing TANF surpluses among each of these three categories of allowable expenditures.

- Some TANF funds have been used to initiative a broad array of programs and services to assist needy families in becoming and remaining self sufficient, including child care, transportation, wage subsidy programs and literacy and English as a Second Language programs. A descriptive list of the numerous programs and services that have been funded over the past few fiscal years is available on our web site — [www.fiscalpolicy.org](http://www.fiscalpolicy.org).
- TANF funds have also been used to provide fiscal relief to state and local governments and the portion of the state's TANF Block Grant going to fiscal relief has been increasing steadily. The 2001-2002 Executive Budget requested fiscal relief of about \$770 million, up from \$597 million in 2000-2001 and more than double the \$233 million in 1998-1999.
- Finally, a significant portion of the TANF block grant has been allocated to reserve or contingency funds or otherwise left unspent. As of September 30, 2001, New York had a

---

<sup>1</sup>This year the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program which replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program will be up for reauthorization in Congress.

balance of \$865.4 million of unobligated funds. In addition, largely due to administrative delays in the implementation of programs and services, New York’s federal TANF “account” showed a balance of \$740.5 million in obligated but not yet liquidated funds.

**The Executive Budget’s TANF surplus proposals will deplete New York’s TANF reserve, are unsustainable in future years, and aptly demonstrate the critical need for federal government to include tax revenue restitution in its package of World Trade Center attack financial assistance.**

This year the federal TANF block grant will again equal \$2.4 billion. In addition, the Division of the Budget estimates that there are approximately \$918 million available from prior year TANF block grants — the \$662 million which had been specifically allocated for reserves, \$118.3 million in unallocated prior year TANF funds, \$89 million due to caseload re-estimates and \$49 million from program sunsets.

**Summary of TANF Funding Sources and Uses (in billions)**

<b>SOURCES</b>	
Current Year Federal TANF Block Grant	\$2.440
Reserves and other Unspent Funds from Prior Year Federal TANF Block Grants	\$ .918
<b>Total Available Funding</b>	<b>\$3.358</b>
<b>USES</b>	
Estimated 2002-2003 Spending on Assistance and Closely Related Programs (Base Expenditures)	\$1.010
One-time fiscal relief	\$ .563
Other expenditures (i.e. transitional services, ongoing fiscal relief)	\$1.788
<b>Total Proposed TANF Spending</b>	<b>\$3.361</b>

The Governor proposes to spend \$3.4 billion from the TANF block grant in SFY 2002-2003. Of this \$3.4 billion, approximately \$1 billion is required for cash assistance, emergency assistance, administration and other closely-related programs. This leaves a “TANF surplus” of about \$2.4 billion which the Executive Budget proposes to spend in its entirety.

The Governor’s budget plans to completely deplete the unspent TANF reserves in order to fill the budget gaps in this fiscal year. While it is perfectly acceptable and desirable to use reserve funds to maintain spending during an economic downturn, it might not be prudent to totally exhaust these reserves before knowing the length and the depth of the current recession.

The Governor would use TANF resources to provide fiscal relief by funding existing programs of assistance to needy families to an unprecedented degree. The Governor’s budget

recommends using TANF funding for the Tuition Assistance Program (\$345 million), pre-K programs (\$50 million), Advantage Schools<sup>2</sup> (\$10 million) and Extended Day Programs (\$11.3 million). In addition, the Governor proposes to use \$351 million for the refundable portion of the state Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and \$87 million for the state Child and Dependent Care Credit (CDCC). In the 2002-2003 proposed Executive Budget, the state would continue to transfer the maximum allowable \$241 million to Title XX. Other “child welfare” fiscal relief would increase by \$39 million from \$146 million in 2001-02 to \$185 million in 2002-03 for existing programs and adds an additional \$7.6 million for two new child welfare programs.<sup>3</sup>

Given the extent to which the Executive Budget is proposing to use “TANF surplus” to balance the state budget, the funds left to support new and innovative approaches to helping low-income families are extremely limited. Despite proposing over \$1 billion more in TANF surplus spending, the Governor’s budget decreases spending for TANF-funded employment and transitional services initiatives by \$17 million, from \$210 million to \$193 million. Less than 10 percent of the proposed TANF surplus spending would be used to provide these critical services to help families more from welfare to work, despite widespread agreement that the families that continue to receive public assistance are in need of more intensive support and transitional services than those that have left the welfare rolls over the past six to seven years.

The Executive Budget increases the Employment/Transitional Block Grant by \$65 million, from \$60 million to \$125 million but eliminates \$34 million dollars of specific funding for transportation, drug screening/treatment, domestic violence screening and the youth enterprise program resulting in a net proposed increase of only \$31 million. Services and Health Initiatives/ Targeted Services are increased from \$67 million in 2001-02 to \$71 million in the proposed budget with additional funding provided for Advantage Schools, Displaced Homemakers and Home Visiting. Funds are appropriated for several “new” programs — Green Teams, Evaluation of Welfare Reform, School-based Health Centers and Blueprint. Green teams had been funded from the TANF-base last year. Evaluation of welfare reform was funded in previous years but did not receive any TANF surplus funding from the SFY 2001-02 appropriation. School-based health centers are included as “pregnancy prevention” spending and included in the Senate Finance budget summary as “an effort to offset General Fund spending with federal TANF funds.” Blueprint, a juvenile delinquency prevention demonstration project, seems to be the only “new” program.

Almost \$50 million dollars of programs are classified by the Division of Budget as

---

<sup>2</sup> For the past several years, Advantage Schools have received \$10 million from the TANF block grant with another \$10 million provided by the General Fund. This year’s Executive Budget increases the overall appropriation for Advantage Schools to \$25 million and takes all the money from the TANF block grant. This analysis includes the new \$5 million as a program expansion but classifies the \$10 in incremental TANF funding which is merely supplanting General Fund resources as fiscal relief.

<sup>3</sup> It is somewhat difficult to determine when funding is for a new program and when funding constitutes fiscal relief for an existing effort. This analysis classifies several of the programs that the Division of Budget lists as “Services and Health Initiatives” as Child Welfare Fiscal Relief (Home Visiting, APPS, YEETP) based on the prior year characterizations of these funding commitments as “fiscal relief.” For example, the Senate Finance Committee Minority’s Comparison of the Executive, Senate, Assembly and Enacted Budget Provisions for 2000-01 classifies all three of these programs, plus the Child Care Credit Expansion as “fiscal relief.” I do not include the \$140 million commitment for Child Welfare Emergency Assistance to Families as fiscal relief since these expenditures have historically been funded by AFDC/TANF.

“legislative initiatives” and none of these are recommended for funding from the SFY 2002-03 TANF surplus. These initiatives include the health care recruitment and retention program, the wage subsidy program, the preventive services initiative, technology training, ESL training, adult and family literacy, VESID/LIVES, homeless assistance, parents count demo, work programs in educational institutions, ACCESS -welfare to careers, and caretaker relatives services.

The Governor’s 2002-03 budget proposes to maintain the transfer from the TANF block grant to the Child Care Block Grant at its current level of \$304 million. Other child care spending initiatives funded in 2000-2001 but not in 2001-2002 ---- Child Care for Migrant Families (\$2.5 million), Child Care Enforcement and Oversight (\$18.5 million) and the Child Care Worker Retention Program (\$40 million) are not included in the Executive Budget proposal for 2002-03.

Half of the increased TANF surplus expenditures proposed by the Governor are one-time accounting adjustments which enable New York to reclassify prior year expenditures from General Fund spending to the TANF block grant. For example, the Governor intends to claim an additional \$200 million in prior year EITC expenditures and \$47 million in prior year CDCC expenditures to the TANF grant. In a similar fashion, \$186.4 million in expenditures that were previously charged to the state’s Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement for 1998-99 will be reclassified as TANF expenditures and an additional \$30 million has been designated for “audit recoveries.” The Governor’s budget proposal also includes a one-time \$100,000 expenditures for World Trade Center MOE Relief which is contingent on federal government approval.

Even after accounting for the “one-time” expenditures adjustments, the Governor’s proposed level of overall TANF surplus spending --- \$1.8 billion --- is not sustainable. The proposed \$1.8 billion in TANF surplus expenditures on ongoing programs is about \$350 million more than can be sustained in future fiscal years, without taking into account the need to rebuild New York’s contingency reserve funds. This means that if the Governor’s budget is approved, next year the state will be faced with the need to either cut TANF spending by \$400 million or use General Fund resources to fill this gap.

Clearly, the Governor is proposing to use the TANF block grant and the accumulated TANF reserves to help fill the budget gap created by the revenue losses associated with the September 11 attack and the subsequent economic recession. Certainly a large portion of this gap would not exist if the federal government had agreed to reimburse New York for the loss of tax revenues related to the September 11 attack. As the Fiscal Policy Institute has proposed elsewhere, the federal government should immediately advance New York an amount equal to the estimate of lost tax revenues related directly to the September 11 attacks. This advance can be reconciled at a later date when a more precise accounting for the impact of the attacks is possible and New York will either receive additional funds or refund the excess funds provided. This important restoration of lost tax revenues would eliminate the need for New York to raid its TANF funds for this purpose.

Being forced to use our TANF resources this way is also disturbing from another perspective. In the process of reauthorization of the TANF block grant, this year Congress can be expected to closely scrutinize how states have used their TANF block grants over the past five years. While using welfare money as a substitute for state spending is not prohibited under the federal law, Congressional leaders, including U.S. Representative Nancy Johnson, an influential Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee and the subcommittee that deals with TANF and related issues, have urged states to be careful about using TANF funds to replace

state spending. In a March 15, 2000 letter to all fifty governors, Representative Johnson wrote:

In reviewing these and similar investments for your own state, I hope you will be careful to avoid supplanting TANF funds. By supplantation, I mean replacing state dollars with TANF dollars on activities that are legal uses of TANF funding. Supplantation, of course, is perfectly legal under the TANF statute. However, if the savings from supplanted federal funds are used for purposes other than those specified in the TANF legislation, Congress will react by assuming that we have provided states with too much money. As the reauthorization of the TANF legislation in 2002 approaches, it would be a shame if a few states followed the suggestions of their budget officials and replaced state dollars with TANF dollars in order to provide tax cuts, build roads or bridges, or in general use funds for non-TANF purposes. It has become increasingly clear that the media, child advocates, Congressional committees, and at my request the General Accounting Office, are watching to see if states supplant TANF funds. Thus, it is likely that jurisdictions that do so will become widely known and criticized. Equally important, these jurisdictions could provoke Congress to take actions that would hold serious consequences for every states.

The Executive Budget's proposals to use of TANF funds to replace state spending have not gone unnoticed by national think tanks concerned with the TANF program. For example, in a story in the Times Union on February 2, Steve Savner, an attorney with the Center for Law and Social Policy in Washington, D.C. expressed concern about the Executive Budget's TAP proposals.

**An increase in the federal and/or state minimum wage would result in a small, but symbolically important, reduction in future TANF spending requirements.**

Many current TANF recipients are working but earning so little that they continue to be eligible for cash assistance. One reason that these families continue to have incomes below the county-specific standards of need, despite considerable hours of work, is that the purchasing power of the minimum wage had deteriorated significantly over the past 30+ years. The attached table provides estimates of the number of workers in each county who would benefit from a minimum wage increase from the current \$5.15 an hour to \$6.75 per hour. Some of these workers in each county are currently receiving TANF or Safety Net cash assistance. If the minimum wage were to be increased, their incomes would go up but spending on cash assistance (and in most cases food stamps and the EITC) would go down.

The federal minimum wage reached its high point in terms of purchasing power on February 1, 1968 when it and the state minimum wage were both increased to \$1.60 per hour. In January 2002 dollars, this would be the equivalent of more than \$8.00 per hour. A job at those wage levels made it possible for a worker to get his or her feet on the ground, to support a family and to lay the foundation for a better future. In the 1960s and 1970s, the earnings of a full-time, year-round worker receiving the minimum wage were enough to lift a family of three above the poverty line. That is no longer true. Despite the increase of the federal minimum wage to \$5.15 per hour on September 1, 1997, a person working full-time, year-round at that level will earn less than 75 percent of the poverty line for a family of three, and have less than two-thirds of the purchasing power of a similar worker in 1968. With the current minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour and the existing rules for earned income disregards, a family of three with an adult working full time at the

minimum wage may still be eligible for cash assistance in most jurisdictions in New York.

Facing the current budget gap, New York should increase its minimum wage in order to boost the incomes of low-income families while reducing state and local expenditures for cash assistance. At \$5.15 per hour, the state minimum wage is equal to the federal minimum wage. New York should join the eleven other states that have acted to increase their minimum wages above the federal \$5.15 an hour. Washington State's minimum wage is now \$6.90 an hour, and rises with inflation. In Massachusetts, the minimum wage is \$6.75 an hour. In January 2002, California's minimum wage increased to \$6.75 while Connecticut's increased to \$6.70 an hour. Other states with minimum wages above the federal minimum wage include Maine (\$5.75 scheduled to increase to \$6.25 in January 2003), Alaska (\$6.75), Delaware (\$6.15), Oregon (\$6.50), Vermont (\$6.25), Hawaii (\$5.25), and Rhode Island (\$6.15).

It would not be unprecedented for New York to have a state minimum wage higher than the federal minimum. During two periods in the late 1960s and early 1970s (the first lasting 13 months and the second almost four years), New York maintained a minimum wage above that of the federal government.

**Many former welfare recipients may be forced to return to the TANF caseloads because Unemployment Insurance (UI) eligibility requirements make it difficult for them to qualify for benefits when they lose their jobs.**

Although the unemployment insurance system was created to provide income support to those who involuntarily lose these jobs by replacing a portion of an unemployed family's earnings while the unemployed person is looking for a new job, many workers do not receive unemployment benefits when they lose their jobs and some of these are forced to rely on TANF and other public assistance programs to sustain their families. Like the unemployment insurance programs in other states, New York's program was designed to meet the needs of male household heads with full-time, full-year employment and therefore workers who do not match this profile, particularly former welfare recipients with low wages, part-time and/or part-year work, and family responsibilities, are much less likely to receive benefits when they are unemployed and if they do receive benefits, may receive weekly benefits too small to support their families.

There are a number of ways in which New York's current UI system fails to provide an adequate safety net for former welfare recipients and other low-income workers. Former welfare recipients often are forced to leave a job for compelling personal reasons and since the New York law is vague about the definition of "good cause" for separation from employment, these workers may be unfairly denied benefits. Second, New York's UI system requires that a worker have earned \$1600 in a single quarter which disadvantages low-wage and part-time workers. Third, former welfare recipients may have a more difficult time maintaining eligibility for benefits because they are more likely to have family circumstances which restrict their job searches beyond what is allowed by the law. Finally, UI benefits are set at one half of average weekly earnings (up to a maximum) so benefits for low-wage workers are often so low that even workers who are eligible for UI benefits must turn to the public assistance system for supplemental assistance.

The following are a number of ways in which New York's unemployment insurance program could be reformed to better serve the needs of former welfare recipients and therefore

decrease the likelihood that they will return to the welfare rolls.<sup>4</sup>

- Eligibility rules for unemployment insurance should be revised to increase the percentage of the unemployed who actually receive benefits. Many low wage workers do not qualify for benefits because they have not earned \$1600 in a single quarter. In order to ensure equitable treatment of low wage workers, eligibility rules should be revised to require a minimum number of hours per quarter rather than an earnings threshold.
- Although New York's unemployment insurance law is better than the law of most other states in that it permits benefits for those who find themselves without work due to personal circumstances, the statute does not explicitly discuss these "compelling individual circumstances" and many low wage workers, particularly women, may be denied benefits due to unduly narrow and inconsistent interpretations of the law by program administrators. New York should explicitly recognize that compelling domestic circumstances, health-related reasons, marital obligations and domestic violence constitute "good cause" justifying a voluntary separation from work.
- For those workers who do receive benefits, the weekly benefit, one half of the average weekly wage, is often not sufficient to keep their families' incomes above the poverty line. Many minimum wage workers receive weekly UI benefits so low they are eligible for public assistance. Consideration should be given to setting the benefit level at more than 50% of the average weekly wage for those who have worked full-time at the minimum wage for six months or more.

#### **New York should improve TANF and MOE expenditure reporting.**

The New York State Division of the Budget does a good job of making information available on the uses of the TANF Block Grant proposed by the Governor in his Executive Budget. These lists then serve as the basis for Senate and Assembly review and revision, and for the discussions of the allocation of the TANF surplus by the Budget Conference Subcommittee on Human Resources. To fully inform the policymaking process and the public, however, the state agencies responsible for the implementation of welfare reform in New York State should report quarterly on the obligations and disbursements that have been made against the programmatic allocations of the TANF Block Grant and of MOE funds that were included in the adopted budget.

The unliquidated balances in New York's federal TANF account (\$740.5 million as of September 30, 2001) imply that New York has been slow to spend appropriated funds but the lack of expenditure reporting makes it impossible to identify which programs are responsible for the unspent funds. The Executive Budget makes note that prior-year set-asides for initiatives such as the New York Works Block Grant will "remain available for expenditure in the forthcoming fiscal year" but does not provide dollar amounts. The Governor's proposed appropriation bills include long lists of re-appropriations for TANF programs not included in the 2002-03 Executive Budget but since there is no reporting of how much has been spent, there is no way to determine how much will be available for these programs and services.

Reporting could be improved by building upon the reporting requirements established by the federal government. The goal of this reporting should be to provide state legislators and the public with useful and timely information on the utilization of the federal, state and local resources

---

<sup>4</sup>For a more complete discussion of these issues, see FPI's June 2000 report, *Modernizing New York's Unemployment Insurance System*, available on our web site: [www.fiscalpolicy.org](http://www.fiscalpolicy.org).



allocated to meet the requirements of the federal welfare reform law.

1. At the same time that the state makes quarterly reports to the federal government on its TANF and MOE expenditures, this same information, broken down into the program categories used in the state budget process, should be reported to the legislature and made public.
2. The states provide quarterly reports on their MOE expenditures to the federal government. Since New York State's MOE expenditures are made partially by the state and partially by the local social services districts, a supplementary report should be made available to state legislators and the public showing the state-local breakdown of New York's MOE expenditures.
3. The relevant state agencies should also produce a supplementary report for state legislators and the public that presents a breakdown, by spending category, of the state's unliquidated obligations.
4. The new federal TANF regulations require all quarterly financial reports to be filed electronically. These electronic reports should be promptly posted by the relevant New York agencies on their Internet sites. *See* the attached copies of the New York's ACF form for the fourth quarter of federal fiscal year 2001 and the table of contents summarizing the data provided on the web site of the Department of Health and Humans Services's Administration for Children and Families.
5. Since many of the single purpose TANF programs have been folded into block grants provided to local social service districts, expenditure reports for each social service district should also be required. These reports should be sufficiently detailed to enable state legislators and the public to determine how much is being spent on each specific purpose (e.g. transportation, domestic violence screening.)

Thank you.

**SFY 2001-02 and PROPOSED SFY 2002-03 TANF BLOCK GRANT COMMITMENTS**

	<u>SFY2001-02</u>	<u>SFY 2002-03</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>
<b>TANF BASE EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$1,079,166</b>	<b>\$1,010,065</b>	<b>(\$69,101)</b>
<b>ONGOING FISCAL RELIEF</b>	<b>\$770,600</b>	<b>\$1,291,200</b>	<b>\$520,600</b>
<b>Child Welfare Investments*</b>			
<i>Existing Programs</i>			
Title XX	\$241,000	\$241,000	\$0
Local JD/PINS	\$80,000	\$105,000	\$25,000
NYC Foster Care Tuition	\$36,000	\$41,000	\$5,000
OCFS JDs	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0
Home Visiting	\$5,600	\$14,800	\$9,200
APPS - Responsible Parenting Program	\$7,700	\$7,700	\$0
YEETP	\$4,300	\$4,300	\$0
<i>New Programs</i>			
PINS/PREVENTIVE Services		\$4,600	\$4,600
Child Welfare Quality		\$3,000	\$3,000
<b>Tax Credits</b>			
EITC	\$323,000	\$351,000	\$28,000
CDCC	\$61,000	\$87,000	\$26,000
<b>Education Fiscal Relief</b>			
Pre-K	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
TAP	\$0	\$345,000	\$345,000
Advantage Schools	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
Extended Day	\$0	\$11,300	\$11,300
School-based health centers	\$0	\$3,500	\$3,500
<b>ONE -TIME EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$563,400</b>	<b>\$563,400</b>
Prior Year EITC	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000
Prior Year CDCC	\$0	\$47,000	\$47,000
Audit Recoveries	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000
WTC MOE Relief	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000
Prior Year MOE Reconciliation	\$0	\$186,400	\$186,400
<b>CHILD CARE</b>	<b>\$304,000</b>	<b>\$304,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>INNOVATIVE PROGRAM AND SERVICE INITIATIVE</b>	<b>\$210,400</b>	<b>\$192,660</b>	<b>(\$17,740)</b>
<b>Employment/Transitional Initiatives</b>	<b>\$94,000</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>\$31,000</b>
Employment/Transitional Block Grant	\$60,000	\$125,000	\$65,000
Transportation	\$10,000	\$0	(\$10,000)
Drug Screening/Treatment	\$15,000	\$0	(\$15,000)
DV Screening	\$8,000	\$0	(\$8,000)
Youth Enterprise Program	\$1,000	\$0	(\$1,000)
<b>Services and Health Initiatives</b>	<b>\$67,200</b>	<b>\$67,660</b>	<b>\$460</b>
Summer Youth Employment	\$25,000	\$15,000	(\$10,000)
Displaced Homemakers	\$1,200	\$2,800	\$1,600
Green Teams	\$0	\$860	\$860
Evaluation of Welfare Reform	\$0	\$500	\$500
Advantage Schools	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$5,000
Food Pantries	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0
Pregnancy Prevention	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0
Title XX - WIC	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0
Blueprint	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500
WIC	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$0
Alternatiaves to Incarceration	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$0
<b>Legislative Initiatives</b>	<b>\$49,200</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$49,200)</b>
Recruitment/Retention (Health care)	\$20,000	\$0	(\$20,000)
Employment/Transitional Services	\$29,200	\$0	(\$29,200)
<i>Wage Subsidy Program</i>	\$5,000	\$0	(\$5,000)
<i>Preventive Services Initiative</i>	\$6,700	\$0	(\$6,700)
<i>Technology Training</i>	\$7,000	\$0	(\$7,000)
<i>ESL Training</i>	\$2,000	\$0	(\$2,000)
<i>Adult land Family Literacy</i>	\$1,000	\$0	(\$1,000)
<i>VESID/LIVES</i>	\$2,000	\$0	(\$2,000)
<i>Homeless Assistance</i>	\$3,000	\$0	(\$3,000)
<i>Parents Count Demo</i>	\$500	\$0	(\$500)
<i>Work Programs in Educational Institu</i>	\$500	\$0	(\$500)
<i>ACCESS - Welfare to Careers</i>	\$1,000	\$0	(\$1,000)
<i>Caretaker Relative</i>	\$500	\$0	(\$500)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,364,166</b>	<b>\$3,361,325</b>	<b>\$997,159</b>

## New York Workers Who Would Benefit from a \$1.60 Increase in the Minimum Wage by County of Residence

	Average Annual Resident Employment: 2000*	Workers with Wages between \$5.15 and \$6.74 Who Would Benefit Directly**		Workers with Wages between \$6.75 and \$7.74 Who Would Benefit Indirectly***		Workers Who Would Benefit Directly or Indirectly	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>STATEWIDE****</b>	<b>7,656,932</b>	<b>701,717</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>531,451</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>1,233,169</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
Albany	135,100	12,500	9.3%	9,300	6.9%	21,800	16.1%
Allegany	19,100	1,900	9.9%	1,400	7.3%	3,300	17.3%
Bronx	398,500	36,800	9.2%	28,700	7.2%	65,500	16.4%
Broome	84,300	9,200	10.9%	6,900	8.2%	16,100	19.1%
Cattaraugus	33,400	3,600	10.8%	2,700	8.1%	6,300	18.9%
Cayuga	31,900	3,300	10.3%	2,500	7.8%	5,800	18.2%
Chautauqua	56,200	6,200	11.0%	4,700	8.4%	10,900	19.4%
Chemung	36,800	4,000	10.9%	3,000	8.2%	7,000	19.0%
Chenango	20,300	2,200	10.8%	1,700	8.4%	3,900	19.2%
Clinton	33,300	3,200	9.6%	2,400	7.2%	5,600	16.8%
Columbia	29,800	2,700	9.1%	2,000	6.7%	4,700	15.8%
Cortland	18,700	2,000	10.7%	1,500	8.0%	3,500	18.7%
Delaware	17,600	2,200	12.5%	1,700	9.7%	3,900	22.2%
Dutchess	103,900	9,900	9.5%	7,400	7.1%	17,300	16.7%
Erie	385,400	42,200	10.9%	31,500	8.2%	73,700	19.1%
Essex	15,000	1,700	11.3%	1,300	8.7%	3,000	20.0%
Franklin	18,500	2,000	10.8%	1,500	8.1%	3,500	18.9%
Fulton	22,200	2,400	10.8%	1,900	8.6%	4,300	19.4%
Genesee	26,800	2,700	10.1%	2,000	7.5%	4,700	17.5%
Greene	17,900	2,000	11.2%	1,500	8.4%	3,500	19.6%
Hamilton	2,100	300	14.3%	200	9.5%	500	23.8%
Herkimer	26,300	3,000	11.4%	2,200	8.4%	5,200	19.8%
Jefferson	35,600	4,000	11.2%	3,000	8.4%	7,000	19.7%
Kings	833,000	81,800	9.8%	63,400	7.6%	145,200	17.4%
Lewis	10,000	1,100	11.0%	800	8.0%	1,900	19.0%
Livingston	29,200	2,500	8.6%	1,800	6.2%	4,300	14.7%
Madison	30,100	2,700	9.0%	2,000	6.6%	4,700	15.6%
Manhattan	730,300	58,300	8.0%	44,900	6.1%	103,200	14.1%
Monroe	325,500	30,200	9.3%	22,600	6.9%	52,800	16.2%
Montgomery	19,500	2,400	12.3%	1,800	9.2%	4,200	21.5%
Nassau	598,400	53,100	8.9%	39,300	6.6%	92,400	15.4%
Niagara	89,800	10,100	11.2%	7,500	8.4%	17,600	19.6%
Oneida	96,300	10,700	11.1%	8,000	8.3%	18,700	19.4%
Onondaga	199,500	18,700	9.4%	14,100	7.1%	32,800	16.4%
Ontario	45,700	4,100	9.0%	3,100	6.8%	7,200	15.8%
Orange	136,200	11,300	8.3%	8,400	6.2%	19,700	14.5%
Orleans	17,700	1,700	9.6%	1,300	7.3%	3,000	16.9%
Oswego	47,400	4,700	9.9%	3,600	7.6%	8,300	17.5%

## New York Workers Who Would Benefit from a \$1.60 Increase in the Minimum Wage by County of Residence

	Average Annual Resident Employment: 2000*	Workers with Wages between \$5.15 and \$6.74 Who Would Benefit Directly**		Workers with Wages between \$6.75 and \$7.74 Who Would Benefit Indirectly***		Workers Who Would Benefit Directly or Indirectly	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>STATEWIDE****</b>	<b>7,656,932</b>	<b>701,717</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>531,451</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>1,233,169</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
Otsego	26,900	2,600	9.7%	2,000	7.4%	4,600	17.1%
Putnam	47,400	3,100	6.5%	2,200	4.6%	5,300	11.2%
Queens	875,100	75,600	8.6%	58,400	6.7%	134,000	15.3%
Rensselaer	67,700	6,200	9.2%	4,700	6.9%	10,900	16.1%
Richmond	175,700	13,200	7.5%	9,800	5.6%	23,000	13.1%
Rockland	125,400	10,000	8.0%	7,400	5.9%	17,400	13.9%
Saratoga	90,300	7,700	8.5%	5,700	6.3%	13,400	14.8%
Schenectady	61,600	6,700	10.9%	5,000	8.1%	11,700	19.0%
Schoharie	12,700	1,300	10.2%	1,000	7.9%	2,300	18.1%
Schuyler	7,500	800	10.7%	600	8.0%	1,400	18.7%
Seneca	13,100	1,500	11.5%	1,100	8.4%	2,600	19.8%
St. Lawrence	41,700	4,400	10.6%	3,300	7.9%	7,700	18.5%
Steuben	41,500	4,200	10.1%	3,200	7.7%	7,400	17.8%
Suffolk	621,600	50,900	8.2%	38,100	6.1%	89,000	14.3%
Sullivan	26,400	3,100	11.7%	2,300	8.7%	5,400	20.5%
Tioga	22,800	2,100	9.2%	1,600	7.0%	3,700	16.2%
Tompkins	44,400	3,200	7.2%	2,400	5.4%	5,600	12.6%
Ulster	71,200	7,200	10.1%	5,400	7.6%	12,600	17.7%
Warren	26,700	3,000	11.2%	2,300	8.6%	5,300	19.9%
Washington	24,200	2,500	10.3%	1,900	7.9%	4,400	18.2%
Wayne	42,200	3,600	8.5%	2,700	6.4%	6,300	14.9%
Westchester	384,800	33,000	8.6%	24,500	6.4%	57,500	14.9%
Wyoming	17,400	1,700	9.8%	1,300	7.5%	3,000	17.2%
Yates	11,700	1,100	9.4%	800	6.8%	1,900	16.2%

\* Excludes self-employed.

\*\* Assumes a \$1.60 increase in the federal minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$6.75.

\*\*\* Various studies have found that, due to the so-called "spill-over effects," the group of workers earning just above the minimum wage (perhaps as much as a dollar above) also receive a wage gain as a result of an increase. For example, William Spriggs and Bruce Klein, 1994, *Raising the Floor: The Effects of the Minimum Wage on Low-Wage Workers*, Washington, D.C., Economic Policy Institute.

\*\*\*\* Statewide estimates provided by the Economic Policy Institute. County-specific estimates do not add to the statewide totals due to rounding.

Note: The number of workers in each county in each wage range was estimated using the Economic Policy Institute estimate of the number of workers statewide in each wage group and distributing them among the counties based on the 1996 distribution of low-income tax filers by county.

# Estimated Family Assistance Spending in New York

TANF Block Grant and MOE (in thousands)

	<u>SFY</u> <u>1998-1999</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>1999-2000</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>2000-2001</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>2001-2002</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>SFY</u> <u>2002-2003</u>
<b>Annual TANF Grant</b>	\$2,442,930	\$2,442,930	\$2,442,930	\$2,442,930	\$2,442,930
<b>Annual MOE</b>	<u>\$1,718,578</u>	<u>\$1,718,578</u>	<u>\$1,718,578</u>	<u>\$1,718,578</u>	<u>\$1,718,578</u>
<b>Total Resources for Family Assistance</b>	<u>\$4,161,508</u>	<u>\$4,161,508</u>	<u>\$4,161,508</u>	<u>\$4,161,508</u>	<u>\$4,161,508</u>
<b>Base Temporary Assistance Expenditures</b>	\$3,287,737	\$2,941,699	\$2,515,608	\$2,778,764	\$2,709,663
<b>Administration</b>	\$661,202	\$578,855	\$472,978	\$269,032	\$264,110
<b>Programs</b>	\$2,626,535	\$2,362,844	\$2,042,630	\$2,332,015	\$2,413,479
Family Assistance	\$1,932,800	\$1,614,800	\$1,413,400	\$1,581,304	\$1,637,634
Emergency Assistance to Families	\$159,600	\$119,800	\$80,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
Child Welfare Emergency Assistance to Families	\$340,000	\$400,000	\$340,000	\$273,700	\$305,000
Other	\$194,135	\$228,244	\$209,230	\$417,011	\$410,845
<b>MOE Surcharge</b>				\$177,717	\$32,074
<b>Programmatic Initiatives</b>	<u>\$180,300</u>	<u>\$641,700</u>	<u>\$980,400</u>	<u>\$210,400</u>	<u>\$192,660</u>
<b>Child Care</b>	<u>\$76,600</u>	<u>\$430,000</u>	<u>\$291,000</u>	<u>\$304,000</u>	<u>\$304,000</u>
<b>Total Expenditures on Family Assistance</b>	<u>\$3,544,637</u>	<u>\$4,013,399</u>	<u>\$3,787,008</u>	<u>\$3,293,164</u>	<u>\$3,206,323</u>
<b>Fiscal Relief and Cost Containment</b>	\$233,000	\$403,000	\$593,000	\$770,600	\$1,291,200
<b>One-time Measures</b>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>	<u><u>\$563,400</u></u>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>	<u><u>\$563,400</u></u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>\$3,777,637</u>	<u>\$4,416,399</u>	<u>\$4,380,008</u>	<u>\$4,063,764</u>	<u>\$5,060,923</u>

\*Annual TANF Grant minus Total - Base Expenditures

Source: State of New York, Executive Department: Division of the Budget.

## Estimated TANF Spending in New York

(in thousands)

	<u>SFY</u> <u>1997-1998</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>1998-1999</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>1999-2000</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>2000-2001</u>	<u>SFY</u> <u>2001-2002</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>SFY</u> <u>2002-2003</u>
<b>Annual TANF Grant</b>		<b>\$2,442,930</b>	<b>\$2,442,930</b>	<b>\$2,442,930</b>	<b>\$2,442,930</b>	<b>\$2,442,930</b>
<b>Base Temporary Assistance Expenditures</b>						
<b>Administration</b>		\$350,551	\$258,796	\$261,089	\$120,410	\$120,410
<b>Programs</b>		\$1,200,544	\$963,853	\$760,453	\$958,756	\$889,655
Family Assistance		\$966,400	\$714,600	\$474,200	\$663,427	\$531,559
Emergency Assistance to Families		\$79,800	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
Child Welfare Emergency Assistance to Families		\$100,000	\$160,000	\$220,000	\$100,000	\$140,000
Other		\$54,344	\$49,253	\$26,253	\$165,329	\$188,096
<b>Total - Base Expenditures</b>		<b>\$1,551,095</b>	<b>\$1,222,649</b>	<b>\$1,021,542</b>	<b>\$1,079,166</b>	<b>\$1,010,065</b>
<b>TANF Surplus</b>		<b>\$891,835</b>	<b>\$1,220,281</b>	<b>\$1,421,388</b>	<b>\$1,363,764</b>	<b>\$1,432,865</b>
 <b>Allocations of Surplus Funds</b>						
<b>Programmatic Initiatives</b>	\$310,550	\$180,300	\$641,700	\$980,400	\$210,400	\$192,660
<b>Child Care</b>	\$66,600	\$76,600	\$430,000	\$291,000	\$304,000	\$304,000
<b>Fiscal Relief and Cost Containment</b>	\$416,400	\$233,000	\$403,000	\$593,000	\$770,600	\$1,291,200
<b>One-time Measures</b>					\$0	\$563,400
<b>Total - Surplus Allocations</b>	<b>\$793,550</b>	<b>\$489,900</b>	<b>\$1,474,700</b>	<b>\$1,864,400</b>	<b>\$1,285,000</b>	<b>\$2,351,260</b>
TANF Surplus - TANF Surplus Allocations		\$401,935	\$254,419	\$443,012	\$78,764	\$918,395

\*Annual TANF Grant minus Total - Base Expenditures

## Fiscal Relief, Cost Containment and Federal Maximization

(in thousands)

	<u>SFY 1997-1998</u>	<u>SFY 1998-1999</u>	<u>SFY 1999-2000</u>	<u>SFY 2000-2001</u>	<u>SFY 2001-2002</u>	<u>Proposed SFY 2002-2003</u>
<b>State MOE Refinancing</b>	<b>\$248,400</b>	<b>\$18,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$286,400</b>
			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Other One-time Fiscal Relief</b>			\$0	\$0	\$0	<b>\$277,000</b>
Prior year E TC and CDCC			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$247,000
Audit recoveries			0	0	0	\$30,000
 <b>Child Welfare Fiscal Relief</b>	 <b>\$168,000</b>	 <b>\$215,000</b>	 <b>\$354,000</b>	 <b>\$402,000</b>	 <b>\$369,000</b>	 <b>\$406,600</b>
Transfers	\$168,000	\$215,000	\$241,000	\$241,000	\$241,000	\$241,000
Transfer to Title	\$160,000	\$207,000	\$233,000	\$233,000	\$233,000	\$233,000
Transfer to Title - Foster Care rates increase	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000
Other Child Welfare Fiscal Relief	\$0	\$0	\$113,000	\$161,000	\$128,000	\$165,600
OCFS Juvenile Delinquents Program	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Local Juvenile Delinquents Persons in Need of Supervi:	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$105,000
New York City Foster Care Tuition	\$0	\$0	\$43,000	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$41,000
Preventive Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
P NS Preventive Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,600
Child Welfare Quality Improvement	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000
 <b>Education-Related Fiscal Relief Initiatives</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$419,800</b>
Tuition Assistance Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$345,000
Pre-Extended Day	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,000
School-based health centers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,300
Advantage Schools (partial)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,500
Advantage Schools (partial)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
 <b>Other Fiscal Relief Initiatives</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$15,100</b>	 <b>\$17,600</b>	 <b>\$26,800</b>
Home visiting	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,600	\$5,600	\$14,800
Pregnancy Prevention	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,700	\$7,700	\$7,700
Youth Education and Employment Training Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800	\$4,300	\$4,300
 <b>Tax Credit Cost Containment</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$0</b>	 <b>\$49,000</b>	 <b>\$174,000</b>	 <b>\$384,000</b>	 <b>\$438,000</b>
Earned Income Tax Credit			\$49,000	\$174,000	\$323,000	\$351,000
Child and Dependent Care Credit					\$61,000	\$87,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$416,400</b>	<b>\$233,000</b>	<b>\$403,000</b>	<b>\$591,100</b>	<b>\$770,600</b>	<b>\$1,854,600</b>

## Programmatic Initiatives

in thousands

	<u>SFY 1997-1998</u>	<u>SFY 1998-1999</u>	<u>SFY 1999-2000</u>	<u>SFY 2000-2001</u>	<u>SFY 2001-2002</u>	<u>Proposed SFY 2002-2003</u>
<b>Child Care</b>						
Child Care Assistance	\$66,600	\$76,600	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$304,000	\$304,000
Child Care Enforcement Oversight	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,500	\$0	\$0
Child Care for Migrant Workers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$0
Child Care Reserve Fund	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Child Care Recruitment Retention				\$40,000	\$0	\$0
<b>Subtotal - Child Care</b>	<b>\$66,600</b>	<b>\$76,600</b>	<b>\$430,000</b>	<b>\$291,000</b>	<b>\$304,000</b>	<b>\$304,000</b>
<b>Employment Transitional Services Health</b>						
Academic Intervention	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0
ACCESS Welfare to Careers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$0
Advantage Schools	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$15,000
Automotive Skills Training	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Blueprint	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500
BIDGE Child Care	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bridge College to Work	\$3,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Building Independence for the Long Term	\$1,800	\$0	\$18,100	Block Grant	\$0	\$0
Built-on-Pride Apprenticeships	\$400	\$0	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$0
Caretaker Relative Assistance	\$0	\$0		\$1,000	\$500	\$0
Case Management for Homeless Families Rent Subsidy Program	\$0	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$3,000	\$0
Alternative to Incarceration Pilot	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Child Assistance Program Expansion	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$1,000	Block Grant	\$0	\$0
Child Support Disregard Toward MOE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,000	\$0	\$0
Compliance with Federal Reporting Requirements	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0
CONY Work Experience	\$500	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Displaced Homemakers Program	\$600	\$0	\$600	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$2,800
Domestic Violence Screening	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	Block grant
Drug Abuse Screening Treatment	\$18,000	\$12,000	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$15,000	Block grant
EDGE Plus : English as a Second Language	\$5,000	\$0	\$3,000	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$0
EDGE Plus : Literacy and Work Preparedness	\$8,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$0
EDGE Plus : Local Interagency ES/D Employment Services (	\$2,500	\$0	\$6,000	\$3,000	\$2,000	\$0
EDGE Enhancement	\$0	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Empire State Development Agency Job Specific Training	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$0
Employment Agency Initiative	\$3,000	\$0	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$0	\$0
Employment Transitional Block Grant	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$125,000
Employment Set-Aside	\$0	\$0	\$3,700	\$2,000	\$0	\$0
Family Loan Program	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$500	\$0	\$0
Federal Compliance Staff	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0
Food Pantries Nutrition Assistance	\$0	\$0	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Green Teams	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$860
Health Care Recruitment Retention	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80,000	\$20,000	\$0
High Performance Bonus Spending***	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$0



ome isiting Expansion	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,800	\$0	\$0
ospital Wage Su idy	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
n EST	\$3,250	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$0
inship Foster Care Workgroup	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150	\$0	\$0
earnfare	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$0	\$0
Medical Exams	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	Block Grant	\$0	\$0
Medical Society	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200	\$0	\$0
Mental ealth Foster Care ecruitment etention	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,000	\$0	\$0
Merit Scholars ncentives	\$500	\$0	\$1,000	Block Grant	\$0	\$0
New York Works (Work Now)	\$29,000	\$13,000	\$100,000	\$103,600	\$0	\$0
Parents Count Demo	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$500	\$0
Performance Awards	\$11,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
P NS Workgroup	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150	\$0	\$0
Preventive Services nitiative	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$23,000	\$6,700	\$0
ape and Pregnancy Prevention	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Department of a or o Placement Staff	\$0	\$0	\$2,300	TANF Base	\$0	\$0
Summer Youth Employment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,000	\$25,000	\$15,000
TANF Services Block Grant	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0	\$0
Technology Training	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,800	\$7,000	\$0
Teen Works	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$0	\$0
Transitional Activities	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Transition Performance	\$22,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Transitional Opportunities Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000	\$0	\$0
Transportation	\$8,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$0
Wage Su idy Demonstration Program	\$0	\$0	\$12,000	\$45,000	\$5,000	\$0
Welfare Management Systems pdate	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$30,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
Welfare eform Contingency eserve Fund	\$104,000	\$114,000	\$330,000	\$318,000	\$0	\$0
Welfare eform Evaluation	\$0	\$300	\$0	\$500	\$0	\$500
Women, nfants and Children Program	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
Women, nfants and Children Program Expansion	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Work Programs in Educational nstitutions	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$500	\$0
Workplace Accommodations**	\$3,000	\$0	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$0	\$0
Youth Enterprise Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0
Youth Post Discharge Program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0
<b>Su total - Other Services</b>	<b>\$310,550</b>	<b>\$180,300</b>	<b>\$641,700</b>	<b>\$980,400</b>	<b>\$210,400</b>	<b>\$192,660</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$377,150</b>	<b>\$256,900</b>	<b>\$1,071,700</b>	<b>\$1,271,400</b>	<b>\$514,400</b>	<b>\$496,660</b>

\* See the next ta le for a complete eakdown of TANF-funded programs administered y the Department of a or.

\*\* CASP stands for Consolidated Application for State Administered Programs which distri tes funds for various DO pograms that use TANF and state General Fund money.

\*\*\* New York received this onus from the federal government for exceeding work participation re uirements in federal fiscal year 1999.

\*\*\*\* This su total includes Workplace Accommodations, which is administered y the Department of a or ta les from other sources may include this program under Transition ocal Administration .

Source: State of New York, Executive Department: Division of the Budget, April and Novem er 1999, anuary 2000.

## Maintenance of Effort Expenditures

(in thousands)

	<u>SFY 1998-1999</u>	<u>SFY 1999-2000</u>	<u>SFY 2000-2001</u>	<u>SFY 2001-2002</u>	<u>Proposed SFY 2002-2003</u>
<b>Administration</b>	<b>\$310,651</b>	<b>\$320,059</b>	<b>\$211,889</b>	<b>\$220,672</b>	<b>\$224,417</b>
<b>Programs</b>	<b>\$1,425,991</b>	<b>\$1,378,991</b>	<b>\$1,265,177</b>	<b>\$1,308,011</b>	<b>\$1,443,107</b>
<b>Family Assistance</b>	\$966,400	\$900,200	\$939,200	\$917,877	\$1,106,075
Family Assistance Commitments				\$663,427	\$531,559
Foster Care MOE Swap				\$150,000	\$175,000
Five Year Time Limit Cases				\$104,450	\$399,516
<b>Predetermination Grant</b>		\$19,000			
<b>Child Support Disregard</b>	\$26,300	\$26,300	\$21,945	\$19,402	\$19,402
<b>Emergency Assistance to Families</b>	\$79,800	\$79,800	\$40,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
<b>Child Welfare Emergency Assistance to Families</b>	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$120,000	\$173,700	\$165,000
<b>Other</b>	\$113,491	\$113,691	\$144,032	\$167,032	\$142,032
TANF Day Care	\$78,297	\$78,297	\$104,000	\$127,000	\$102,000
EDGE/BRIDGE	\$12,494	\$12,694	\$14,332	\$14,332	\$14,332
Job Placement and Retention	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700	\$3,700
EARP/Assessment	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Tier II Debt	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
<b>Programmed MOE Surcharge</b>				<b>\$177,717</b>	<b>\$32,074</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,736,642</b>	<b>\$1,699,050</b>	<b>\$1,477,066</b>	<b>\$1,706,400</b>	<b>\$1,699,598</b>
<b>Annual MOE Requirement</b>	<b>\$1,718,578</b>	<b>\$1,718,578</b>	<b>\$1,718,578</b>	<b>\$1,718,578</b>	<b>\$1,718,578</b>

Source: State of New York, Executive Department: Division of the Budget. These are budgeted amounts. New York has met its MOE in each year, generally by increasing the state and local share of cash assistance payments from 50% to 60%.