Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

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

Updated November 21, 2018

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
RL32760

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

SUMMARY

RL32760

November 21, 2018

Gene Falk
Specialist in Social Policy

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

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 and Expenditures. TANF provides fixed funding for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the territories, and American Indian tribes. The basic block grant totals $16.5 billion per year. States are also required in total to contribute, from their own funds, at least $10.3 billion annually under a maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirement.

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 FY2017, expenditures on basic assistance totaled $7.1 billion—23% of total federal TANF and MOE dollars. Basic assistance is often—but not exclusively—paid as cash. In addition to funding basic assistance, TANF also contributes funds for child care and services for children who have been, or are at risk of being, abused and neglected. Some states also count expenditures in prekindergarten programs toward the MOE requirement.

The TANF Assistance Caseload. A total of 1.4 million families, composed of 3.4 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded assistance in September 2017. The bulk of the "recipients" were children—2.5 million in that month. The assistance caseload is heterogeneous. The type of family once thought of as the "typical" assistance family—one with an unemployed adult recipient—accounted for 32% of all families on the rolls in FY2016. Additionally, 31% of cash assistance families had an employed adult, while 38% of all TANF families were "child-only" and 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 benefit amounts are set by states. In July 2016, the maximum monthly benefit for a family of three ranged from $923 in Alaska to $170 in Mississippi. In all states, the maximum TANF cash assistance amount for this sized family was less than 50% of poverty-level income.

Work Requirements. TANF's main federal work requirement is actually a performance measure that applies to the states. States determine the work rules that apply to individual recipients. TANF law requires states to engage 50% of all families and 90% of two-parent families with work-eligible individuals in work activities, though these standards can be reduced by "credits." Therefore, the effective standards states face are often less than the 50% or 90% targets, and vary by state. In FY2017, states achieved, on average, an all-family participation rate of 53.0% and a two-parent rate of 69.5%. In FY2017, two jurisdictions did not meet the all-family participation standard: Nevada and Guam. This is a reduction from FY2012, when 16 states did not meet that standard. In FY2017, nine jurisdictions did not meet the two-parent standard. States that do not meet work standards are *at risk* of being penalized by a reduction in their block grant.

Contents

Introduction 1
Funding and Expenditures 1
When Does TANF Funding Expire? 1
How Are TANF Programs Funded? 1
How Much Has the Value of the TANF Basic Block Grant Changed Over Time? 1
How Have States Used TANF Funds? 2
How Much of the TANF Grant Has Gone Unspent? 3
The Caseload 4
How Many Families Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded Benefits and Services? 4
How Many Families and People Currently Receive TANF- or MOE-Funded "Assistance"? 4
How Does the Current Assistance Caseload Level Compare with Historical Levels? 5
What Are the Characteristics of Families Receiving TANF Assistance? 6
TANF Cash Benefits: How Much Does a Family Receive in TANF Cash Per Month? 7
TANF Work Participation Standards 8
What Is the TANF Work Participation Standard States Must Meet? 8
Have There Been Changes in the Work Participation Rules Enacted Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Law? 9
What Work Participation Rates Have the States Achieved? 9
How Many Jurisdictions Did Not Meet the All-Families Standard? 10
Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard? 13

Figures

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Funds by Spending Category, FY2017 3
Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance, July 1959-September 2017 5
Figure 3. Characteristics of Assistance Families, Selected Years FY1988 to FY2016 7
Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single Parent Family with Two Children, 50 States and the District of Columbia, July 2016 8
Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2017 10
Figure 6. States that Met or Did Not Meet the TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard: FY2006-FY2017 12
Figure 7. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2006-FY2017 14

Tables

Table 1. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Nominal and Constant Dollars 2
Table 2. TANF Assistance Caseload: September 2017 4

Table A-1. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961 to 2016 15

Table A-2. Families Receiving AFDC/TANF Assistance by Family Category, Selected Years, FY1988 to FY2016 17
Table B-1. Use of FY2017 TANF and MOE Funds by Category 18
Table B-2. Use of FY2017 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percentage of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding 21
Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2017 24
Table B-4. Number of Families, Recipients, Children, and Adults Receiving TANF Assistance by State, September 2017 25
Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Assistance by State, September of Selected Years 27
Table B-6. TANF Assistance Families by Number of Parents by State: September 2017 29

Appendixes

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables 15
Appendix B. State Tables 18

Contacts

Author Information 31

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. **Appendix B** presents a series of tables with state-level data. This report does not provide information on TANF program rules (for a discussion of TANF rules, see CRS Report RL32748, *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*, by Gene Falk).

Funding and Expenditures

When Does TANF Funding Expire?

Under the terms of the FY2019 continuing resolution (P.L. 115-245), federal TANF funding is scheduled to expire on December 7, 2018.

How Are TANF Programs Funded?

TANF programs are funded through a combination of federal and state funds. In FY2018, TANF has two federal grants to states. The bulk of the TANF funding is in a basic block grant to the states, totaling $16.5 billion for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Indian tribes. There is also a contingency fund available that provides extra federal funds to states that meet certain conditions.

Additionally, states are required to expend a minimum amount of their own funds for TANF and TANF-related activities under what is known as the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. States are required to spend at least 75% of what they spent in FY1994 on TANF's predecessor programs. The minimum MOE amount, in total, is $10.3 billion per year for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

How Much Has the Value of the TANF Basic Block Grant Changed Over Time?

TANF was created in the 1996 welfare reform law, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA, P.L. 104-193). A TANF basic block grant amount—both nationally and for each state—was established in the 1996 welfare reform law. The amount established in that law for the 50 states, District of Columbia, territories, and tribes was $16.6 billion in total. From FY1997 through FY2016, that amount remained the same. It was not adjusted for changes that occur over time, such as inflation, the size of the TANF assistance caseload, or changes in the poverty population. During this period, the real (inflation-adjusted) value of the block grant declined by one-third (33.1%). Beginning with FY2017, the state family assistance grant was reduced by 0.33% from its historical levels to finance TANF-related research and technical assistance. The reduced block grant amount is $16.5 billion.

Table 1 shows the state family assistance grant, in both nominal (actual) and real (inflation-adjusted) dollars for each year, FY1997 through FY2018. In real (inflation-adjusted) terms, the FY2018 block grant was 36% below its value in FY1997.

Table 1. TANF Basic Block Grant Funding in Nominal and Constant Dollars

(In billions of $)

Fiscal Year	State Family Assistance Grant: 50 States, DC, Tribes, and Territories	State Family Assistance Grant Constant 1997 Dollars	Cumulative Percentage Change
1997	$16.567	$16.567	
1998	16.567	16.306	-1.6%
1999	16.567	15.991	-3.5
2000	16.567	15.498	-6.5
2001	16.567	15.020	-9.3
2002	16.567	14.792	-10.7
2003	16.567	14.456	-12.7
2004	16.567	14.124	-14.7
2005	16.567	13.680	-17.4
2006	16.567	13.190	-20.4
2007	16.567	12.893	-22.2
2008	16.567	12.345	-25.5
2009	16.567	12.382	-25.3
2010	16.567	12.182	-26.5
2011	16.567	11.859	-28.4
2012	16.567	11.585	-30.1
2013	16.567	11.394	-31.2
2014	16.567	11.217	-32.3
2015	16.567	11.179	-32.5
2016	16.567	11.082	-33.1
2017	16.512	10.820	-34.7
2018	16.512	10.564	-36.2

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

Notes: Constant dollars were computed using the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers (CPI-U).

How Have States Used TANF Funds?

Figure 1 shows the uses of federal TANF grants to states and state MOE funds in FY2017. In FY2017, a total of $31.1 billion of both federal TANF and state MOE expenditures were either expended or transferred to other block grant programs. Basic assistance—ongoing benefits to families to meet basic needs—represented 23% ($7.1 billion) of total FY2017 TANF and MOE dollars.

TANF is a major contributor of child care funding. In FY2017, $5 billion (16% of all TANF and MOE funds) were either expended on child care or transferred to the child care block grant (the Child Care and Development Fund, or CCDF). TANF work-related activities (including education

and training) were the third-largest TANF and MOE spending category at $3.3 billion, or 11% of total TANF and MOE funds. TANF also helps low-wage parents by helping to finance state refundable tax credits, such as state add-ons to the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). TANF and MOE expenditures on refundable tax credits in FY2017 totaled $2.8 billion, or 9% of total TANF and MOE spending.

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, spending about $2.2 billion on such activities. TANF and MOE funds also help fund state prekindergarten (pre-K) programs, with total FY2017 expenditures for that category also at $2.5 billion. TANF and MOE funds are also used for short-term and emergency benefits and a wide range of other social services.

Figure 1. Uses of TANF Funds by Spending Category, FY2017

(Dollars in billions)



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

Notes: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

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 FY2017 (September 30, 2017, the most recent data currently available), a total of $5.1 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 FY2017, states had made such commitments to spend—that is, had obligated—a total of $1.8 billion. At the end of FY2017, states had $3.3 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 *assistance*. There is no complete reporting on families receiving other TANF benefits and services.

Assistance is defined as benefits provided to families to meet ongoing, basic needs.[1] It is most often paid in cash. However, some states use TANF or MOE funds to provide an "earnings supplement" to working parents added to monthly Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) allotments. These "earnings supplements" are paid separately from the regular TANF cash assistance program. Additionally, TANF MOE dollars are used to fund food assistance for immigrants barred from regular SNAP benefits in certain states. These forms of nutrition aid meet an ongoing need, and thus are considered TANF assistance.

As discussed in a previous section of this report, TANF basic assistance accounts for about 24% of all TANF expenditures. Therefore, the federal reporting requirements that pertain to families receiving "assistance" are 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 "Assistance"?

Table 2 provides assistance caseload information. A total of 1.4 million families, composed of 3.4 million recipients, received TANF- or MOE-funded assistance in September 2017. The bulk of the "recipients" were children—2.5 million in that month. (The September 2017 data exclude Puerto Rico.) For state-by-state assistance caseloads, see **Table B-4**.

Table 2. TANF Assistance Caseload: September 2017

Families	1,354,901
Recipients	3,410,086
Child Recipients	2,481,584
Adult Recipients	928,502

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.

[1] The definition of TANF assistance is not in statute. However, because the statutory language has most TANF requirements triggered by a family receiving "assistance," the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations define assistance at 45 C.F.R. §260.31.

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

Figure 2 provides a long-term historical perspective on the number of families receiving assistance from TANF or its predecessor program, from July 1959 to September 2017. The shaded areas of the figure represent months when the national economy was in recession. Though the health of the national economy has affected the trend in the cash assistance caseload, the long-term trend in receipt of cash assistance does not follow a classic countercyclical pattern. Such a pattern would have the caseload rise during economic slumps, and then fall again during periods of economic growth. Factors other than the health of the economy (demographic trends, policy changes) also have influenced the caseload trend.

The figure shows two periods of sustained caseload increases: the period from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s and a second period from 1988 to 1994. The number of families receiving assistance peaked in March 1994 at 5.1 million families. The 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. During the recent 2007-2009 recession and its aftermath, the caseload began to rise from 1.7 million families in August 2008, peaking in December 2010 at close to 2.0 million families. By September 2017, the assistance caseload had declined to 1.4 million families.

Figure 2. Number of Families Receiving Cash Assistance, July 1959-September 2017



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

Notes: Shaded areas denote months when the national economy was in recession. Information represents families receiving cash assistance from Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and TANF. For October 1999 through September 2017, includes families receiving assistance from Separate State Programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. See **Table A-1** for average annual data on families, recipients, adult recipients, and child recipients of ADC, AFDC, and TANF cash assistance for 1961 to 2016.

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

What Are the Characteristics of Families Receiving TANF Assistance?

Before PRWORA, the "typical" family receiving assistance has been headed by a single parent (usually the mother) with one or two children. That single parent has also typically been unemployed. However, over the past 20 years the assistance caseload decline has occurred together with a major shift in the composition of the rolls. **Figure 3** shows the change in the size and composition of the assistance caseload under both AFDC (1988 and 1994) and TANF. In FY1988, an estimated 84% of AFDC families were headed by an unemployed adult recipient. In FY2016, families with an unemployed adult recipient represented 32% of all cash assistance families. This decline occurred, in large part, as the number of families headed by unemployed adult recipients declined more rapidly than other components of the assistance caseload. In FY1994, a monthly average of 3.8 million families per month who received AFDC cash assistance had adult recipients who were not working. In FY2016, a monthly average of 485,000 families per month had adult recipients or work-eligible individuals, with no adult recipient or work-eligible individual working.

With the decline in families headed by unemployed adults, the share of the caseload represented by families with employed adults and "child only" families has increased. In FY2016, families with employed adult recipients represented 31% of all assistance families. This category includes families in "earnings supplement" programs separate from the regular TANF cash assistance program. "Child-only" families are those where no adult recipient receives benefits in their own right; the family receives benefits on behalf of its children. The share of the caseload that was child-only in FY2016 was 38%. In FY2016, families with a nonrecipient, nonparent relative (grandparents, aunts, uncles) represented 14% of all assistance families. Families with ineligible, noncitizen adults or adults who have not reported their citizenship status made up 11% of the assistance caseload in that year. Families where the parent received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and the children received TANF made up 9% of all assistance families in FY2016.

Figure 3. Characteristics of Assistance Families, Selected Years FY1988 to FY2016



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulations of the TANF national data files.

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

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.

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 not meeting a program requirement (e.g., a work requirement), and are also paid a lower benefit.

Figure 4 shows the maximum monthly TANF cash benefit by state for a single mother caring for two children (family of three) in July 2016.[2] The benefit amounts shown are those for a single-parent family with two children.[3] For a family of three, the maximum TANF benefit paid in July 2016 varied from $170 per month in Mississippi to $923 per month in Alaska. The map shows a

[2] 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).

[3] 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 substate geography.

regional pattern to the maximum monthly benefit paid, with lower benefit amounts in the South than in other regions. In all states, the maximum TANF cash assistance amount for this sized family was less than 50% of poverty-level income.[4]

Figure 4. TANF Cash Assistance Maximum Monthly Benefit Amounts for a Single Parent Family with Two Children, 50 States and the District of Columbia, July 2016



Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on data from the Urban Institute's *Welfare Rules Database*. The welfare rules database has information for the 50 states and District of Columbia. It does not have information on TANF assistance programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands or tribal TANF programs.

TANF Work Participation Standards

TANF's main federal work requirement is actually a performance measure that applies to the states, rather than individual recipients. States determine the work rules that apply to individual recipients.

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

[4] In 2016, the HHS poverty guidelines for the contiguous 48 states and the District of Columbia for a family of three was $1,680 per month. Higher poverty lines applied in Alaska ($2,100 per month for a family of three) and Hawaii ($1,933 per month for a family of three).

number of hours.[5] 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.

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 and by year.

States that do not 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 not meeting the standard. Penalties can also be forgiven for states that enter into "corrective compliance plans," and subsequently meet the work standard.

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 (DRA, P.L. 109-171) made several changes to the work participation rules effective in FY2007:

- 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.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA, P.L. 111-5), a law enacted in response to the sharp economic downturn of 2007-2009, held states "harmless" for caseload increases affecting the work participation standards for FY2009 through FY2011. It did so by allowing states to "freeze" caseload reduction credits at pre-recession levels through the FY2011 standards.

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-

[5] Families without a work-eligible individual are excluded from the participation rate calculation. It excludes families where the parent is a non-recipient (for example, disabled receiving Supplemental Security Income or an ineligible noncitizen) or the children in the family are being cared for by a non-parent relative (e.g., grandparent, aunt, uncle) who does not receive assistance on his or her behalf.

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).

Figure 5 shows the national average all-families work participation rate for FY2002 through FY2017. For the period FY2002 through FY2011, states achieved an average all-families work participation rate hovering around 30%. The work participation rate increased since then. In FY2016, it exceeded 50% for the first time since TANF was established. However, it is important to note that the increase in the work participation rate has not come from an increase in the number of recipients in regular TANF assistance programs who are either working or in job preparation activities. This increase stems mostly from states creating new "earnings supplement" programs that use TANF funds to aid working parents in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly food stamps) or who have left the regular TANF assistance programs for work.[6]

Figure 5. National Average TANF Work Participation Rate for All Families, FY2002-FY2017



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

How Many Jurisdictions Did Not Meet the All-Families Standard?

Figure 6 shows which states did not meet the TANF all-families work participation standards from FY2006 through FY2017. Before FY2007, the first year that DRA was effective, only a few jurisdictions did not meet TANF all-families work participation standards. However, in FY2007, 15 jurisdictions did not meet the all-families standard. This number declined to 9 in FY2008 and 8 in FY2009.

[6] See CRS In Focus IF10856, *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families: Work Requirements*.

In FY2012, despite the uptick in the national average work participation rate, 16 states did not meet the all-family standard, the largest number of states that did not meet their participation standards in any one year since the enactment of TANF. FY2012 was the year that ARRA's "freeze" of the caseload reduction credit expired, and states were generally required to meet higher standards than in previous years.

The number of jurisdictions that did not meet the all-families standard declined over the FY2012 to FY2017 period. In FY2017, two jurisdictions did not meet the all-family participation standard: Nevada and Guam.

Figure 6. States that Met or Did Not Meet the TANF All-Families Work Participation Standard: FY2006-FY2017

(Changes to TANF work participation standard rules under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 [DRA], effective in FY2007)

YES = State met standard NO = State did not meet standard

	PRE-DRA	POST-DRA* →										
	FY2006	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
Alabama	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Alaska	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Arizona	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Arkansas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
California	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Colorado	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Connecticut	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Delaware	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
D.C.	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Florida	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Georgia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Hawaii	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Idaho	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Illinois	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Indiana	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Iowa	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kansas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kentucky	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Louisiana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Maine	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Maryland	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Massachusetts	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Michigan	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Minnesota	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Mississippi	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Missouri	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Montana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Nebraska	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Nevada	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
New Hampshire	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
New Jersey	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
New Mexico	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
New York	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
North Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
North Dakota	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ohio	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Oklahoma	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Oregon	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Pennsylvania	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Puerto Rico	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Rhode Island	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
South Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
South Dakota	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Tennessee	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Texas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Utah	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Vermont	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
Virginia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Washington	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
West Virginia	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Wisconsin	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Wyoming	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Guam	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Virgin Islands	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
# YES	51	39	45	46	46	45	38	43	45	49	50	52
# NO	3	15	9	8	8	9	16	11	9	5	4	2

*Changes to TANF Work Participation Standard Rules Under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) became effective in FY2007.

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

Have States Met the Two-Parent Work Participation Standard?

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

Figure 7 shows whether each state met its two-parent work participation standard for FY2006 through FY2017. However, the display on the table is more complex than that for reporting whether a state met or did not meet its "all family" rate.

A substantial number of states have reported *no* two-parent families subject to the work participation standard. 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. 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.

For states with two-parent families in their caseloads, the table reports "Yes" for states that met the two-parent standard, and "No" for states that did not meet the two-parent standard. Of the 28 jurisdictions that had two-parent families in their FY2017 TANF work participation calculation, 19 met the standard and 9 did not.

Figure 7. Two-Parent TANF Work Participation Standard, Status by State: FY2006-FY2017

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

YES = State met standard NO = State did not meet standard NA = Standard not applicable
No 2-parent families reported

	PRE-DRA	POST-DRA* →										
	FY2006	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017
Alabama	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Alaska	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Arizona	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Arkansas	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
California	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Colorado	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Connecticut	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Delaware	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D.C.	NO	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Georgia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hawaii	NA	NA	YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Idaho	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Illinois	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	NA	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Iowa	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Kansas	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Kentucky	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Louisiana	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	NA	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
Maryland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Massachusetts	NA	NA	YES	YES	YES	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Michigan	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Minnesota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mississippi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	NA	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
New Hampshire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Mexico	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
New York	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
North Carolina	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
North Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ohio	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES
Pennsylvania	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
South Carolina	YES	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Dakota	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennessee	NA	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NA	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Texas	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
Virginia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Washington	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
West Virginia	NA	NO	NA	NA	YES	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wisconsin	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Wyoming	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Guam	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
# Qual. States	25	30	28	27	29	27	27	27	28	28	28	28
# YES	21	22	22	20	23	22	7	9	10	13	17	19
# NO	3	7	6	7	6	5	20	18	18	15	11	9

*Changes to TANF Work Participation Standard Rules Under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (DRA) became effective in FY2007.

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

Appendix A. Supplementary Tables

Table A-1. Trends in the Cash Assistance Caseload: 1961 to 2016

					TANF Child Recipients	
Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	As a Percentage of All Children	As a Percentage of All Poor Children
1961	0.873	3.363	0.765	2.598	3.7%	14.3%
1962	0.939	3.704	0.860	2.844	4.0	15.7
1963	0.963	3.945	0.988	2.957	4.1	17.4
1964	1.010	4.195	1.050	3.145	4.3	18.6
1965	1.060	4.422	1.101	3.321	4.5	21.5
1966	1.096	4.546	1.112	3.434	4.7	26.5
1967	1.220	5.014	1.243	3.771	5.2	31.2
1968	1.410	5.702	1.429	4.274	5.9	37.8
1969	1.696	6.689	1.716	4.973	6.9	49.7
1970	2.207	8.462	2.250	6.212	8.6	57.7
1971	2.763	10.242	2.808	7.435	10.4	68.5
1972	3.048	10.944	3.039	7.905	11.1	74.9
1973	3.148	10.949	3.046	7.903	11.2	79.9
1974	3.219	10.847	3.041	7.805	11.2	75.0
1975	3.481	11.319	3.248	8.071	11.8	71.2
1976	3.565	11.284	3.302	7.982	11.8	76.2
1977	3.568	11.015	3.273	7.743	11.6	73.9
1978	3.517	10.551	3.188	7.363	11.2	72.8
1979	3.509	10.312	3.130	7.181	11.0	68.0
1980	3.712	10.774	3.355	7.419	11.5	63.2
1981	3.835	11.079	3.552	7.527	11.7	59.2
1982	3.542	10.358	3.455	6.903	10.8	49.6
1983	3.686	10.761	3.663	7.098	11.1	50.1
1984	3.714	10.831	3.687	7.144	11.2	52.3
1985	3.701	10.855	3.658	7.198	11.3	54.4
1986	3.763	11.038	3.704	7.334	11.5	56.0
1987	3.776	11.027	3.661	7.366	11.5	56.4
1988	3.749	10.915	3.586	7.329	11.4	57.8
1989	3.798	10.992	3.573	7.419	11.5	57.9
1990	4.057	11.695	3.784	7.911	12.1	57.9
1991	4.497	12.930	4.216	8.715	13.2	59.8

Year	Families (millions)	Recipients (millions)	Adults (millions)	Children (millions)	TANF Child Recipients: As a Percentage of All Children	TANF Child Recipients: As a Percentage of All Poor Children
1992	4.829	13.773	4.470	9.303	13.9	59.9
1993	5.012	14.205	4.631	9.574	14.1	60.0
1994	5.033	14.161	4.593	9.568	13.9	61.7
1995	4.791	13.418	4.284	9.135	13.1	61.5
1996	4.434	12.321	3.928	8.600	12.3	58.7
1997	3.740	10.376	NA	NA	10.0	50.1
1998	3.050	8.347	NA	NA	8.1	42.9
1999	2.578	6.924	NA	NA	6.7	39.4
2000	2.303	6.143	1.655	4.479	6.1	38.1
2001	2.192	5.717	1.514	4.195	5.7	35.3
2002	2.187	5.609	1.479	4.119	5.6	33.6
2003	2.180	5.490	1.416	4.063	5.5	31.3
2004	2.153	5.342	1.362	3.969	5.4	30.2
2005	2.061	5.028	1.261	3.756	5.1	28.9
2006	1.906	4.582	1.120	3.453	4.6	26.7
2007	1.730	4.075	0.956	3.119	4.2	23.2
2008	1.701	4.005	0.946	3.059	4.1	21.6
2009	1.838	4.371	1.074	3.296	4.4	21.2
2010	1.919	4.598	1.163	3.435	4.6	20.9
2011	1.907	4.557	1.149	3.408	4.6	20.9
2012	1.852	4.402	1.104	3.298	4.4	20.3
2013	1.726	4.042	0.993	3.050	4.1	19.1
2014	1.650	3.957	1.007	2.950	4.0	18.9
2015	1.609	4.126	1.155	2.971	4.0	20.4
2016	1.488	3.785	1.044	2.741	3.7	20.6

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

Notes: NA denotes not available. During transition reporting from AFDC to TANF, caseload statistics on adult and child recipients were not collected. For those years, TANF children as a percent of all children and percent of all poor children were estimated by HHS and published in *Welfare Indicators and Risk Factors, Annual Report to Congress*, Table TANF 2, p. A-7. See http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/14/indicators/rpt_indicators.pdf.

Table A-2. Families Receiving AFDC/TANF Assistance by Family Category, Selected Years, FY1988 to FY2016

	AFDC		TANF		
	1988	1994	2001	2006	2016
Number of Families Receiving Assistance					
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Not Working	3,136,566	3,798,997	992,445	825,490	484,959
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Working	243,573	378,620	420,794	259,001	465,199
Child-Only/SSI Parent	59,988	171,391	171,951	176,670	132,338
Child-Only/Noncitizen Parent	47,566	184,397	125,900	153,445	153,717
Child-Only/Other Ineligible Parent	51,764	146,227	91,447	158,113	4,775
Child-Only/Caretaker Relative	188,598	328,290	255,984	261,944	208,202
Child-Only/Unknown	19,897	38,341	143,834	122,738	74,410
Totals	3,747,952	5,046,263	2,202,356	1,957,402	1,523,600
Percentage of All Families Receiving Assistance					
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Not Working	83.7%	75.3%	45.1%	42.2%	31.8%
Adult Recipient or Work-Eligible Parent/Working	6.5	7.5	19.1	13.2	30.5
Child-Only/SSI Parent	1.6	3.4	7.8	9.0	8.7
Child-Only/Noncitizen Parent	1.3	3.7	5.7	7.8	10.1
Child-Only/Other Ineligible Parent	1.4	2.9	4.2	8.1	0.3
Child-Only/Caretaker Relative	5.0	6.5	11.6	13.4	13.7
Child-Only/Unknown	0.5	0.8	6.5	6.3	4.9
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulations of the FY1988 and FY1994 AFDC Quality Control (QC) data files and the FY2001, FY2006, and FY2016 TANF National Data Files.

Notes: FY2001 through FY2016 data include families receiving assistance from separate state programs (SSPs) with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. For FY2016, TANF families with an adult recipient include those families with "work-eligible" nonrecipient parents. These include nonrecipient parents who have been time-limited or sanctioned off the rolls, but the family continues to receive a reduced benefit. For FY2001 and FY2006, such families cannot be identified and are classified as "child-only" families.

Appendix B. State Tables

Table B-1. Use of FY2017 TANF and MOE Funds by Category

(Dollars in millions)

State	Basic Assistance	Administrative Costs	Work, Education, and Training	Child Care	Refundable Tax Credit	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Child Welfare	Pre-K/Head Start	Other	Totals
Alabama	$22.318	$26.710	$5.349	$5.679	$0.000	$36.833	$32.240	$41.648	$40.208	$210.984
Alaska	58.114	6.024	8.397	8.879	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.985	86.399
Arizona	37.732	43.656	1.443	0.000	0.000	10.369	147.105	0.000	119.624	359.929
Arkansas	5.948	18.829	13.920	8.032	0.000	5.368	0.231	105.196	4.811	162.335
California	2539.250	573.786	1620.135	615.700	0.000	237.887	0.000	0.000	1010.169	6596.928
Colorado	89.927	23.474	10.687	11.929	77.489	31.389	46.532	74.851	43.716	409.995
Connecticut	52.352	46.885	12.037	41.764	0.000	18.646	61.273	83.561	171.132	487.651
Delaware	17.421	4.736	7.063	67.490	0.000	2.724	0.000	0.000	15.160	114.595
District of Columbia	121.650	8.398	37.991	59.532	28.928	51.110	0.000	0.000	9.299	316.909
Florida	163.180	83.371	46.314	318.206	0.000	0.934	242.113	0.000	80.542	934.661
Georgia	86.540	20.570	11.265	22.183	0.000	0.085	257.554	0.000	90.828	489.024
Hawaii	39.957	16.540	52.170	4.972	0.000	0.425	1.294	0.000	84.876	200.233
Idaho	7.871	7.519	2.549	15.025	0.000	11.750	1.327	1.475	1.713	49.229
Illinois	43.419	0.184	18.685	596.459	47.254	0.916	221.080	58.586	79.217	1065.801
Indiana	16.714	23.452	182.300	112.404	28.904	0.546	15.520	0.000	131.405	511.244
Iowa	37.166	8.206	11.799	58.254	26.505	0.253	62.264	0.000	22.299	226.746
Kansas	13.920	14.568	1.594	6.673	48.347	0.071	22.980	14.437	50.495	173.086
Kentucky	170.762	14.601	29.380	38.815	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	15.474	269.032

State	Basic Assistance	Administrative Costs	Work, Education, and Training	Child Care	Refundable Tax Credit	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Child Welfare	Pre-K/Head Start	Other	Totals
Louisiana	19.191	18.079	26.153	10.214	14.671	9.471	33.144	45.991	35.029	211.945
Maine	25.693	3.138	0.310	14.888	7.561	4.162	7.683	0.415	28.130	91.980
Maryland	115.787	31.019	31.450	8.397	152.582	26.370	20.035	55.962	55.808	497.410
Massachusetts	207.063	36.557	174.674	327.404	174.125	103.873	8.311	0.000	66.263	1,098.270
Michigan	133.132	53.908	5.417	26.586	45.440	66.929	81.665	186.193	649.995	1,249.266
Minnesota	98.144	46.341	57.751	173.904	160.076	27.478	0.000	5.700	19.524	588.918
Mississippi	8.585	4.572	33.655	27.660	0.000	0.000	12.859	0.000	43.971	131.302
Missouri	42.341	7.317	19.813	64.380	0.000	59.191	102.816	0.000	60.586	356.444
Montana	26.080	7.451	6.282	10.495	0.000	2.195	3.187	0.000	9.708	65.397
Nebraska	26.603	5.383	14.079	23.489	35.062	0.000	2.836	0.000	0.290	107.742
Nevada	39.108	9.559	1.362	17.887	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	34.465	102.382
New Hampshire	18.987	11.041	5.403	15.118	0.000	2.213	3.662	0.000	17.081	73.505
New Jersey	99.529	52.403	77.142	159.671	354.819	16.630	0.000	560.009	58.912	1,379.114
New Mexico	55.422	5.073	18.259	30.528	74.623	0.000	0.895	17.600	84.412	286.811
New York	1,455.625	389.219	147.068	355.940	1,410.980	219.797	290.559	467.685	361.475	5,098.348
North Carolina	41.570	43.356	4.785	194.900	0.000	5.077	125.782	115.709	44.926	576.104
North Dakota	4.070	4.422	4.070	1.102	0.000	0.019	17.270	0.000	1.274	32.226
Ohio	246.989	117.873	87.008	424.009	0.000	53.852	11.099	0.000	191.421	1,132.250
Oklahoma	42.603	11.274	10.776	48.668	0.000	3.536	15.999	12.079	29.282	174.217
Oregon	89.263	39.235	16.558	12.911	1.467	32.130	12.811	12.001	87.605	303.981
Pennsylvania	186.912	79.850	98.385	488.909	0.000	15.459	0.000	154.677	169.790	1,193.982
Rhode Island	24.435	5.434	10.869	41.679	19.129	26.237	27.334	0.800	10.171	166.088

State	Basic Assistance	Administrative Costs	Work, Education, and Training	Child Care	Refundable Tax Credit	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Child Welfare	Pre-K/Head Start	Other	Totals
South Carolina	38.231	24.983	14.782	4.085	0.000	0.000	0.000	26.794	54.010	162.886
South Dakota	13.813	2.581	3.866	0.803	0.000	3.174	1.958	0.000	3.057	29.254
Tennessee	62.597	22.152	9.618	18.976	0.000	0.000	0.000	61.668	1.377	176.387
Texas	50.837	77.601	82.284	0.000	0.000	32.166	284.108	342.674	59.966	929.636
Utah	25.289	8.863	26.555	21.438	0.000	4.419	3.676	5.501	33.702	129.443
Vermont	15.230	6.631	2.696	30.996	19.013	1.360	5.508	0.000	15.842	97.276
Virginia	68.485	31.387	38.944	32.558	0.371	5.269	0.000	0.000	84.885	261.900
Washington	143.608	88.021	145.004	222.086	0.000	56.731	0.000	61.125	315.382	1,031.957
West Virginia	26.753	15.010	0.461	15.321	0.000	19.584	35.656	0.000	26.644	139.428
Wisconsin	85.911	24.187	27.486	208.262	69.700	38.553	4.484	0.000	122.860	581.443
Wyoming	6.706	6.481	3.508	1.554	0.000	3.399	0.000	1.016	4.952	27.615
Totals	7,068.836	2,231.910	3,279.551	5,026.817	2,797.046	1,248.578	2,224.848	2,513.354	4,758.747	31,149.686

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

Table B-2. Use of FY2017 TANF and MOE Funds by Category as a Percentage of Total Federal TANF and State MOE Funding

State	Basic Assistance	Administrative Costs	Work, Education, and Training	Child Care	Refundable Tax Credit	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Child Welfare	Pre-K/Head Start	Other	Totals
Alabama	10.6%	12.7%	2.5%	2.7%	0.0%	17.5%	15.3%	19.7%	19.1%	100.0%
Alaska	67.3	7.0	9.7	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	100.0
Arizona	10.5	12.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	2.9	40.9	0.0	33.2	100.0
Arkansas	3.7	11.6	8.6	4.9	0.0	3.3	0.1	64.8	3.0	100.0
California	38.5	8.7	24.6	9.3	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	15.3	100.0
Colorado	21.9	5.7	2.6	2.9	18.9	7.7	11.3	18.3	10.7	100.0
Connecticut	10.7	9.6	2.5	8.6	0.0	3.8	12.6	17.1	35.1	100.0
Delaware	15.2	4.1	6.2	58.9	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	13.2	100.0
District of Columbia	38.4	2.6	12.0	18.8	9.1	16.1	0.0	0.0	2.9	100.0
Florida	17.5	8.9	5.0	34.0	0.0	0.1	25.9	0.0	8.6	100.0
Georgia	17.7	4.2	2.3	4.5	0.0	0.0	52.7	0.0	18.6	100.0
Hawaii	20.0	8.3	26.1	2.5	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.0	42.4	100.0
Idaho	16.0	15.3	5.2	30.5	0.0	23.9	2.7	3.0	3.5	100.0
Illinois	4.1	0.0	1.8	56.0	4.4	0.1	20.7	5.5	7.4	100.0
Indiana	3.3	4.6	35.7	22.0	5.7	0.1	3.0	0.0	25.7	100.0
Iowa	16.4	3.6	5.2	25.7	11.7	0.1	27.5	0.0	9.8	100.0
Kansas	8.0	8.4	0.9	3.9	27.9	0.0	13.3	8.3	29.2	100.0
Kentucky	63.5	5.4	10.9	14.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	100.0
Louisiana	9.1	8.5	12.3	4.8	6.9	4.5	15.6	21.7	16.5	100.0
Maine	27.9	3.4	0.3	16.2	8.2	4.5	8.4	0.5	30.6	100.0
Maryland	23.3	6.2	6.3	1.7	30.7	5.3	4.0	11.3	11.2	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Administrative Costs	Work, Education, and Training	Child Care	Refundable Tax Credit	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Child Welfare	Pre-K/Head Start	Other	Totals
Massachusetts	18.9	3.3	15.9	29.8	15.9	9.5	0.8	0.0	6.0	100.0
Michigan	10.7	4.3	0.4	2.1	3.6	5.4	6.5	14.9	52.0	100.0
Minnesota	16.7	7.9	9.8	29.5	27.2	4.7	0.0	1.0	3.3	100.0
Mississippi	6.5	3.5	25.6	21.1	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	33.5	100.0
Missouri	11.9	2.1	5.6	18.1	0.0	16.6	28.8	0.0	17.0	100.0
Montana	39.9	11.4	9.6	16.0	0.0	3.4	4.9	0.0	14.8	100.0
Nebraska	24.7	5.0	13.1	21.8	32.5	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.3	100.0
Nevada	38.2	9.3	1.3	17.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.7	100.0
New Hampshire	25.8	15.0	7.4	20.6	0.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	23.2	100.0
New Jersey	7.2	3.8	5.6	11.6	25.7	1.2	0.0	40.6	4.3	100.0
New Mexico	19.3	1.8	6.4	10.6	26.0	0.0	0.3	6.1	29.4	100.0
New York	28.6	7.6	2.9	7.0	27.7	4.3	5.7	9.2	7.1	100.0
North Carolina	7.2	7.5	0.8	33.8	0.0	0.9	21.8	20.1	7.8	100.0
North Dakota	12.6	13.7	12.6	3.4	0.0	0.1	53.6	0.0	4.0	100.0
Ohio	21.8	10.4	7.7	37.4	0.0	4.8	1.0	0.0	16.9	100.0
Oklahoma	24.5	6.5	6.2	27.9	0.0	2.0	9.2	6.9	16.8	100.0
Oregon	29.4	12.9	5.4	4.2	0.5	10.6	4.2	3.9	28.8	100.0
Pennsylvania	15.7	6.7	8.2	40.9	0.0	1.3	0.0	13.0	14.2	100.0
Rhode Island	14.7	3.3	6.5	25.1	11.5	15.8	16.5	0.5	6.1	100.0
South Carolina	23.5	15.3	9.1	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.4	33.2	100.0
South Dakota	47.2	8.8	13.2	2.7	0.0	10.9	6.7	0.0	10.5	100.0
Tennessee	35.5	12.6	5.5	10.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0	0.8	100.0
Texas	5.5	8.3	8.9	0.0	0.0	3.5	30.6	36.9	6.5	100.0

State	Basic Assistance	Administrative Costs	Work, Education, and Training	Child Care	Refundable Tax Credit	Emergency and Short-Term Benefits	Child Welfare	Pre-K/Head Start	Other	Totals
Utah	19.5	6.8	20.5	16.6	0.0	3.4	2.8	4.3	26.0	100.0
Vermont	15.7	6.8	2.8	31.9	19.5	1.4	5.7	0.0	16.3	100.0
Virginia	26.1	12.0	14.9	12.4	0.1	2.0	0.0	0.0	32.4	100.0
Washington	13.9	8.5	14.1	21.5	0.0	5.5	0.0	5.9	30.6	100.0
West Virginia	19.2	10.8	0.3	11.0	0.0	14.0	25.6	0.0	19.1	100.0
Wisconsin	14.8	4.2	4.7	35.8	12.0	6.6	0.8	0.0	21.1	100.0
Wyoming	24.3	23.5	12.7	5.6	0.0	12.3	0.0	3.7	17.9	100.0
Totals	22.7	7.2	10.5	16.1	9.0	4.0	7.1	8.1	15.3	100.0

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

Notes: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Table B-3. Unspent TANF Funds at the End of FY2017

(September 30, 2017, in millions of dollars)

State	Obligated but Not Spent	Unobligated Balances
Alabama	$19.0	$55.2
Alaska	48.1	0.0
Arizona	0.0	30.7
Arkansas	32.7	31.0
California	307.2	0.0
Colorado	0.0	96.4
Connecticut	0.0	0.8
Delaware	0.6	7.8
District of Columbia	0.2	32.8
Florida	17.1	0.0
Georgia	23.8	40.9
Hawaii	15.6	225.8
Idaho	0.0	20.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0
Indiana	46.3	109.5
Iowa	3.8	0.5
Kansas	0.4	67.9
Kentucky	0.0	66.5
Louisiana	7.9	0.0
Maine	5.6	141.1
Maryland	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	116.8
Minnesota	0.0	59.3
Mississippi	0.0	23.6
Missouri	0.0	0.3
Montana	10.3	13.1
Nebraska	0.0	64.2
Nevada	23.7	0.0
New Hampshire	0.0	57.5
New Jersey	22.7	35.0
New Mexico	52.9	38.3

State	Obligated but Not Spent	Unobligated Balances
New York	121.4	519.5
North Carolina	41.7	0.0
North Dakota	0.0	9.7
Ohio	462.7	29.4
Oklahoma	76.3	0.0
Oregon	0.0	50.3
Pennsylvania	63.3	427.0
Rhode Island	0.0	11.1
South Carolina	0.0	0.0
South Dakota	0.0	22.5
Tennessee	0.0	517.8
Texas	190.0	1.3
Utah	0.0	79.2
Vermont	0.0	0.0
Virginia	8.0	122.0
Washington	0.0	65.1
West Virginia	0.0	57.4
Wisconsin	167.1	33.2
Wyoming	2.6	22.8
Total	1,771.0	3,303.1

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 Assistance by State, September 2017

			Recipients	
State	Families	Total Recipients	Children	Adults
Alabama	9,326	21,188	17,042	4,146
Alaska	3,093	8,388	5,726	2,662
Arizona	8,222	17,255	13,693	3,562
Arkansas	3,072	6,879	5,215	1,664
California	511,311	1,485,521	1,046,866	438,655

State	Families	Total Recipients	Recipients	
			Children	Adults
Colorado	16,646	43,906	31,116	12,790
Connecticut	9,798	19,315	14,062	5,253
Delaware	3,873	10,760	6,486	4,274
District of Columbia	3,124	7,678	5,965	1,713
Florida	45,027	72,840	61,895	10,945
Georgia	12,245	14,818	11,840	2,978
Guam	541	1,161	967	194
Hawaii	4,937	13,577	9,549	4,028
Idaho	1,928	2,833	2,783	50
Illinois	12,613	27,018	23,723	3,295
Indiana	6,963	14,008	12,684	1,324
Iowa	10,694	26,261	19,568	6,693
Kansas	4,134	9,420	7,185	2,235
Kentucky	20,785	55,729	34,218	21,511
Louisiana	5,521	13,515	11,243	2,272
Maine	18,452	60,391	36,750	23,641
Maryland	18,611	46,232	34,308	11,924
Massachusetts	51,196	125,310	86,051	39,259
Michigan	13,846	33,706	27,370	6,336
Minnesota	18,519	44,087	34,171	9,916
Mississippi	4,891	10,210	8,037	2,173
Missouri	12,452	28,598	21,698	6,900
Montana	4,517	11,421	8,342	3,079
Nebraska	5,262	12,984	10,682	2,302
Nevada	9,828	25,330	18,852	6,478
New Hampshire	4,884	11,811	8,440	3,371
New Jersey	12,640	28,603	21,970	6,633
New Mexico	11,066	28,047	21,081	6,966
New York	132,675	339,719	239,780	99,939
North Carolina	11,144	18,122	17,040	1,082
North Dakota	1,105	2,777	2,333	444
Ohio	54,161	99,843	89,070	10,773
Oklahoma	6,797	15,246	13,089	2,157
Oregon	43,754	130,642	83,570	47,072
Pennsylvania	50,615	125,892	92,886	33,006
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA

State	Families	Total Recipients	Recipients	
			Children	Adults
Rhode Island	4,468	10,517	7,760	2,757
South Carolina	8,672	18,924	15,929	2,995
South Dakota	3,030	6,011	5,515	496
Tennessee	24,562	54,192	42,509	11,683
Texas	28,839	63,920	55,448	8,472
Utah	4,013	9,760	7,177	2,583
Vermont	3,371	7,858	5,528	2,330
Virgin Islands	197	603	404	199
Virginia	38,253	37,157	28,283	8,874
Washington	35,284	79,332	54,059	25,273
West Virginia	7,113	14,353	11,580	2,773
Wisconsin	16,318	35,263	29,160	6,103
Wyoming	513	1,155	886	269
Totals	1,354,901	3,410,086	2,481,584	928,502

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

Notes: Data for Puerto Rico are unavailable for September 2017. TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-5. Number of Needy Families with Children Receiving Assistance by State, September of Selected Years

State	1994	2007	2010	2016	2017	% Change to 2017 from ...		
						1994	2010	2016
Alabama	48,752	18,104	23,052	10,564	9,326	-80.9	-59.5	-11.7
Alaska	12,450	3,127	3,507	3,097	3,093	-75.2	-11.8	-0.1
Arizona	72,728	36,934	18,774	9,107	8,222	-88.7	-56.2	-9.7
Arkansas	25,298	8,472	8,469	3,478	3,072	-87.9	-63.7	-11.7
California	916,795	470,502	590,121	564,179	511,311	-44.2	-13.4	-9.4
Colorado	40,544	9,355	11,707	16,814	16,646	-58.9	42.2	-1.0
Connecticut	60,336	20,322	16,848	10,683	9,798	-83.8	-41.8	-8.3
Delaware	11,408	4,034	5,508	4,216	3,873	-66.1	-29.7	-8.1
District of Columbia	27,320	6,231	8,547	4,432	3,124	-88.6	-63.4	-29.5
Florida	239,702	46,864	57,742	47,034	45,027	-81.2	-22.0	-4.3
Georgia	141,596	23,600	20,133	12,570	12,245	-91.4	-39.2	-2.6

						% Change to 2017 from ...		
State	**1994**	**2007**	**2010**	**2016**	**2017**	**1994**	**2010**	**2016**
Guam	2,089	936	1,276	764	541	-74.1	-57.6	-29.2
Hawaii	21,312	6,426	9,953	5,901	4,937	-76.8	-50.4	-16.3
Idaho	8,635	1,506	1,820	1,957	1,928	-77.7	5.9	-1.5
Illinois	241,290	26,222	24,337	14,205	12,613	-94.8	-48.2	-11.2
Indiana	72,654	42,058	36,062	7,836	6,963	-90.4	-80.7	-11.1
Iowa	39,137	19,872	21,548	11,777	10,694	-72.7	-50.4	-9.2
Kansas	29,524	13,892	15,554	5,262	4,134	-86.0	-73.4	-21.4
Kentucky	78,720	29,492	30,875	23,242	20,785	-73.6	-32.7	-10.6
Louisiana	84,162	11,023	10,849	5,772	5,521	-93.4	-49.1	-4.3
Maine	22,322	12,352	15,377	19,951	18,452	-17.3	20.0	-7.5
Maryland	80,266	19,630	25,110	20,592	18,611	-76.8	-25.9	-9.6
Massachusetts	108,985	46,483	49,836	53,453	51,196	-53.0	2.7	-4.2
Michigan	215,873	71,892	67,241	15,417	13,846	-93.6	-79.4	-10.2
Minnesota	59,987	26,642	24,574	19,256	18,519	-69.1	-24.6	-3.8
Mississippi	55,232	11,658	11,895	5,759	4,891	-91.1	-58.9	-15.1
Missouri	91,875	39,544	39,262	14,904	12,452	-86.4	-68.3	-16.5
Montana	11,416	3,217	3,686	3,388	4,517	-60.4	22.5	33.3
Nebraska	15,435	6,913	8,702	5,366	5,262	-65.9	-39.5	-1.9
Nevada	14,620	7,411	10,612	9,525	9,828	-32.8	-7.4	3.2
New Hampshire	11,398	4,733	6,175	4,826	4,884	-57.2	-20.9	1.2
New Jersey	122,376	34,123	34,516	15,941	12,640	-89.7	-63.4	-20.7
New Mexico	34,535	12,503	21,223	11,821	11,066	-68.0	-47.9	-6.4
New York	461,751	156,420	154,936	141,428	132,675	-71.3	-14.4	-6.2
North Carolina	129,258	24,537	23,705	16,859	11,144	-91.4	-53.0	-33.9
North Dakota	5,410	2,156	1,996	1,124	1,105	-79.6	-44.6	-1.7
Ohio	244,099	78,129	105,140	57,184	54,161	-77.8	-48.5	-5.3
Oklahoma	46,572	9,002	9,388	7,147	6,797	-85.4	-27.6	-4.9
Oregon	40,504	18,645	31,751	49,132	43,754	8.0	37.8	-10.9
Pennsylvania	212,457	60,167	53,274	53,678	50,615	-76.2	-5.0	-5.7
Puerto Rico	57,337	12,617	13,371	8,051	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	22,776	8,107	6,758	3,794	4,468	-80.4	-33.9	17.8
South Carolina	50,430	14,936	19,347	9,396	8,672	-82.8	-55.2	-7.7
South Dakota	6,601	2,842	3,291	3,100	3,030	-54.1	-7.9	-2.3
Tennessee	109,678	58,244	62,714	29,123	24,562	-77.6	-60.8	-15.7
Texas	284,973	59,972	51,931	30,074	28,839	-89.9	-44.5	-4.1
Utah	17,505	5,069	6,646	3,961	4,013	-77.1	-39.6	1.3

						% Change to 2017 from ...		
State	1994	2007	2010	2016	2017	1994	2010	2016
Vermont	9,761	4,503	3,256	3,359	3,371	-65.5	3.5	0.4
Virgin Islands	1,146	395	537	251	197	-82.8	-63.3	-21.5
Virginia	74,257	31,563	37,448	22,345	38,253	-48.5	2.1	71.2
Washington	101,542	49,076	70,200	39,709	35,284	-65.3	-49.7	-11.1
West Virginia	40,279	9,699	10,496	7,362	7,113	-82.3	-32.2	-3.4
Wisconsin	75,086	17,824	24,746	17,520	16,318	-78.3	-34.1	-6.9
Wyoming	5,351	255	318	485	513	-90.4	61.3	5.8
Totals	5,015,545	1,720,231	1,926,140	1,468,171	1,354,901	-72.7	-29.2	-7.20619

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

Notes: Data for Puerto Rico are unavailable for September 2017. Total change excludes data for Puerto Rico for all years. Caseload data for 2000 through 2017 include those families in Separate State Programs with expenditures countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Table B-6. TANF Assistance Families by Number of Parents by State: September 2017

					Percentage of All Families Receiving Assistance			
State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Totals	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Totals
Alabama	4,013	51	5,262	9,326	43.0	0.5	56.4	100.0
Alaska	1,891	347	855	3,093	61.1	11.2	27.6	100.0
Arizona	3,104	183	4,935	8,222	37.8	2.2	60.0	100.0
Arkansas	1,543	65	1,464	3,072	50.2	2.1	47.7	100.0
California	276,833	93,664	140,814	511,311	54.1	18.3	27.5	100.0
Colorado	9,702	1,132	5,812	16,646	58.3	6.8	34.9	100.0
Connecticut	3,308	2	6,488	9,798	33.8	0.0	66.2	100.0
Delaware	1,031	12	2,830	3,873	26.6	0.3	73.1	100.0
District of Columbia	1,713	0	1,411	3,124	54.8	0.0	45.2	100.0
Florida	6,694	374	37,959	45,027	14.9	0.8	84.3	100.0
Georgia	3,504	93	8,648	12,245	28.6	0.8	70.6	100.0
Guam	119	27	395	541	22.0	5.0	73.0	100.0
Hawaii	2,958	779	1,200	4,937	59.9	15.8	24.3	100.0
Idaho	50	0	1,878	1,928	2.6	0.0	97.4	100.0
Illinois	2,688	0	9,925	12,613	21.3	0.0	78.7	100.0

					Percentage of All Families Receiving Assistance			
State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Totals	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Totals
Indiana	1,621	61	5,281	6,963	23.3	0.9	75.8	100.0
Iowa	5,456	562	4,676	10,694	51.0	5.3	43.7	100.0
Kansas	1,666	262	2,206	4,134	40.3	6.3	53.4	100.0
Kentucky	5,140	504	15,141	20,785	24.7	2.4	72.8	100.0
Louisiana	2,257	0	3,264	5,521	40.9	0.0	59.1	100.0
Maine	9,841	6,929	1,682	18,452	53.3	37.6	9.1	100.0
Maryland	11,504	368	6,739	18,611	61.8	2.0	36.2	100.0
Massachusetts	34,382	3,282	13,532	51,196	67.2	6.4	26.4	100.0
Michigan	5,417	0	8,429	13,846	39.1	0.0	60.9	100.0
Minnesota	10,006	0	8,513	18,519	54.0	0.0	46.0	100.0
Mississippi	1,930	0	2,961	4,891	39.5	0.0	60.5	100.0
Missouri	7,508	0	4,944	12,452	60.3	0.0	39.7	100.0
Montana	2,386	506	1,625	4,517	52.8	11.2	36.0	100.0
Nebraska	2,422	0	2,840	5,262	46.0	0.0	54.0	100.0
Nevada	4,620	852	4,356	9,828	47.0	8.7	44.3	100.0
New Hampshire	3,262	25	1,597	4,884	66.8	0.5	32.7	100.0
New Jersey	7,352	0	5,288	12,640	58.2	0.0	41.8	100.0
New Mexico	5,308	829	4,929	11,066	48.0	7.5	44.5	100.0
New York	85,882	2,815	43,978	132,675	64.7	2.1	33.1	100.0
North Carolina	1,001	38	10,105	11,144	9.0	0.3	90.7	100.0
North Dakota	444	0	661	1,105	40.2	0.0	59.8	100.0
Ohio	8,976	695	44,490	54,161	16.6	1.3	82.1	100.0
Oklahoma	2,157	0	4,640	6,797	31.7	0.0	68.3	100.0
Oregon	29,730	7,414	6,610	43,754	67.9	16.9	15.1	100.0
Pennsylvania	32,023	618	17,974	50,615	63.3	1.2	35.5	100.0
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rhode Island	3,113	222	1,133	4,468	69.7	5.0	25.4	100.0
South Carolina	2,995	0	5,677	8,672	34.5	0.0	65.5	100.0
South Dakota	496	0	2,534	3,030	16.4	0.0	83.6	100.0
Tennessee	10,441	316	13,805	24,562	42.5	1.3	56.2	100.0
Texas	8,473	0	20,366	28,839	29.4	0.0	70.6	100.0
Utah	1,911	0	2,102	4,013	47.6	0.0	52.4	100.0

					Percentage of All Families Receiving Assistance			
State	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Totals	Single Parent	Two Parent	No Parent	Totals
Vermont	1,671	318	1,382	3,371	49.6	9.4	41.0	100.0
Virgin Islands	167	0	30	197	84.8	0.0	15.2	100.0
Virginia	14,185	0	24,068	38,253	37.1	0.0	62.9	100.0
Washington	16,314	6,046	12,924	35,284	46.2	17.1	36.6	100.0
West Virginia	2,054	0	5,059	7,113	28.9	0.0	71.1	100.0
Wisconsin	5,091	229	10,998	16,318	31.2	1.4	67.4	100.0
Wyoming	229	20	264	513	44.6	3.9	51.5	100.0
Totals	668,582	129,640	556,679	1,354,901	49.3	9.6	41.1	100.0

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

Notes: Data for Puerto Rico are unavailable for September 2017. TANF cash assistance caseload includes families receiving assistance in state-funded programs counted toward the TANF maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.

Author Information

Gene Falk
Specialist in Social Policy

Acknowledgments

Jameson Carter and Mariam Ghavalyan updated the information in this report. Amber Wilhelm produced this report's data visualizations.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.