

Appendix One

Use of TANF for Child Care in Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2001 and 2002: Differences in Transfers to CCDF and Direct Spending on Child Care									
State	FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2001 - FY 2002		
	FY01 Transferred to CCDF ¹ (in millions)	Percent of FY01 Award Transferred to CCDF ²	FY01 Direct Spend ³ (in millions)	FY02 Transferred to CCDF ⁴ (in millions)	Percent of FY02 Award Transferred To CCDF ⁵	FY02 Direct Spend ⁶ (in millions)	DIFFERENCE IN TRANSFER ⁷ (in millions)	DIFFERENCE IN DIRECT SPEND ⁸ (in millions)	TOTAL DIFFERENCE (in millions)
ALABAMA	26.6	20%	0.0	24.7	20%	20.8	-1.9	20.8	18.9
ALASKA	13.2	22%	6.3	13.4	22%	6.0	0.2	-0.3	-0.1
ARIZONA	0.7	0%	36.7	0.7	0%	44.2	0.1	7.5	7.6
ARKANSAS	12.0	18%	4.9	-6.0	NA	0.9	-18.0	-4.1	-22.1
CALIFORNIA	266.8	7%	505.8	423.4	11%	418.9	156.6	-86.9	69.7
COLORADO	30.1	20%	3.6	33.9	20%	6.3	3.8	2.7	6.5
CONNECTICUT	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
DELAWARE	-1.6	NA	0.0	1.0	3%	0.0	2.6	0.0	2.6
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	18.5	16%	26.1	18.5	16%	43.1	0.0	17.0	17.0
FLORIDA	150.4	23%	148.7	122.5	20%	154.7	-27.9	6.0	-21.9
GEORGIA	40.0	11%	-1.0	23.2	6%	0.0	-16.8	1.0	-15.8
HAWAII	4.8	5%	0.0	9.0	9%	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2
IDAHO	8.5	24%	0.0	9.0	26%	0.6	0.5	0.6	1.1
ILLINOIS	30.1	5%	102.4	0.0	0%	141.6	-30.1	39.2	9.1
INDIANA	53.3	26%	48.1	21.1	10%	0.4	-32.2	-47.7	-79.9
IOWA ^{7,8}	27.5	21%	0.0	27.4	20%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
KANSAS	11.0	11%	0.0	15.1	15%	0.0	4.1	0.0	4.1
KENTUCKY	36.2	20%	16.9	36.2	19%	17.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
LOUISIANA	54.3	30%	0.9	40.4	21%	3.1	-13.9	2.2	-11.7
MAINE	3.4	4%	7.2	6.3	8%	9.4	3.0	2.2	5.1
MARYLAND	0.0	0%	-29.5	-23.1	NA	1.0	-23.1	30.6	7.5
MASSACHUSETTS	91.9	20%	158.5	91.9	20%	133.5	0.0	-25.0	-25.0
MICHIGAN	14.7	2%	165.2	0.0	0%	221.2	-14.7	56.0	41.3
MINNESOTA ⁴	20.2	7%	0.0	17.9	7%	0.0	-2.3	0.0	-2.3
MISSISSIPPI	19.4	20%	18.8	19.2	20%	23.1	-0.2	4.3	4.1
MISSOURI	20.7	9%	0.0	12.9	6%	0.0	-7.8	0.0	-7.8
MONTANA	7.6	16%	0.0	9.4	20%	0.1	1.8	0.1	1.9
NEBRASKA	9.0	16%	0.0	9.0	15%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NEVADA	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NEW JERSEY ^{1,7}	0.0	0%	5.6	0.0	0%	-20.4	0.0	-25.9	-25.9
NEW MEXICO	31.2	24%	0.0	29.4	24%	0.0	-1.8	0.0	-1.8
NEW YORK	375.0	15%	0.0	394.3	16%	0.0	19.3	0.0	19.3
NORTH CAROLINA	72.5	21%	33.6	75.5	22%	28.4	2.9	-5.2	-2.3
NORTH DAKOTA	0.0	0%	2.6	0.0	0%	2.3	0.0	-0.3	-0.3
OHIO	136.7	19%	68.7	145.6	20%	71.3	8.9	2.5	11.5
OKLAHOMA	30.3	20%	0.0	29.5	20%	15.6	-0.8	15.6	14.8
OREGON	0.0	0%	9.9	0.0	0%	5.2	0.0	-4.7	-4.7
PENNSYLVANIA	25.6	4%	25.2	31.4	4%	29.6	5.9	4.4	10.3
RHODE ISLAND	0.5	1%	0.0	0.0	0%	0.0	-0.5	0.0	-0.5
SOUTH CAROLINA	1.4	1%	0.0	1.5	2%	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
SOUTH DAKOTA	4.3	20%	0.0	2.0	9%	0.0	-2.3	0.0	-2.3
TENNESSEE	73.1	33%	16.0	43.8	21%	34.6	-29.3	18.6	-10.7
TEXAS	0.0	0%	0.0	2.3	0%	0.1	2.3	0.1	2.5
UTAH	0.0	0%	0.0	0.0	0%	4.6	0.0	4.6	4.6
VERMONT	6.2	13%	2.7	7.6	15%	3.1	1.5	0.4	1.8
VIRGINIA	27.7	17%	0.1	29.2	18%	0.2	1.5	0.1	1.5
WASHINGTON	86.7	22%	90.8	109.9	27%	85.4	23.2	-5.4	17.8
WEST VIRGINIA	0.0	0%	27.3	0.0	0%	28.5	0.0	1.2	1.2
WISCONSIN	63.4	19%	140.1	63.3	19%	33.2	-0.1	-106.9	-107.0
WYOMING	-5.1	NA	0.0	3.8	19%	4.1	8.9	4.1	13.0
Total	1,898.7	11%	1,642.6	1,926.3	11%	1,572.0	27.6	-70.6	-43.0
TOTAL USE		3,541.3			3,498.3				

Source: Calculations by CLASP from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, TANF Financial Data, Combined Spending From TANF Grant in FY 2001 Through Fourth Quarter, and Combined Spending From TANF Grant in FY 2002 Through Fourth Quarter, FY 2001 Federal Funds Spent in 2001 Through Fourth Quarter, and FY 2002 Funds Spent in 2002 Through Fourth Quarter. Available at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/index.html>. All figures based on HHS data.

Notes:

- This column represents transfers to the CCDF block grant from the TANF block grant in FY 2001 from current year funds. Negative figures represent reversal of prior year transfers. Numbers rounded to the nearest \$100,000. New Jersey had a transfer amount less than \$50,000.
- This column was calculated by dividing the total TANF transferred to CCDF by the sum of the FY 2001 annual TANF block grant plus any supplemental grant plus any High Performance or Out-of-Wedlock Bonus awarded during FY 2001.
- This column represents direct spending of TANF dollars in FY 2001 from current and prior year funds. Negative figures represent state revisions of reported prior year spending figures. Numbers rounded to the nearest \$100,000. Iowa, Minnesota, and Utah each reported spending less than \$50,000.
- This column represents transfers to the CCDF block grant from the TANF block grant in FY 2002 from current year funds. Negative figures represent reversal of prior year transfers.
- This column was calculated by dividing the total TANF transferred to CCDF by the sum of the FY 2002 annual TANF block grant plus any supplemental grant plus any High Performance or Out-of-Wedlock Bonus awarded during FY 2002.
- This column represents direct spending of TANF dollars in FY 2002 from current and prior year funds. Negative figures represent state revisions of reported prior year spending figures.
- Numbers rounded to the nearest \$100,000. The transfer amounts for Iowa and New Jersey decreased by less than \$50,000 each.
- Numbers rounded to the nearest \$100,000. The reported direct expenditure amounts for Iowa and Minnesota decreased by less than \$50,000 each.

Appendix Two

Use of TANF for Child Care in Federal Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002: TANF Funds Transferred to CCDF and Directly Spent on Child Care, as Share of Total TANF Used							
State	FY 2001			FY 2002			FY 2001 - FY 2002
	FY01 Total TANF Used ¹ (in millions)	FY01 Total Transfer/Direct Spend Committed to Child Care ² (in millions)	FY01 Share of TANF Used Committed to Child Care ³ (in %)	FY02 Total TANF Used ⁴ (in millions)	FY02 Total Transfer/Direct Spend Committed to Child Care ⁵ (in millions)	FY01 Share of TANF Used Committed to Child Care ⁶ (in %)	Percentage Point Change in Share of TANF Used Committed to Child Care FY01 - FY02 ⁷
ALABAMA	106.0	26.6	25%	132.6	45.5	34%	9.2
ALASKA	56.1	19.5	35%	66.4	19.4	29%	-5.5
ARIZONA	207.5	37.4	18%	241.1	45.0	19%	0.6
ARKANSAS ⁵	82.4	16.9	21%	41.2	-5.1	NA	NA
CALIFORNIA	4,002.6	772.6	19%	3,271.1	842.3	26%	6.4
COLORADO	162.4	33.7	21%	191.4	40.2	21%	0.2
CONNECTICUT	256.0	0.0	0%	277.3	0.0	0%	0.0
DELAWARE ³	33.8	-1.6	NA	30.5	1.0	3%	NA
DIST. OF COLUMBIA	114.5	44.6	39%	154.5	61.6	40%	0.9
FLORIDA	744.3	299.2	40%	788.0	277.3	35%	-5.0
GEORGIA ³	353.6	39.0	11%	393.3	23.2	6%	-5.1
HAWAII	97.8	4.8	5%	56.3	9.0	16%	11.1
IDAHO	43.2	8.5	20%	36.9	9.6	26%	6.3
ILLINOIS	601.8	132.5	22%	585.1	141.6	24%	2.2
INDIANA	292.8	101.4	35%	244.1	21.5	9%	-25.8
IOWA	136.0	27.5	20%	127.4	27.4	22%	1.3
KANSAS	95.3	11.0	12%	100.1	15.1	15%	3.5
KENTUCKY	183.3	53.1	29%	170.0	53.2	31%	2.3
LOUISIANA	127.4	55.2	43%	241.5	43.5	18%	-25.3
MAINE	61.2	10.5	17%	70.9	15.7	22%	4.9
MARYLAND ^{3,6}	241.4	-29.5	NA	250.6	-22.1	NA	NA
MASSACHUSETTS	459.4	250.4	55%	449.2	225.4	50%	-4.3
MICHIGAN	795.8	179.9	23%	809.6	221.2	27%	4.7
MINNESOTA	285.9	20.2	7%	325.9	17.9	6%	-1.6
MISSISSIPPI	139.9	38.2	27%	150.8	42.3	28%	0.8
MISSOURI	223.0	20.7	9%	227.9	12.9	6%	-3.6
MONTANA	48.0	7.6	16%	59.5	9.5	16%	0.1
NEBRASKA	43.1	9.0	21%	61.6	9.0	15%	-6.3
NEVADA	37.0	0.0	0%	65.1	0.0	0%	0.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	31.3	0.0	0%	39.9	0.0	0%	0.0
NEW JERSEY ⁵	295.2	5.6	2%	575.6	-20.4	NA	NA
NEW MEXICO	144.6	31.2	22%	121.7	29.4	24%	2.5
NEW YORK	2,642.3	375.0	14%	2,639.7	394.3	15%	0.7
NORTH CAROLINA	361.0	106.2	29%	361.1	103.9	29%	-0.6
NORTH DAKOTA	27.9	2.6	9%	23.8	2.3	10%	0.3
OHIO	947.9	205.4	22%	708.7	216.9	31%	8.9
OKLAHOMA	108.9	30.3	28%	130.8	45.1	34%	6.6
OREGON	169.2	9.9	6%	175.1	5.2	3%	-2.9
PENNSYLVANIA	620.3	50.8	8%	718.1	61.1	9%	0.3
RHODE ISLAND	95.0	0.5	1%	99.8	0.0	0%	-0.5
SOUTH CAROLINA	103.2	1.4	1%	109.5	1.5	1%	0.1
SOUTH DAKOTA	18.8	4.3	23%	18.8	2.0	11%	-12.0
TENNESSEE	268.3	89.1	33%	276.0	78.4	28%	-4.8
TEXAS	516.3	0.0	0%	528.8	2.5	0%	0.5
UTAH	68.9	0.0	0%	90.2	4.6	5%	5.1
VERMONT	44.9	8.9	20%	55.4	10.7	19%	-0.5
VIRGINIA	170.5	27.8	16%	181.3	29.3	16%	-0.1
WASHINGTON	504.2	177.6	35%	480.9	195.4	41%	5.4
WEST VIRGINIA	178.6	27.3	15%	181.1	28.5	16%	0.5
WISCONSIN	428.6	203.6	47%	388.9	96.6	25%	-22.7
WYOMING	15.1	-5.1	NA	20.3	7.9	39%	NA
Total	17,792.4	3,541.3	20%	17,545.4	3,498.3	20%	0.0

Source: Calculations by CLASP from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, TANF Financial Data, Combined Spending From TANF Grant in FY 2001 Through Fourth Quarter and TANF Financial Data, Combined Spending From TANF Grant in FY 2002 Through Fourth Quarter. Available at <http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofs/data/index.html>. All figures based on HHS data.

Notes:
1 This column was calculated by adding the total TANF transferred to CCDF, total TANF transferred to SSBG, and total expenditures on TANF assistance and on non-assistance in FY 2001.
2 Direct spending for this fiscal year includes direct spending of funds from prior year TANF grants expended in FY 2001. Transfers include reversals of prior year transfers.
3 This column was calculated by determining the percentage of total TANF funds used in FY 2001 that were transferred to CCDF and directly spent on child care.
4 Delaware reversed prior year transfers and did not spend any TANF directly on child care in FY 2001. Maryland did not transfer any TANF to child care and showed negative spending in FY 2001.
5 Georgia transferred \$40 million in FY 2001 and reported a negative expenditure of \$1 million.
6 This column was calculated by adding the total TANF transferred to CCDF, total TANF transferred to SSBG, and total expenditures on TANF assistance and on non-assistance in FY 2002.
7 Direct spending for this fiscal year includes direct spending of funds from prior year TANF grants expended in FY 2002. Transfers include reversals of prior year transfers.
8 Arkansas and Maryland both reported reversals of prior year transfers and positive direct spending. New Jersey did not transfer any TANF in FY 2002 and reported negative spending.
9 This column was calculated by determining the percentage of total TANF funds used in FY 2002 that were transferred to CCDF and directly spent on child care.
10 This column shows the percentage point change in the share of total TANF funds used for child care between FY 2001 and FY 2002.