

**MEMORANDUM**

April 29, 2019

**To:** Multiple Offices

**From:** Emilie Stoltzfus, Specialist in Social Policy, estoltzfus@crs.loc.gov, 7-2324

**Subject:** **Comparison of Current and Proposed Mandatory Funding to States and Tribes Under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act**

**This memorandum was prepared to enable distribution to more than one congressional office.**

---

This memorandum provides a comparison of mandatory funding provided to states under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act as currently authorized and as would be authorized by the draft Family First Transition and Support Act of 2019 (ERN19131). It focuses primarily on this funding and does not discuss all policy changes in the draft bill. I trust this information will be useful. Please let me know if you have questions (7-2324).

## Overview

The draft Family First Transition and Support Act (ERN19131, “draft bill”) would expand federal resources available to state, territorial, and tribal child welfare agencies for support of a broad range of child and family services. Specifically, it would amend Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act to permanently increase the total annual mandatory funding authorization for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program, from \$345 million to \$665 million.<sup>1</sup> This increase would permit expanded support for child and family services, including kinship placement support, as well as other programs and activities funded with PSSF mandatory dollars. Separately, it would appropriate an additional \$75 million (for each of FY2020 and FY2021) to provide additional targeted support for states as they seek to strengthen and improve the quality of their foster care placement setting options consistent with the placement setting definitions and requirements of the Family First Prevention and Services Act (FFPSA). Finally, although not further addressed in this memorandum, the bill would also increase federal resources to state child welfare agencies by expanding federal Title IV-E eligibility for children placed in foster family homes. The draft bill would do this by removing for children placed in foster family homes the “lookback” eligibility requirements now associated with eligibility for federal (Title IV-E). These include an income test, and certain additional requirements tied to the family from which a child is removed.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A permanent boost would entail the full \$665 million becoming a part of the program’s permanent baseline, which is a matter subject to determination by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

<sup>2</sup> These provisions are sometimes referred to as the “lookback” because they require a state (as part of operating its current Title

States would be required to reinvest any savings from this expanded IV-E foster care support into other child welfare services.

## Increase in PSSF Mandatory Funding Authorization

The draft bill would amend Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act to increase the total annual mandatory funding authorization for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) program from \$345 million to \$665 million. This would enable increased funding for a broad range of child and family services and would also permit additional for other programs and activities that are now funded out of mandatory PSSF appropriation.<sup>3</sup>

## PSSF Mandatory Funding for Services to Children and Families

The increased authorization of mandatory PSSF funding would offer states, territories, and tribes an estimated \$469 million in flexible funds (compared to current law \$269 million) to provide PSSF services to children and families. Under current law there are four broadly defined categories of services – family support, family preservation, family reunification, and adoption promotion and support – that may be supported with these PSSF funds. The draft bill would authorize and define a fifth PSSF category to support “kinship placement support services.” States would continue to be required to spend no less than 90% of their share of this funding on PSSF services, including a “significant” portion on each of the now five categories of services that would be authorized.<sup>4</sup>

As is the case under current law, there are no specific federal eligibility requirements for a child or family that are associated with these additional PSSF services funds. Instead they are intended to enable states to serve children and their families, without regard to whether a child is living in foster care or is living at home. Also, as under current law, states and tribes would be required to provide matching funds (\$1 in non-federal funds for every \$3 in federal PSSF funding) to receive this increased PSSF funding.

## PSSF Mandatory Funding for Tribes and Other Program and Activities Support with PSSF Funding

Under current law, before any of the PSSF mandatory funding is distributed to states and territories for child and family services, some of the overall PSSF mandatory funding is reserved for specific programs and activities related to providing child welfare services to children and their families. The draft bill would continue this practice and would generally increase the reservation of PSSF mandatory funding for these activities.

---

IV-E program) to *look back* to certain income and other eligibility tests that were in place on July 16, 1996 as part of the prior law Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. For more information, request a copy of CRS Congressional Distribution (CD) Memorandum, *The Title IV-E Income Test Included in the “Lookback,”* April 19, 2019, by Emilie Stoltzfus.

<sup>3</sup> Apart from the program’s mandatory funding, some funding is authorized to be provided for the PSSF program on a discretionary basis. The draft bill would not amend the discretionary funding provisions for PSSF and this funding is not further discussed in the memorandum.

<sup>4</sup> Sec. 432(a)(4) requires a state to spend no less than 90% of its PSSF funding on services, including “significant” portions of its funding on each of the four current law PSSF service categories. The draft bill would maintain this provision, but would amend it to require the “significant” spending on what would be five PSSF service categories. HHS has certain authority to exempt a given tribe from the Sec. 432(a)(4) requirement and this authority would be continued by the draft bill. Puerto Rico is required to meet all PSSF requirements in the same manner as the 50 states and DC. Each of the remaining four territories may opt to receive these funds as part of consolidated social services funding (45 CFR 97) and do not need to meet any of the PSSF plan requirements.

- The **tribal PSSF child and family services** funding set-aside would increase to 4.5% of the proposed mandatory funding (\$29.9 million) from less than 3% of the current law mandatory funding (\$9.2 million).
- **Court Improvement Program (CIP)** funding would be doubled to \$60 million (from current law \$30 million) and the amount of this CIP funding reserved for tribal court improvement would be increased to \$5 million (compared to current law \$1 million).<sup>5</sup>
- Funding for **Regional Partnership Grants (RPGs)** to improve outcomes for children and families affected by substance use disorder funding would be set at \$60 million (compared to current law \$20 million).<sup>6</sup>
- The uses for **Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) grant** funding would be expanded to include support for child welfare caseworker training on best practices for working with families impacted by substance use disorder or behavioral health issues and to identify and reduce vicarious trauma among caseworkers; funding for the grants would be increased to \$50 million (compared to current law \$20 million).
- Support for **Research, Evaluation, Training, and Technical Assistance** would be increased to \$26 million (compared to current law \$6 million). Of that \$26 million, \$6 million would remain available for current law purposes, \$15 million would be provided for competitive grants to support state-directed research and demonstration projects intended to expand the number of evidence-based prevention programs that may be supported with Title IV-E prevention services and for additional purposes, and \$5 million would be provided to HHS to accelerate identification of prevention services that may be supported with Title IV-E funding.

## Selected Family First Implementation Funding

The draft Family First Transition and Support Act (ERN19131) would separately appropriate \$75 million for each of two years (FY2020 and FY2021) to support selected activities intended to enable states to more easily meet the FFPSA preference for ensuring children in foster care live in foster family home, rather than congregate or group settings, and, further, that the group foster care settings states do use meet the standards in FFPSA for family-based residential treatment facilities for substance abuse and for qualified residential treatment programs (QRTPs) or other qualified settings.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, the funds

---

<sup>5</sup> This proposed increase matches the request made by the Trump Administration in its FY2020 budget for increased PSSF mandatory funding that will allow a reservation of \$60 million of those funds for CIP funds, without any resulting reduction in mandatory PSSF funding for child and family services. The Administration describes the doubled level of CIP funding as necessary to assist state courts in meeting new legislative requirements made of them, including additional training and permanency hearing requirements included in FFPSA [Family First Prevention Services Act, P.L. 115-123, Title VII of Div. E.], and, in the face of the opioid crisis, to help equip judges with more information on appropriate, testing, treatment and recovery option to enable them to make safe, timely and well-informed decisions for children and families. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF), *Justifications of Estimate FY2020*, p. 274.

<sup>6</sup> This proposed increase matches the request made by the Trump Administration in its FY2020 budget for increased PSSF mandatory funding that will additionally allow a reservation of \$60 million of those funds for RPGs without any resulting reduction in mandatory PSSF funding for child and family services. According to HHS, providing \$60 million for RPGs out of mandatory PSSF funding would enable a continuation of recent expansion of the program – permitted when additional RPG funding (provided via PSSF *discretionary* appropriations) raised the grant total to just under \$39 million in each of FY2018 and FY2019 – and would enable grantees in more states to “address the significant problem of the intersection of substance use disorders, including opioid addiction, and child welfare involvement.” HHS, ACF, *Justifications of Estimate FY2020*, p. 274.

<sup>7</sup> As amended by Sec. 50741 of the FFPSA, Sec. 472(j) of the SSA (effective October 1, 2018) describes licensed family-based residential treatment facilities for substance abuse. Additionally, no sooner than October 1, 2019 (or, at state option, no later than October 1, 2021), Sec. 472(c) of the SSA includes a revised definition of “foster family home” and Sec. 472(k) specifies the non-foster family home settings that may qualify for federal foster care support for more than 14 days, including QRTPs, as well as

could be used to improve implementation of the state's required health care oversight plan for children in foster care.<sup>8</sup>

Three percent of these funds would be reserved for tribes and the remaining funds would be distributed by formula to each state and territory. No non-federal (matching) funds would be required in order for a state to receive these funds. This funding is appropriated in each of two years (FY2020 and FY2021).

## Sequestration and PSSF Funding

Under the Budget Control Act (BCA, P.L. 112-25), as amended, PSSF mandatory funding is subject to annual sequestration in every year through FY2027.<sup>9</sup> This means a portion of the dollars appropriated for the PSSF program are subsequently cancelled (sequestered). This cancellation of funds reduces the amount of mandatory PSSF dollars to be distributed by a certain annually calculated amount that is designed to ensure that the deficit reduction goal set by the BCA is met.<sup>10</sup> The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is responsible for this calculation and for implementing the sequester.

For FY2020, OMB has reported that the sequester applicable to PSSF mandatory funding will be 5.9% of the \$345 million in currently authorized mandatory PSSF funding.<sup>11</sup> This will reduce the expected \$345 million appropriation in mandatory funding by a little more than \$20 million dollars. Because the PSSF sequestration amount has already been calculated for FY2020 (based on the current law authorization level), this amount is unlikely to change even if the total PSSF appropriation for FY2020 is more than \$345 million. (While OMB is ultimately responsible for making this determination, recent practice suggests that OMB generally does not re-calculate sequester amounts based on subsequent changes in appropriations.) This means that whether PSSF mandatory funding remains at \$345 million for FY2020, as provided in current law, or it is increased to \$665 million as proposed in the draft Family First Transition and Support Act, the amount of the FY2020 sequester would likely be the same roughly \$20 million. Further, it is likely that the \$75 million in new FY2020 mandatory funding for selected Family First implementation activities in FY2020 would not be reduced by sequestration, because these funds were not part of OMB's sequestration calculation for FY2020. However any of the newly authorized mandatory funding provided for the PSSF program, or for selected Family First implementation, in FY2021 or any later year (through FY2027) would be expected to be reduced by sequestration, assuming the amounts are authorized by law before OMB calculates the sequestration amounts for those years.

## Estimated Funding Overall and By State

**Table 1** shows estimated mandatory PSSF funding for FY2020 – *as a national total* – under current law and as proposed in the draft Family First Transition and Support Act (ERN19131). **Table 2** shows this comparison – *as a total by state* and **Table 3** shows the comparison by specific purpose and by state.

---

settings that provide high quality residential care and supportive services for children and youth found to be, or at risk of becoming, victims of sex trafficking; supervised independent living settings for youth age 18 or older; and settings specializing in providing prenatal, post-partum or parenting supports for youth).

<sup>8</sup> See Sec. 422(b)(15) of the SSA.

<sup>9</sup> See “Annual Mandatory Spending Sequester,” in CRS Report R44874, *The Budget Control Act: Frequently Asked Questions*, by Grant A. Driessen and Megan S. Lynch.

<sup>10</sup> See “Appendix B. Child Welfare Programs by Type of Funding Authority and Sequestration Status,” in CRS Report R43458, *Child Welfare: An Overview of Federal Programs and Their Current Funding*, by Emilie Stoltzfus.

<sup>11</sup> See *OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2020*, March 18, 2019, p 6 of 17. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/2020\\_JC\\_Sequestration\\_Report\\_3-18-19.pdf#page=15](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/2020_JC_Sequestration_Report_3-18-19.pdf#page=15).

---

**Table 1. Mandatory FY2020 Funding for Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act, Under Current Law and As Proposed in the Draft Family First Transition and Support Act**

All funding amounts rounded to the nearest million and shown prior to sequestration.

<b>Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act (SSA)</b>	<b>Current Law</b>	<b>Proposed in Draft Family First Transition and Support Act</b>
<b>Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Program</b>	<b>\$345 million</b>	<b>\$665 million</b>
<u>PSSF services for children and families</u>	<u>\$269 million</u>	<u>\$469 million</u>
States and Territories	\$260 million	\$439 million
Tribes	\$9 million	\$30 million
<u>Court Improvement Program</u>	<u>\$30 million</u>	<u>\$60 million</u>
State and Territories	\$29 million	\$55 million
Tribes	\$1 million	\$5 million
<u>Research, Evaluation, Training &amp; Technical Assistance</u>	<u>\$6 million</u>	<u>\$26 million</u>
Currently Authorized Activities	\$6 million	\$6 million
State-Directed Research and Demonstration	-	\$15 million
Accelerated Identification of Evidence-Based Programs	-	\$5 million
<u>Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) grants</u>	<u>\$20 million</u>	<u>\$50 million</u>
<u>Regional Partnership Grants (RPG)</u>	<u>\$20 million</u>	<u>\$60 million</u>
<b>Selected Family First Implementation</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$75 million</b>
<u>Selected Family First Implementation</u>	-	<u>\$75 million</u>
State and Territories	-	\$73 million
Tribes	-	\$2 million
<b>Total Mandatory Funding Under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the SSA (authorized or appropriated)</b>	<b>\$345 million</b>	<b>\$740 million</b>

**Source:** Table prepared by Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on current law and the draft Family First Transition and Support Act (ERN19131 or the “draft bill”).

**Notes:** All amounts concern mandatory funding only and are given pre-sequestration. FY2020 amounts reflect the mandatory funding authorization level for the PSSF program and mandatory appropriation for Selected Family First Implementation, as provided in current law or as proposed in the draft bill.

**Discretionary PSSF funding:** Any FY2020 PSSF discretionary funding that may be appropriated is not estimated or discussed in this memorandum. The draft bill would leave unchanged the current PSSF discretionary authorization.

**Sequestration:** All of the funding levels in Table 1 are shown as appropriated or authorized to be appropriated. However, mandatory funding appropriated under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act (SSA), including PSSF program funding, is subject to annual sequestration (through FY2027). For FY2020, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has reported that the sequester of PSSF funds will total just over \$20 million, i.e., 5.9% of the currently authorized mandatory program funding of \$345 million. (See *OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2020*, March 18, 2019, p 6 of 17.) The effect of sequestration on any new mandatory Title IV-B, Subpart 2 funding provided for FY2020 by the draft bill is not entirely certain. See table note “Estimate of Funding Post-sequestration,” following Tables 2 and 3.

**Table 2. Estimated Share of Mandatory FY2020 Funding under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act, All Purposes, By State**

Dollars in millions. Allotments by state are estimates based on an overall estimate of post-sequestration funding.

<b>Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act (SSA)</b>	<b>Current Law</b>	<b>Proposed in Draft Family First Transition and Support Act</b>
<b>TOTAL Funding</b> (before sequestration)	<b>\$345.000</b>	<b>\$740.000</b>
<i>State</i>		
Alabama	\$5.554	\$11.401
Alaska	\$0.764	\$1.337
Arizona	\$6.748	\$13.957
Arkansas	\$3.050	\$6.154
California	\$31.534	\$66.445
Colorado	\$3.578	\$7.330
Connecticut	\$2.404	\$4.826
Delaware	\$1.146	\$2.132
District of Columbia (DC)	\$0.938	\$1.689
Florida	\$19.519	\$40.800
Georgia	\$11.337	\$23.598
Hawaii	\$1.289	\$2.444
Idaho	\$1.586	\$3.078
Illinois	\$11.578	\$24.160
Indiana	\$5.425	\$11.208
Iowa	\$2.623	\$5.275
Kansas	\$2.079	\$4.143
Kentucky	\$4.360	\$8.914
Louisiana	\$5.844	\$12.003
Maine	\$1.226	\$2.307
Maryland	\$4.644	\$9.553
Massachusetts	\$4.175	\$8.595
Michigan	\$8.275	\$17.208
Minnesota	\$3.387	\$6.939
Mississippi	\$4.011	\$8.147
Missouri	\$5.327	\$10.975
Montana	\$0.929	\$1.687
Nebraska	\$1.450	\$2.803
Nevada	\$2.701	\$5.424
New Hampshire	\$0.848	\$1.524
New Jersey	\$5.840	\$12.127
New Mexico	\$3.003	\$6.023
New York	\$15.652	\$32.800
North Carolina	\$9.557	\$19.879
North Dakota	\$0.595	\$0.987
Ohio	\$9.885	\$20.606

<b>Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act (SSA)</b>	<b>Current Law</b>	<b>Proposed in Draft Family First Transition and Support Act</b>
Oklahoma	\$3.961	\$8.078
Oregon	\$3.810	\$7.753
Pennsylvania	\$10.095	\$21.058
Rhode Island	\$1.121	\$2.083
South Carolina	\$5.211	\$10.692
South Dakota	\$0.899	\$1.622
Tennessee	\$7.210	\$14.894
Texas	\$28.956	\$60.818
Utah	\$1.950	\$3.904
Vermont	\$0.672	\$1.138
Virginia	\$5.604	\$11.623
Washington	\$5.937	\$12.272
West Virginia	\$2.034	\$3.999
Wisconsin	\$4.720	\$9.704
Wyoming	\$0.502	\$0.788
<b>50 states &amp; DC - subtotal</b>	<b>\$285.545</b>	<b>\$588.906</b>
<i>Territories</i>		
American Samoa	\$0.182	\$0.371
Guam	\$0.323	\$0.665
Northern Mariana Islands	\$0.150	\$0.306
Puerto Rico	\$3.969	\$8.053
US Virgin Islands	\$0.460	\$0.678
<b>Territories - subtotal</b>	<b>\$5.083</b>	<b>\$10.073</b>
<i>Tribes</i>		
<b>Tribes - subtotal</b>	<b>\$9.551</b>	<b>\$36.200</b>
<i>Other Activities</i>		
Research, Evaluation, Training & Technical	\$5.646	\$25.646
Regional Partnership Grants (RPGs)	\$18.820	\$58.820
<b>Other Activities - subtotal</b>	<b>\$24.466</b>	<b>\$84.466</b>
<b>TOTAL estimated funding post-sequestration</b> (see note)	<b>\$324.645</b>	<b>\$719.645</b>

**Source:** Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on current law and the draft Family First Transition and Support Act (ERN19131 or the “draft bill”).

**Notes:** The majority of PSSF funding is distributed to a state in proportion to its share of children in the nation receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits (based on most recent available three-year average). For the estimates in the table, a state’s share was based on distribution factors used to allot FY2018 PSSF funds. Additionally, all amounts shown concern mandatory funding only (no estimates of discretionary PSSF funding for current or proposed draft bill) is included in the amounts shown. Finally, *allotments by state* are given as post-sequestration estimates. See estimate of funding post-sequestration.

**Estimate of Funding Post-Sequestration:** The total funding levels given at the top of Table 2 are shown as appropriated or authorized to be appropriated and without any sequestration. However, the estimated allotments were calculated based on an estimated post-sequestration level of funding and the total estimated post-sequestration funding level is shown at the bottom of Table 2. For FY2020, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has reported that the sequester of PSSF funds will total just above \$20 million, i.e., 5.9% of the currently authorized mandatory program funding of \$345

million. (See *OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2020*, March 18, 2019, p 6 of 17, [https://www.whitehouse.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2019/03/2020\\_JC\\_Sequestration\\_Report\\_3-18-19.pdf#page=15](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2019/03/2020_JC_Sequestration_Report_3-18-19.pdf#page=15).) This will reduce PSSF funding available for distribution under current law to a bit less than \$325 million for FY2020; the reduction in funding must be shared proportionately by each of the programs or activities that receives mandatory PSSF funding. The treatment of new mandatory funding provided for FY2020 under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 is not certain. However for purposes of the post-sequestration funding estimates shown at the bottom of Table 2, CRS has assumed that *for FY2020* OMB will not sequester to the higher level of mandatory funding that would be provided under the draft bill. This assumption was made because in past years, once the annual sequestration amount applicable to mandatory Title IV-B, subpart 2 funding had been determined, the level was not changed (for that fiscal year) *even if additional mandatory funding is appropriated for that fiscal year*. If this practice is followed for FY2020, then the new mandatory funding authorized or appropriated by the draft bill would not be subject to sequestration in FY2020 – i.e., total reduction of Title IV-B, Subpart 2 funding would remain at just above \$20 million for FY2020. However the OMB is ultimately responsible for implementation of the sequester and it may determine a broader application in FY2020. Further mandatory funding provided at higher levels in subsequent years (as proposed in the draft bill) would be subject to annual sequestration (through FY2027).

**Allotments:** State amounts are estimated allotment of formula funds to state highest courts for the Court Improvement Program (CIP) and estimated allotments to state child welfare agencies for PSSF child and family services, Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) grants, and Selected Support for Family First Implementation. For estimated allotment by state and by purpose see Table 3. **Territorial** amounts include funding provided on a formula basis for the same purposes as are included in state allotments. However, only Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are eligible for CIP funds. For estimated allotment by territory and by purpose see **Table 3**.

**Tribal Reservation:** Includes reservation to tribes for PSSF child and family services (distributed by formula) and for tribal court improvement funding (distributed by competitive award). No MCV grant funding is reserved for tribes under current law or the draft bill.



**Table 3. Estimated Share of Mandatory FY2020 Formula Funding under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 of the Social Security Act, - Current Law and as Proposed in draft Family First Transition and Support Act, by Program/Activity and By State**

Dollars in Millions. Allotments by state are estimates based on overall estimate of post-sequestration funding.

<b>Title IV-B, Subpart 2</b> <i>Mandatory Funding to be Distributed by Formula to State or Tribal Child Welfare Agencies and for the Court Improvement Program</i>	<b>PSSF Child and Family Services</b> Cols. A		<b>Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) Grants</b> Cols. B		<b>Selected Family First Implementation</b> Cols. C		<b>TOTAL to State or Tribal Child Welfare Agency</b> includes funding distributed by formula only Cols A+B+C		<b>Court Improvement Program (CIP)</b> CIP funding is provided to state or tribal courts	
	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING before sequestration</b>	<b>\$269.000</b>	<b>\$469.000</b>	<b>\$20.000</b>	<b>\$50.000</b>	<b>Not authorized</b>	<b>\$75.000</b>	<b>\$289.000</b>	<b>\$594.000</b>	<b>\$30.000</b>	<b>\$60.000</b>
Alabama	\$4.731	\$8.211	\$0.365	\$0.946	NA	\$1.403	\$5.096	\$10.559	\$0.458	\$0.841
Alaska	\$0.441	\$0.765	\$0.034	\$0.088	NA	\$0.131	\$0.475	\$0.984	\$0.289	\$0.353
Arizona	\$5.749	\$9.977	\$0.443	\$1.149	NA	\$1.704	\$6.192	\$12.831	\$0.557	\$1.126
Arkansas	\$2.475	\$4.295	\$0.191	\$0.495	NA	\$0.734	\$2.665	\$5.524	\$0.385	\$0.630
California	\$27.479	\$47.692	\$2.118	\$5.494	NA	\$8.148	\$29.597	\$61.334	\$1.937	\$5.111
Colorado	\$2.868	\$4.978	\$0.221	\$0.574	NA	\$0.851	\$3.090	\$6.403	\$0.488	\$0.928
Connecticut	\$1.862	\$3.231	\$0.144	\$0.372	NA	\$0.552	\$2.005	\$4.156	\$0.399	\$0.670
Delaware	\$0.792	\$1.374	\$0.061	\$0.158	NA	\$0.235	\$0.853	\$1.767	\$0.293	\$0.365
District of Columbia	\$0.611	\$1.061	\$0.047	\$0.122	NA	\$0.181	\$0.659	\$1.365	\$0.279	\$0.325
Florida	\$17.175	\$29.808	\$1.324	\$3.434	NA	\$5.092	\$18.499	\$38.334	\$1.021	\$2.466
Georgia	\$9.860	\$17.113	\$0.760	\$1.971	NA	\$2.923	\$10.620	\$22.008	\$0.717	\$1.590
Hawaii	\$0.908	\$1.576	\$0.070	\$0.182	NA	\$0.269	\$0.978	\$2.026	\$0.311	\$0.417
Idaho	\$1.162	\$2.017	\$0.090	\$0.232	NA	\$0.345	\$1.252	\$2.594	\$0.334	\$0.484
Illinois	\$10.011	\$17.374	\$0.772	\$2.002	NA	\$2.968	\$10.782	\$22.344	\$0.796	\$1.816
Indiana	\$4.528	\$7.859	\$0.349	\$0.905	NA	\$1.343	\$4.877	\$10.107	\$0.548	\$1.100
Iowa	\$2.071	\$3.595	\$0.160	\$0.414	NA	\$0.614	\$2.231	\$4.623	\$0.392	\$0.652
Kansas	\$1.571	\$2.726	\$0.121	\$0.314	NA	\$0.466	\$1.692	\$3.506	\$0.388	\$0.638
Kentucky	\$3.638	\$6.314	\$0.280	\$0.727	NA	\$1.079	\$3.918	\$8.120	\$0.442	\$0.794
Louisiana	\$5.000	\$8.678	\$0.385	\$1.000	NA	\$1.483	\$5.386	\$11.161	\$0.458	\$0.842
Maine	\$0.857	\$1.488	\$0.066	\$0.171	NA	\$0.254	\$0.923	\$1.914	\$0.303	\$0.393
Maryland	\$3.844	\$6.671	\$0.296	\$0.769	NA	\$1.140	\$4.140	\$8.579	\$0.504	\$0.975

<b>Title IV-B, Subpart 2</b> <i>Mandatory Funding to be Distributed by Formula to State or Tribal Child Welfare Agencies and for the Court Improvement Program</i>	<b>PSSF Child and Family Services</b> Cols. A		<b>Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) Grants</b> Cols. B		<b>Selected Family First Implementation</b> Cols. C		<b>TOTAL to State or Tribal Child Welfare Agency</b> includes funding distributed by formula only Cols A+B+C		<b>Court Improvement Program (CIP)</b> CIP funding is provided to state or tribal courts	
	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Massachusetts	\$3.392	\$5.887	\$0.261	\$0.678	NA	\$1.006	\$3.653	\$7.570	\$0.521	\$1.024
Michigan	\$7.065	\$12.262	\$0.545	\$1.413	NA	\$2.095	\$7.610	\$15.770	\$0.665	\$1.438
Minnesota	\$2.688	\$4.666	\$0.207	\$0.538	NA	\$0.797	\$2.896	\$6.001	\$0.492	\$0.939
Mississippi	\$3.363	\$5.837	\$0.259	\$0.672	NA	\$0.997	\$3.622	\$7.506	\$0.388	\$0.640
Missouri	\$4.471	\$7.760	\$0.345	\$0.894	NA	\$1.326	\$4.816	\$9.980	\$0.511	\$0.996
Montana	\$0.587	\$1.019	\$0.045	\$0.117	NA	\$0.174	\$0.632	\$1.310	\$0.297	\$0.377
Nebraska	\$1.028	\$1.785	\$0.079	\$0.206	NA	\$0.305	\$1.108	\$2.295	\$0.343	\$0.508
Nevada	\$2.158	\$3.745	\$0.166	\$0.431	NA	\$0.640	\$2.324	\$4.816	\$0.377	\$0.608
New Hampshire	\$0.504	\$0.874	\$0.039	\$0.101	NA	\$0.149	\$0.543	\$1.124	\$0.305	\$0.399
New Jersey	\$4.847	\$8.413	\$0.374	\$0.969	NA	\$1.437	\$5.221	\$10.819	\$0.620	\$1.308
New Mexico	\$2.467	\$4.282	\$0.190	\$0.493	NA	\$0.731	\$2.657	\$5.506	\$0.345	\$0.516
New York	\$13.568	\$23.549	\$1.046	\$2.713	NA	\$4.023	\$14.614	\$30.285	\$1.038	\$2.515
North Carolina	\$8.240	\$14.301	\$0.635	\$1.648	NA	\$2.443	\$8.875	\$18.392	\$0.682	\$1.488
North Dakota	\$0.285	\$0.494	\$0.022	\$0.057	NA	\$0.084	\$0.307	\$0.635	\$0.288	\$0.351
Ohio	\$8.491	\$14.737	\$0.655	\$1.698	NA	\$2.518	\$9.146	\$18.953	\$0.739	\$1.653
Oklahoma	\$3.277	\$5.687	\$0.253	\$0.655	NA	\$0.972	\$3.529	\$7.314	\$0.432	\$0.765
Oregon	\$3.152	\$5.470	\$0.243	\$0.630	NA	\$0.935	\$3.395	\$7.035	\$0.415	\$0.718
Pennsylvania	\$8.668	\$15.044	\$0.668	\$1.733	NA	\$2.570	\$9.336	\$19.348	\$0.759	\$1.710
Rhode Island	\$0.766	\$1.329	\$0.059	\$0.153	NA	\$0.227	\$0.825	\$1.709	\$0.296	\$0.374
South Carolina	\$4.412	\$7.657	\$0.340	\$0.882	NA	\$1.308	\$4.752	\$9.847	\$0.459	\$0.845
South Dakota	\$0.562	\$0.975	\$0.043	\$0.112	NA	\$0.166	\$0.605	\$1.253	\$0.294	\$0.368
Tennessee	\$6.201	\$10.763	\$0.478	\$1.240	NA	\$1.839	\$6.679	\$13.842	\$0.531	\$1.052
Texas	\$25.411	\$44.102	\$1.959	\$5.081	NA	\$7.534	\$27.369	\$56.717	\$1.587	\$4.101
Utah	\$1.419	\$2.462	\$0.109	\$0.284	NA	\$0.421	\$1.528	\$3.167	\$0.422	\$0.737
Vermont	\$0.365	\$0.633	\$0.028	\$0.073	NA	\$0.108	\$0.393	\$0.814	\$0.279	\$0.323
Virginia	\$4.643	\$8.058	\$0.358	\$0.928	NA	\$1.377	\$5.001	\$10.363	\$0.603	\$1.261

<b>Title IV-B, Subpart 2</b> <i>Mandatory Funding to be Distributed by Formula to State or Tribal Child Welfare Agencies and for the Court Improvement Program</i>	<b>PSSF Child and Family Services</b> Cols. A		<b>Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) Grants</b> Cols. B		<b>Selected Family First Implementation</b> Cols. C		<b>TOTAL to State or Tribal Child Welfare Agency</b> includes funding distributed by formula only Cols A+B+C		<b>Court Improvement Program (CIP)</b> CIP funding is provided to state or tribal courts	
	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>	<i>Current Law</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Washington	\$4.998	\$8.674	\$0.385	\$0.999	NA	\$1.482	\$5.383	\$11.156	\$0.553	\$1.117
West Virginia	\$1.587	\$2.755	\$0.122	\$0.317	NA	\$0.471	\$1.709	\$3.543	\$0.325	\$0.456
Wisconsin	\$3.922	\$6.808	\$0.302	\$0.784	NA	\$1.163	\$4.225	\$8.755	\$0.495	\$0.949
Wyoming	\$0.206	\$0.357	\$0.016	\$0.041	NA	\$0.061	\$0.222	\$0.459	\$0.280	\$0.328
<b>50 states &amp; DC subtotal</b>	<b>\$240.375</b>	<b>\$417.189</b>	<b>\$18.528</b>	<b>\$48.062</b>	-	<b>\$71.271</b>	<b>\$258.903</b>	<b>\$536.523</b>	<b>\$26.642</b>	<b>\$52.383</b>
<i>Territories</i>										
American Samoa	\$0.174	\$0.250	\$0.008	\$0.021	NA	\$0.101	\$0.182	\$0.371		
Guam	\$0.305	\$0.478	\$0.018	\$0.047	NA	\$0.140	\$0.323	\$0.665		
Northern Mariana Islands	\$0.145	\$0.199	\$0.006	\$0.015	NA	\$0.092	\$0.150	\$0.306		
Puerto Rico	\$3.330	\$5.725	\$0.251	\$0.651	NA	\$1.040	\$3.581	\$7.416	\$0.387	\$0.637
US Virgin Islands	\$0.191	\$0.279	\$0.009	\$0.024	NA	\$0.106	\$0.200	\$0.409	\$0.260	\$0.269
<b>Territories Subtotal</b>	<b>\$4.144</b>	<b>\$6.931</b>	<b>\$0.292</b>	<b>\$0.758</b>	-	<b>\$1.479</b>	<b>\$4.436</b>	<b>\$9.167</b>	<b>\$0.647</b>	<b>\$0.906</b>
<b>Tribes - Subtotal</b>	<b>\$8.610</b>	<b>\$29.009</b>	a	a	-	<b>\$2.250</b>	<b>\$8.610</b>	<b>\$31.259</b>	<b>\$0.941</b>	<b>\$4.941</b>
<b>TOTAL estimated post-sequestration funding to States, Territories, and Tribes</b> (see notes)	<b>\$253.129</b>	<b>\$453.129</b>	<b>\$18.820</b>	<b>\$48.820</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$75.000</b>	<b>\$271.949</b>	<b>\$576.949</b>	<b>\$28.230</b>	<b>\$58.230</b>

**Source:** Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) based on current law and the draft Family First Transition and Support Act (ERN19131 or the “draft bill”).

**Notes:** Funding for Regional Partnership Grants (RPGs) or for Research, Evaluation, Training and Technical Assistance is awarded entirely on a competitive basis and is not shown in this table. However, a state or tribal child welfare agency may compete for certain funds provided for one or both of these PSSF program activities. (For FY2020 current law and proposed mandatory funding for RPGs and research, evaluation, Training and Technical Assistance, see bottom of **Table 2.**) The majority of PSSF funding is distributed to a state in proportion to its share of children in the nation receiving Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits (based on most recent available three-year average). For the estimates in Table 3, a state’s share was based on distribution factors used to allot FY2018 PSSF funds. Additionally, all amounts shown concern mandatory funding only (no estimates of discretionary PSSF funding for current or proposed draft bill) is included in the amounts shown. Finally, *allotments by state are given as post-sequestration estimates. See estimate of funding post-sequestration.*

**Estimate of Funding Post-Sequestration:** The total funding levels given at the top of Table 3 are shown as appropriated or authorized to be appropriated and without any sequestration. However, the estimated allotments were calculated based on an estimated post-sequestration level of funding and the total estimated post-

sequestration funding level is shown at the bottom of Table 2. For FY2020, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has reported that the sequester of PSSF funds will total just above \$20 million, i.e., 5.9% of the currently authorized mandatory program funding of \$345 million. (See *OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2020*, March 18, 2019, p 6 of 17, [https://www.whitehouse.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2019/03/2020\\_JC\\_Sequestration\\_Report\\_3-18-19.pdf#page=15](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2019/03/2020_JC_Sequestration_Report_3-18-19.pdf#page=15).) This will reduce PSSF funding available for distribution under current law to a bit less than \$325 million for FY2020; the reduction in funding must be shared proportionately by each of the programs or activities that receives mandatory PSSF funding. The treatment of new mandatory funding provided for FY2020 under Title IV-B, Subpart 2 is not certain. However for purposes of the post-sequestration funding estimates shown at the bottom of Table 3, CRS has assumed that *for FY2020* OMB will not sequester to the higher level of mandatory funding that would be provided under the draft bill. This assumption was made because in past years, once the annual sequestration amount applicable to mandatory Title IV-B, subpart 2 funding had been determined the level was not changed (for that fiscal year) *even if additional mandatory funding is appropriated for that fiscal year*. If this practice is followed for FY2020, then the new mandatory funding authorized or appropriated by the draft bill would not be subject to sequestration in FY2020 – i.e., total reduction of Title IV-B, Subpart 2 funding would remain at just above \$20 million for FY2020. However the OMB is ultimately responsible for implementation of the sequester and it may determine a broader application in FY2020. Further mandatory funding provided at higher levels in subsequent years (as proposed in the draft bill) would be subject to annual sequestration (through FY2027).

- a. Under current law, and under the draft bill, no Monthly Caseworker Visit (MCV) funding is reserved for tribes.