



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

Federal Publications

Key Workplace Documents

10-17-2013

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions

Gene Falk
Congressional Research Service

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Key Workplace Documents at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Federal Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions

Abstract

This report provides responses to frequently asked questions about the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It is intended to serve as a quick reference to provide easy access to information and data. This report does not provide information on TANF program rules.

Keywords

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF, unemployment, welfare

Comments

Suggested Citation

Falk, G. (2013). *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant: Responses to frequently asked questions*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

A more recent version of this report can be found here:

http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/1442



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions

Gene Falk

Specialist in Social Policy

October 17, 2013

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL32760

Summary

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant funds a wide range of benefits and services for low-income families with children. TANF was created in the 1996 welfare reform law (P.L. 104-193). This report responds to some frequently asked questions about TANF; it does not describe TANF rules (see, instead, CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk).

TANF Funding. TANF provides fixed funding to states, the bulk of which is provided in a \$16.5 billion-per-year basic federal block grant. States are also required in total to contribute, from their own funds, at least \$10.4 billion under a maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement.

Federal and State TANF Expenditures. Though TANF is best known for funding cash assistance payments for needy families with children, the block grant and MOE funds are used for a wide variety of benefits and activities. In FY2012, expenditures on basic assistance (cash assistance) totaled \$9.0 billion—28.6% of total federal TANF and MOE dollars. TANF also contributes funds for child care and services for children who have been, or are at risk of being, abused and neglected.

Cash Assistance Caseload. A total of 1.8 million families, composed of 4.1 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded cash in March 2013. The bulk of the “recipients” were children—3.1 million in that month. The cash assistance caseload is very heterogeneous. The type of family historically thought of as the “typical” cash assistance family—one with an unemployed adult recipient—accounted for less than half of all families on the rolls in FY2010. Additionally, 15% of cash assistance families had an employed adult, while almost half of all families had no adult recipient. Child-only families include those with disabled adults receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), adults who are nonparents (e.g., grandparents, aunts, uncles) caring for children, and families consisting of citizen children and ineligible noncitizen parents.

Cash Assistance Benefits. TANF cash benefits are set by states. In July 2011, the maximum monthly benefit for a family of three ranged from \$923 in Alaska to \$170 in Mississippi. Benefits in all states represent a fraction of poverty-level income. In the median jurisdiction (North Dakota), the maximum monthly benefit of \$427 for a family of three represents 28% of poverty-level income.

Cash Assistance Work Requirements. TANF requires states to engage 50% of all families and 90% of two-parent families in work activities. However, these standards are reduced by caseload reduction from FY2005. Further, states may get an extra credit against these standards by spending more than required under the TANF MOE. Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% or 90% targets, and vary by state. In FY2010, states achieved an all-family participation rate of 29.0% and a two-parent rate of 33.4%. That year, eight jurisdictions failed the all-family standard, and six jurisdictions failed the two-parent standard. States that fail to meet work standards are *at risk* of being penalized by a reduction in their block grant.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Current Topics.....	1
What Is TANF’s Current Funding Status?.....	1
What Is TANF’s Funding Level?.....	1
Did the Cash Assistance Caseload Rise During the Recent Recession?.....	2
What Is the Administration’s “Waiver” Initiative?.....	2
Has Any State Formally Applied for a “Waiver” of TANF Work Participation Standards?	2
May States Require Drug Testing of Assistance Recipients?	2
History	3
When Was the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant Created?.....	3
Has Legislation Modified TANF Since the 1996 Law?	3
Funding and Expenditures	4
How Much Has the TANF Grant Declined in Value Because of Inflation?	4
How Have States Used TANF Funds?.....	5
How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?.....	6
The Caseload	7
How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services?	7
How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Cash Assistance?	7
How Does the Current Cash Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels?	7
What Are the Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families?	8
TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month?	10
TANF Work Participation Standards	14
What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?.....	14
Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law?	14
What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?.....	15
What Has Been the National Average All-Family Work Participation Rate?.....	15
How Many Jurisdictions Have Failed the All-Families Standard From FY2002 Through FY2010?.....	16
Are States that Recently Failed the All-Family Standard Being Penalized?.....	19
Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?	19

Figures

Figure 1. Federal TANF and State MOE Funds Used in FY2012, by Major Benefit and Service Category.....	6
Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance: July 1959-March 2013	8
Figure 3. Composition of the Cash Assistance Caseload: FY2010.....	9
Figure 4. National Average All-Families Work Participation Rate: FY2002-FY2010	16

Tables

Table 1. Federal TANF Funding: FY2006 Through FY2013	1
Table 2. Basic TANF Block Grant in Constant 1997 Dollars	4
Table 3. TANF Cash Assistance Caseload: March 2013.....	7
Table 4. Maximum Monthly TANF Cash Benefit for a Family of Three: July 2011.....	10
Table 5. Maximum Monthly TANF Cash Assistance Benefits by Family Size: July 2011	12
Table 6. States Failing TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard: FY2002-FY2010	17
Table 7. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2002-FY2010.....	19
Table A-1. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2003-FY2006	22
Table A-2. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2011-FY2013	23
Table A-3. Use of TANF and State Maintenance of Effort Funds: FY2012	23
Table B-1. Use of FY2012 TANF and MOE Funds by Category	24
Table B-2. Use of FY2012 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percent of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding	26
Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2012	29
Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Cash Assistance, March 2013.....	30
Table B-5. Number of Families Receiving TANF Cash Assistance, March 1994, 2007, 2012, and 2013	32
Table B-6. Families Receiving TANF Cash Assistance, by Number of Parents Receiving Assistance on Their Own Behalf: March 2013.....	34
Table B-7. TANF All-Family Work Participation Rate by State: FY2002 Through FY2010.....	36
Table B-8. TANF Two-Parent Work Participation Rate: FY2002-FY2010	38

Appendixes

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables	22
Appendix B. State Tables.....	24

Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	39
---------------------------------	----

Introduction

This report provides responses to frequently asked questions about the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant. It is intended to serve as a quick reference to provide easy access to information and data. This report does not provide information on TANF program rules. For such information, see CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk. For a non-technical overview of TANF, see CRS Report R40946, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant: An Introduction*, by Gene Falk.

Current Topics

What Is TANF's Current Funding Status?

H.R. 2775, as it cleared Congress and was signed by the President, funds TANF through January 15, 2014. It funds TANF at the same levels as were provided in FY2013 through that date. It makes no changes in TANF policies.

What Is TANF's Funding Level?

Table 1 shows TANF funding for FY2006 through FY2013. The bulk of TANF funding is in a basic block grant (the state family assistance grant), which provides annual funding totaling \$16.5 billion for the 50 states and District of Columbia. This grant and amount was established in the 1996 welfare reform law and has not been changed since then.

Table 1. Federal TANF Funding: FY2006 Through FY2013

(Dollars in millions)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
State family assistance grant	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489	\$16,489
Supplemental grants	319	319	319	319	319	211	0	0
Healthy marriage/responsible fatherhood grants	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150
Grants to the territories	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78
Grants for tribal work programs	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Regular contingency funds	93	59	428	1,107	212	334	612	610 ^a
Emergency contingency funds				617	4,383			
Totals	17,137	17,103	17,472	18,768	21,639	17,270	17,337	17,335

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from HHS.

- a. P.L. 112-275 appropriated \$612 million to the TANF contingency fund for FY2013 and reserved \$2 million of these funds for a commission on child abuse and neglect fatalities. Thus, \$610 million is available for FY2013 TANF contingency fund grants to states.

In addition to federal TANF funds, states are required in total to contribute, from their own funds, at least \$10.4 billion per year for TANF-related activities for low-income families with children. This level of state funding, known as *maintenance-of-effort* (MOE) funding, was also established in the 1996 welfare law and has not been changed since then.

Did the Cash Assistance Caseload Rise During the Recent Recession?

The TANF cash assistance caseload rose from August 2008 through December 2010, increasing 17% from 1,675,297 families in July 2008 to a peak of 1,952,451 families in December 2010. The caseload has declined since then, standing at 1,753,668 in March 2013.

What Is the Administration’s “Waiver” Initiative?

On July 12, 2012, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announced that it would accept applications for “waivers” of the TANF work participation standards. In general, these are waivers of the way the performance of state welfare-to-work programs are assessed. (The requirements that apply to individuals are determined by the states, but the federal TANF work participation standards influenced the design of state programs and requirements.) For a discussion, see CRS Report R42627, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): Welfare Waivers*, by Gene Falk.

Has Any State Formally Applied for a “Waiver” of TANF Work Participation Standards?

As of September 27, 2013, no states had formally applied for a waiver of TANF work participation standards under the Administration’s waiver initiative.

May States Require Drug Testing of Assistance Recipients?

Yes. The 1996 assistance reform law gave states the *option* of requiring drug tests for assistance recipients and penalizing those who fail such tests. (See Section 902 of P.L. 104-193.) However, specific state policies regarding drug testing raise constitutional issues. See CRS Report R42326, *Constitutional Analysis of Suspicionless Drug Testing Requirements for the Receipt of Governmental Benefits*, by David H. Carpenter.

The 1996 welfare reform law contained two other provisions related to drug abuse and TANF applicants or recipients. The law established a lifetime ban on eligibility for TANF and food stamps for those convicted of a drug-related felony. However, states may either opt out entirely or modify and limit this lifetime ban. (See Section 115 of P.L. 104-193.)

Further, TANF allows states to establish Individual Responsibility Plans (IRPs) for their TANF families. The IRP may require participation in a substance abuse treatment program. A family may be sanctioned for failure to comply with its IRP.

For a discussion of states that require drug testing in TANF and related programs, see CRS Report R42394, *Drug Testing and Crime-Related Restrictions in TANF, SNAP, and Housing Assistance*, by Maggie McCarty et al.

History

When Was the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant Created?

The TANF block grant was created by the 1996 welfare reform law, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA, P.L. 104-193). PRWORA is also referred to in this report as the 1996 welfare reform law. TANF replaced the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), which dated back to the Social Security Act of 1935, and several other related programs.

Has Legislation Modified TANF Since the 1996 Law?

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (P.L. 105-33) included provisions establishing “welfare-to-work” grants for FY1998 and FY1999 and made several other policy and technical changes to TANF. No new welfare-to-work grants were made after FY1999.

The original funding authority for TANF ended on September 30, 2002. Over the four-year period from 2002 through 2005, Congress considered, but did not pass, legislation to modify and reauthorize TANF (see CRS Report RL33418, *Welfare Reauthorization in the 109th Congress: An Overview*, by Gene Falk, Melinda Gish, and Carmen Solomon-Fears). Over this four-year period, Congress passed 12 “temporary extensions” of TANF and related programs as stop-gap measures until it could reach agreement on a longer-term reauthorization. (See **Appendix A, Table A-1** for a listing of the temporary extensions.)

The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA, P.L. 109-171) included a long-term extension of funding for TANF through FY2010. It also modified TANF work participation standards; established \$100 million per year in TANF research and technical assistance funds for “healthy marriage promotion” initiatives; and provided \$50 million per year for “responsible fatherhood initiatives.” (For a discussion of TANF provisions in the DRA, see CRS Report RS22369, *TANF, Child Care, Marriage Promotion, and Responsible Fatherhood Provisions in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171)*, by Gene Falk.) The Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-291) provided that healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood initiatives would be funded at \$75 million each for FY2011. Temporary extension legislation continued these activities for FY2012 and FY2013 at \$75 million for responsible fatherhood and \$75 million for healthy marriage initiatives.

P.L. 112-96 (the law that extended the payroll tax cut through 2012) provided TANF funding through the end of FY2012. It provided FY2012 funding for the basic TANF block grant, healthy

marriage and responsible fatherhood competitive grants, and certain other funds at their FY2011 levels. It did not provide FY2012 funding for TANF supplemental grants.

In addition, P.L. 112-96

- prevents electronic benefit transaction access to TANF cash at liquor stores, casinos, and strip clubs; states are required to prohibit access to TANF cash at Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) at such establishments; and
- requires states to report TANF data in a manner that facilitates the exchange of that data with other programs' data systems.

Legislation that extended TANF funding for FY2013 did not include policy changes.

Funding and Expenditures

How Much Has the TANF Grant Declined in Value Because of Inflation?

From FY1997 (the first full year of TANF funding) through FY2012 (ended September 30, 2012), the real value of the TANF block grant declined by 30.1%. **Table 2** shows the impact of inflation on the value of the TANF block grant for each year, FY1997 through FY2012.

Table 2. Basic TANF Block Grant in Constant 1997 Dollars

Fiscal Year	Value of the Block Grant in Millions of FY1997 Dollars	Percentage Change from FY1997 Value
1997	\$16.5	
1998	16.2	-1.6%
1999	15.9	-3.5
2000	15.4	-6.4
2001	14.9	-9.4
2002	14.7	-10.7
2003	14.4	-12.7
2004	14.1	-14.7
2005	13.6	-17.4
2006	13.1	-20.4
2007	12.8	-22.2
2008	12.3	-25.5
2009	12.3	-25.3
2010	12.1	-26.5
2011	11.8	-28.4
2012	11.5	-30.1

Source: Congressional Research Service. Constant dollars were computed using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U).

How Have States Used TANF Funds?


TANF is best known as a funding source of cash assistance benefits for needy families with children. However, states have considerable discretion in using TANF funds, and have used them for a wide range of benefits and services.

Figure 1 shows the uses of federal TANF grants to states and state MOE funds in FY2012. In FY2012, a total of \$31.4 billion of both federal TANF and state MOE expenditures were either expended or transferred to other block grant programs. Basic assistance, the category that most closely reflects cash assistance, represented 28.6% (\$9.0 billion) of total FY2012 TANF and MOE dollars.

TANF is a major contributor of child care funding. In FY2012, 16.0% of all TANF funds used were either expended on child care or transferred to the child care block grant (the Child Care and Development Fund, or CCDF). TANF is also a major contributor to the child welfare system, which provides foster care, adoption assistance, and services to families with children who either have experienced or are at risk of experiencing child abuse or neglect. However, TANF's accounting system does a poor job of capturing expenditures associated with spending on the child welfare system. Most TANF funding for these programs is subsumed in the catch-all "other" expenditure category.

Figure I. Federal TANF and State MOE Funds Used in FY2012, by Major Benefit and Service Category

Total = \$31.4 billion



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) with data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

See **Appendix A, Table A-3** for dollar amounts of total federal TANF and state MOE funds associated with each of these categories. For state-specific information on the use of TANF funds, see **Table B-1** and **Table B-2**.

How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent?

TANF law permits states to “reserve” unused funds without time limit. This permits flexibility in timing of the use of TANF funds, including the ability to “save” funds for unexpected occurrences that might increase costs (such as recessions or natural disasters).

At the end of FY2012 (September 30, 2012, the latest data currently available), a total of \$3.1 billion of federal TANF funding remained neither transferred nor spent. However, some of these unspent funds represent monies that states had already committed to spend later. At the end of FY2012, states had made such commitments to spend—that is, had obligated—a total of \$1.4 billion. Generally, obligations are binding commitments to spend, and they come in the form of contracts and grants to provide benefits and services. However, the definition of “obligation” varies from program to program, and because TANF essentially consists of 54 different programs (one for each state, the District of Columbia, and the territories), what constitutes an obligation may vary.

At the end of FY2012, states also had \$1.7 billion of “unobligated balances.” These funds are available to states to make *new* spending commitments. **Table B-3** shows unspent TANF funds by state.

The Caseload

How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services?

This number is not known. Federal TANF reporting requirements focus on families receiving only ongoing cash *assistance*, with no complete reporting on families receiving other TANF benefits and services. As discussed in a previous section of this report, TANF basic assistance accounts for about 28.6% of all TANF expenditures. Therefore, the federal reporting requirements that pertain to families receiving “assistance” are very likely to undercount the number of families receiving any TANF-funded benefit or service.

How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Cash Assistance?

Table 3 provides cash assistance caseload information. A total of 1.8 million families, composed of 4.1 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded cash in March 2013. The bulk of the “recipients” were children—3.1 million in that month. For state-by-state cash assistance caseloads, see **Appendix B**.

Table 3. TANF Cash Assistance Caseload: March 2013

Families	1,753,668
Total Recipients	4,097,377
Children	3,094,144
Adults	1,003,233

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).


Notes: TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

How Does the Current Cash Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels?

The number of families receiving cash assistance peaked in March 1994 at 5.1 million families. The cash assistance caseload fell rapidly in the late 1990s (after the 1996 welfare reform law) before leveling off in 2001. In 2004, the caseload began another decline, albeit at a slower pace than in the late 1990s. Nationally, the caseload began to rise beginning in August 2008, peaking in December 2010 at close to 2.0 million families.

Figure 2 provides a long-term historical perspective on the number of families receiving cash assistance, from July 1959 to March 2013.

Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance: July 1959-March 2013



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) with data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: Represents families receiving cash assistance from Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and TANF. For October 1999 through March 2013, includes families receiving assistance from Separate State Programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-5 shows recent trends in the number of cash assistance families by state.

What Are the Characteristics of Cash Assistance Families?


Historically, the “typical” cash assistance family has been headed by a single parent (usually the mother) with one or two children. The single parent has also typically been unemployed.

However, the cash assistance caseload decline has occurred together with a major shift in the composition of the rolls. Today, less than half of all cash assistance families are headed by an unemployed adult recipient. Almost 4 in 10 of all cash assistance families had no adult recipient

or work-eligible individual at all, with the adults in the family ineligible for aid and the benefits paid only on behalf of the child (these are known as “child-only” families). This shift occurred because the caseload decline was concentrated among the families thought of as the “typical” cash assistance families, and welfare-to-work efforts have been concentrated on this population.

Figure 3 shows the composition of the cash assistance caseload in FY2010. Families with an unemployed adult recipient represent 46% of all cash assistance families. Families with an employed (in a regular job) adult recipient, who receive cash assistance as an earnings supplement, comprise an additional 15% of the cash assistance rolls. Within the “child-only” portion of the caseload, families with a parent (usually a disabled parent) receiving SSI and the children receiving TANF as a supplement to that benefit represent 10% of the cash assistance caseload. Families that are made up of children living with a non-parent relative (grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc.) represent 13% of the cash assistance caseload. Families of child citizens living with ineligible parents who are noncitizens or who have not reported their citizenship status make up 11% of the total cash assistance caseload. The remainder of the cash assistance caseload represents child recipients for whom data on the adults they live with are not available.

Figure 3. Composition of the Cash Assistance Caseload: FY2010



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulations of the FY2010 TANF National Data Files.

Notes: Includes families receiving assistance from Separate State Programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. Families with an adult include families with nonrecipient parents who are “work-eligible.” Most non-recipient parents who are “work-eligible” are those who have reached time limits or have been sanctioned off the rolls in states that permit continuation of aid to children of such parents.

For more information on the characteristics and the changes in the composition of the cash assistance caseload, see CRS Report R43187, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): Characteristics of the Cash Assistance Caseload*, by Gene Falk.

TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month?

There are *no* federal rules that help determine the amount of TANF cash benefits paid to a family. (There are also no federal rules that require states to use TANF to pay cash benefits, though all states do so.) Benefit amounts are determined solely by the states.

Table 4 shows the maximum monthly TANF cash benefit by state for a family of three in July 2011.¹ The benefit amounts shown are those for a single-parent family with two children. Some states vary their benefit amounts for other family types such as two-parent families or “child-only” cases. States also vary their benefits by other factors such as housing costs and sub-state geography.

Most states base TANF cash benefit amounts on family size, paying larger cash benefits to larger families on the presumption that they have greater financial needs. The maximum monthly cash benefit is usually paid to a family that receives no other income (e.g., no earned or unearned income) and complies with program rules. Families with income other than TANF often are paid a reduced benefit. Moreover, some families are financially sanctioned for failure to meet a program requirement (e.g., a work requirement), and are also paid a lower benefit.

The table also shows the benefit amounts relative to poverty-level income. TANF pays a family in cash only a fraction of poverty level income (as officially determined and published by the Department of Health and Human Services). For a family of three, the maximum TANF benefit paid in July 2011 varied from \$170 per month in Mississippi (11.0% of poverty-level income) to \$923 per month in Alaska (47.8% of poverty-level income).²

Table 4. Maximum Monthly TANF Cash Benefit for a Family of Three: July 2011

State	Maximum Monthly Benefit for a Family of 3	Maximum Monthly Benefit as a Percent of the 2011 Federal Poverty Guidelines
Alabama	\$215	13.9%
Alaska	923	47.8
Arizona	278	18.0

¹ States are not required to report to the federal government their cash assistance benefit amounts in either the TANF state plan (under Section 402 of the Social Security Act) or in annual program reports (under Section 411 of the Social Security Act). The benefit amounts shown are from the “Welfare Rules Database,” maintained by the Urban Institute and funded by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

² Different poverty thresholds, with greater dollar amounts, apply in Alaska than in the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia. New York’s benefit of \$753 per month represents 48.8% of the poverty guidelines that apply in the 48 contiguous states and District of Columbia.

State	Maximum Monthly Benefit for a Family of 3	Maximum Monthly Benefit as a Percent of the 2011 Federal Poverty Guidelines
Arkansas	204	13.2
California	638	41.3
Colorado	462	29.9
Connecticut	674	43.6
Delaware	338	21.9
District of Columbia	428	27.7
Florida	303	19.6
Georgia	280	18.1
Hawaii	610	34.3
Idaho	309	20.0
Illinois	432	28.0
Indiana	288	18.7
Iowa	426	27.6
Kansas	429	27.8
Kentucky	262	17.0
Louisiana	240	15.5
Maine	485	31.4
Maryland	574	37.2
Massachusetts	633	41.0
Michigan	492	31.9
Minnesota	532	34.5
Mississippi	170	11.0
Missouri	292	18.9
Montana	504	32.6
Nebraska	364	23.6
Nevada	383	24.8
New Hampshire	675	43.7
New Jersey	424	27.5
New Mexico	380	24.6
New York	753	48.8
North Carolina	272	17.6
North Dakota	427	27.7
Ohio	434	28.1
Oklahoma	292	18.9
Oregon	506	32.8

State	Maximum Monthly Benefit for a Family of 3	Maximum Monthly Benefit as a Percent of the 2011 Federal Poverty Guidelines
Pennsylvania	421	27.3
Rhode Island	554	35.9
South Carolina	221	14.3
South Dakota	555	35.9
Tennessee	185	12.0
Texas	260	16.8
Utah	498	32.3
Vermont	665	43.1
Virginia	389	25.2
Washington	478	31.0
West Virginia	340	22.0
Wisconsin	628	40.7
Wyoming	577	37.4
Median State	427	27.7
Maximum	923	48.8
Minimum	170	11.0

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) with data from the Urban Institute's "Welfare Rules Database."

As discussed above, most states vary maximum benefits by family size, paying larger benefits for larger families. The exceptions are Idaho and Wisconsin, which pay a flat maximum benefit. Additionally, some states do not increase benefits—or provide a smaller than usual increase in benefits—for a family already on the rolls when a new baby is born. This is known as the “family cap” policy, which 17 states had in July 2011.³

Table 5. Maximum Monthly TANF Cash Assistance Benefits by Family Size: July 2011
Benefits for a Single Parent and Children

State	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six
Alabama	\$190	\$215	\$245	\$275	\$305
Alaska	821	923	1,025	1,127	1,229
Arizona	220	278	334	392	449
Arkansas	162	204	247	286	331

³ States that had a family cap policy as of July 2011 are Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

State	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six
California	516	638	762	866	972
Colorado	364	462	561	665	767
Connecticut	544	674	786	886	992
Delaware	270	338	407	475	544
District of Columbia	336	428	523	602	708
Florida	241	303	364	426	487
Georgia	235	280	330	378	410
Hawaii	486	610	736	861	986
Idaho	309	309	309	309	309
Illinois	318	432	474	555	623
Indiana	230	288	347	405	464
Iowa	361	426	495	548	610
Kansas	352	429	497	558	619
Kentucky	225	262	328	383	432
Louisiana	188	240	284	327	366
Maine	363	485	611	733	856
Maryland	453	574	695	805	885
Massachusetts	531	633	731	832	936
Michigan	403	492	597	694	828
Minnesota	437	532	621	697	773
Mississippi	146	170	194	218	242
Missouri	234	292	342	388	431
Montana	401	504	606	709	812
Nebraska	293	364	435	506	577
Nevada	318	383	448	513	578
New Hampshire	606	675	738	798	879
New Jersey	322	424	488	552	616
New Mexico	304	380	459	536	613
New York	548	753	905	1,063	1,172
North Carolina	236	272	297	324	349
North Dakota	328	427	523	620	717
Ohio	355	434	536	627	698
Oklahoma	225	292	361	422	483
Oregon	432	506	621	721	833
Pennsylvania	330	421	514	607	687
Rhode Island	449	554	634	714	794

State	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six
South Carolina	175	221	266	311	355
South Dakota	496	555	613	671	730
Tennessee	142	185	226	264	305
Texas	225	260	312	347	399
Utah	399	498	583	663	731
Vermont	560	665	751	842	904
Virginia	323	389	451	537	570
Washington	385	478	562	648	736
West Virginia	301	340	384	420	460
Wisconsin	628	628	628	628	628
Wyoming	543	577	577	611	611

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) with data from the Urban Institute’s “Welfare Rules Database.”

TANF Work Participation Standards

What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet?

The TANF statute requires states to have 50% of their caseload meet standards of participation in work or activities—that is, a family member must be in specified activities for a minimum number of hours.⁴ There is a separate participation standard that applies to the two-parent portion of a state’s caseload, requiring 90% of the state’s two-parent caseload to meet participation standards. States that fail the TANF work participation standards are at risk of being penalized by a reduction in their block grant amounts.

However, the statutory work participation standards are reduced by a “caseload reduction credit.” The caseload reduction credit reduces the participation standard one percentage point for each percentage point decline in a state’s caseload. Additionally, under a regulatory provision, a state may get “extra” credit for caseload reduction if it spends more than required under the TANF MOE. Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% and 90% targets, and vary by state.

Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law?

The 50% and 90% target standards that states face, as well as the caseload reduction credit, date back to the 1996 welfare reform law. However, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171) made several changes to the work participation rules effective in FY2007:

⁴ Some families are excluded from the participation rate calculation.


- The caseload reduction credit was changed to measure caseload reduction from FY2005, rather than the original law's FY1995.
- The work participation standards were broadened to include families receiving cash aid in "separate state programs." Separate state programs are programs run with state funds, distinct from a state's "TANF program," but with expenditures countable toward the TANF MOE.
- HHS was instructed to provide definition to the allowable TANF work activities listed in law. HHS was also required to define what is meant by a "work-eligible" individual, expanding the number of families that are included in the work participation calculation.
- States were required to develop plans and procedures to verify work activities.

What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved?

HHS computes two work participation rates for each state that are then compared with the effective (after-credit) standard to determine if it has met the TANF work standard. An "all-families" work participation rate is computed and compared with the all-families effective standard (50% minus the state's caseload reduction credit). HHS also computes a two-parent work participation rate that is compared with the two-parent effective standard (90% minus the state's caseload reduction credit).

What Has Been the National Average All-Family Work Participation Rate?

Figure 4 shows the national average all-families work participation rate for FY2002 through FY2010. For the period FY2002 through FY2010, states have achieved an all-families work participation rate hovering around 30%. In FY2010, the all-families work participation rate was 29.0%. This is well below the statutory target of 50% for all families, but most (not all) states met the standard because of credits against the 50% standard.

Figure 4. National Average All-Families Work Participation Rate: FY2002-FY2010

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: FY2002 through FY2006 work participation rates are based on federal work participation standard rules. They exclude the effects of “grandfathered” waivers of pre-1996. The 1996 welfare reform law gave states the option to continue their pre-reform “waiver” programs and have their work participation rates based on the rules of the state waivers, not the federal rules. The last of these pre-1996 waivers expired in 2006. The all family work participation rates for FY2002 through FY2006 that include the effect of the waivers are slightly higher than the rates shown here.

How Many Jurisdictions Have Failed the All-Families Standard From FY2002 Through FY2010?

Table 6 shows which states failed the TANF all-families work participation standards from FY2002 through FY2010. Before FY2007 (the first year policies under the DRA were effective), only a few jurisdictions failed to meet TANF all-families work participation standards. In FY2006, three jurisdictions failed the standard, and that was the greatest number that failed the standards over the FY2002 through FY2006 period.

However, in FY2007 15 jurisdictions failed to meet the all-families standard. This number declined to 9 in FY2008 and 8 in FY2009. In FY2010 (the most recent year for which data are available), 8 jurisdictions failed to meet the standard. Of these, 6 (California, Maine, Ohio, Oregon, Puerto Rico, and Guam) failed the standards in all years since FY2007.

**Table 6. States Failing TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard:
FY2002-FY2010**

Changes to TANF Work Participation Standard Rules Under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA)
Effective in FY2007

	Pre-DRA Policies					Post-DRA Policies			
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Alabama									
Alaska									
Arizona									
Arkansas									
California						X	X	X	X
Colorado									
Connecticut					X				
Delaware									
District of Columbia								X	X
Florida									
Georgia									
Hawaii									
Idaho									
Illinois									
Indiana				X	X	X			
Iowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky						X			
Louisiana									
Maine						X	X	X	X
Maryland									
Massachusetts									
Michigan						X	X		X
Minnesota						X			
Mississippi									
Missouri							X	X	
Montana									
Nebraska									
Nevada		X				X			
New Hampshire									
New Jersey									
New Mexico						X			

	Pre-DRA Policies					Post-DRA Policies			
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New York									
North Carolina									
North Dakota									
Ohio						X	X	X	X
Oklahoma									
Oregon						X	X	X	X
Pennsylvania									
Puerto Rico						X	X	X	X
Rhode Island									
South Carolina									
South Dakota									
Tennessee									
Texas									
Utah									
Vermont						X			
Virginia									
Washington									
West Virginia						X	X		
Wisconsin									
Wyoming									
Guam	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Virgin Islands						X			
Number of Jurisdictions Failing Standard	1	2	1	2	3	15	9	8	8

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

As shown in **Figure 4** there was little change in the national average all-families work participation rate from FY2007 through FY2010. However, following a spike in the number of states failing the standard in FY2007, the number of states failing fell to nine in FY2008 and eight in both FY2009 and FY2010. Some of the decline in the number of states failing the standard is attributable to the increased use of “extra” credit states received for spending beyond what is required by law. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) study found that, in FY2009, 32 of the 45 states that met their standard claimed this “extra credit.” GAO calculated that 17 of these states would not have met their participation standards without claiming the “extra” credit for spending beyond what was required by law.⁵

⁵ See U.S. Government Accountability Office, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families: Update on Families Served (continued...)

Are States that Recently Failed the All-Family Standard Being Penalized?

States that fail to meet the TANF work participation standard are at *risk* of being penalized through a reduction in their block grant. However, penalties can be forgiven if a state claims, and the Secretary of HHS finds, that it had “reasonable cause” for failing the standard. Penalties can also be forgiven for states that enter into “corrective compliance plans,” and subsequently meet the work standard. HHS has not announced the status of penalties for failing to meet the all-families standard for FY2007 and subsequent years.

Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?

In addition to meeting a work standard for all families, TANF also imposes a second, 90% standard for the two-parent portion of its cash assistance caseload. This standard too can be reduced for caseload reduction.

Table 7 shows whether each state met its two-parent work participation standard for FY2002 through FY2012. However, the display on the table is more complex than that for reporting whether a state failed its “all family” rate. A substantial number of states have reported *no* two-parent families subject to the work participation standard.⁶ These states are denoted on the table with an “NA,” indicating that the two-parent standard was not applicable to the state in that year. For states with two-parent families in its caseload, the table reports “Yes” for states that met the two-parent standard, and “No” for states that failed the two-parent standard.

In FY2010, 25 jurisdictions reported that no two-parent families were included in the TANF work participation standard calculation. Of the 29 jurisdictions that had two-parent families in their TANF work participation calculation, 23 met the standard and 6 did not.

Table 7. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2002-FY2010

(“Yes” indicates a state met the standard; “No” indicates the state failed to meet the standard; and “NA” means the standard was not applicable to the state in that year (no two-parent families in its caseload).)

	Pre-DRA Policies					Post-DRA Policies			
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Alaska	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Arizona	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

(...continued)

and Work Participation. Statement of Kay E. Brown, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security. Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, GAO-11-990T, September 8, 2011, p. 12, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/126892.pdf>.

⁶ Before the changes made by the DRA were effective, a number of states had their two-parent families in separate state programs that were not included in the work participation calculation. When DRA brought families receiving assistance in separate state programs into the work participation rate calculations, a number of states moved these families into solely-state-funded programs. These are state-funded programs with expenditures *not* countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, and hence are outside of TANF’s rules.

	Pre-DRA Policies					Post-DRA Policies			
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Arkansas	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Colorado	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Columbia	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	YES
Idaho	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NO	YES	YES	YES
Iowa	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kansas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kentucky	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
Louisiana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	YES	NO	NO	NO
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES
Michigan	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NO	NO	NO	NO
New Hampshire	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
New York	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
Oklahoma	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO

	Pre-DRA Policies					Post-DRA Policies			
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pennsylvania	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
South Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
West Virginia	NO	NO	NA	NA	NA	NO	NA	NA	YES
Wisconsin	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	Yes	Yes
Wyoming	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Guam	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Number of Jurisdictions without Two-Parent Families	24	25	29	29	30	24	26	27	25
Number of Jurisdictions with Two-Parent Families	30	29	25	25	24	30	28	27	29
Number of Jurisdictions Meeting the Two-Parent Standard	25	25	21	23	21	22	22	20	23
Number of States Failing the Two-Parent Standard	5	4	4	2	3	8	6	7	6

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Failure to meet the two-parent standard alone typically has smaller financial consequences for the state than failure to meet the all-family standard or failure to meet both the all-family and two-parent standards. Under HHS regulations, if a state fails only the two-parent standard, the penalty reduction in the block grant is prorated for the share of the overall cash assistance caseload that represents two-parent families. Two-parent families typically account for a small share of the overall cash assistance caseload.

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

Table A-1. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2003-FY2006

Public Law	Time Period	Notes
P.L. 107-229	Oct. 1, 2002-Dec. 31, 2002	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 107-294	Jan. 1, 2003-Mar. 31, 2003	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 108-7	Apr. 1, 2003-June 30, 2003	Extension as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act.
P.L. 108-40	July 1, 2003-Sept. 30, 2003	Free-standing bill that amended the Social Security Act to extend TANF and related programs.
P.L. 108-89	Oct. 1, 2003-Mar. 31, 2004	Multipurpose bill that extended programs through the first half of FY2004.
P.L. 108-210	Apr. 1, 2004-June 30, 2004	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the program through June 30, 2004.
P.L. 108-262	July 1, 2004-Sept. 30, 2004	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the program through Sept. 30, 2004.
P.L. 108-308	Oct. 1, 2004- Mar. 31, 2005	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through Mar. 31, 2005.
P.L. 109-4	Apr. 1, 2005-June 30, 2005	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through June 30, 2005.
P.L. 109-19	July 1, 2005-Sept. 30, 2005	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through Sept. 30, 2005.
P.L. 109-68	Oct. 1, 2005-Dec. 31, 2005	Bill to provide extra funding to help states provide benefits to families affected by Hurricane Katrina, suspend certain requirements in states affected by the hurricane, and extend the funding authority for the programs through December 31, 2005.
P.L. 109-161	Jan. 1, 2006-Mar. 31, 2006	Freestanding bill that extended funding authority for the programs through March 31, 2006. It reduced the bonus for reducing out-of-wedlock births for FY2006-FY2010 to offset the costs of the temporary extension.

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Table A-2. Temporary Extensions of TANF, FY2011-FY2013

Public Law	Time Period	Notes
P.L. 111-242	Oct. 1, 2010-Dec. 3, 2010	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 111-290	Dec. 4, 2010-Dec. 7, 2010	Extension as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 111-291	Dec. 8, 2010-Sept. 30, 2011 (except supplemental grants, Dec. 8, 2010-June 30, 2011)	Extension as part of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010. It funded supplemental grants only through the first three quarters of FY2011 and at a reduced rate.
P.L. 112-35	Oct. 1, 2011-Dec. 31, 2011	Free-standing bill to extend TANF for three months. No funding for TANF supplemental grants.
P.L. 112-78	Jan 1, 2012-February 21, 2012	Extension of TANF for two months, as part of a bill to provide a two-month extension for the 2011 payroll tax reduction, extended unemployment compensation, and other expiring provisions.
P.L. 112-96	February 22, 2012-Sept. 30, 2012	Extension of TANF for the remainder of FY2012 included as part of a bill to extend the 2011 payroll tax reduction, unemployment compensation, and other expiring provisions.
P.L. 112-175	Oct. 1, 2011-March 27, 2013	Extension of TANF for the first six months of FY2013 as part of a continuing resolution.
P.L. 113-6	March 28, 2013-Sept. 30, 2013	Extension of TANF for the remainder of FY2013 as part of a continuing resolution.

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Table A-3. Use of TANF and State Maintenance of Effort Funds: FY2012

	Millions of Dollars	Percent of Total Federal and MOE Funds
Basic Assistance	\$8,982.2	28.6%
Administration	2,254.0	7.2
Work Expenditures	2,163.1	6.9
Child Care	5,022.4	16.0
Other Work Supports	3,004.5	9.6
Other	9,931.9	31.7
Totals	31,358.1	100.0

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Appendix B. State Tables

Table B-1. Use of FY2012 TANF and MOE Funds by Category

(Dollars in millions)

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work Expenditures	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other	Totals
Alabama	\$49.6	\$19.7	\$22.9	\$5.5	\$6.8	\$66.4	\$170.9
Alaska	41.3	5.2	11.1	21.8	1.0	4.9	85.5
Arizona	49.3	39.2	9.6	-1.1	2.0	247.0	345.9
Arkansas	14.6	9.0	32.5	10.7	3.8	104.0	174.6
California	3,285.2	569.0	528.0	793.0	164.7	1,142.7	6,482.7
Colorado	70.7	20.4	3.9	-30.8	8.7	192.8	265.8
Connecticut	81.1	31.4	16.8	35.8	5.0	323.6	493.7
Delaware	19.1	7.8	4.9	45.1	-0.4	11.5	88.1
District of Columbia	35.8	7.6	10.7	56.5	16.6	47.3	174.3
Florida	169.5	32.3	58.7	333.3	4.5	377.6	975.8
Georgia	43.9	23.9	20.7	23.3	10.9	399.9	522.7
Hawaii	69.2	15.7	93.6	25.3	3.5	59.7	267.0
Idaho	7.2	4.8	6.6	11.0	0.3	13.1	43.0
Illinois	127.4	33.1	33.8	624.5	15.7	351.2	1,185.7
Indiana	40.7	23.3	20.7	38.7	32.0	92.3	247.6
Iowa	66.4	15.2	17.8	45.1	17.9	64.1	226.5
Kansas	33.1	12.1	0.7	20.0	63.9	53.2	183.0
Kentucky	112.2	12.8	36.5	98.4	20.3	27.2	307.4

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work Expenditures	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other	Totals
Louisiana	17.9	20.0	7.9	5.2	22.7	187.4	261.0
Maine	69.6	3.7	12.2	10.8	17.0	1.8	115.0
Maryland	141.7	42.1	48.6	23.6	130.9	182.7	569.6
Massachusetts	360.0	37.5	6.7	301.9	107.4	353.8	1,167.3
Michigan	253.1	165.1	82.3	22.4	239.4	821.7	1,584.0
Minnesota	86.4	42.5	63.6	122.7	142.0	48.0	505.2
Mississippi	19.0	3.8	23.8	19.1	22.7	18.2	106.6
Missouri	91.9	11.1	17.8	69.3	0.0	222.9	413.0
Montana	15.6	9.0	11.4	12.2	0.0	8.3	56.5
Nebraska	25.4	4.6	18.9	23.5	35.4	2.5	110.4
Nevada	43.7	8.8	1.6	0.9	1.3	42.7	99.0
New Hampshire	29.7	13.4	7.2	6.4	1.4	18.6	76.7
New Jersey	209.9	63.3	74.9	78.9	185.7	494.6	1,107.2
New Mexico	63.9	9.3	8.8	30.5	47.2	46.4	206.0
New York	1,470.9	364.2	151.2	468.8	1,423.4	1,520.7	5,399.3
North Carolina	64.2	41.5	46.2	177.2	60.0	233.9	623.0
North Dakota	5.9	4.1	4.4	1.0	1.5	20.5	37.3
Ohio	366.0	112.3	44.7	443.9	13.6	115.7	1,096.4
Oklahoma	21.8	23.6	0.0	58.7	26.9	61.2	192.1
Oregon	152.1	35.7	13.5	9.5	2.2	131.6	344.7
Pennsylvania	293.7	88.5	104.4	430.9	14.4	154.9	1,086.8
Rhode Island	36.9	12.6	8.4	22.7	13.8	67.9	162.3
South Carolina	31.4	13.5	14.3	4.1	2.1	83.1	148.5
South Dakota	14.2	2.5	4.1	0.8	0.1	7.8	29.5

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work Expenditures	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other	Totals
Tennessee	118.5	34.0	68.9	82.4	0.0	68.9	372.6
Texas	92.6	73.0	83.7	26.9	6.9	631.4	914.5
Utah	26.6	8.8	24.8	7.5	2.0	34.4	104.0
Vermont	18.3	6.2	0.2	24.0	22.4	10.9	82.0
Virginia	104.1	20.8	51.4	42.6	8.4	79.5	306.7
Washington	242.0	55.2	171.5	125.2	1.3	465.9	1,061.1
West Virginia	33.0	13.6	1.9	28.4	27.5	40.3	144.6
Wisconsin	137.2	24.4	52.6	180.6	47.8	160.9	603.4
Wyoming	8.7	3.0	1.8	3.7	0.0	14.3	31.4
Totals	8,982.2	2,254.0	2,163.1	5,022.4	3,004.5	9,931.9	31,358.1

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), with data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Table B-2. Use of FY2012 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percent of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work Expenditures	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other	Totals
Alabama	29.0%	11.5%	13.4%	3.2%	4.0%	38.9%	100.0%
Alaska	48.4	6.1	13.0	25.5	1.2	5.8	100.0
Arizona	14.2	11.3	2.8	-0.3	0.6	71.4	100.0
Arkansas	8.3	5.2	18.6	6.1	2.2	59.6	100.0
California	50.7	8.8	8.1	12.2	2.5	17.6	100.0
Colorado	26.6	7.7	1.5	-11.6	3.3	72.6	100.0
Connecticut	16.4	6.4	3.4	7.3	1.0	65.5	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work Expenditures	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other	Totals
Delaware	21.7	8.9	5.6	51.2	-0.4	13.0	100.0
District of Columbia	20.5	4.3	6.1	32.4	9.5	27.1	100.0
Florida	17.4	3.3	6.0	34.2	0.5	38.7	100.0
Georgia	8.4	4.6	4.0	4.5	2.1	76.5	100.0
Hawaii	25.9	5.9	35.1	9.5	1.3	22.3	100.0
Idaho	16.8	11.1	15.3	25.6	0.6	30.6	100.0
Illinois	10.7	2.8	2.8	52.7	1.3	29.6	100.0
Indiana	16.4	9.4	8.3	15.6	12.9	37.3	100.0
Iowa	29.3	6.7	7.9	19.9	7.9	28.3	100.0
Kansas	18.1	6.6	0.4	10.9	34.9	29.1	100.0
Kentucky	36.5	4.2	11.9	32.0	6.6	8.9	100.0
Louisiana	6.9	7.6	3.0	2.0	8.7	71.8	100.0
Maine	60.6	3.2	10.6	9.4	14.7	1.6	100.0
Maryland	24.9	7.4	8.5	4.1	23.0	32.1	100.0
Massachusetts	30.8	3.2	0.6	25.9	9.2	30.3	100.0
Michigan	16.0	10.4	5.2	1.4	15.1	51.9	100.0
Minnesota	17.1	8.4	12.6	24.3	28.1	9.5	100.0
Mississippi	17.9	3.6	22.3	17.9	21.3	17.1	100.0
Missouri	22.3	2.7	4.3	16.8	0.0	54.0	100.0
Montana	27.6	15.9	20.2	21.6	0.0	14.7	100.0
Nebraska	23.0	4.2	17.1	21.3	32.1	2.3	100.0
Nevada	44.2	8.9	1.7	0.9	1.3	43.1	100.0
New Hampshire	38.7	17.4	9.4	8.4	1.8	24.3	100.0
New Jersey	19.0	5.7	6.8	7.1	16.8	44.7	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Administration	Work Expenditures	Child Care	Other Work Supports	Other	Totals
New Mexico	31.0	4.5	4.3	14.8	22.9	22.5	100.0
New York	27.2	6.7	2.8	8.7	26.4	28.2	100.0
North Carolina	10.3	6.7	7.4	28.4	9.6	37.5	100.0
North Dakota	15.7	11.0	11.7	2.7	4.1	54.8	100.0
Ohio	33.4	10.2	4.1	40.5	1.2	10.6	100.0
Oklahoma	11.3	12.3	0.0	30.5	14.0	31.8	100.0
Oregon	44.1	10.4	3.9	2.8	0.6	38.2	100.0
Pennsylvania	27.0	8.1	9.6	39.7	1.3	14.3	100.0
Rhode Island	22.7	7.8	5.2	14.0	8.5	41.8	100.0
South Carolina	21.2	9.1	9.6	2.8	1.4	55.9	100.0
South Dakota	48.1	8.4	13.9	2.7	0.4	26.4	100.0
Tennessee	31.8	9.1	18.5	22.1	0.0	18.5	100.0
Texas	10.1	8.0	9.2	2.9	0.8	69.0	100.0
Utah	25.6	8.4	23.8	7.2	1.9	33.1	100.0
Vermont	22.3	7.6	0.3	29.3	27.3	13.3	100.0
Virginia	33.9	6.8	16.7	13.9	2.7	25.9	100.0
Washington	22.8	5.2	16.2	11.8	0.1	43.9	100.0
West Virginia	22.8	9.4	1.3	19.6	19.0	27.9	100.0
Wisconsin	22.7	4.0	8.7	29.9	7.9	26.7	100.0
Wyoming	27.6	9.7	5.6	11.6	0.0	45.5	100.0
Totals	28.6	7.2	6.9	16.0	9.6	31.7	100.0

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2012

(September 30, 2012, in millions of dollars)

State	Obligated but Not Expended	Unobligated Funds	Total Unspent Funds
Alabama	\$3.5	\$5.7	\$9.2
Alaska	0.0	75.5	75.5
Arizona	0.0	24.8	24.8
Arkansas	0.0	42.1	42.1
California	141.1	0.0	141.2
Colorado	0.0	17.6	17.6
Connecticut	0.0	6.3	6.3
Delaware	3.9	5.7	9.6
District of Columbia	9.5	59.7	69.2
Florida	49.1	87.5	136.6
Georgia	35.0	54.1	89.0
Hawaii	13.2	28.8	42.0
Idaho	31.4	0.0	31.4
Illinois	0.0	57.3	57.3
Indiana	189.0	21.7	210.7
Iowa	3.9	8.7	12.5
Kansas	0.0	39.0	39.0
Kentucky	1.9	7.7	9.6
Louisiana	0.2	0.0	0.2
Maine	0.0	3.4	3.4
Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	119.0	119.0
Minnesota	54.3	79.5	133.8
Mississippi	5.6	12.9	18.5
Missouri	0.0	19.4	19.4
Montana	0.8	44.6	45.5
Nebraska	0.1	55.9	56.1
Nevada	0.0	9.0	9.0
New Hampshire	0.0	4.7	4.7
New Jersey	148.2	23.5	171.7
New Mexico	28.0	0.0	28.0
New York	221.4	300.3	521.6
North Carolina	187.4	3.5	190.9

State	Obligated but Not Expended	Unobligated Funds	Total Unspent Funds
North Dakota	0.0	18.7	18.7
Ohio	42.1	47.1	89.2
Oklahoma	46.9	6.7	53.7
Oregon	0.0	0.2	0.2
Pennsylvania	70.4	208.1	278.5
Rhode Island	13.9	0.0	13.9
South Carolina	0.0	13.6	13.6
South Dakota	0.0	16.0	16.0
Tennessee	0.0	20.5	20.5
Texas	92.4	0.0	92.4
Utah	0.0	86.5	86.5
Vermont	0.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1.6	25.1	26.7
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0
West Virginia	9.5	0.0	9.5
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	5.0	24.1	29.1
Totals	1,409.1	1,684.2	3,093.3

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS, based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Cash Assistance, March 2013

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Alabama	19,551	46,976	34,936	12,040
Alaska	3,730	10,027	6,748	3,279
Arizona	16,037	36,395	25,906	10,489
Arkansas	6,848	15,267	10,894	4,373
California	567,593	1,366,728	1,086,982	279,746
Colorado	14,825	38,576	27,511	11,065
Connecticut	14,592	28,828	20,310	8,518
Delaware	4,903	13,784	8,416	5,368
District of Columbia	5,701	13,597	10,496	3,101
Florida	54,608	97,257	79,592	17,665
Georgia	17,806	34,670	30,450	4,220
Guam	1,325	3,159	2,383	776

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Hawaii	9,206	26,621	17,605	9,016
Idaho	1,823	2,746	2,587	159
Illinois	21,569	47,895	39,315	8,580
Indiana	12,837	26,364	23,128	3,236
Iowa	17,848	45,368	31,451	13,917
Kansas	8,288	19,940	14,369	5,571
Kentucky	30,300	60,918	48,398	12,520
Louisiana	7,598	17,033	14,703	2,330
Maine	28,368	60,169	33,540	26,629
Maryland	21,704	51,755	37,877	13,878
Massachusetts	67,820	153,450	102,878	50,572
Michigan	36,189	83,689	62,154	21,535
Minnesota	23,535	52,506	39,935	12,571
Mississippi	9,918	20,789	15,235	5,554
Missouri	35,666	85,842	58,362	27,480
Montana	2,994	7,201	5,308	1,893
Nebraska	6,759	16,136	13,134	3,002
Nevada	10,404	26,588	19,783	6,805
New Hampshire	6,221	15,217	10,222	4,995
New Jersey	32,291	78,425	54,528	23,897
New Mexico	14,956	36,779	27,124	9,655
New York	158,864	403,178	288,137	115,041
North Carolina	19,882	38,069	32,296	5,773
North Dakota	1,394	3,477	2,725	752
Ohio	68,472	136,887	110,858	26,029
Oklahoma	7,611	16,823	14,106	2,717
Oregon	43,400	103,269	74,594	28,675
Pennsylvania	71,741	176,064	126,890	49,174
Puerto Rico	13,115	36,080	22,733	13,347
Rhode Island	5,928	14,096	9,668	4,428
South Carolina	12,537	28,587	22,174	6,413
South Dakota	3,122	6,184	5,351	833
Tennessee	51,336	123,991	90,614	33,377
Texas	39,555	88,440	77,575	10,865
Utah	4,477	10,916	7,997	2,919
Vermont	3,427	7,769	5,407	2,362
Virgin Islands	406	1,193	857	336

State	Families	Recipients	Children	Adults
Virginia	31,316	67,310	48,675	18,635
Washington	48,239	112,200	76,282	35,918
West Virginia	8,788	19,241	14,234	5,007
Wisconsin	25,902	61,773	46,024	15,749
Wyoming	343	1,135	687	448
Totals	1,753,668	4,097,377	3,094,144	1,003,233

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), on the basis of data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: Caseload data include those families in Separate State Programs with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-5. Number of Families Receiving TANF Cash Assistance, March 1994, 2007, 2012, and 2013

	1994	2007	2010	2012	2013	Percentage Change to March 2013 from March....		
						1994	2007	2013
Alabama	51,217	18,005	20,740	20,818	19,551	-61.8%	8.6%	-6.1%
Alaska	13,209	3,376	3,296	3,906	3,730	-71.8	10.5	-4.5
Arizona	71,713	35,617	35,227	17,268	16,037	-77.6	-55.0	-7.1
Arkansas	26,355	8,600	8,492	7,440	6,848	-74.0	-20.4	-8.0
California	916,427	471,775	576,355	580,388	567,593	-38.1	20.3	-2.2
Colorado	42,541	11,149	11,785	14,024	14,825	-65.2	33.0	5.7
Connecticut	59,351	20,890	17,261	15,118	14,592	-75.4	-30.1	-3.5
Delaware	11,592	4,027	5,089	5,301	4,903	-57.7	21.8	-7.5
District of Columbia	27,047	5,748	9,786	5,805	5,701	-78.9	-0.8	-1.8
Florida	248,514	47,337	57,471	53,706	54,608	-78.0	15.4	1.7
Georgia	141,859	24,681	20,464	18,443	17,806	-87.4	-27.9	-3.5
Guam	1,863	931	1,245	1,316	1,325	-28.9	42.3	0.7
Hawaii	20,395	6,410	9,630	9,536	9,206	-54.9	43.6	-3.5
Idaho	9,016	1,661	1,742	1,874	1,823	-79.8	9.8	-2.7
Illinois	241,817	31,397	21,973	33,709	21,569	-91.1	-31.3	-36.0
Indiana	74,843	41,226	35,915	17,004	12,837	-82.8	-68.9	-24.5
Iowa	40,676	20,082	21,345	19,108	17,848	-56.1	-11.1	-6.6
Kansas	30,591	14,550	14,202	11,094	8,288	-72.9	-43.0	-25.3
Kentucky	81,141	29,788	30,028	30,057	30,300	-62.7	1.7	0.8

	1994	2007	2010	2012	2013	Percentage Change to March 2013 from March....		
						1994	2007	2013
Louisiana	88,059	10,730	10,273	9,191	7,598	-91.4	-29.2	-17.3
Maine	23,231	12,736	14,942	15,039	28,368	22.1	122.7	88.6
Maryland	81,253	19,077	24,052	23,753	21,704	-73.3	13.8	-8.6
Massachusetts	112,803	44,579	49,062	64,449	67,820	-39.9	52.1	5.2
Michigan	227,114	75,173	70,633	40,919	36,189	-84.1	-51.9	-11.6
Minnesota	64,055	26,513	24,048	24,499	23,535	-63.3	-11.2	-3.9
Mississippi	56,420	11,210	11,805	11,263	9,918	-82.4	-11.5	-11.9
Missouri	93,735	39,577	38,847	37,723	35,666	-62.0	-9.9	-5.5
Montana	12,278	3,184	3,742	3,174	2,994	-75.6	-6.0	-5.7
Nebraska	16,323	7,426	8,539	7,375	6,759	-58.6	-9.0	-8.4
Nevada	14,011	6,424	10,365	10,590	10,404	-25.7	62.0	-1.8
New Hampshire	11,574	5,183	6,247	6,294	6,221	-46.3	20.0	-1.2
New Jersey	123,025	34,884	33,047	34,162	32,291	-73.8	-7.4	-5.5
New Mexico	33,847	14,017	19,342	18,001	14,956	-55.8	6.7	-16.9
New York	457,660	159,447	156,188	157,885	158,864	-65.3	-0.4	0.6
North Carolina	134,063	25,509	24,382	21,562	19,882	-85.2	-22.1	-7.8
North Dakota	6,079	2,016	2,037	1,648	1,394	-77.1	-30.9	-15.4
Ohio	254,021	77,624	103,012	153,065	68,472	-73.0	-11.8	-55.3
Oklahoma	47,428	9,283	9,315	8,472	7,611	-84.0	-18.0	-10.2
Oregon	43,617	18,872	30,199	37,927	43,400	-0.5	130.0	14.4
Pennsylvania	211,771	63,637	51,085	77,566	71,741	-66.1	12.7	-7.5
Puerto Rico	58,869	13,809	13,581	14,711	13,115	-77.7	-5.0	-10.8
Rhode Island	22,872	8,296	7,505	6,559	5,928	-74.1	-28.5	-9.6
South Carolina	53,260	15,652	17,934	14,131	12,537	-76.5	-19.9	-11.3
South Dakota	7,129	2,825	3,209	3,184	3,122	-56.2	10.5	-1.9
Tennessee	111,740	62,395	61,685	56,972	51,336	-54.1	-17.7	-9.9
Texas	286,613	61,566	49,871	44,529	39,555	-86.2	-35.8	-11.2
Utah	17,908	5,146	6,724	5,048	4,477	-75.0	-13.0	-11.3
Vermont	9,988	4,463	3,106	3,440	3,427	-65.7	-23.2	-0.4
Virgin Islands	1,078	440	507	427	406	-62.3	-7.7	-4.9
Virginia	75,854	31,354	36,744	33,391	31,316	-58.7	-0.1	-6.2
Washington	104,326	52,292	69,637	53,392	48,239	-53.8	-7.8	-9.7
West Virginia	41,521	9,774	9,690	9,289	8,788	-78.8	-10.1	-5.4

	1994	2007	2010	2012	2013	Percentage Change to March 2013 from March....		
						1994	2007	2013
Wisconsin	78,739	17,211	21,353	26,152	25,902	-67.1	50.5	-1.0
Wyoming	5,857	273	352	317	343	-94.1	25.6	8.2
Totals	5,098,288	1,749,847	1,905,106	1,902,014	1,753,668	-65.6	0.2	-7.8

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), on the basis of data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: Caseload data include those families in Separate State Programs with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-6. Families Receiving TANF Cash Assistance, by Number of Parents Receiving Assistance on Their Own Behalf: March 2013

State	Single-Parent Families	Two-Parent Families	No-Parent Families	Total Families	Single-Parent Families	Two-Parent Families	No-Parent Families
Alabama	11,584	204	7,763	19,551	59.3%	1.0%	39.7%
Alaska	2,315	442	973	3,730	62.1	11.8	26.1
Arizona	9,237	573	6,227	16,037	57.6	3.6	38.8
Arkansas	4,071	173	2,604	6,848	59.4	2.5	38.0
California	248,412	53,505	265,676	567,593	43.8	9.4	46.8
Colorado	8,998	1,159	4,668	14,825	60.7	7.8	31.5
Connecticut	8,441	0	6,151	14,592	57.8	0.0	42.2
Delaware	1,723	22	3,158	4,903	35.1	0.4	64.4
District of Columbia	3,412	0	2,289	5,701	59.8	0.0	40.2
Florida	13,873	757	39,978	54,608	25.4	1.4	73.2
Georgia	4,155	0	13,651	17,806	23.3	0.0	76.7
Guam	566	209	550	1,325	42.7	15.8	41.5
Hawaii	5,323	2,204	1,679	9,206	57.8	23.9	18.2
Idaho	156	0	1,667	1,823	8.6	0.0	91.4
Illinois	7,605	0	13,964	21,569	35.3	0.0	64.7
Indiana	4,049	195	8,593	12,837	31.5	1.5	66.9
Iowa	11,338	1,066	5,444	17,848	63.5	6.0	30.5
Kansas	4,340	530	3,418	8,288	52.4	6.4	41.2

State	Single-Parent Families	Two-Parent Families	No-Parent Families	Total Families	Single-Parent Families	Two-Parent Families	No-Parent Families
Kentucky	10,867	778	18,655	30,300	35.9	2.6	61.6
Louisiana	2,289	0	5,309	7,598	30.1	0.0	69.9
Maine	24,716	988	2,664	28,368	87.1	3.5	9.4
Maryland	14,002	0	7,702	21,704	64.5	0.0	35.5
Massachusetts	42,984	4,451	20,385	67,820	63.4	6.6	30.1
Michigan	21,485	0	14,704	36,189	59.4	0.0	40.6
Minnesota	12,698	0	10,837	23,535	54.0	0.0	46.0
Mississippi	5,466	0	4,452	9,918	55.1	0.0	44.9
Missouri	27,818	0	7,848	35,666	78.0	0.0	22.0
Montana	1,648	283	1,063	2,994	55.0	9.5	35.5
Nebraska	3,098	0	3,661	6,759	45.8	0.0	54.2
Nevada	4,636	1,063	4,705	10,404	44.6	10.2	45.2
New Hampshire	4,792	94	1,335	6,221	77.0	1.5	21.5
New Jersey	23,510	0	8,781	32,291	72.8	0.0	27.2
New Mexico	7,807	943	6,206	14,956	52.2	6.3	41.5
New York	99,634	2,888	56,342	158,864	62.7	1.8	35.5
North Carolina	5,333	220	14,329	19,882	26.8	1.1	72.1
North Dakota	749	0	645	1,394	53.7	0.0	46.3
Ohio	19,548	2,849	46,075	68,472	28.5	4.2	67.3
Oklahoma	2,717	0	4,894	7,611	35.7	0.0	64.3
Oregon	37,711	105	5,584	43,400	86.9	0.2	12.9
Pennsylvania	50,564	975	20,202	71,741	70.5	1.4	28.2
Puerto Rico	10,361	0	2,754	13,115	79.0	0.0	21.0
Rhode Island	3,553	489	1,886	5,928	59.9	8.2	31.8
South Carolina	6,659	0	5,878	12,537	53.1	0.0	46.9
South Dakota	833	0	2,289	3,122	26.7	0.0	73.3
Tennessee	32,404	978	17,954	51,336	63.1	1.9	35.0
Texas	10,861	0	28,694	39,555	27.5	0.0	72.5
Utah	1,872	0	2,605	4,477	41.8	0.0	58.2
Vermont	1,598	377	1,452	3,427	46.6	11.0	42.4
Virgin Islands	406	0	0	406	100.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	19,504	0	11,812	31,316	62.3	0.0	37.7

State	Single-Parent Families	Two-Parent Families	No-Parent Families	Total Families	Single-Parent Families	Two-Parent Families	No-Parent Families
Washington	25,638	5,008	17,593	48,239	53.1	10.4	36.5
West Virginia	3,982	0	4,806	8,788	45.3	0.0	54.7
Wisconsin	13,375	810	11,717	25,902	51.6	3.1	45.2
Wyoming	120	12	211	343	35.0	3.5	61.5
Totals	904,836	84,350	764,482	1,753,668	51.6	4.8	43.6

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), on the basis of data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: Caseload data include those families in Separate State Programs with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-7. TANF All-Family Work Participation Rate by State: FY2002 Through FY2010

State	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
United States	28.9%	27.5%	29.4%	30.3%	30.6%	29.7%	29.4%	29.4%	29.0%
Alabama	37.3	37.1	37.9	38.6	41.6	34.0	37.4	32.4	37.1
Alaska	39.6	41.1	43.6	45.7	45.6	46.8	42.8	37.2	33.3
Arizona	25.9	13.4	25.5	30.3	29.6	30.0	27.8	27.1	29.1
Arkansas	21.4	22.4	27.3	28.3	27.9	35.3	38.8	37.1	34.1
California	27.3	24.0	23.1	25.9	22.2	22.3	25.1	26.8	26.2
Colorado	35.9	32.5	34.7	25.8	30.0	27.3	32.3	37.8	33.6
Connecticut	26.6	30.6	24.3	33.8	30.8	28.8	25.3	34.4	37.2
Delaware	11.7	18.2	22.1	22.6	25.3	32.7	48.8	37.5	38.8
District of Columbia	16.4	23.1	18.2	23.5	17.1	35.0	49.6	23.5	15.0
Florida	30.4	33.1	40.4	38.0	41.0	64.2	42.4	46.1	47.5
Georgia	8.2	10.9	24.8	57.2	64.9	54.2	59.0	57.1	67.5
Hawaii	32.5	34.6	40.3	35.5	37.3	28.7	34.4	40.3	47.6
Idaho	40.7	43.7	41.0	39.9	44.2	53.0	59.5	52.0	49.5
Illinois	58.4	57.8	46.1	43.0	53.0	55.5	42.6	49.3	49.1
Indiana	45.3	40.3	36.3	30.9	26.7	27.5	29.4	17.5	19.2
Iowa	51.2	45.1	50.0	47.8	39.0	40.2	41.1	35.4	34.8
Kansas	37.6	32.4	88.0	86.7	77.2	12.8	19.6	23.9	27.2
Kentucky	32.4	32.8	38.1	39.7	44.6	38.2	38.0	37.3	46.4
Louisiana	38.7	34.6	35.4	34.6	38.4	42.2	40.0	34.4	27.4
Maine	44.5	27.7	32.1	28.3	26.6	21.9	11.4	16.8	19.7

State	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Maryland	8.3	9.1	16.0	20.5	44.5	46.7	36.9	44.0	40.7
Massachusetts	9.2	8.4	10.3	12.6	13.6	17.0	44.7	47.5	22.2
Michigan	28.9	25.3	24.5	22.0	21.6	28.0	33.6	27.9	22.8
Minnesota	31.2	25.0	26.8	28.9	30.3	28.1	29.9	29.8	40.2
Mississippi	18.5	17.2	21.0	22.6	35.5	61.9	63.2	67.5	66.3
Missouri	25.4	28.0	19.5	20.0	18.7	14.0	14.2	13.2	17.5
Montana	37.9	37.4	86.7	83.1	79.2	46.4	44.2	44.2	51.6
Nebraska	22.8	29.4	34.5	31.8	32.0	23.0	51.2	50.3	49.5
Nevada	21.6	22.3	34.5	42.3	47.8	34.0	42.1	39.4	37.6
New Hampshire	32.6	28.2	30.2	24.6	24.1	42.0	47.4	46.5	46.6
New Jersey	36.4	35.0	34.6	29.0	29.2	33.0	18.9	20.1	19.9
New Mexico	42.7	42.0	46.2	41.6	42.3	36.4	37.5	43.1	42.5
New York	38.5	37.1	37.8	35.2	37.8	38.0	37.3	33.4	35.0
North Carolina	27.4	25.3	31.4	27.5	32.4	32.4	24.5	32.3	37.1
North Dakota	30.4	27.0	25.3	31.4	51.9	58.7	50.2	61.0	68.7
Ohio	56.1	62.2	65.2	58.3	54.9	23.7	24.5	23.3	23.1
Oklahoma	26.7	29.2	33.2	34.0	32.9	38.1	29.2	23.0	24.3
Oregon	8.0	14.7	32.1	14.9	15.2	14.7	24.1	9.5	8.4
Pennsylvania	10.4	9.9	7.1	15.2	26.1	48.9	38.6	45.8	46.0
Puerto Rico	5.6	6.1	7.5	13.1	13.1	8.2	11.6	8.7	8.6
Rhode Island	24.6	24.3	23.7	24.2	24.9	26.8	17.5	13.8	12.0
South Carolina	30.2	28.6	53.7	54.3	49.5	53.3	51.7	45.1	37.2
South Dakota	42.5	46.1	54.8	57.5	57.9	53.5	62.2	59.4	61.4
Tennessee	14.3	13.4	13.0	14.3	16.8	45.9	25.2	25.5	26.5
Texas	21.1	28.1	34.2	38.9	42.0	34.6	29.3	37.0	36.1
Utah	27.9	28.1	26.2	30.3	42.5	49.8	37.6	32.6	33.8
Vermont	21.4	24.3	24.9	22.4	22.2	22.4	23.2	29.0	34.9
Virginia	22.6	29.9	50.1	46.3	53.9	43.5	45.4	44.3	42.9
Washington	49.8	46.2	35.4	38.6	36.1	25.4	18.3	23.0	24.2
West Virginia	19.2	14.2	11.7	16.3	26.2	15.4	17.6	19.6	25.9
Wisconsin	69.4	67.2	61.3	44.3	36.2	36.7	37.1	39.9	42.5
Wyoming	82.9	83.0	77.8	82.1	77.2	65.4	50.5	61.3	63.4
Guam	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.0
Virgin Islands	17.7	5.0	10.6	16.9	14.5	17.1	15.5	7.1	9.2

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: FY2002 through FY2006 work participation rates are based on federal work participation standard rules. They exclude the effects of “grandfathered” waivers of pre-1996. The 1996 welfare reform law gave states the

option to continue their pre-reform “waiver” programs and have their work participation rates based on the rules of the state waivers, not the federal rules. The last of these pre-1996 waivers expired in 2006. The all-family work participation rates for FY2002 through FY2006 that include the effect of the waivers are slightly higher than the rates shown here.

Table B-8. TANF Two-Parent Work Participation Rate: FY2002-FY2010

(NA denotes not applicable; state has no two-parent families in the participation rate calculation)

State	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
United States	44.2%	41.8%	45.3%	40.8%	45.9%	35.7%	27.6%	28.3%	33.4%
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	29.1	28.1	24.7	28.6
Alaska	44.5	44.6	52.8	54.7	54.2	58.6	47.0	40.5	35.3
Arizona	52.2	55.3	65.6	74.2	67.5	72.1	64.3	62.6	72.8
Arkansas	24.4	31.8	34.4	45.9	22.3	19.2	32.0	21.7	21.5
California	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.7	26.5	28.6	35.6
Colorado	45.6	40.1	37.5	32.1	35.2	31.4	30.8	33.3	28.6
Connecticut	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	26.8	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
District of Columbia	13.4	19.6	20.1	35.9	13.1	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	59.4	37.5	54.4	56.4
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	70.4	NA	56.3
Idaho	40.2	42.3	37.1	41.4	39.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30.7	31.4	17.8	18.7
Iowa	41.6	39.2	NA	NA	NA	39.7	39.8	27.0	28.0
Kansas	38.5	30.3	93.7	92.8	82.3	12.1	15.5	25.6	28.9
Kentucky	43.7	46.2	51.2	48.9	51.3	48.1	38.8	35.1	42.7
Louisiana	57.2	39.0	38.0	37.0	42.5	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	58.2	29.2	NA	NA	NA	30.1	8.6	16.6	17.2
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	12.9	12.0	15.4	13.5	NA	NA	96.4	92.8	90.1
Michigan	46.5	36.2	35.7	30.4	26.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	27.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	54.8	55.9	90.8	85.4	83.3	55.8	51.6	58.7	57.2
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	45.7	51.4	46.8	45.2
New Hampshire	30.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New Mexico	57.5	52.0	55.3	57.5	54.5	47.2	50.9	63.0	57.4
New York	56.3	52.2	48.3	43.4	48.9	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	46.7	49.2	47.2	44.7	54.0	53.6	51.3	46.6	60.9
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	60.0	67.8	68.4	58.1	55.5	29.3	27.9	23.1	25.4
Oklahoma	NA	50.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	18.9	23.4	35.5	21.1	22.6	12.6	11.1	5.9	7.2
Pennsylvania	11.0	8.8	15.0	17.7	32.5	89.8	79.8	84.2	86.8
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	93.8	94.9	94.9	95.1	94.3	98.5	94.5	13.6	9.2
South Carolina	30.1	25.5	55.9	63.7	64.7	88.0	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44.1	11.9	0.0	0.0
Texas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	59.2	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	32.7	37.5	38.2	35.8	33.9	31.6	31.8	24.0	38.2
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	50.7	44.3	31.1	37.7	43.1	25.2	17.2	18.6	22.3
West Virginia	26.5	25.2	NA	NA	NA	16.4	NA	NA	89.6
Wisconsin	39.3	40.3	33.1	25.5	17.1	20.9	31.6	33.0	31.1
Wyoming	93.8	91.5	87.5	65.2	75.9	74.1	69.4	75.7	48.5
Guam	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	1.1
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Notes: FY2002 through FY2006 work participation rates are based on federal work participation standard rules. They exclude the effects of “grandfathered” waivers of pre-1996. The 1996 welfare reform law gave states the option to continue their pre-reform “waiver” programs and have their work participation rates based on the rules of the state waivers, not the federal rules. The last of these pre-1996 waivers expired in 2006. The all-family work participation rates for FY2002 through FY2006 that include the effect of the waivers are slightly higher than the rates shown here.

Author Contact Information

Gene Falk
 Specialist in Social Policy
 gfalk@crs.loc.gov, 7-7344