

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Service

Series/Staff Member: Shirley Sagawa

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 24265

FolderID:

Folder Title:

Cost/FTE and Match Reports - 1995 [2]

Stack:

S

Row:

66

Section:

1

Shelf:

9

Position:

1

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275
Average, taking into account cost share proposals/other items	19,000	15,000 1/

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275

**Average, taking into account
cost share proposals/other items 19,000 15,000 1/**

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275
Average, taking into account cost share proposals/other items	19,000	15,000 1/

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275
Average, taking into account cost share proposals/other items	19,000	15,000 1/

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275
Average, taking into account cost share proposals/other items	19,000	15,000 1/

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275
Average, taking into account cost share proposals/other items	19,000	15,000 1/

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Reauthorization and Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 6, 1996

Reauthorization Strategy

We need to come to consensus, as quickly as possible, on a strategy that will enable AmeriCorps to continue to thrive in 1997 and beyond. Our authorization expires at the end of FY 1996. Some of the options we have considered are:

1. Pursue a "traditional" reauthorization, with a Senate-first strategy, with the Administration submitting a reauthorization bill with only modest changes, or preparing a "statement of principles" for discussion.
2. Pursue a reauthorization with no Administration bill, but asking a bipartisan group of supporters off of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to introduce a bill and push the Committee to take action.
3. Assume no reauthorization this year, due to election year politics and the short schedule, seek an appropriation without an authorization, and work on a reauthorization bill next year.
4. Develop and unveil a "reform plan" that will inoculate the program against criticisms of opponents. The plan may be either a legislative package that could be part of a FY 1997 appropriations deal, the basis for a reauthorization bill, or a set of administrative changes.

These strategies are not mutually exclusive. We are currently preparing for any of the above options to unfold. We have reason to believe that our most vocal critic, Senator Grassley, would be willing to endorse AmeriCorps if we could publicly agree to a reform plan that would limit AmeriCorps costs. This memo lays out the core of a cost-cutting plan that could allow us to gain Senator Grassley's support while enabling the program to grow more rapidly. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, appropriations deal, or reform package.

Cost-Cutting Proposals

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education

award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher. See the options at the end of the discussion for achieving this objective.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 per week with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 per week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week-- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program.

We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay. The net effect would be that the Corporation's share of the living allowance would go from \$6,800 to \$5,200 for those programs that are 40 weeks, and the Member's actual pay would go from \$7,900 to \$6,100 for that period, unless the local program increases the match.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

Options range from a cap of \$3,000 plus 10% in a hardship fund; to \$5,000 plus no hardship fund; to varying caps per type of program, with an average of no more than \$5,000.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We

might emphasize:

- A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.
- B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.
- C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

The suboptions under this cost saving option are related to what percent of the total program is comprised of such "cost share partnerships." The potential range is between 10-25%.

Summary of Potential Option for Meeting Corporation Cost-Cutting Goals

Average Corporation Costs Where Corporation Supports All Items

<u>Member Costs</u>	<u>Current Program</u>	<u>Reform</u>
Education Award	4,725	4,725
Living Allowance	6,800	up to 6,800
Other	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	13,325	up to 13,325
Program grant	5,500	up to 5,000
Recruitment, admin., etc. 2/	2,000	2,000
TOTAL	20,775	up to 20,275
Average, taking into account cost share proposals/other items	19,000	15,000 1/

1/ By 1999. Assumes about 25% of program will be "cost share proposals," that living allowance will be lowered an average of \$1,000, and that program grants will be lowered an average of \$1,500.

2/ Rough calculation that includes administration, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

Latter draft of letter to the Hill
- at OIG for approval -

CORPORATION
FOR NATIONAL
SERVICE

Dear

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

The Corporation for National Service is currently completing an in-depth survey of the auditability of its financial statements and systems. The survey is being carried out by two independent accounting firms under contract to our Office of Inspector General. The Corporation's Board of Directors is fully involved in this process, and I wanted to apprise you of our progress to date.

The purpose of conducting the survey is to determine whether records of the Corporation from fiscal year 1994 can be audited according to generally accepted accounting principles and to assess the adequacy of internal controls. Twenty-three federal agencies are required by the Chief Financial Officers Act to produce auditable financial statements each year beginning in fiscal year 1996. In addition, the Corporation for National Service is covered by auditing requirements of the Government Corporation Control Act. Since organization of the Corporation for National Service was not completed until April of 1994, much of the audit work also covers systems used by a predecessor organization, the former ACTION agency.

This financial statement review and management controls auditability assessment of the Corporation was begun in May of 1995 under an Office of Inspector General contract with Williams, Adley & Company, LLP in association with Arthur Anderson LLP. The review identified significant issues related to the Corporation's accounting and recordkeeping activities. Specifically, the review has concluded that the Corporation's financial statements from its first year of operations are not auditable, and that the Corporation needs to take additional steps to strengthen internal controls within the organization. The review did not identify any instances of misuse of funds or of fraud, waste, or abuse.

The results of the review were not unexpected. The Corporation was formed immediately upon passage of the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, initially incorporating the Commission on National and Community Service and staff from the Office of National Service. The former ACTION agency was merged with the Corporation in April 1994, six months into the fiscal year. None of these components had been subject to the Government Corporation Control Act. Each had its own accounting system and operations, and had not ever been required to produce -- or had in fact ever produced -- an auditable financial statement.

201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
Telephone: (202) 606-5100

Getting Things Done.
AmeriCorps, National Service
Learn and Serve America
National Senior Service Corps

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

- 2 -

Organizational and financial consolidations with the Corporation, combined with a demanding start-up for major new programs, severely strained the Corporation's limited financial personnel and systems. Particular attention had to be focused on designing interim program data and grant management systems; building a data base for over 20,000 AmeriCorps Members the first year; creating an automated Trust Fund system to manage education awards for these individuals; and modifying the Corporation's accounting and financial system, which was a stopgap measure involving the system carried forward from the former ACTION agency. Therefore, our accounting systems have yet to receive the intense and sustained remedial attention that is needed.

While I understand what has brought us to these results, I am committed to resolving our accounting issues and share Comptroller General Charles Bowsher's views, as noted in recent testimony, that: "agencies have a critical need to greatly improve and modernize financial management systems, which across government, are in abysmal shape today, and, in doing so, to re-engineer financial management processes, while at the same time implementing new accounting and financial reporting requirements."

The Corporation for National Service is re-engineering its financial management processes to meet the challenges resulting from its expanded responsibilities. We appreciate the work of the auditors in helping us to identify the short-term and long-term steps we need to take. To address the findings as they have been identified, we have already taken the following steps:

- Established a single point for approval, documentation of approvals, and periodic reviews of approvals as a means of strengthening controls over access to the accounting system.
- Improved cash receipts control by segregating duties related to the receipt of cash and the entry of information into the accounting system.
- Initiated a detailed cash reconciliation between Corporation and Treasury records for fiscal year 1996.
- Reconciled data between the payment system used for grants and the accounting system.
- Provided for a second review of all investment decisions made by the Corporation.
- Improved the comprehensiveness of procurement policies.
- Enhanced the security of computer systems.

The Corporation is also securing additional independent expertise from prominent accounting firms to augment our staff resources. The selected firms will focus primarily, over the next twelve months, on resolving findings in the audit related to the Corporation's day-to-day operations. Our goal is to resolve all operational issues during this period and develop auditable financial statements for fiscal year 1996 and thereafter.

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION

- 3 -

On a longer term basis, a complete redesign of the Corporation's accounting systems will be undertaken to modernize them and ensure they address both current and emerging needs. This includes the possibility of a complete replacement of the Corporation's current accounting system. Our belief is that while the present system may have been adequate in previous decades for a far smaller organization, state-of-the-art systems are now required for carrying out the Corporation's broader legislative mandate. In this regard, it is important that sufficient funds be appropriated for the Corporation's program administration budget to purchase and put into place the new systems.

A permanent Chief Financial Officer will be nominated in the near future to carry out these initiatives.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the Corporation for National Service has made an extraordinary record in the start-up of AmeriCorps and Learn and Serve America while continuing full support for established programs such as Senior Companions, Foster Grandparents, the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program and VISTA. Our Corporation is a decentralized, diversified, market driven, public private partnership, based in the independent sector. My primary aim has been and continues to have national service established in the public mind as a non-partisan institution in which the American people can take pride. As we move forward, the Corporation's emphasis on having a modern financial management system will pay substantial dividends by improving our efficiency and effectiveness.

Thank you for your continuing interest in the programs of the Corporation for National Service.

Sincerely,

Harris Wofford
Chief Executive Officer

DRAFT *Latest*

March 7, 1996

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
135 Hart Senate Office Building
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510-1501

CORPORATION
FOR NATIONAL
 SERVICE

Dear Senator Grassley,

Thank you for your letter of February 9, 1996, and for the special concern for AmeriCorps you have shown during the last year. I have appreciated our talks and the constructive spirit with which you have worked with me, as you say, not to terminate but to improve AmeriCorps. Working together with you and your colleagues in Congress, I'm convinced we can make it a program in which all Americans -- Republicans as well as Democrats -- take pride. I look forward to your being a partner in that effort, just as you are with the senior programs of the National Senior Service Corps which the Corporation also administers.

I also appreciate the emphasis you put on fulfilling President Clinton's original vision of helping young people to pay for college by serving their communities. I would add my own emphasis that this principle of reciprocity, like the G.I. bill's investment in veterans' education after their national military service, is a longstanding ground for bipartisan agreement. As one who paid for college through the G.I. bill after World War II service in the Air Force, I was a beneficiary of that bipartisanship.

Though the Peace Corps was President Kennedy's favorite program and is his special legacy, it earned -- and has maintained -- strong bipartisan support. The same is true of the Points of Light initiative of President Bush, which is retained as part of our national service legislation. As you well know, the National Service Trust Act of 1993, through which AmeriCorps was created, built on the first National Service Act signed by President Bush in 1990. Under that Act's Commission on National and Community Service, the same kind of grants to support full-time and part-time national service were made, albeit on a smaller scale. And the National Civilian Community Corps (now a branch of AmeriCorps) was created in 1992 with support from both sides of the aisle and was also signed by President Bush. That bipartisanship in Congress and nonpartisanship in the country is the key to the success of national service and community volunteering, and it is my goal to reclaim that tradition, even in this inevitably partisan political year. I welcome your help in doing this.

1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20525
Telephone 202-606-5000

Getting Things Done.
AmeriCorps, National Service
Learn and Serve America
National Senior Service Corps

DRAFT

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Page two
March 7, 1996

Turning to the particular points and proposals of your letter to me of February 9, 1996, and your letter to President Clinton of August 29, 1995, I want to assure you again that I am committed to achieve the cost and performance goals set by the President and Congress. Specifically, I am committed to reducing costs per full-time AmeriCorps member. This will enable more corpsmembers to serve and to get help to pay for college or job training. We will also take steps to increase substantially the contributions to the programs by the private sector and by all nonfederal sources. This will enable us to decrease the proportion of federal dollars going into program support and administrative overhead.

And, as you know, I am especially interested in your proposal that AmeriCorps increase the number of programs where the Corporation provides only educational awards. I believe that approach can be undertaken in a way that will benefit many nonprofit service organizations, enabling them to increase the numbers serving in their programs and enabling more of those serving in their programs to go to college, pay off their student loans, or receive approved job training through the educational awards.

Let me report some of the steps we have been taking in recent months, which I think you will find move AmeriCorps in the direction you favor. While I very much appreciate the contributions made by your criticisms and proposals, I also want to underscore that these are directions that I supported when I took this job. These directions, as you have noted, are also consistent with President Clinton's original vision; and I am happy to report they are directions that the Corporation, by its own trial and error process, has been quietly and diligently pursuing.

1. Reduce Member Costs

The Corporation has held itself out as a new kind of entity -- sensitive to the bottom line, actively involved with our partners in the private and independent sectors, aggressively promoting competition to achieve quality and economy. We are committed to producing the best possible program at the lowest possible cost.

As you know, most start-up enterprises have high costs as investments are made in infrastructure and system-building. Those costs come down as the investments pay off. The Corporation for National Service has already reduced costs from our first year to now. Our second year awards in the AmeriCorps state grant program represented an average real reduction of about 7 percent per member when compared to first year costs, when accounting for inflation. In the renewal process this third year, we are asking grantees whose grant costs exceed the average to reduce their per full-time equivalent cost by 10 percent. We are also eliminating funding for planning grants and for relocation costs for AmeriCorps members. Our goal is to focus Corporation resources directly on corpsmember support, not on program overhead and administrative costs. In addition, we have cut \$7 million out of the Corporation's 1996 administrative budget -- \$2 million in personnel and the rest in travel and other expenses.

DRAFT

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Page three
March 7, 1996

Regarding the National Civilian Community Corps (AmeriCorps*NCCC), our residential CCC program, we have taken significant steps to reduce our first year per member start up cost. We closed the Aberdeen, Maryland, Campus for a savings of \$1 million. We reduced members' living allowance from \$8,000 to \$6,000 this year, and plan to reduce it further to \$4,000 in FY 1997. By consolidating functions and making other structural changes, we cut headquarters staff by 25 percent, and plan additional cuts in campus staff of 30 percent next year.

2. Eliminate Grants to Federal Agencies

In response to concerns raised by Senator Bond and others, we have notified our federal agency grantees that we will no longer provide grants to federal agencies. Local nonprofits who had been affiliated with the federal agency programs will be free to apply for funding on their own to support AmeriCorps members utilized by those nonprofits.

3. Continue to Enforce Prohibitions Against Lobbying

We have also addressed concerns raised by Senator Bond and Representative Hoekstra by again requesting that state commissions and national direct grantees firmly remind AmeriCorps sponsors of all prohibited service activities, including lobbying and partisan political activities. In their renewal requests, programs must now delineate specific actions they will take to ensure that members do not engage in improper political activities. Such actions could include programs signing a certification, highlighting prohibitions in a member training manual, and adding a clause to the member contract. The Corporation will continue to investigate, on a priority basis, every allegation brought to our attention. It is important to note, however, that fewer than two percent of AmeriCorps programs have been accused of such activities. The Corporation has investigated every case brought to its attention and, in the case of ACORN Housing, acted quickly to terminate the grantee for improper activities.

4. Decrease Reliance on Corporation Funding

As a group AmeriCorps programs exceeded goals for private sector fundraising, raising more than \$41 million last year. To further encourage such private sector partnerships, in the 1996-97 renewal documents the Corporation makes it clear that all AmeriCorps programs should secure some funding from nongovernmental sources. We are also increasing the matching requirement for program support for which grantees are responsible from 25 to 33 percent.

5. Increase "Education Award Only" Programs

As you have urged, we are developing a plan to expand substantially the number of sponsors who receive no direct funding from the Corporation, but whose members receive education awards from the National Service Trust. This arrangement may have special appeal

DRAFT

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Page four
March 7, 1996

for religious organizations, higher education institutions, and other organizations with alternative sources of funding. The Act authorizes such awards, and we have piloted a program providing such awards on a competitive basis to the nation's governors. Expanding this program will increase the Corporation's cooperation with the larger world of nonprofit service organizations.

6. Increased Collaboration with National Nonprofit Organizations

We are strengthening and increasing our collaboration with national nonprofit service organizations. Working with such groups as Habitat for Humanity, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, the American Red Cross, and with a growing number of religious service organizations such as the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur and the National Council of Churches, members of AmeriCorps and of other programs of the Corporation such as Learn and Serve America and the Senior Corps are contributing directly to the strengthening and expansion of the independent civic and service sector of our society. Our special partnership with the American Red Cross, for instance, is enabling hundreds of Red Cross trained AmeriCorps members to respond on call by the Red Cross to serve as team leaders in natural disasters such as the recent floods along the Susquehanna River.

When I recently visited AmeriCorps teams working to help the 10,000 families hit by the flood in Pennsylvania, Red Cross officers emphasized the vital role they were playing in helping to utilize effectively more than 2,000 local volunteers. Millard Fuller, founder of Habitat for Humanity, turned from skeptic to enthusiast for the work of AmeriCorps members by seeing how their dedicated service in Habitat projects multiplied the number of unpaid volunteers effectively used and the number of houses built. We intend greater emphasis on such partnerships.

7. Increase State Autonomy

From the beginning, the Corporation has been a partnership between the Federal Government and the states. Consistent with this outlook, we have informed the governor-appointed national service commissions in each state that if they have instituted appropriate peer review processes, the Corporation will no longer review their formula grant selections. As the states enhance their capacity, further devolution will occur.

8. Improve the Grant Review Process

As you know, Senator Bond has expressed interest in the Corporation's grant review process. Our Inspector General has recently completed an examination of that process. While concluding that the Corporation acted within its discretion in those few instances when it awarded grants to lower ranked applicants at the expense of higher ranked applications, the Inspector General also finds some areas where we could strengthen grant competitions. We are

DRAFT

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Page five
March 7, 1996

currently reviewing the Inspector General's draft recommendations regarding the improvement of the peer review process and plan to implement quickly those that are workable. We will keep you informed of the steps we take. We have identified other ways to improve this critical process as well, and will pilot test them during our next review of new grant proposals.

9. Expand Efforts in Evaluation

The Corporation has taken seriously its commitment to make evaluation a central component of the management of AmeriCorps. The evaluation system we have in place provides valuable information about the impact of the program and encourages individual sponsors to track their efforts. As AmeriCorps matures, however, our evaluation needs will change, and as it becomes larger and more decentralized, we will be increasingly constrained in our capacity to monitor and evaluate. Among our goals are to develop evaluation systems that make increasing use of our network of service programs and their expertise, and to encourage and work in close coordination with private and independent sector efforts to evaluate service programs.

10. Increase and Strengthen Unpaid Volunteers

George Romney called full-time national service and traditional unpaid community volunteering "the twin engines" for civic action that pulling together could solve some of our critical educational, environmental, and social problems. A few days before he died George proposed that the Act itself, when reauthorized, should be named the "National Service and Community Volunteering Act of 1996". I agreed with him to propose that change and other changes emphasizing the role of AmeriCorps members as recruiters, organizers, and leaders of part-time, unpaid volunteers. I assured him I would do everything in my power within the present law to see that in AmeriCorps projects, high priority is given to such assignments.

Many of the best programs in which AmeriCorps members work already do just that, multiplying the number of community volunteers and the things that get done by the two forces working together. In addition to the examples already noted of volunteer generation in our work with such large nonprofits as Habitat for Humanity and the Red Cross, we are increasing the number of projects in which AmeriCorps members organize and lead secondary school or college volunteers in unpaid community service. We have now made this volunteer-generation factor a priority in the 1997 competition for project renewals.

I should note that the AmeriCorps record in volunteer generation in its first year was quite remarkable. In the fourth quarter, over three additional community volunteers were recruited for every AmeriCorps member serving. From July 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, it is estimated AmeriCorps members recruited at least 73,000 volunteers who contributed over 700,000 hours of service to their communities, or an average of about ten hours for every

DRAFT

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Page six
March 7, 1996

volunteer recruited. By further emphasizing this role we will increase the value added by each AmeriCorps member and by each federal dollar invested in national service.

* * *

The President and the Congress intended that the Corporation for National Service evolve to face changing situations with creativity, agility, and lack of bureaucracy. From the beginning, we have been engaged in a process of continuous improvement to lower our costs, to improve the ability of our partners to increase the share of costs they bear through fundraising, to devolve responsibility to the states, to root ourselves squarely in the continuum of service that runs from traditional volunteering to full-time service with living allowances and education awards, and from school-based service to Senior Corps programs, to be nonpartisan and firm in our policies against political advocacy, and to make our internal systems more effective.

The items I have outlined above are some of the steps we are taking to achieve these goals. These are steps we can take under the existing statute. These changes significantly address concerns raised by our critics.

You have proposed increasing the private sector or nonfederal match, and have suggested a specific cap on costs per AmeriCorps member. As you know, this is a complex matter and we want to consider carefully any unintended consequences that would adversely affect rural areas and economically disadvantaged urban communities whose access to the private sector may be limited, or affect the autonomy of local nonprofit organizations and youth service corps supported in part by state or local governments. Nevertheless, I believe an increase in the match can be phased in, and per member Corporation costs can be further reduced and limited, whether through a cap or other measures. I am committed to establishing measurable goals for private sector and nonfederal match as well as per capita costs within the next 60 days.

In my Senate confirmation hearing, I said that I would put to leaders of major corporations, foundations, and educational and nonprofit organizations the question: To what extent can the private and independent institutions, including colleges and universities, and also units of state and local government such as schools and police forces contribute more of the resources and assume even more of the responsibility? I am pursuing that possibility actively and will keep you up-to-date.

DRAFT

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Page seven
March 7, 1996

I am ready to sit down with you and other Members of Congress to consider all the above -- and other -- ways to improve and strengthen the program. I look forward to such discussions with you about legislative or administrative changes that can be accomplished to move us further along the lines you and I and the President favor.

Sincerely,

Harris Wofford
Chief Executive Officer

*People
Costs
free on
desk*

Sagawa, Shirley

From: Heinaru, Peter
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 1996 5:44 PM
To: Sagawa, Shirley
Cc: Algra, Diana@CNCS MS Mail Serv
Subject: RE:
Importance: High

Nice presentation -- we can live with all this. The \$15K CNS cost/Member will be difficult for many, but achievable for most. Politically, anything higher doesn't sound like significant reform.

In your point #1, should we add "CNS" as an adjective for the \$15K/ACM -- right now the language talks generically of \$15K though later it speaks of these really being CNS costs.

Thanks Shirley...p.s. -- on the cap, I do believe most can meet, and certainly anything over \$20K sounds real high to most people.

From: Sagawa, Shirley
To: Heinaru, Peter; Waldman, Steven; Russell, Terry; Kowalczyk, Gary; Sofer, Gene; Gray, Tracy@CNCS MS Mail Serve; Jospin, Debbie@CNCS MS Mail Se
Date: Tuesday, March 05, 1996 5:28PM

Here is my revision of the paper I propose to send to OMB tonight.

Memorandum for Distribution

From: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa
Re: AmeriCorps Cost-Cutting Proposal
Date: March 5, 1996

In the last several months, we have undertaken a careful analysis of the AmeriCorps program with a view toward reducing the AmeriCorps per Member costs. These cost reductions will enable the program to grow more rapidly and also address the major concerns raised by Senator Grassley and others. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, if it makes sense to put an Administration bill forward.

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 week, with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700

hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week -- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used to for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is significant. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We might emphasize:

A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors would receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.

B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.

C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

Sagawa, Shirley

To: Thompson, Avelina

Memorandum for Distribution

From: Harris Wofford and Shirley Sagawa

Re: AmeriCorps Cost-Cutting Proposal

Date: March 5, 1996

In the last several months, we have undertaken a careful analysis of the AmeriCorps program with a view toward reducing the AmeriCorps per Member costs. These cost reductions will enable the program to grow more rapidly and also address the major concerns raised by Senator Grassley and others. We believe these changes can be achieved without amending the statute, although they may also form the basis of a reauthorization proposal, if it makes sense to put an Administration bill forward.

1. Establish cost-savings goals.

We believe we could responsibly agree to an average per Member cost to the Corporation of not more than \$15,000, to be phased in by FY1999. In addition, we could agree that no AmeriCorps program would have a per Member cost exceeding \$20,000, to be phased in by FY1999. The per Member cost would be calculated by adding the budgeted Corporation costs of the education award, AmeriCorps grant (living allowance and Member support, plus program support), and Corporation and State Commission overhead that is directly attributable to AmeriCorps. The GAO estimated that the comparable figure for the average per Member cost in FY1995 was \$17,629; we believe it is actually slightly higher.

2. Living allowance

In order to achieve the above goals, we would need to review our policies relating to the living allowance paid to Members. Under the existing statute, the standard living allowance is \$7,945. For a 52-week program, that works out to a little bit more than \$150 week, with the Corporation share being a little more than \$125 week. However, due to the way the statute is written, a 40 week program (in which the Members serve the full 1700 hours over 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks), end up providing a living allowance of almost \$200 a week -- this amount is derived by dividing the annual living allowance of \$7945 by the number of weeks of the program. We may be able to save money by using our waiver authority to enable programs that operate for less than 52 weeks to pay \$150 per week, rather than the higher amount they are now required to pay.

3. Program costs

There are several ways to reduce program costs (the amount of the grant provided to programs that is not used for Member living allowances and benefits). Program costs cover staff, Member training, transportation, insurance, recruitment, and other items. Currently, the average grant amount to cover program costs is about \$5,500, although the range is large. To reduce this amount and simplify the program, we could determine a flat amount that the Corporation would provide per full-time Member and increase the matching funds required. To ensure continued participation of high quality programs for whom the restricted grant amount would pose a hardship, we might reserve a fund that could be tapped by rural programs, new start-ups, residential programs, etc.

3. Cost-share partnerships

To bring down the average per Member cost, the Corporation plans to work aggressively to develop partnerships with organizations that can pay the living allowances and program costs of AmeriCorps from other sources, with the Corporation providing only the education award. We might emphasize:

A. VISTA cost share arrangements, in which VISTA sponsors receive a VISTA free of charge for two years, but agree to pay the VISTA living allowance in subsequent years.

B. Higher education part-time programs, especially those that use college students to organize younger volunteers. Students would serve a minimum of 900 hours over two years.

C. Programs operated by religious organizations, such as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish lay volunteers, who do not want to apply for grant money.

Sagawa, Shirley

From: Kowalczyk, Gary
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 1996 9:11 AM
To: Sagawa, Shirley
Subject: AmeriCorps Cost Cutting Proposal

Pam called. She is asking that we make three changes to the paper:

1. Add a section in the beginning about reauthorization strategy. This could be as simple as what they had or a slightly expanded version. She agrees that this would be the focus for the Panetta meeting.
2. Can we do a table which shows the difference compared to the allowances today? I explained to her that we purposefully had not done this because this is a goal, and we haven't specified exactly how we will get there. She thinks Sperling will not be happy without a table, since he focused so heavily on your earlier table. She said this could be illustrative. [I can try if you would like.]
3. More specifics under the bullets. Specifically, say that the Corporation's share of the living allowance will go from \$6,800 to \$5,800 for those programs that are 10 months, and that the Member's allowance would go from \$8,000 to \$6,800 unless the program increased their match, which we would expect to occur.

I objected a bit to the process. We prepare a paper and they serve to critique, but not to generate their own document for Panetta. She was insistent, however, that this needed to be done before a meeting was scheduled with Panetta. When we finish, she will circulate and schedule a meeting.

Sorry.

MEMORANDUM FOR HARRIS WOFFORD

FROM: Shirley

RE: Analysis of reform proposal

DATE: February 16, 1996

A group of us spent some time analyzing the reform proposal. The following represents our conclusions about the effect of the proposal and steps we should take to prepare to implement it.

Our assumptions about the proposal are as follows:

- o The Corporation would provide \$100 per week living allowance (or "field fellowship") plus \$100 per month in health insurance (and would foot all child care costs for eligible members as under current law).
- o The Corporation would provide up to \$5,000 per member in program costs, provided on a one to one matching basis. (We understand that the exact formula might vary, and discuss options later in the memo.)
- o The education award stays the same as under current law.
- o We would set a target for the number of education awards only Member we would hope to enroll.

We assume that some of the goals of the proposal are:

- o To decrease the average federal cost per FTE for AMeriCorps Members significantly below the GAO-reported average of \$17,629 (Corporation costs).
- o To increase the proportion of federal funds going to Member support verses program support.
- o Potentially, to decrease the average Member living allowance so that it is clear that AmeriCorps Members are making a sacrifice.
- o To gain the support of a significant number of Republicans for the funding and reauthorization of the program.

On the next page is a chart showing our current program and the reform program, as we understand it. The chart is a little confusing because the current program numbers are **not**

the average costs, but rather, the "normal" costs assuming (1) a grantee provides the minimum matching funds for Member support, and (2) the actual "average" program support grant. Therefore, the numbers seem high relative to what we know to be the overall average per FTE amounts. For state programs, the average per FTE amount is about \$17,125 including all Corporation costs. About 60% of that amount goes to members (this percentage increases to about 66% if you exclude Commission and Corporation "overhead").

What the chart does show is that for the average program, the reform plan would not pose a serious hardship, **depending on what type of funding counts toward the match.** The implications of various match restrictions are discussed later in the memo.

Current program -- full time members

<u>MEMBER COSTS</u>	<u>Corporation</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ed award	4,725	0	4,725
Living allowance	6,753	1,192(+)	7,945(+)
FICA*	516	92(+)	608(+)
Health care	1,020	180	1,200
Child care**	250	0	250
SUBTOTAL	13,264	1,464	14,728
Program grant (state average)	5,511	5,236	10,747
State Commission	400	100	500
Corporation***	1,600	0	1,600
SUBTOTAL	7,511	5,336	12,847
TOTAL	20,775	6,800	27,575

Reform proposal -- 52-week full-time members (shorter programs would have lower costs)

<u>MEMBER COSTS</u>	<u>Corporation</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ed award	4,725	0	4,725
Living allowance	5,200	up to 5,200	up to 10,400
FICA*	398	up to 398	up to 796
Health care	1,200	0	1,200
Child care**	250	0	250
SUBTOTAL	11,773	up to 5,598	up to 17,371
Program grant	up to 5,000	up to 5,000	up to 10,000
State Commission	400	100	400
Corporation***	1,600	0	1,600
SUBTOTAL	up to 7,000	up to 5,100	up to 12,000
TOTAL	up to 18,773	up to 10,698	up to 29,371

*FICA is calculated based on 7.65% of living allowance. Not all programs have had to pay FICA, although currently most do. It is a legal determination. To get an across the board exemption for AmeriCorps Members would require the support of the Finance/Ways and Means Committees.

**Child care is calculated based on current total expenditures for child care benefits divided among all AmeriCorps Members. In reality, some Members receive a benefit of up to several thousand dollars, but most do not qualify for this assistance.

***Corporation costs are a very rough calculation that includes federal administration, t/ta, recruitment, evaluation, etc.

Policy issues related to this proposal:

Living allowance

Capping the living allowance at \$10,000 would affect approximately 23 existing programs. These programs tend to recruit higher skilled, more highly educated Members.

Lowering the minimum living allowance to \$100 per week would possibly cause concern to the youth corps community and labor unions, who have lobbied in the past for a minimum wage-level living allowance.

Requiring amounts of the living allowance that exceed \$100 per week to be raised by the programs would increase the "match" burden for most current programs by about \$1,500.

We have assumed that the Corporation would continue to pay most or all of a health care policy and child care benefits. If these are eliminated, the effect of lowering the living allowance would be more severe, and would effectively eliminate most single parents from AmeriCorps.

Assuming that many programs end up dropping the living allowance to the minimum amount by not augmenting it, there may be an effect on the demographics of the program; based on current data, it is the middle class Members who say they are most likely to forego AmeriCorps if the living allowance were lowered or eliminated.

Program support

Current program support grants range from almost nothing to more than \$10,000 per member, with the average being about \$5,500. The reform proposal would have the effect of requiring a larger match from most programs (currently about one-third programs are providing a 50% or better match).

We are assuming that programs would be free to raise and spend more than the required match, and that the proposal does not cap total available resources. If this is true, the effect would mainly be that most programs would have to raise more funds than they are now raising or lower costs significantly. (In a few cases, programs that want to maintain their current levels of support from the Corporation would have the incentive to increase overall program costs -- for example, Volunteer Maryland currently receives \$5,224 per Member from the Corporation and contributes only \$3,723. Such a program might want to increase its contribution so it could receive the maximum.)

Significant issues are raised around the administration of a challenge grant. If the challenge works like a typical government match, in which the grantee says "I will go out and raise \$5,000 if you give me \$5,000," with compliance being monitored after the fact, no such problems arise. If, on the other hand, grantees must have the cash in hand in order to draw down the corresponding amount of the grant, there would have to be a significant auditing

capacity put into place that does not now exist. When such challenge grants have been proposed in the past, the Corporation has not been able to administer them in this fashion. If, as City Year has proposed, we rely on an independent audit to verify that funds are indeed in the bank, there would be a timing problem -- in many cases, it takes up to 18 months for an audit to be completed. We are investigating other challenge grant systems (like the FEC) and hoping to find a simple way to administer the dollar for dollar match.

A policy issue to be decided is what would count toward the "challenge." Federal agency funds would presumably not count. Would the funds have to be in cash or could it be in kind? Programs have an easier time with in kind, but could more easily "pad" an in-kind match. Perhaps that matters less when the amount of the Corporation grant is effectively capped at \$5,000. If more than 10 - 15% of the match must come from nongovernmental sources, staff predict a majority of programs would drop out.

The effect on the actual design of programs is hard to predict. Consider a few circumstances:

Rural programs tend to have high transportation costs, tend to use federal funds as their base of support, and have more difficulty raising nongovernmental funds. Would we provide a "rural supplement"?

Programs that exist primarily as national service programs tend to have higher overhead costs attributed to AmeriCorps than those that are organized by entities that exist to carry out other missions.

Geographically dispersed programs tend to have high travel costs. Many programs would have to be redesigned to eliminate large group trainings and other events demanding that Members gather together. Would this have an effect on quality (usually the trainings are conducted by the substantive experts) and the sense of unity Members have? Could this be offset by more local gatherings across programs, new training designs that do not require travel, and use of technology (such as internet)?

Youth corps and other programs involving at-risk youth tend to rely heavily on federal funds. Eliminating use of federal funds as a match (coupled with our cutting off of grants to federal agencies) will cause a good portion of these programs to drop out.

Education award only issues

A key part of this proposal is that "education awards only" programs would become a significant part of the AmeriCorps portfolio. Currently, the Corporation has 3 education awards only programs in AmeriCorps*State and National and another 13 in which the Corporation provides only minimal program support and no Member support. (In another 16 programs, the Corporation provides significant program support, but no Member support.) In addition, there are currently 40 A*VISTA cost share agreements (covering 600 A*VISTAs). Staff estimate that most of the current "ed awards only" and "cost shares" are supported by federal funding. Concerns about ed award only programs in the past have centered on quality and fit with AmeriCorps. For that reason, other than in the federal partnerships arena, we have not worked aggressively to promote this option outside of the existing grantee universe. A*VISTA on the other hand, has made it a priority to pursue these kinds of relationships. Interestingly, as we learned in the meeting yesterday, most A*VISTA cost-shares were created after an organization had had experience with fully funded A*VISTAs. This will be critical to our marketing plans for cost-shares.

Does the field have the capacity to significantly increase the number of ed awards only and cost share agreements? That depends on the assumptions about who will pay the related costs. Here are options:

Federal programs: We have pursued these aggressively through the Office of Federal Partnerships, which at one time had as many as 6 staff. We are down to 1 staff person in this office and have determined that this is no longer a priority. However, this is the most likely source of funding for additional cost-share arrangements.

State funding: State funding could be a fertile source of cost-share funds, especially if national service can be positioned as a strategy to solving critical social problems targeted by states for reform. State Commissions and state offices could pursue these arrangements more effectively than Washington-based staff.

Higher education: Higher education institutions may be an excellent source of cost-share funds, provided that we are comfortable with part-time Members. A review of our part-time portfolio indicates that most of our part-time programs are higher education-sponsored programs or those that use college students as Members. Issues to consider are the fact that part-time programs have tended to be lower quality than full-time programs; implications of providing education awards to unstipended part-time Members; whether we would be effectively "displacing" current volunteers with AmeriCorps Members (by providing an education award to those who would otherwise be regular volunteers); and whether we are concerned with creating more situations in which individuals receiving ed awards are serving alongside those who are not.

Local government funds: We have not fully explored whether school districts, police, and municipalities might be a source of cost-share funds. Currently, municipal funds are the funding source for a few education awards only programs. Note potential union issues (AFSCME has

been our closest ally among the unions up to now).

Existing service programs: Providing education awards to existing service programs could be perceived as "displacing" current full-time servers (if we end up simply providing ed awards to an existing corps or program for their existing slots). If we expect these programs to add additional members, staff feel it is unlikely that many will want to participate due to the high cost involved.

Non-profits: Given the costs of operating a program of a significant size (a program of 20 full-time Members would cost more than \$100,000), staff believe it is unlikely that many non-profits would be interested in paying for an education award only program similar to the programs funded by AmeriCorps. Much more attractive would be a A*VISTA-style cost-share arrangement for one or two Members. Either would have to be marketed strategically and aggressively to achieve the large numbers contemplated.

Next steps

The issues identified in this analysis suggest several action steps that should be taken immediately, if we are to pursue the reform plan.

- o We should firm up the specifics of the proposal and provide a memo to OMB for review.
- o We should do a legal review to determine if legislative amendments would be needed to implement any of the pieces of the plan.
- o We should develop a plan for consulting with our constituency groups and the staff about the proposal.
- o We should consider differential matching rates or dedicated "pots" of funding for certain types of programs and funding. For example, we might provide two dollars for every private dollar (2:1), no dollars for each federal dollar (0:1), one dollar for each dollar of other types of funding (1:1); we might also have a higher (2:1 or 3:1) matching rate for start-up programs, rural programs; programs that have other kinds of hardships, etc. Providing these kinds of incentives could mitigate against unintended negative effects on the portfolio of programs.
- o We should develop a phase in for the plan.
- o We should come to terms with what kind of assignment appropriately constitutes an AmeriCorps assignment.
- o We should develop a plan to market and manage more education award-only programs and A*VISTA cost-share partnerships.
- o We should explore additional ways to support local programs' fundraising capacity, including technical assistance, partnership agreements, the Partnership for National Service, and new initiatives.

1995 COST / TIC

Ameri Corps State

ave FTE cost (NS) for 364
programs
\$ 12,184

12,600 194
12,200 195
106 of those are above
\$13,800 - list attached

ASC - Competitive Progs

Ave FTE cost - \$12,137

ASC - Formula Progs

Ave FTE cost = \$12,214

Ameri Corps Direct

ave FTE cost (CNS) for ~~39~~⁴⁴

Nat'l Non Profts \$ 10,071

25 of those are above \$13,800

COMPETITIVE

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
						A%	B-G%	
94ASCAK002 Alaska State Community Service Commission								
Competitive								
South Alaska Guidance Association (SAGA)	Juneau	AK	71.5	\$950,001	\$13,287	46%	64%	\$1,317,355
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			71.5	\$950,001		24%	45%	\$1,317,355
Grantee Total	Alaska State Community Service		71.5	\$950,001		46%	64%	\$1,317,355
94ASCAL001 Alabama National & Community Service State Commission								
Competitive								
Birmingham AIDS Outreach		AL	13.0	\$174,457	\$13,420	15%	39%	\$60,759
Birmingham AIDS Outreach (BAO)		AL	29.0	\$399,817	\$13,787	24% 15%	45% 39%	\$140,848
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			42.0	\$574,274		24%	45%	\$201,607
Grantee Total	Alabama National & Community		42.0	\$574,274		15%	39%	\$201,607
94ASCAZ003 Arizona National and Community Service Commission								
Competitive								
AZ Board of Regents / Rural Health Office / Univ of AZ		AZ	22.0	\$322,588	\$14,663	15%	42%	\$135,492
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			22.0	\$322,588		24%	45%	\$135,492
Grantee Total	Arizona National and Community		22.0	\$322,588		15%	42%	\$135,492
94ASCCA005 California Commission on Improving Life Through Service								
Competitive								
California Conservation Corps	Sacramento	CA	117.5	\$1,646,894	\$14,016	40%	52%	\$1,429,166
County of Sacramento, Department of Parks and Recreation		CA	50.0	\$690,000	\$13,800	24% 15%	45% 43%	\$268,066
East Bay Conservation Corps		CA	126.0	\$2,240,000	\$17,778	24% 19%	45% 35%	\$896,929
Kern County Superintendent of Schools		CA	28.0	\$385,338	\$13,762	24% 25%	45% 38%	\$173,567
Los Angeles Conservation Corps		CA	142.0	\$2,168,716	\$15,273	24% 17%	45% 53%	\$1,316,916
Sacramento Child Abuse Prevention Council		CA	22.0	\$306,935	\$13,952	24% 20%	45% 57%	\$202,845
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			485.5	\$7,437,883		24%	45%	\$4,287,489
Grantee Total	California Commission on Improving		485.5	\$7,437,883		23%	46%	\$4,287,489
94ASCCO006 Community Partnership Office								
Competitive								
Volunteers of America Colorado Branch, Inc.		CO	19.0	\$208,343	\$10,965	15%	25%	\$44,047
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			19.0	\$208,343		24%	45%	\$44,047

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
Grantee Total	Community Partnership Office		19.0	\$208,343		15% 25%	\$44,047
<hr/>							
94ASCCT007	Connecticut Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Bridgeport Police Department		CT	34.5	\$516,644	\$14,975	15% 43%	\$243,669
Community Action for Greater Middlesex County, Inc.		CT	33.0	\$453,924	\$13,755	24% 15% 45% 43%	\$179,123
Leadership, Education and Athletics in Partnership		CT	83.0	\$1,290,000	\$15,542	24% 40% 45% 55%	\$1,294,304
Southend Community Services, Inc.		CT	30.0	\$400,022	\$13,334	24% 21% 45% 40%	\$161,754
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>180.5</i>	<i>\$2,660,590</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$1,878,850</i>
Grantee Total	Connecticut Commission on National &		180.5	\$2,660,590		23% 45%	\$1,878,850
<hr/>							
94ASCDE008	Delaware Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Delaware Parent Aide & Resource Mother Coalition		DE	20.0	\$246,689	\$12,334	15% 27%	\$60,929
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>20.0</i>	<i>\$246,689</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$60,929</i>
Grantee Total	Delaware Commission on National &		20.0	\$246,689		15% 27%	\$60,929
<hr/>							
94ASCFL010	Florida Governor's Commission on Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Frostproof Care Center, Inc.		FL	20.0	\$279,404	\$13,970	16% 54%	\$161,868
St. Petersburg Junior College		FL	40.0	\$548,785	\$13,720	24% 15% 45% 42%	\$214,384
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>60.0</i>	<i>\$828,189</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$376,252</i>
Grantee Total	Florida Governor's Commission on		60.0	\$828,189		16% 48%	\$376,252
<hr/>							
94ASCGA011	GA Commission on National and Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs		GA	60.0	\$828,000	\$13,800	17% 50%	\$441,707
Hands on Atlanta, Inc.		GA	77.0	\$963,149	\$12,508	24% 15% 45% 35%	\$286,006
YMCA of Metropolitan Atlanta, Inc.		GA	20.0	\$269,373	\$13,469	24% 15% 45% 41%	\$101,281
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>157.0</i>	<i>\$2,060,522</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$828,994</i>
Grantee Total	GA Commission on National and		157.0	\$2,060,522		16% 42%	\$828,994
<hr/>							
94ASCHI012	Hawaii State Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Hawaii Lawyers Care		HI	22.5	\$325,987	\$14,488	20% 58%	\$256,447
						24% 45%	

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			22.5	\$325,987			\$256,447
Grantee Total	Hawaii State Commission on National		22.5	\$325,987		20% 58%	\$256,447
<hr/>							
94ASCIA016	Iowa Commission on Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Des Moines Independent Community School District	IA		20.0	\$242,202	\$12,110	17% 34%	\$76,630
Mid-Iowa Community Action, Inc.	IA		25.0	\$259,774	\$10,391	24% 15% 45% 31%	\$60,319
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			45.0	\$501,976		24% 45%	\$136,949
Grantee Total	Iowa Commission on Community		45.0	\$501,976		16% 33%	\$136,949
<hr/>							
94ASCIL014	Illinois Commission on Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Cornerstone Services, Inc.	IL		20.0	\$0	\$0	100% 0%	\$323,200
Mid-America Chapter, American Red Cross	IL		26.0	\$376,097	\$14,465	24% 15% 45% 45%	\$167,356
Public Allies - Chicago	IL		40.0	\$451,327	\$11,283	24% 59% 45% 41%	\$532,006
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			86.0	\$827,424		24% 45%	\$1,022,562
Grantee Total	Illinois Commission on Community		86.0	\$827,424		58% 29%	\$1,022,562
<hr/>							
94ASCIN015	Indiana Commission on Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Marion County Family Advocacy Center, Inc.	IN		20.0	\$251,272	\$12,564	15% 52%	\$122,203
State Student Assistance Commission of Indiana (SSACI)	IN		27.0	\$343,073	\$12,706	24% 15% 45% 67%	\$270,707
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			47.0	\$594,345		24% 45%	\$392,910
Grantee Total	Indiana Commission on Community		47.0	\$594,345		15% 59%	\$392,910
<hr/>							
94ASCKS017	Kansas Commission on National and Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Kansas State University	KS		42.0	\$612,395	\$14,581	22% 41%	\$355,296
Topeka Youth Project	KS		28.0	\$417,364	\$14,906	24% 20% 45% 45%	\$220,954
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			70.0	\$1,029,759		24% 45%	\$576,250
Grantee Total	Kansas Commission on National and		70.0	\$1,029,759		21% 43%	\$576,250
<hr/>							
94ascky018	Kentucky Community Service Commission						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Homeless and Housing Coalition of Kentucky, Inc.	KY		40.0	\$500,258	\$12,506	19% 54%	\$266,583
						24% 45%	

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
Morehead State University		KY	31.0	\$427,800	\$13,800	15% 69%	\$427,690
Northern Kentucky United Way and Community Chest		KY	20.0	\$271,913	\$13,596	24% 15% 45% 49%	\$128,193
Simpson County Board of Education		KY	25.0	\$322,775	\$12,911	24% 15% 45% 25%	\$74,460
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>116.0</i>	<i>\$1,522,747</i>		24% 45%	<i>\$896,926</i>
Grantee Total	Kentucky Community Service		116.0	\$1,522,747		16% 49%	\$896,926
<hr/>							
94ASCLA019	Louisiana Serve Commission						
Competitive							
New Orleans Youth Action Corps		LA	66.0	\$2,000	\$30	0% 0%	\$0
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>66.0</i>	<i>\$2,000</i>		24% 45%	<i>\$0</i>
Grantee Total	Louisiana Serve Commission		66.0	\$2,000		0% 0%	\$0
<hr/>							
94ASCMA022	Massachusetts National & Community Service Commission						
Competitive							
City Year Boston		MA	308.0	\$3,600,000	\$11,688	15% 51%	\$2,265,244
YouthBuild Boston, Inc.		MA	89.0	\$1,086,200	\$12,204	24% 33% 45% 57%	\$1,187,892
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>397.0</i>	<i>\$4,686,200</i>		24% 45%	<i>\$3,453,136</i>
Grantee Total	Massachusetts National & Community		397.0	\$4,686,200		24% 54%	\$3,453,136
<hr/>							
94ASCMD021	Governor's Commission on Service						
Competitive							
Action for the Homeless, Inc.		MD	27.0	\$328,304	\$12,159	15% 49%	\$138,629
Maryland Conservation Corps (MD-DNR-Public Lands & Forestry)		MD	151.0	\$2,200,000	\$14,570	24% 30% 45% 39%	\$1,190,410
Maryland State Department of Education		MD	30.0	\$358,520	\$11,951	24% 15% 45% 40%	\$114,411
Montgomery County Government, Department of Police		MD	23.5	\$374,889	\$15,953	24% 32% 45% 54%	\$300,620
University of Maryland at Baltimore		MD	22.0	\$320,937	\$14,588	24% 20% 45% 45%	\$157,931
Volunteer Maryland/Governor's Office on Volunteerism		MD	120.0	\$1,655,265	\$13,794	24% 40% 45% 41%	\$1,114,463
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>373.5</i>	<i>\$5,237,915</i>		24% 45%	<i>\$3,016,464</i>
Grantee Total	Governor's Commission on Service		373.5	\$5,237,915		25% 45%	\$3,016,464
<hr/>							
94ASCME020	Maine Commission on National & Community Service						
Competitive							
Portland West Neighborhood Planning Council		ME	20.0	\$276,000	\$13,800	18% 37%	\$102,911
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>20.0</i>	<i>\$276,000</i>		24% 45%	<i>\$102,911</i>

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
Grantee Total	Maine Commission on National &		20.0	\$276,000		18% 37%	\$102,911
94ASCM1023	Michigan Community Service Commission						
<i>Competitive</i>							
The Regents of The University of Michigan	MI		32.0	\$349,216	\$10,913	23% 76%	\$372,875
United Way Community Services	MI		20.0	\$261,661	\$13,083	24% 45% 18% 34%	\$85,509
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>52.0</i>	<i>\$610,877</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$458,384</i>
Grantee Total	Michigan Community Service		52.0	\$610,877		21% 55%	\$458,384
94ASCMN024	Minnesota Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
City of Saint Paul	MN		63.5	\$866,546	\$13,646	16% 38%	\$305,046
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	MN		77.0	\$46,546	\$604	24% 45% 96% 100%	\$1,619,519
Southeastern Minnesota Initiative Fund	MN		55.0	\$716,400	\$13,025	24% 45% 18% 27%	\$197,343
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>195.5</i>	<i>\$1,629,492</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$2,121,908</i>
Grantee Total	Minnesota Commission on National &		195.5	\$1,629,492		43% 55%	\$2,121,908
94ASCMO026	Missouri Commission on Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
American Youth Foundation	MO		43.0	\$628,457	\$14,615	18% 55%	\$415,224
American Youth Foundation	MO		28.0	\$378,460	\$13,516	24% 45% 18% 60%	\$269,585
Grace Hill Neighborhood Services	MO		20.0	\$275,222	\$13,761	24% 45% 15% 46%	\$122,936
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>91.0</i>	<i>\$1,282,139</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$807,745</i>
Grantee Total	Missouri Commission on Community		91.0	\$1,282,139		17% 54%	\$807,745
94ASCMT027	Montana Community Services Advisory Council						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Montana Conservation Corps, Inc.	MT		118.5	\$897,500	\$7,574	59% 72%	\$1,738,071
The University of Montana	MT		5.0	\$40,000	\$8,000	24% 45% 100% 63%	\$76,656
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>123.5</i>	<i>\$937,500</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$1,814,727</i>
Grantee Total	Montana Community Services		123.5	\$937,500		79% 68%	\$1,814,727
94ASCNC034	NC State Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
North Carolina State University	NC		30.0	\$410,349	\$13,678	15% 42%	\$180,089
						24% 45%	

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A%	Match % B-G%	Match in \$\$
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro		NC	35.0	\$429,127	\$12,261	25%	57%	\$317,817
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>65.0</i>	<i>\$839,476</i>		24%	45%	<i>\$497,906</i>
Grantee Total	NC State Commission on National &		65.0	\$839,476		20%	50%	\$497,906
<hr/>								
94ASCNE028	Nebraska Commission for National and Community Service							
<hr/>								
Competitive								
Lincoln Action Program		NE	3.0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%	\$0
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>3.0</i>	<i>\$0</i>		24%	45%	<i>\$0</i>
Grantee Total	Nebraska Commission for National		3.0	\$0		0%	0%	\$0
<hr/>								
94ASCNH030	New Hampshire Commission on National & Community Service							
<hr/>								
Competitive								
NH Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence		NH	32.0	\$416,509	\$13,016	15%	39%	\$141,715
Student Conservation Association, Inc.		NH	20.0	\$398,024	\$19,901	24%	45%	\$157,104
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>52.0</i>	<i>\$814,533</i>		24%	45%	<i>\$298,819</i>
Grantee Total	New Hampshire Commission on		52.0	\$814,533		15%	35%	\$298,819
<hr/>								
94ASCNJ031	New Jersey Commission on National & Community Service							
<hr/>								
Competitive								
Edison Youth Service Corps, Inc.		NJ	5.0	\$2,000	\$400	100%	95%	\$90,556
New Jersey Youth Corps		NJ	101.5	\$1,475,245	\$14,534	24%	45%	\$938,521
Urban Schools Service Corps		NJ	144.5	\$1,983,906	\$13,729	24%	45%	\$572,885
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>251.0</i>	<i>\$3,461,151</i>		24%	45%	<i>\$1,601,962</i>
Grantee Total	New Jersey Commission on National &		251.0	\$3,461,151		47%	58%	\$1,601,962
<hr/>								
94ASCNM032	New Mexico Commission for National & Community Service							
<hr/>								
Competitive								
National Indian Youth Leadership Development Project Inc		NM	20.0	\$288,802	\$14,440	15%	25%	\$71,685
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>20.0</i>	<i>\$288,802</i>		24%	45%	<i>\$71,685</i>
Grantee Total	New Mexico Commission for National		20.0	\$288,802		15%	25%	\$71,685
<hr/>								
94ASCNY033	New York Commission on National & Community Service							
<hr/>								
Competitive								
Aspira of New York, Inc.		NY	83.0	\$1,145,400	\$13,800	15%	35%	\$373,595
City Volunteer Corps, Inc		NY	120.0	\$1,554,000	\$12,950	24%	45%	\$694,275
						24%	45%	

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
						A%	B-G%	
New York City Police Department	NY		43.5	\$502,310	\$11,547	49%	50%	\$498,773
New York State Corps Collaboration	NY		132.0	\$1,821,600	\$13,800	18%	50%	\$1,021,743
RF/CUNY on behalf of New York City Technical College	NY		12.5	\$25,000	\$2,000	0%	65%	\$47,295
Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families	NY		65.0	\$698,074	\$10,740	15%	57%	\$273,493
The Institute for Human Services, Inc.	NY		20.0	\$275,991	\$13,800	17%	65%	\$227,091
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			476.0	\$6,022,375		24%	45%	\$3,136,265
Grantee Total	New York Commission on National &		476.0	\$6,022,375		19%	51%	\$3,136,265
<hr/>								
94ASCOH036	Governor's Community Service Commission							
<i>Competitive</i>								
Greater Columbus Arts Council	OH		20.0	\$332,054	\$16,603	29%	48%	\$218,703
Neighborhood Centers Association	OH		20.0	\$264,898	\$13,245	15%	55%	\$148,273
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			40.0	\$596,952		24%	45%	\$366,976
Grantee Total	Governor's Community Service		40.0	\$596,952		22%	51%	\$366,976
<hr/>								
94ASCOR038	Oregon Community Service Commission							
<i>Competitive</i>								
COCC (Central Oregon Community College Foundation)	Bend	OR	18.8	\$261,677	\$13,956	15%	39%	\$101,559
Forest Grove School District	OR		16.0	\$2,000	\$125	0%	45%	\$0
Maple Elementary School/School District #19, Springfield	OR		10.0	\$2,000	\$200	0%	88%	\$15,308
Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence	OR		21.0	\$332,114	\$15,815	16%	26%	\$87,586
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			65.8	\$597,791		24%	45%	\$204,453
Grantee Total	Oregon Community Service Commission		65.8	\$597,791		8%	38%	\$204,453
<hr/>								
94ASCPA039	PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service							
<i>Competitive</i>								
PA Association of Colleges and Universities	PA		50.0	\$794,901	\$15,898	18%	26%	\$222,837
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			50.0	\$794,901		24%	45%	\$222,837
Grantee Total	PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of		50.0	\$794,901		18%	26%	\$222,837
<hr/>								
94ASCPR040	Puerto Rico State Commission of Community Service							
<i>Competitive</i>								
Centros Sor Isolina Ferre, Inc.	PR		20.0	\$280,001	\$14,000	15%	39%	\$99,225
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			20.0	\$280,001		24%	45%	\$99,225

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$
Grantee Total	Puerto Rico State Commission of		20.0	\$280,001		15% 39%	\$99,225
94ASCR1041	Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
City Year, Inc.		RI	66.0	\$839,300	\$12,717	15% 46%	\$458,422
Public Education Fund		RI	28.5	\$440,000	\$15,439	24% 26% 45% 51%	\$294,366
The Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education		RI	32.0	\$494,525	\$15,454	24% 24% 45% 34%	\$201,466
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>126.5</i>	<i>\$1,773,825</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$954,254</i>
Grantee Total	Rhode Island Commission for National		126.5	\$1,773,825		22% 44%	\$954,254
94ASCTN044	Tenn. Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
Memphis City Schools		TN	18.3	\$336,008	\$18,328	15% 43%	\$158,890
Nashville Healthcare Partnership/Middle Tennessee		TN	40.0	\$546,288	\$13,657	24% 16% 45% 73%	\$619,830
NashvilleREAD, Inc.		TN	21.0	\$284,752	\$13,560	24% 15% 45% 36%	\$92,650
Porter-Leath Children's Center		TN	20.0	\$240,304	\$12,015	24% 15% 45% 47%	\$97,981
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		TN	20.0	\$268,510	\$13,426	24% 15% 45% 41%	\$99,486
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>119.3</i>	<i>\$1,675,862</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$1,068,837</i>
Grantee Total	Tenn. Commission on National &		119.3	\$1,675,862		15% 48%	\$1,068,837
94ASCTX045	Texas Commission for National & Community Service						
<i>Competitive</i>							
American Institute for Learning		TX	95.0	\$1,306,250	\$13,750	36% 56%	\$1,287,317
Children's Association for Maximum Potential (CAMP)		TX	20.0	\$30,690	\$1,535	24% 0% 45% 46%	\$26,494
City Year Inc		TX	65.0	\$818,205	\$12,588	24% 15% 45% 47%	\$486,015
Dallas Youth Services Corps		TX	90.0	\$746,287	\$8,292	24% 22% 45% 25%	\$229,740
Greater Dallas Community of Churches		TX	43.0	\$591,390	\$13,753	24% 17% 45% 48%	\$293,445
Mental Health Association in Texas		TX	84.0	\$988,668	\$11,770	24% 15% 45% 43%	\$335,577
Serve Houston		TX	109.8	\$1,303,880	\$11,873	24% 23% 45% 30%	\$475,338
Workreation Inc		TX	21.1	\$297,056	\$14,078	24% 15% 45% 41%	\$112,933
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>527.9</i>	<i>\$6,082,426</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$3,246,859</i>

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
Grantee Total	Texas Commission for National &		527.9	\$6,082,426		18% 42%	\$3,246,859
<hr/>							
94ASCUT046	Utah Commission on National & Community Service						
Competitive							
Association for Utah Community Health		UT	18.0	\$226,125	\$12,563	25% 36%	\$94,359
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>18.0</i>	<i>\$226,125</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$94,359</i>
Grantee Total	Utah Commission on National &		18.0	\$226,125		25% 36%	\$94,359
<hr/>							
94ASCWA047	Washington Commission on National & Community Service						
Competitive							
Department of Ecology		WA	100.0	\$59,300	\$593	95% 100%	\$2,005,048
Employment Security Department		WA	384.3	\$3,495,007	\$9,096	24% 51% 45% 38%	\$2,794,841
Kitsap Community Action Program (KCAP)		WA	29.0	\$363,402	\$12,531	24% 15% 45% 32%	\$104,941
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>513.3</i>	<i>\$3,917,709</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$4,904,830</i>
Grantee Total	Washington Commission on National		513.3	\$3,917,709		54% 56%	\$4,904,830
<hr/>							
94ASCWI051	Wisconsin National & Community Service Board						
Competitive							
Kenosha Voluntary Action Center II		WI	11.0	\$147,446	\$13,404	28% 50%	\$100,128
Milwaukee Community Service Corps		WI	37.0	\$283,754	\$7,669	24% 34% 45% 26%	\$124,619
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>48.0</i>	<i>\$431,200</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$224,747</i>
Grantee Total	Wisconsin National & Community		48.0	\$431,200		31% 38%	\$224,747
<hr/>							
94ASCWV050	WV Commission for National & Community Service						
Competitive							
West Virginia Research Corp		Morgantown WV	13.3	\$177,560	\$13,317	46% 69%	\$304,601
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>13.3</i>	<i>\$177,560</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$304,601</i>
Grantee Total	WV Commission for National &		13.3	\$177,560		46% 69%	\$304,601
<hr/>							
94ASCWY052	Wyoming Commission for National & Community Service						
Competitive							
Wyoming Crime Victims Compensation Commission		WY	20.0	\$274,891	\$13,745	15% 25%	\$65,474
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>20.0</i>	<i>\$274,891</i>		<i>24% 45%</i>	<i>\$65,474</i>
Grantee Total	Wyoming Commission for National &		20.0	\$274,891		15% 25%	\$65,474
<hr/>							
Total	103 Programs		5,191.6	\$63,009,020		24% 45%	\$41,552,422

*\$12,137 per
FTE - Competitive programs*

FORMULA

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
						A%	B-G%	
94ASCAK002 Alaska State Community Service Commission								
Formula								
Nine Star Enterprises, Inc.	Anchorage	AK	9.0	\$144,707	\$16,079	15%	34%	\$48,583
Rural Alaska Community Action Program, Inc.		AK	9.0	\$155,620	\$17,291	41%	42%	\$110,954
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			18.0	\$300,327		28%	38%	\$159,537
Grantee Total	Alaska State Community Service		18.0	\$300,327		28%	38%	\$159,537
94ASCAL001 Alabama National & Community Service State Commission								
Formula								
Alabama Council on Human Relations, Inc.		AL	20.0	\$258,262	\$12,913	15%	46%	\$104,168
Montgomery YMCA		AL	24.0	\$324,252	\$13,510	15%	35%	\$103,361
State Association of CASA		AL	21.0	\$189,168	\$9,008	15%	29%	\$54,579
The University of Alabama		AL	20.0	\$77,521	\$3,876	0%	39%	\$49,503
West Alabama Health Services, Inc.		AL	20.0	\$220,725	\$11,036	15%	31%	\$54,534
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			105.0	\$1,069,928		12%	36%	\$366,145
Grantee Total	Alabama National & Community		105.0	\$1,069,928		12%	36%	\$366,145
94ASCAR004 Arkansas Commission on National and Community Service								
Formula								
Arkansas Family Network		AR	13.0	\$165,902	\$12,762	15%	27%	\$38,311
Southeast Arkansas Community Based Education Center		AR	10.0	\$150,225	\$15,023	15%	38%	\$56,204
Univ of Central Arkansas		AR	24.5	\$313,399	\$12,792	15%	42%	\$114,245
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			47.5	\$629,526		15%	36%	\$208,760
Grantee Total	Arkansas Commission on National and		47.5	\$629,526		15%	36%	\$208,760
94ASCAZ003 Arizona National and Community Service Commission								
Formula								
Arizona Center for Vocational & Technical Skills		AZ	28.5	\$340,459	\$11,946	15%	70%	\$357,545
AZ Council of Centers for Children & Adults (ACCCA)		AZ	24.0	\$294,103	\$12,254	15%	49%	\$122,914
City of Mesa, AZ		AZ	24.0	\$287,621	\$11,984	15%	44%	\$94,718
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			76.5	\$922,183		15%	54%	\$575,177
Grantee Total	Arizona National and Community		76.5	\$922,183		15%	54%	\$575,177
94ASCCA005 California Commission on Improving Life Through Service								

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A%	Match % B-C%	Match in \$\$
Formula								
AD Care, Inc.	San Luis Obispo	CA	29.0	\$352,633	\$12,160	15%	35%	\$101,107
Bay Area Youth Agency Consortium		CA	52.0	\$736,678	\$14,167	28%	57%	\$570,576
Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc.		CA	13.3	\$230,084	\$17,365	15%	33%	\$81,561
California Conservation Corps		CA	94.0	\$823,327	\$8,759	60%	62%	\$1,301,828
California Conservation Corps		CA	41.5	\$549,421	\$13,239	20%	87%	\$1,304,600
California Conservation Corps		CA	119.0	\$664,491	\$5,584	82%	70%	\$2,042,750
California Court Appointed Special Advocate Association		CA	24.0	\$347,723	\$14,488	15%	25%	\$83,076
Civic Center Barrio Housing Corporation		CA	24.0	\$349,580	\$14,566	15%	25%	\$84,149
Community Services & Employment Training, Inc. (C-SET)		CA	18.0	\$228,515	\$12,695	15%	45%	\$78,060
Constitutional Rights Foundation		CA	22.0	\$325,823	\$14,810	15%	49%	\$157,017
EYE Counseling and Crisis Services		CA	37.0	\$638,722	\$17,263	15%	28%	\$183,540
Imperial County Office of Education		CA	27.0	\$391,160	\$14,487	15%	37%	\$134,328
Partners In School Innovation		CA	14.0	\$247,190	\$17,656	53%	44%	\$231,620
Redwood Community Action Agency		CA	21.0	\$303,600	\$14,457	18%	50%	\$167,269
Sacramento County Office of Education		CA	21.5	\$364,401	\$16,949	17%	35%	\$139,004
San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council		CA	23.0	\$337,338	\$14,667	18%	35%	\$122,985
Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity		CA	21.0	\$304,640	\$14,507	16%	25%	\$73,257
The June Burnett Foundation		CA	48.0	\$708,880	\$14,768	19%	65%	\$694,405
Volunteer Center of San Francisco		CA	24.0	\$444,619	\$18,526	45%	42%	\$345,339
Yolo County Superintendent of Schools		CA	30.0	\$399,938	\$13,331	16%	40%	\$150,235
Formula Subtotal			703.3	\$8,748,763		26%	44%	\$8,046,707
Grantee Total	California Commission on Improving		703.3	\$8,748,763		26%	44%	\$8,046,707

94ASCCO006 Community Partnership Office

Formula								
Colorado Mountain College		CO	24.0	\$253,638	\$10,568	24%	26%	\$83,183
Larimer County Employment & Training Services		CO	17.0	\$234,191	\$13,776	15%	29%	\$61,386

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A%	Match % B-G%	Match in \$\$
Office of Rural Job Training	CO		14.0	\$189,173	\$13,512	100%	40%	\$297,273
Sheridan School District #2	CO		22.0	\$288,696	\$13,123	15%	71%	\$283,066
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>77.0</i>	<i>\$965,698</i>		<i>39%</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>\$724,908</i>
Grantee Total	Community Partnership Office		77.0	\$965,698		39%	41%	\$724,908
<hr/>								
94ASCCT007	Connecticut Commission on National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
City of Meriden, Connecticut	CT		20.0	\$193,900	\$9,695	55%	46%	\$201,886
Volunteer Center of Greater Bridgeport	CT		46.5	\$633,344	\$13,620	15%	29%	\$172,325
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>66.5</i>	<i>\$827,244</i>		<i>35%</i>	<i>38%</i>	<i>\$374,211</i>
Grantee Total	Connecticut Commission on National &		66.5	\$827,244		35%	38%	\$374,211
<hr/>								
94ASCDC009	D. C. Commission on National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Latin American Youth Center	Washington DC	DC	17.5	\$241,345	\$13,791	15%	45%	\$98,341
The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness	DC		0.0	\$30,000	?	0%	56%	\$38,930
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>17.5</i>	<i>\$271,345</i>		<i>7%</i>	<i>51%</i>	<i>\$137,271</i>
Grantee Total	D. C. Commission on National &		17.5	\$271,345		7%	51%	\$137,271
<hr/>								
94ASCDE008	Delaware Commission on National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Dover Housing Authority	Dover	DE	20.0	\$274,000	\$13,700	15%	29%	\$73,128
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>20.0</i>	<i>\$274,000</i>		<i>15%</i>	<i>29%</i>	<i>\$73,128</i>
Grantee Total	Delaware Commission on National &		20.0	\$274,000		15%	29%	\$73,128
<hr/>								
94ASCFL010	Florida Governor's Commission on Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Centro Campesino-Farmworker Center, Inc	FL		22.0	\$305,525	\$13,888	16%	58%	\$197,500
City of Brooksville	FL		18.0	\$254,520	\$14,140	15%	25%	\$60,984
Escambia-Pensacola Human Relations Commission	FL		15.0	\$209,070	\$13,938	15%	52%	\$114,610
Greater Miami Service Corps	FL		30.0	\$402,796	\$13,427	16%	47%	\$195,623
Lake County Board of County Commissioners	FL		13.0	\$181,194	\$13,938	19%	49%	\$91,483
Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Inc.	FL		20.0	\$324,932	\$16,247	21%	29%	\$110,768

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
Okaloosa-Walton Community College	FL		20.0	\$272,476	\$13,624	15% 46%	\$118,579
The Center for Drug-Free Living, Inc	FL		20.0	\$304,010	\$15,201	15% 25%	\$74,379
United Way of Martin County	FL		20.0	\$278,760	\$13,938	40% 34%	\$170,674
United Way of the Big Bend	FL		20.0	\$304,010	\$15,201	16% 46%	\$147,883
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			198.0	\$2,837,293		19% 41%	\$1,282,483
Grantee Total	Florida Governor's Commission on		198.0	\$2,837,293		19% 41%	\$1,282,483

94ASCGA011		GA Commission on National and Community Service					
Formula							
City of Macon/ Police Department	GA		20.0	\$275,707	\$13,785	16% 56%	\$170,955
Douglas/Coffee County Service Corps, Inc.	GA		23.0	\$309,701	\$13,465	15% 71%	\$340,117
Georgia School-Age Care Association, Inc.	GA		21.0	\$293,670	\$13,984	15% 51%	\$162,520
Metro Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless	GA		22.0	\$299,860	\$13,630	24% 42%	\$143,056
Mid State Children's Challenge Projects, Inc.	GA		24.0	\$324,178	\$13,507	15% 39%	\$116,669
Southwest Georgia Easter Seal Society, Inc.	GA		8.0	\$100,952	\$12,619	15% 50%	\$45,134
West Georgia Medical Center	GA		20.0	\$213,832	\$10,692	16% 40%	\$69,173
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			138.0	\$1,817,900		17% 50%	\$1,047,624
Grantee Total	GA Commission on National and		138.0	\$1,817,900		17% 50%	\$1,047,624

94ASCHI012		Hawaii State Commission on National & Community Service					
Formula							
AmeriCorps ACHIEVE Hawaii	HI		17.0	\$235,068	\$13,828	15% 47%	\$114,599
DLNR Youth Corps	HI		7.0	\$68,732	\$9,819	43% 65%	\$108,664
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			24.0	\$303,800		29% 56%	\$223,263
Grantee Total	Hawaii State Commission on National		24.0	\$303,800		29% 56%	\$223,263

94ASCIA016		Iowa Commission on Community Service					
Formula							
Community Corrections Improvement Association	IA		22.5	\$271,861	\$12,083	15% 61%	\$160,926
Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence	IA		20.0	\$242,673	\$12,134	15% 32%	\$65,410
Iowa State University Extension	IA		14.0	\$213,069	\$15,219	15% 48%	\$135,294
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			56.5	\$727,603		15% 47%	\$361,630

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
						A%	B-G%	
Grantee Total	Iowa Commission on Community		56.5	\$727,603		15%	47%	\$361,630
<hr/>								
94ASCID013	Idaho Commission for National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation		ID	10.0	\$123,818	\$12,382	38%	69%	\$139,553
Lewis-Clark State College		ID	13.0	\$172,440	\$13,265	14%	60%	\$118,004
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>23.0</i>	<i>\$296,258</i>		<i>26%</i>	<i>64%</i>	<i>\$257,557</i>
Grantee Total	Idaho Commission for National &		23.0	\$296,258		26%	64%	\$257,557
<hr/>								
94ASCIL014	Illinois Commission on Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Asian Human Services of Chicago, Inc.		IL	0.0	\$29,000	?	0%	25%	\$9,667
Belleville Area College		IL	22.0	\$280,267	\$12,739	15%	25%	\$65,131
Chicago Commons Association		IL	20.0	\$312,610	\$15,631	15%	29%	\$88,293
City of Decatur, Illinois		IL	24.0	\$309,207	\$12,884	15%	25%	\$68,704
Illinois Department of Corrections		IL	0.0	\$29,828	?	0%	43%	\$22,616
Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources		IL	25.0	\$348,925	\$13,957	27%	25%	\$123,935
Latino Youth, Inc.		IL	15.0	\$234,838	\$15,656	16%	24%	\$60,717
Rend Lake College		IL	20.0	\$246,420	\$12,321	15%	25%	\$57,574
Rend Lake College		IL	25.0	\$350,312	\$14,012	15%	40%	\$136,297
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville		IL	20.0	\$265,486	\$13,274	15%	37%	\$87,528
Travelers & Immigrants Aid		IL	0.0	\$28,699	?	0%	61%	\$45,668
United Way of Champaign County		IL	20.0	\$305,931	\$15,297	16%	44%	\$143,876
Uptown Habitat for Humanity		IL	9.0	\$114,582	\$12,731	15%	80%	\$98,623
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>200.0</i>	<i>\$2,856,105</i>		<i>13%</i>	<i>37%</i>	<i>\$1,008,629</i>
Grantee Total	Illinois Commission on Community		200.0	\$2,856,105		13%	37%	\$1,008,629
<hr/>								
94ASCIN015	Indiana Commission on Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
City of Elkhart		IN	18.0	\$244,553	\$13,586	26%	51%	\$150,623
Community Centers of Indianapolis, Inc.		IN	20.0	\$226,368	\$11,318	15%	32%	\$57,457

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%		Match in \$\$
Fort Wayne Community Schools		IN	10.0	\$135,734	\$13,573	15%	45%	\$60,216
Fort Wayne Parks & Recreation Department		IN	11.5	\$152,088	\$13,225	50%	65%	\$224,401
Hoosier Valley Economic Opportunity Corporation		IN	10.0	\$134,655	\$13,466	16%	40%	\$49,480
Martin University		IN	13.5	\$185,671	\$13,753	15%	25%	\$47,080
Middle Way House, Inc.		IN	10.0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%	\$0
Mt. Vernon Community School Corporation		IN	10.0	\$137,400	\$13,740	17%	66%	\$120,357
Telamon Corporation		IN	8.5	\$131,842	\$15,511	15%	38%	\$48,441
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>111.5</i>	<i>\$1,348,311</i>		<i>19%</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>\$758,055</i>
Grantee Total	Indiana Commission on Community		111.5	\$1,348,311		19%	40%	\$758,055
<hr/>								
94ASCK017	Kansas Commission on National and Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Fort Hays State Univ		KS	20.0	\$229,000	\$11,450	15%	47%	\$100,866
Mennonite Housing Rehabilitation Services Inc		KS	8.0	\$115,849	\$14,481	15%	25%	\$27,220
United Way of Wyandotte County		KS	21.0	\$253,000	\$12,048	21%	48%	\$132,253
Wichita State University		KS	0.0	\$0	?	0%	0%	\$0
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>49.0</i>	<i>\$597,849</i>		<i>13%</i>	<i>30%</i>	<i>\$260,339</i>
Grantee Total	Kansas Commission on National and		49.0	\$597,849		13%	30%	\$260,339
<hr/>								
94ASCKY018	Kentucky Community Service Commission							
<i>Formula</i>								
Christian County Public Schools		KY	18.0	\$238,847	\$13,269	15%	47%	\$97,200
Community Action Council		KY	18.0	\$238,848	\$13,269	15%	28%	\$60,321
Eastern Kentucky University		KY	22.0	\$267,597	\$12,164	15%	71%	\$260,800
The Neighborhood Place		KY	18.5	\$240,806	\$13,017	23%	23%	\$73,006
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>76.5</i>	<i>\$986,098</i>		<i>17%</i>	<i>42%</i>	<i>\$491,327</i>
Grantee Total	Kentucky Community Service		76.5	\$986,098		17%	42%	\$491,327
<hr/>								
94ASCLA019	Louisiana Serve Commission							
<i>Formula</i>								
Mid City Redevelopment Alliance		LA	40.0	\$592,998	\$14,825	15%	35%	\$202,067

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%		Match in \$\$
Shreveport Green		LA	7.5	\$125,000	\$16,667	15%	59%	\$99,326
Tri-State Girls & Boys Club		LA	0.0	\$45,000	?	0%	27%	\$16,400
University of Southwestern Louisiana		LA	19.0	\$274,214	\$14,432	15%	39%	\$106,538
Vernon Community Action Council Inc		LA	6.0	\$73,016	\$12,169	16%	44%	\$27,303
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>72.5</i>	<i>\$1,110,228</i>		<i>12%</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>\$451,634</i>
Grantee Total	Louisiana Serve Commission		72.5	\$1,110,228		12%	41%	\$451,634

94ASCMA022		Massachusetts National & Community Service Commission						
Formula								
Berkshire Training and Employment Program		MA	11.0	\$46,194	\$4,199	75%	87%	\$214,225
Cambridge Community Services		MA	5.5	\$75,327	\$13,696	34%	61%	\$81,582
City of New Bedford		MA	0.0	\$25,000	?	0%	50%	\$25,421
Corporation for Public Management		MA	8.0	\$128,943	\$16,118	55%	62%	\$193,333
Greater Holyoke Foundation, Inc.		MA	18.0	\$213,944	\$11,886	25%	59%	\$159,587
Lawrence Youth Commission		MA	30.0	\$251,055	\$8,369	37%	81%	\$579,908
Lowell YWCA		MA	10.0	\$60,000	\$6,000	45%	93%	\$165,530
Old Colony Y Services Corps		MA	24.0	\$250,000	\$10,417	29%	59%	\$217,700
ROCA Inc.		MA	15.0	\$151,519	\$10,101	60%	70%	\$300,007
University of Massachusetts at Boston		MA	0.0	\$25,000	?	0%	45%	\$20,697
University of Massachusetts Boston		MA	9.0	\$107,760	\$11,973	15%	69%	\$136,405
Worcester Community Action Council		MA	30.0	\$221,958	\$7,399	34%	79%	\$289,042
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>160.5</i>	<i>\$1,556,700</i>		<i>34%</i>	<i>68%</i>	<i>\$2,383,437</i>
Grantee Total	Massachusetts National & Community		160.5	\$1,556,700		34%	68%	\$2,383,437

94ASCMD021		Governor's Commission on Service						
Formula								
Anne Arundel Community College		Arnold MD	20.0	\$315,798	\$15,790	15%	35%	\$136,417
Frostburg State University		MD	29.0	\$427,409	\$14,738	19%	31%	\$140,113
Salisbury State University		MD	20.0	\$241,311	\$12,066	15%	28%	\$60,281

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-C%		Match in \$\$
University of Maryland at Baltimore		MD	22.0	\$320,937	\$14,588	20%	45%	\$157,931
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>91.0</i>	<i>\$1,305,455</i>		<i>17%</i>	<i>35%</i>	<i>\$494,742</i>
Grantee Total	Governor's Commission on Service		91.0	\$1,305,455		17%	35%	\$494,742
<hr/>								
94ASCME020	Maine Commission on National & Community Service							
Formula								
Job Training Administrative Office		ME	22.0	\$319,500	\$14,523	39%	55%	\$314,826
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>22.0</i>	<i>\$319,500</i>		<i>39%</i>	<i>55%</i>	<i>\$314,826</i>
Grantee Total	Maine Commission on National &		22.0	\$319,500		39%	55%	\$314,826
<hr/>								
94ASCMIO23	Michigan Community Service Commission							
Formula								
American Youth Foundation-Miniwanca		MI	21.0	\$305,863	\$14,565	18%	32%	\$98,375
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metropolitan Detroit		MI	16.0	\$254,947	\$15,934	18%	29%	\$79,942
Eastern Michigan University		MI	19.0	\$222,005	\$11,684	60%	58%	\$314,989
Ecumenical Project SAVE		MI	20.0	\$241,000	\$12,050	16%	48%	\$99,125
Grand Rapids Service Corps		MI	34.0	\$262,739	\$7,728	37%	84%	\$356,123
Marquette County Health Department		MI	12.0	\$169,145	\$14,095	15%	25%	\$40,393
Michigan State University		MI	8.0	\$114,179	\$14,272	15%	60%	\$122,194
Oakland University		MI	20.0	\$241,350	\$12,068	15%	40%	\$87,758
SOS Crisis Center		MI	20.0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%	\$0
United Way of Genesee and Lapeer Counties		MI	28.0	\$320,099	\$11,432	15%	57%	\$159,152
United Way of Saginaw County		MI	32.0	\$306,650	\$9,583	43%	58%	\$291,282
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>230.0</i>	<i>\$2,437,977</i>		<i>23%</i>	<i>45%</i>	<i>\$1,649,333</i>
Grantee Total	Michigan Community Service		230.0	\$2,437,977		23%	45%	\$1,649,333
<hr/>								
94ASCMN024	Minnesota Commission on National & Community Service							
Formula								
Minneapolis Public Schools- Family and Community Education		MN	25.0	\$281,272	\$11,251	18%	69%	\$222,842
Minnesota Department of Economic Security		MN	67.5	\$0	\$0	100%	100%	\$1,390,838
Neighborhood House Association		MN	24.0	\$259,803	\$10,825	29%	73%	\$330,019

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
						A%	B-G%	
Pillsbury Neighborhood Services, Inc.	MN	*	26.0	\$279,590	\$10,753	35%	49%	\$199,127
Two or More, Inc.	MN		25.0	\$350,307	\$14,012	15%	64%	\$283,976
Formula Subtotal			167.5	\$1,170,972		40%	71%	\$2,426,802
Grantee Total	Minnesota Commission on National &		167.5	\$1,170,972		40%	71%	\$2,426,802
<hr/>								
94ASCMO026	Missouri Commission on Community Service							
Formula								
Inter/Serv	MO		23.3	\$297,531	\$12,797	16%	41%	\$122,047
Lincoln Univ	MO		8.0	\$110,204	\$13,776	15%	36%	\$38,819
Southeast Missouri State University	MO		27.5	\$399,241	\$14,518	15%	35%	\$154,583
YMCA of Greater Kansas	MO		15.0	\$204,060	\$13,604	25%	61%	\$180,087
YouthNet of Greater Kansas City	MO		24.5	\$317,219	\$12,948	46%	50%	\$291,239
Formula Subtotal			98.3	\$1,328,255		23%	45%	\$786,775
Grantee Total	Missouri Commission on Community		98.3	\$1,328,255		23%	45%	\$786,775
<hr/>								
94ASCMS025	Mississippi Commission for National & Community Service							
Formula								
North Mississippi Regional Center (NMRC)	MS		13.5	\$143,046	\$10,596	15%	41%	\$43,023
Operation Shoestring, Inc.	MS		27.0	\$302,691	\$11,211	15%	64%	\$192,224
Southern Coalition for Educational Equity	MS		15.0	\$226,838	\$15,123	15%	49%	\$117,321
Formula Subtotal			55.5	\$672,575		15%	51%	\$352,568
Grantee Total	Mississippi Commission for National		55.5	\$672,575		15%	51%	\$352,568
<hr/>								
94ASCMT027	Montana Community Services Advisory Council							
Formula								
Missoula Aging Services, Inc.	MT		23.0	\$323,684	\$14,073	15%	34%	\$100,066
Formula Subtotal			23.0	\$323,684		15%	34%	\$100,066
Grantee Total	Montana Community Services		23.0	\$323,684		15%	34%	\$100,066
<hr/>								
94ASCNC034	NC State Commission on National & Community Service							
Formula								
AIDS Service Agency of North Carolina, Inc.	NC		66.0	\$201,439	\$3,052	15%	76%	\$253,472
City of Wilmington, Wilmington Police Department	NC		14.0	\$160,621	\$11,473	17%	34%	\$48,203

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A%	Match % B-G%	Match in \$\$
Day Care Services Association		NC	22.0	\$268,096	\$12,186	18%	37%	\$89,798
Lutheran Family Services in the Carolinas		NC	21.3	\$200,672	\$9,407	15%	53%	\$103,545
NC Center for the Study of Black History		NC	17.0	\$201,454	\$11,850	15%	26%	\$47,825
NC Low Income Housing Coalition		NC	22.0	\$286,147	\$13,007	25%	73%	\$338,192
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill		NC	24.5	\$329,838	\$13,463	29%	49%	\$226,760
University of North Carolina at Charlotte		NC	12.5	\$94,903	\$7,592	0%	33%	\$47,280
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			199.3	\$1,743,170		17%	48%	\$1,155,075
Grantee Total	NC State Commission on National &		199.3	\$1,743,170		17%	48%	\$1,155,075
<hr/>								
94ASCNE028	Nebraska Commission for National and Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Community Action of Nebraska, Inc.		NE	24.0	\$335,400	\$13,975	15%	25%	\$79,265
Indian Centers, Inc.		NE	6.0	\$82,770	\$13,795	15%	41%	\$30,470
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			30.0	\$418,170		15%	33%	\$109,735
Grantee Total	Nebraska Commission for National		30.0	\$418,170		15%	33%	\$109,735
<hr/>								
94ASCNH030	New Hampshire Commission on National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Newfound Area School District		NH	0.0	\$20,000	?	25%	41%	\$10,125
Tri-County Community Action Program, Inc.		NH	23.5	\$303,643	\$12,921	15%	26%	\$72,133
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			23.5	\$323,643		20%	33%	\$82,258
Grantee Total	New Hampshire Commission on		23.5	\$323,643		20%	33%	\$82,258
<hr/>								
94ASCNJ031	New Jersey Commission on National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Catholic Community Services		NJ	16.3	\$198,144	\$12,193	15%	32%	\$53,130
Community Agencies Corporation		NJ	23.5	\$283,929	\$12,082	15%	40%	\$132,941
International Institute of New Jersey		NJ	20.0	\$246,976	\$12,349	15%	55%	\$131,738
New Jersey Community Development Corporation		NJ	22.0	\$336,620	\$15,301	20%	29%	\$111,340
New Jersey Public Interest Research Foundation		NJ	22.5	\$277,253	\$12,322	19%	29%	\$81,813
Prevent Child Abuse--New Jersey Chapter		NJ	17.5	\$290,943	\$16,625	17%	29%	\$88,274

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%		Match in \$\$
Rutgers University		NJ	20.7	\$250,000	\$12,097	15%	57%	\$145,323
Union City Day Care Program, Inc.		NJ	20.0	\$202,663	\$10,133	15%	58%	\$254,908
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>162.4</i>	<i>\$2,086,528</i>		<i>16%</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>\$999,467</i>
Grantee Total	New Jersey Commission on National &		162.4	\$2,086,528		16%	41%	\$999,467
<hr/>								
94ASCNM032	New Mexico Commission for National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Siete del Norte Community Development Corporation		NM	21.5	\$319,170	\$14,845	15%	32%	\$100,633
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>21.5</i>	<i>\$319,170</i>		<i>15%</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>\$100,633</i>
Grantee Total	New Mexico Commission for National		21.5	\$319,170		15%	32%	\$100,633
<hr/>								
94ASCNV029	Nevada Commission for National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Battle Mountain Band Council		Battle Mountain NV	0.0	\$7,500	?	0%	25%	\$2,539
St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church		NV	10.0	\$133,319	\$13,332	15%	28%	\$34,616
University of Nevada, Las Vegas		NV	17.5	\$234,581	\$13,405	20%	43%	\$98,814
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>27.5</i>	<i>\$375,400</i>		<i>12%</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>\$135,969</i>
Grantee Total	Nevada Commission for National &		27.5	\$375,400		12%	32%	\$135,969
<hr/>								
94ASCNY033	New York Commission on National & Community Service							
<i>Formula</i>								
Bedford Stuyvesant Community Conference Inc.		NY	20.0	\$276,000	\$13,800	15%	38%	\$103,368
Bronx Youth Conservation Corps (BYCC)		NY	35.0	\$435,118	\$12,432	38%	43%	\$288,572
Clinton County Youth Bureau		NY	15.0	\$167,846	\$11,190	15%	27%	\$45,261
Health Association of Niagara County, Inc. (HANCI)		NY	20.0	\$276,000	\$13,800	15%	71%	\$300,573
Monroe Community College		NY	94.0	\$1,136,845	\$12,094	15%	51%	\$473,294
New York State Corps Collaboration c/o YRDC		NY	50.0	\$690,000	\$13,800	16%	44%	\$313,240
New York State Council on Children and Families		NY	20.0	\$253,493	\$12,675	15%	54%	\$120,819
Phoenix House Foundation, Inc.		NY	91.5	\$911,312	\$9,960	24%	67%	\$779,420
YMCA of Greater New York: AmeriCorps Project		NY	20.0	\$275,455	\$13,773	29%	56%	\$205,541
Youth Resource Development Corporation (YRDC)		NY	20.0	\$275,865	\$13,793	19%	28%	\$80,569
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>385.5</i>	<i>\$4,697,934</i>		<i>20%</i>	<i>48%</i>	<i>\$2,710,657</i>

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$\$
Grantee Total	New York Commission on National &		385.5	\$4,697,934		20% 48%	\$2,710,657
<hr/>							
94ASCOH036	Governor's Community Service Commission						
<i>Formula</i>							
Center for Alternative Resources	OH		21.0	\$360,995	\$17,190	15% 47%	\$194,972
Community Resource Center	OH		13.0	\$166,838	\$12,834	15% 25%	\$38,282
Ohio Coalition for the Homeless	OH		31.0	\$391,370	\$12,625	29% 61%	\$311,500
Ohio Department of Youth Services	OH		20.0	\$300,741	\$15,037	15% 53%	\$174,687
Ohio University	OH		28.0	\$388,803	\$13,886	15% 49%	\$183,158
Riverview Behavioral Healthcare Services, Inc.	OH		16.0	\$243,520	\$15,220	14% 36%	\$82,441
The Vietnam Veterans of America	OH		10.0	\$152,346	\$15,235	15% 70%	\$159,792
Toledo Area Private Industry Council	OH		25.5	\$306,068	\$12,003	15% 59%	\$162,794
University of Dayton - SWEAT, Inc.	OH		20.0	\$340,659	\$17,033	15% 41%	\$148,404
Youngstown State University	OH		10.0	\$115,996	\$11,600	17% 33%	\$31,624
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>194.5</i>	<i>\$2,767,336</i>		<i>17% 47%</i>	<i>\$1,487,654</i>
Grantee Total	Governor's Community Service		194.5	\$2,767,336		17% 47%	\$1,487,654
<hr/>							
94ASCOK037	Oklahoma Community Service Commission						
<i>Formula</i>							
Literacy Coalition for Metro Tulsa Inc	OK		24.0	\$264,620	\$11,026	15% 68%	\$178,087
OK State Service Council - American Red Cross	OK		20.0	\$201,382	\$10,069	20% 66%	\$119,832
Rural Health Projects, Inc.	OK		22.0	\$344,185	\$15,645	15% 42%	\$148,416
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>66.0</i>	<i>\$810,187</i>		<i>17% 59%</i>	<i>\$446,335</i>
Grantee Total	Oklahoma Community Service		66.0	\$810,187		17% 59%	\$446,335
<hr/>							
94ASCOR038	Oregon Community Service Commission						
<i>Formula</i>							
Friends of the Children	Portland OR		20.0	\$318,597	\$15,930	15% 40%	\$132,660
Multnomah County District Attorney's Office	OR		20.0	\$232,917	\$11,646	24% 26%	\$76,232
OR Dept of Human Resources (DHR)	OR		20.0	\$246,104	\$12,305	15% 24%	\$54,494
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>60.0</i>	<i>\$797,618</i>		<i>18% 30%</i>	<i>\$263,386</i>

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A%	Match % B-G%	Match in \$\$
Grantee Total	Oregon Community Service Commission		60.0	\$797,618		18%	30%	\$263,386
<hr/>								
94ASCPA039	PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service							
Formula								
Appalchia Intermediate Unit 8-PA Mountain Service Corps	PA		52.0	\$727,709	\$13,994	15%	36%	\$243,734
Butler Regional Family Treatment Proqram Service	PA		26.5	\$392,860	\$14,825	15%	27%	\$115,009
City of Philadelphia, Fairmount Park Commission	PA		5.0	\$58,656	\$11,731	41%	87%	\$95,024
County of Allegheny Department of Federal Program	PA		20.0	\$268,688	\$13,434	15%	25%	\$62,525
Energy Coordinating Agency of Philadelphia, Inc.	PA		25.0	\$344,221	\$13,769	15%	66%	\$294,609
Keystone School District	PA		31.0	\$420,425	\$13,562	15%	26%	\$105,106
Pennsylvania Campus Compact/PACU	PA		35.0	\$583,764	\$16,679	15%	35%	\$213,928
Union-Snyder Office of Human Resources	PA		21.5	\$226,314	\$10,526	15%	60%	\$113,776
Visions International, Inc.	PA		50.0	\$371,848	\$7,437	42%	92%	\$1,094,767
YouthBuild Pittsburgh, Inc.	PA		35.0	\$477,966	\$13,656	15%	25%	\$114,683
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>301.0</i>	<i>\$3,872,451</i>		<i>20%</i>	<i>48%</i>	<i>\$2,453,161</i>
Grantee Total	PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of		301.0	\$3,872,451		20%	48%	\$2,453,161
<hr/>								
94ASCPR040	Puerto Rico State Commission of Community Service							
Formula								
The Office of Arroyo Mayor	PR		21.0	\$273,080	\$13,004	15%	30%	\$73,854
University of the Sacred Heart	PR		20.0	\$266,020	\$13,301	15%	44%	\$109,206
Youth Service Center, Arecibo	PR		30.0	\$368,500	\$12,283	15%	38%	\$122,203
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>71.0</i>	<i>\$907,600</i>		<i>15%</i>	<i>37%</i>	<i>\$305,263</i>
Grantee Total	Puerto Rico State Commission of		71.0	\$907,600		15%	37%	\$305,263
<hr/>								
94ASCRI041	Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service							
Formula								
City of Pawtucket	RI		19.0	\$300,000	\$15,789	15%	39%	\$116,522
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>19.0</i>	<i>\$300,000</i>		<i>15%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>\$116,522</i>
Grantee Total	Rhode Island Commission for National		19.0	\$300,000		15%	39%	\$116,522
<hr/>								
94ASCSC042	South Carolina Commission on National & Community Service							

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-C%	Match in \$
Formula							
Benedict College		SC	20.0	\$235,740	\$11,787	16% 26%	\$54,948
Lander University & Upper Savannah Cons. for Child & Family		SC	16.0	\$242,591	\$15,162	14% 38%	\$96,610
South Carolina Victim Assistance Network		SC	24.0	\$295,142	\$12,298	15% 28%	\$75,930
University of South Carolina		SC	28.0	\$315,483	\$11,267	15% 43%	\$145,346
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>88.0</i>	<i>\$1,088,956</i>		<i>15% 34%</i>	<i>\$372,834</i>
Grantee Total	South Carolina Commission on		88.0	\$1,088,956		15% 34%	\$372,834
<hr/>							
94ASCSD043		General Convention of Sioux YMCAs					
Formula							
General Convention of Sioux YMCAs	Dupree	SD	12.0	\$161,919	\$13,493	17% 25%	\$43,603
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>12.0</i>	<i>\$161,919</i>		<i>17% 25%</i>	<i>\$43,603</i>
Grantee Total	General Convention of Sioux YMCAs		12.0	\$161,919		17% 25%	\$43,603
<hr/>							
94ASCTN044		Tenn. Commission on National & Community Service					
Formula							
Applalachia Habitat for Humanity		TN	8.0	\$87,651	\$10,956	15% 92%	\$238,494
Auxiliary Probation Service, Juvenile Court of Memphis & She		TN	25.0	\$1,600	\$64	0% 99%	\$115,648
Exchange Club Center for the Prevention of Child Abuse		TN	17.5	\$268,670	\$15,353	15% 61%	\$298,539
Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee		TN	20.0	\$276,000	\$13,800	15% 51%	\$131,727
North Tennessee Private Industry Council, Inc.		TN	20.0	\$236,000	\$11,800	15% 57%	\$122,269
TN Dept. of Mental Health/Health Retardation		TN	5.0	\$71,101	\$14,220	15% 32%	\$33,822
Upper Cumberland County Community Health Agency		TN	10.0	\$117,545	\$11,755	15% 54%	\$70,800
Vanderbilt University Medical Center/Center for Health Servi		TN	20.0	\$276,573	\$13,829	15% 50%	\$137,108
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>125.5</i>	<i>\$1,335,140</i>		<i>13% 62%</i>	<i>\$1,148,407</i>
Grantee Total	Tenn. Commission on National &		125.5	\$1,335,140		13% 62%	\$1,148,407
<hr/>							
94ASCTX045		Texas Commission for National & Community Service					
Formula							
Armed Services YMCA		TX	20.0	\$260,667	\$13,033	15% 25%	\$59,309
City Year Inc		TX	0.0	\$2,240	?	0% 47%	\$2,000
Middle Earth Unlimited Inc - Db Youth Options		TX	26.0	\$350,600	\$13,485	15% 25%	\$82,994

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-C%	Match in \$\$
Virginia Commonwealth University		VA	20.0	\$239,903	\$11,995	15% 27%	\$60,060
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>95.0</i>	<i>\$1,090,826</i>		<i>9% 33%</i>	<i>\$399,431</i>
Grantee Total	Virginia Commission on National &		95.0	\$1,090,826		9% 33%	\$399,431
<hr/>							
94ASCVT048	Vermont Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Formula</i>							
Lyndon State College		VT	22.5	\$299,717	\$13,321	15% 44%	\$120,499
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>22.5</i>	<i>\$299,717</i>		<i>15% 44%</i>	<i>\$120,499</i>
Grantee Total	Vermont Commission on National &		22.5	\$299,717		15% 44%	\$120,499
<hr/>							
94ASCWA047	Washington Commission on National & Community Service						
<i>Formula</i>							
Community Youth Services		WA	32.5	\$358,408	\$11,028	20% 25%	\$97,123
Educational Service District 101		WA	22.0	\$322,379	\$14,654	42% 43%	\$236,707
Neutral Zone		WA	20.0	\$244,203	\$12,210	27% 39%	\$114,390
Pasco School District #1		WA	20.0	\$276,824	\$13,841	17% 47%	\$133,975
YMCA of Snohomish County		WA	20.0	\$259,494	\$12,975	20% 48%	\$131,100
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>114.5</i>	<i>\$1,461,308</i>		<i>25% 40%</i>	<i>\$713,295</i>
Grantee Total	Washington Commission on National		114.5	\$1,461,308		25% 40%	\$713,295
<hr/>							
94ASCWI051	Wisconsin National & Community Service Board						
<i>Formula</i>							
Catholic Charities Bureau, Inc.		WI	0.0	\$7,606	?	0% 75%	\$23,116
Community Adolescent Program, Inc.		WI	16.0	\$245,357	\$15,335	22% 51%	\$158,896
Kenosha Voluntary Action Center		WI	11.0	\$153,481	\$13,953	27% 50%	\$101,193
NorthCentral Technical College		WI	27.0	\$264,087	\$9,781	16% 32%	\$68,929
Open Door Community Center, Inc.		WI	12.0	\$181,651	\$15,138	15% 25%	\$45,814
Operation Fresh Start, Inc.		WI	16.0	\$173,064	\$10,817	20% 75%	\$128,658
Western Wisconsin Private Industry Council, Inc.		WI	20.0	\$217,028	\$10,851	18% 25%	\$53,793
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>102.0</i>	<i>\$1,242,274</i>		<i>17% 48%</i>	<i>\$580,399</i>
Grantee Total	Wisconsin National & Community		102.0	\$1,242,274		17% 48%	\$580,399
<hr/>							
94ASCWV050	WV Commission for National & Community Service						

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match % A% B-G%	Match in \$
Formula							
Regional Family Resources Network (RFRN)	Charleston	WV	15.0	\$160,575	\$10,705	16% 59%	\$77,012
Southern Appalachian Labor School		WV	15.0	\$105,750	\$7,050	44% 89%	\$313,703
West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence		WV	12.0	\$203,750	\$16,979	17% 25%	\$54,385
Formula Subtotal			42.0	\$470,075		26% 58%	\$445,100
Grantee Total	WV Commission for National &		42.0	\$470,075		26% 58%	\$445,100
<hr/>							
94ASCWY052	Wyoming Commission for National & Community Service						
Formula							
Laramie County Community College		WY	11.3	\$105,300	\$9,360	0% 28%	\$40,561
Wyoming Congress of Parents and Teachers (dba Wyoming PTA)		WY	20.5	\$194,700	\$9,498	15% 26%	\$40,418
Formula Subtotal			31.8	\$300,000		8% 27%	\$80,979
Grantee Total	Wyoming Commission for National &		31.8	\$300,000		8% 27%	\$80,979
<hr/>							
Total	261 Programs		5,534.6	\$67,599,853		20% 45%	\$41,719,445

*\$12,214 per FTE
Formula programs*