

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 [3]

Stack:
S

Row:
66

Section:
1

Shelf:
9

Position:
1

All State Programs

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
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	15%	39%	\$140,848
Competitive Subtotal			42.0	\$574,274		15%	39%	\$201,607
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
Formula Subtotal			105.0	\$1,069,928		12%	36%	\$366,145
Grantee Total	Alabama National & Community		147.0	\$1,644,202		13%	37%	\$567,752
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
Competitive Subtotal			71.5	\$950,001		46%	64%	\$1,317,355
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
Formula Subtotal			18.0	\$300,327		28%	38%	\$159,537
Grantee Total	Alaska State Community Service		89.5	\$1,250,328		34%	47%	\$1,476,892
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
Competitive Subtotal			22.0	\$322,588		15%	42%	\$135,492
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

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$\$
Formula Subtotal			76.5	\$922,183		15% 54%	\$575,177
Grantee Total	Arizona National and Community		98.5	\$1,244,771		15% 51%	\$710,669
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
Formula Subtotal			47.5	\$629,526		15% 36%	\$208,760
Grantee Total	Arkansas Commission on National and		47.5	\$629,526		15% 36%	\$208,760
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	15% 43%	\$268,066
East Bay Conservation Corps	CA		126.0	\$2,240,000	\$17,778	19% 35%	\$896,929
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	CA		28.0	\$385,338	\$13,762	25% 38%	\$173,567
Los Angeles Conservation Corps	CA		142.0	\$2,168,716	\$15,273	17% 53%	\$1,316,916
Sacramento Child Abuse Prevention Council	CA		22.0	\$306,935	\$13,952	20% 57%	\$202,845
Competitive Subtotal			485.5	\$7,437,883		23% 46%	\$4,287,489
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

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$
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
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>703.3</i>	<i>\$8,748,763</i>		<i>26% 44%</i>	<i>\$8,046,707</i>
Grantee Total	California Commission on Improving		1,188.8	\$16,186,646		25% 45%	\$12,334,196

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>			<i>19.0</i>	<i>\$208,343</i>		<i>15% 25%</i>	<i>\$44,047</i>

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
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% 41%</i>	<i>\$724,908</i>

Grantee Total	Community Partnership Office		96.0	\$1,174,041		34% 38%	\$768,955
----------------------	-------------------------------------	--	-------------	--------------------	--	----------------	------------------

94ASCCT007 Connecticut Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive

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	15% 43%	\$179,123

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$
Leadership, Education and Athletics in Partnership	CT		83.0	\$1,290,000	\$15,542	40% 55%	\$1,294,304
Southend Community Services, Inc.	CT		30.0	\$400,022	\$13,334	21% 40%	\$161,754
Competitive Subtotal			180.5	\$2,660,590		23% 45%	\$1,878,850
Formula							
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
Formula Subtotal			66.5	\$827,244		35% 38%	\$374,211
Grantee Total	Connecticut Commission on National &		247.0	\$3,487,834		27% 43%	\$2,253,061

94ASCDC009 D. C. Commission on National & Community Service

Formula							
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
Formula Subtotal			17.5	\$271,345		7% 51%	\$137,271
Grantee Total	D. C. Commission on National &		17.5	\$271,345		7% 51%	\$137,271

94ASCDE008 Delaware Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive							
Delaware Parent Aide & Resource Mother Coalition	DE		20.0	\$246,689	\$12,334	15% 27%	\$60,929
Competitive Subtotal			20.0	\$246,689		15% 27%	\$60,929
Formula							
Dover Housing Authority	Dover DE		20.0	\$274,000	\$13,700	15% 29%	\$73,128
Formula Subtotal			20.0	\$274,000		15% 29%	\$73,128
Grantee Total	Delaware Commission on National &		40.0	\$520,689		15% 28%	\$134,057

94ASCFL010 Florida Governor's Commission on Community Service

Competitive							
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	15% 42%	\$214,384
Competitive Subtotal			60.0	\$828,189		16% 48%	\$376,252
Formula							
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

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$\$
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
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
Formula Subtotal			198.0	\$2,837,293		19% 41%	\$1,282,483

Grantee Total	Florida Governor's Commission on	258.0	\$3,665,482	18%	42%	\$1,658,735
----------------------	---	--------------	--------------------	------------	------------	--------------------

94ASCGA011 GA Commission on National and Community Service

Competitive

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	15% 35%	\$286,006
YMCA of Metropolitan Atlanta, Inc.	GA	20.0	\$269,373	\$13,469	15% 41%	\$101,281
Competitive Subtotal		157.0	\$2,060,522		16% 42%	\$828,994

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
Formula Subtotal		138.0	\$1,817,900		17% 50%	\$1,047,624

Grantee Total	GA Commission on National and	295.0	\$3,878,422	16%	48%	\$1,876,618
----------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------	------------	------------	--------------------

94ASCSD043 General Convention of Sioux YMCAs

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
Formula								
General Convention of Sioux YMCAs	Dupree	SD	12.0	\$161,919	\$13,493	17%	25%	\$43,603
Formula Subtotal			12.0	\$161,919		17%	25%	\$43,603
Grantee Total	General Convention of Sioux YMCAs		12.0	\$161,919		17%	25%	\$43,603
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	30%	39%	\$1,190,410
Maryland State Department of Education	MD		30.0	\$358,520	\$11,951	15%	40%	\$114,411
Montgomery County Government, Department of Police	MD		23.5	\$374,889	\$15,953	32%	54%	\$300,620
University of Maryland at Baltimore	MD		22.0	\$320,937	\$14,588	20%	45%	\$157,931
Volunteer Maryland/Governor's Office on Volunteerism	MD		120.0	\$1,655,265	\$13,794	40%	41%	\$1,114,463
Competitive Subtotal			373.5	\$5,237,915		25%	45%	\$3,016,464
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
University of Maryland at Baltimore	MD		22.0	\$320,937	\$14,588	20%	45%	\$157,931
Formula Subtotal			91.0	\$1,305,455		17%	35%	\$494,742
Grantee Total	Governor's Commission on Service		464.5	\$6,543,369		22%	41%	\$3,511,205
94ASCOH036 Governor's Community Service Commission								
Competitive								
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
Competitive Subtotal			40.0	\$596,952		22%	51%	\$366,976
Formula								
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

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share %		Grantee Share in \$\$
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>			194.5	\$2,767,336		17%	47%	\$1,487,654
Grantee Total	Governor's Community Service		234.5	\$3,364,288		17%	48%	\$1,854,630

94ASCHI012 Hawaii State Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive

Hawaii Lawyers Care	HI		22.5	\$325,987	\$14,488	20%	58%	\$256,447
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			22.5	\$325,987		20%	58%	\$256,447

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		46.5	\$629,787		26%	57%	\$479,710
----------------------	--	--	-------------	------------------	--	------------	------------	------------------

94ASCID013 Idaho Commission for National & Community Service

Formula

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>			23.0	\$296,258		26%	64%	\$257,557

Grantee Total	Idaho Commission for National &		23.0	\$296,258		26%	64%	\$257,557
----------------------	--	--	-------------	------------------	--	------------	------------	------------------

94ASCIL014 Illinois Commission on Community Service

Competitive

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	15%	45%	\$167,356
Public Allies - Chicago	IL		40.0	\$451,327	\$11,283	59%	41%	\$532,006

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$
Competitive Subtotal			86.0	\$827,424		58% 29%	\$1,022,562
Formula							
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
Formula Subtotal			200.0	\$2,856,105		13% 37%	\$1,008,629
Grantee Total	Illinois Commission on Community		286.0	\$3,683,529		21% 36%	\$2,031,191

94ASCIN015 Indiana Commission on Community Service

Competitive

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	15% 67%	\$270,707
Competitive Subtotal			47.0	\$594,345		15% 59%	\$392,910

Formula

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
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

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-C%	Grantee Share in \$
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
Formula Subtotal			111.5	\$1,348,311		19% 40%	\$758,055
Grantee Total	Indiana Commission on Community		158.5	\$1,942,657		18% 44%	\$1,150,965

94ASCIA016 Iowa Commission on Community Service

Competitive

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	15% 31%	\$60,319
Competitive Subtotal			45.0	\$501,976		16% 33%	\$136,949

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
Formula Subtotal			56.5	\$727,603		15% 47%	\$361,630

Grantee Total	Iowa Commission on Community		101.5	\$1,229,579		16% 41%	\$498,579
----------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--------------	--------------------	--	----------------	------------------

94ASCKS017 Kansas Commission on National and Community Service

Competitive

Kansas State University	KS		42.0	\$612,395	\$14,581	22% 41%	\$355,296
Topeka Youth Project	KS		28.0	\$417,364	\$14,906	20% 45%	\$220,954
Competitive Subtotal			70.0	\$1,029,759		21% 43%	\$576,250

Formula

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
Formula Subtotal			49.0	\$597,849		13% 30%	\$260,339

Grantee Total	Kansas Commission on National and		119.0	\$1,627,608		16% 34%	\$836,589
----------------------	--	--	--------------	--------------------	--	----------------	------------------

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
94ascky018	Kentucky Community Service Commission							
Competitive								
Homeless and Housing Coalition of Kentucky, Inc.	KY		40.0	\$500,258	\$12,506	19%	54%	\$266,583
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	15%	49%	\$128,193
Simpson County Board of Education	KY		25.0	\$322,775	\$12,911	15%	25%	\$74,460
Competitive Subtotal			116.0	\$1,522,747		16%	49%	\$896,926
Formula								
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
Formula Subtotal			76.5	\$986,098		17%	42%	\$491,327
Grantee Total	Kentucky Community Service		192.5	\$2,508,845		17%	46%	\$1,388,253
94ASCLA019	Louisiana Serve Commission							
Competitive								
New Orleans Youth Action Corps	LA		66.0	\$2,000	\$30	0%	0%	\$0
Competitive Subtotal			66.0	\$2,000		0%	0%	\$0
Formula								
Mid City Redevelopment Alliance	LA		40.0	\$592,998	\$14,825	15%	35%	\$202,067
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
Formula Subtotal			72.5	\$1,110,228		12%	41%	\$451,634
Grantee Total	Louisiana Serve Commission		138.5	\$1,112,228		10%	34%	\$451,634
94ASCME020	Maine Commission on National & Community Service							
Competitive								
Portland West Neighborhood Planning Council	ME		20.0	\$276,000	\$13,800	18%	37%	\$102,911
Competitive Subtotal			20.0	\$276,000		18%	37%	\$102,911

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$\$
Formula							
Job Training Administrative Office	ME		22.0	\$319,500	\$14,523	39% 55%	\$314,826
Formula Subtotal			22.0	\$319,500		39% 55%	\$314,826
Grantee Total	Maine Commission on National &		42.0	\$595,500		29% 46%	\$417,737

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	33% 57%	\$1,187,892
Competitive Subtotal			397.0	\$4,686,200		24% 54%	\$3,453,136

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
Formula Subtotal			160.5	\$1,556,700		34% 68%	\$2,383,437

Grantee Total	Massachusetts National & Community		557.5	\$6,242,900		33% 66%	\$5,836,573
----------------------	---	--	--------------	--------------------	--	----------------	--------------------

94ASCM1023 Michigan Community Service Commission

Competitive							
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	18% 34%	\$85,509
Competitive Subtotal			52.0	\$610,877		21% 55%	\$458,384

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$\$
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
Formula Subtotal			230.0	\$2,437,977		23% 45%	\$1,649,333
Grantee Total	Michigan Community Service		282.0	\$3,048,854		23% 46%	\$2,107,717
94ASCMN024	Minnesota Commission on National & Community Service						
Competitive							
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	96% 100%	\$1,619,519
Southeastern Minnesota Initiative Fund	MN		55.0	\$716,400	\$13,025	18% 27%	\$197,343
Competitive Subtotal			195.5	\$1,629,492		43% 55%	\$2,121,908
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
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 &		363.0	\$2,800,464		41% 65%	\$4,548,710

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$\$
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
94ASCMO026 Missouri Commission on Community Service							
Competitive							
American Youth Foundation	MO		43.0	\$628,457	\$14,615	18% 55%	\$415,224
American Youth Foundation	MO		28.0	\$378,460	\$13,516	18% 60%	\$269,585
Grace Hill Neighborhood Services	MO		20.0	\$275,222	\$13,761	15% 46%	\$122,936
Competitive Subtotal			91.0	\$1,282,139		17% 54%	\$807,745
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		189.3	\$2,610,394		21% 48%	\$1,594,520
94ASCMT027 Montana Community Services Advisory Council							
Competitive							
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	100% 63%	\$76,656
Competitive Subtotal			123.5	\$937,500		79% 68%	\$1,814,727
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		146.5	\$1,261,184		58% 56%	\$1,914,793

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
94ASCNC034 NC State Commission on National & Community Service								
Competitive								
North Carolina State University	NC		30.0	\$410,349	\$13,678	15%	42%	\$180,089
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro	NC		35.0	\$429,127	\$12,261	25%	57%	\$317,817
Competitive Subtotal			65.0	\$839,476		20%	50%	\$497,906
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
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
Formula Subtotal			199.3	\$1,743,170		17%	48%	\$1,155,075
Grantee Total	NC State Commission on National &		264.3	\$2,582,646		17%	48%	\$1,652,981
94ASCNE028 Nebraska Commission for National and Community Service								
Competitive								
Lincoln Action Program	NE		3.0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%	\$0
Competitive Subtotal			3.0	\$0		0%	0%	\$0
Formula								
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
Formula Subtotal			30.0	\$418,170		15%	33%	\$109,735
Grantee Total	Nebraska Commission for National		33.0	\$418,170		10%	22%	\$109,735
94ASCNV029 Nevada Commission for National & Community Service								
Formula								
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

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A % B-G%		Grantee Share in \$
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	NV		17.5	\$234,581	\$13,405	20%	43%	\$98,814
Formula Subtotal			27.5	\$375,400		12%	32%	\$135,969
Grantee Total	Nevada Commission for National &		27.5	\$375,400		12%	32%	\$135,969
94ASCNH030			New Hampshire Commission on National & Community Service					
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	15%	31%	\$157,104
Competitive Subtotal			52.0	\$814,533		15%	35%	\$298,819
Formula								
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
Formula Subtotal			23.5	\$323,643		20%	33%	\$82,258
Grantee Total	New Hampshire Commission on		75.5	\$1,138,176		18%	34%	\$381,077
94ASCNJ031			New Jersey Commission on National & Community Service					
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	25%	51%	\$938,521
Urban Schools Service Corps	NJ		144.5	\$1,983,906	\$13,729	15%	28%	\$572,885
Competitive Subtotal			251.0	\$3,461,151		47%	58%	\$1,601,962
Formula								
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
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
Formula Subtotal			162.4	\$2,086,528		16%	41%	\$999,467

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
Grantee Total	New Jersey Commission on National &		413.4	\$5,547,679		25%	46%	\$2,601,429
94ASCNM032	New Mexico Commission for National & Community Service							
Competitive								
National Indian Youth Leadership Development Project Inc	NM		20.0	\$288,802	\$14,440	15%	25%	\$71,685
Competitive Subtotal			20.0	\$288,802		15%	25%	\$71,685
Formula								
Siete del Norte Community Development Corporation	NM		21.5	\$319,170	\$14,845	15%	32%	\$100,633
Formula Subtotal			21.5	\$319,170		15%	32%	\$100,633
Grantee Total	New Mexico Commission for National		41.5	\$607,972		15%	28%	\$172,318
94ASCNY033	New York Commission on National & Community Service							
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	19%	35%	\$694,275
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
Competitive Subtotal			476.0	\$6,022,375		19%	51%	\$3,136,265
Formula								
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

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
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
Formula Subtotal			385.5	\$4,697,934		20%	48%	\$2,710,657
Grantee Total	New York Commission on National &		861.5	\$10,720,309		20%	49%	\$5,846,922
94ASCOK037 Oklahoma Community Service Commission								
Formula								
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
Formula Subtotal			66.0	\$810,187		17%	59%	\$446,335
Grantee Total	Oklahoma Community Service		66.0	\$810,187		17%	59%	\$446,335
94ASCOR038 Oregon Community Service Commission								
Competitive								
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%	0%	\$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
Competitive Subtotal			65.8	\$597,791		8%	38%	\$204,453
Formula								
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
Formula Subtotal			60.0	\$797,618		18%	30%	\$263,386
Grantee Total	Oregon Community Service Commission		125.8	\$1,395,409		12%	35%	\$467,839
94ASCPA039 PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service								
Competitive								
PA Association of Colleges and Universities	PA		50.0	\$794,901	\$15,898	18%	26%	\$222,837
Competitive Subtotal			50.0	\$794,901		18%	26%	\$222,837
Formula								
Appalachia Intermediate Unit 8-PA Mountain Service Corps	PA		52.0	\$727,709	\$13,994	15%	36%	\$243,734

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$
Butler Regional Family Treatment Program 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
Formula Subtotal			301.0	\$3,872,451		20%	48%	\$2,453,161
Grantee Total	PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of		351.0	\$4,667,352		20%	46%	\$2,675,998

94ASCP040		Puerto Rico State Commission of Community Service						
Competitive								
Centros Sor Isolina Ferre, Inc.	PR	20.0	\$280,001	\$14,000	15%	39%	\$99,225	
Competitive Subtotal		20.0	\$280,001		15%	39%	\$99,225	
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	
Formula Subtotal		71.0	\$907,600		15%	37%	\$305,263	
Grantee Total	Puerto Rico State Commission of		91.0	\$1,187,601		15%	38%	\$404,488

94ASCR1041		Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service						
Competitive								
City Year, Inc.	RI	66.0	\$839,300	\$12,717	15%	46%	\$458,422	
Public Education Fund	RI	28.5	\$440,000	\$15,439	26%	51%	\$294,366	
The Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education	RI	32.0	\$494,525	\$15,454	24%	34%	\$201,466	
Competitive Subtotal		126.5	\$1,773,825		22%	44%	\$954,254	
Formula								
City of Pawtucket	RI	19.0	\$300,000	\$15,789	15%	39%	\$116,522	

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			19.0	\$300,000		15% 39%	\$116,522
Grantee Total	Rhode Island Commission for National		145.5	\$2,073,825		20% 42%	\$1,070,776

94ASCSC042 South Carolina Commission on National & Community Service

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>		88.0	\$1,088,956		15%	34%	\$372,834
Grantee Total	South Carolina Commission on		88.0	\$1,088,956		15% 34%	\$372,834

94ASCTN044 Tenn. Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive

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	16%	73%	\$619,830
NashvilleREAD, Inc.	TN	21.0	\$284,752	\$13,560	15%	36%	\$92,650
Porter-Leath Children's Center	TN	20.0	\$240,304	\$12,015	15%	47%	\$97,981
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	TN	20.0	\$268,510	\$13,426	15%	41%	\$99,486
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>		119.3	\$1,675,862		15%	48%	\$1,068,837

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>		125.5	\$1,335,140		13%	62%	\$1,148,407

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%	Grantee Share in \$\$
Grantee Total	Tenn. Commission on National &		244.8	\$3,011,002		14% 57%	\$2,217,244
94ASCTX045	Texas Commission for National & Community Service						
Competitive							
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	0% 46%	\$26,494
City Year Inc	TX		65.0	\$818,205	\$12,588	15% 47%	\$486,015
Dallas Youth Services Corps	TX		90.0	\$746,287	\$8,292	22% 25%	\$229,740
Greater Dallas Community of Churches	TX		43.0	\$591,390	\$13,753	17% 48%	\$293,445
Mental Health Association in Texas	TX		84.0	\$988,668	\$11,770	15% 43%	\$335,577
Serve Houston	TX		109.8	\$1,303,880	\$11,873	23% 30%	\$475,338
Workreation Inc	TX		21.1	\$297,056	\$14,078	15% 41%	\$112,933
Competitive Subtotal			527.9	\$6,082,426		18% 42%	\$3,246,859
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 - Dba Youth Options	TX		26.0	\$350,600	\$13,485	15% 25%	\$82,994
Project Vida	TX		19.5	\$216,239	\$11,089	15% 25%	\$47,030
School of Social Work - Univ of TX at Arlington	TX		31.3	\$430,609	\$13,779	15% 26%	\$115,833
Serve Houston	TX		25.2	\$299,059	\$11,874	23% 30%	\$109,024
Texas Agricultural Extension Service	TX		46.0	\$611,738	\$13,299	55% 29%	\$483,316
Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	TX		46.5	\$290,851	\$6,255	0% 46%	\$243,604
The Capitol Area Foster Parents Association	TX		20.0	\$231,080	\$11,554	15% 63%	\$120,244
The University of Texas at Austin	TX		51.3	\$381,632	\$7,446	15% 26%	\$113,026
The University of Texas at El Paso	TX		12.0	\$148,003	\$12,334	15% 26%	\$37,972
Workreation Inc	TX		22.9	\$321,749	\$14,050	15% 41%	\$122,321
Youth Harvest Community Services Program	TX		50.0	\$690,000	\$13,800	15% 25%	\$171,590
Formula Subtotal			370.6	\$4,234,467		16% 33%	\$1,708,263

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
Grantee Total	Texas Commission for National &		898.5	\$10,316,893		17%	37%	\$4,955,122
94ASCUT046	Utah Commission on National & Community Service							
Competitive								
Association for Utah Community Health		UT	18.0	\$226,125	\$12,563	25%	36%	\$94,359
Competitive Subtotal			18.0	\$226,125		25%	36%	\$94,359
Formula								
Davis County		UT	10.0	\$108,406	\$10,841	15%	79%	\$137,429
Dixie College		UT	8.0	\$84,399	\$10,550	31%	54%	\$62,403
Grand County Council		UT	8.5	\$102,444	\$12,052	39%	76%	\$157,623
Ogden City Corporation		UT	0.0	\$24,999	?	0%	25%	\$8,415
Salt Lake County - YOUTH FORCE		UT	15.0	\$170,139	\$11,343	19%	39%	\$57,717
Formula Subtotal			41.5	\$490,387		21%	55%	\$423,587
Grantee Total	Utah Commission on National &		59.5	\$716,512		22%	51%	\$517,946
94ASCVT048	Vermont Commission on National & Community Service							
Formula								
Lyndon State College		VT	22.5	\$299,717	\$13,321	15%	44%	\$120,499
Formula Subtotal			22.5	\$299,717		15%	44%	\$120,499
Grantee Total	Vermont Commission on National &		22.5	\$299,717		15%	44%	\$120,499
94ASCVA049	Virginia Commission on National & Community Service							
Formula								
Fredricksburg City Public Schools		VA	20.0	\$213,744	\$10,687	15%	31%	\$55,198
Northern Virginia Urban League, Inc.		VA	20.0	\$320,950	\$16,048	15%	47%	\$164,383
Southwest Virginia Community College		VA	20.0	\$220,041	\$11,002	0%	22%	\$60,790
Urban League of Hampton Roads		VA	15.0	\$96,188	\$6,413	0%	38%	\$59,000
Virginia Commonwealth University		VA	20.0	\$239,903	\$11,995	15%	27%	\$60,060
Formula Subtotal			95.0	\$1,090,826		9%	33%	\$399,431
Grantee Total	Virginia Commission on National &		95.0	\$1,090,826		9%	33%	\$399,431
94ASCWA047	Washington Commission on National & Community Service							
Competitive								
Department of Ecology		WA	100.0	\$59,300	\$593	95%	100%	\$2,005,048

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-C%	Grantee Share in \$
Employment Security Department	WA		384.3	\$3,495,007	\$9,096	51% 36%	\$2,794,841
Kitsap Community Action Program (KCAP)	WA		29.0	\$363,402	\$12,531	15% 32%	\$104,941
Competitive Subtotal			513.3	\$3,917,709		54% 56%	\$4,904,830

Formula

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
Formula Subtotal			114.5	\$1,461,308		25% 40%	\$713,295

Grantee Total	Washington Commission on National		627.8	\$5,379,017		36% 46%	\$5,618,125
----------------------	--	--	--------------	--------------------	--	----------------	--------------------

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	34% 26%	\$124,619
Competitive Subtotal			48.0	\$431,200		31% 38%	\$224,747

Formula

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
Formula Subtotal			102.0	\$1,242,274		17% 48%	\$580,399

Grantee Total	Wisconsin National & Community		150.0	\$1,673,474		20% 45%	\$805,146
----------------------	---	--	--------------	--------------------	--	----------------	------------------

94ASCWV050 WV Commission for National & Community Service

Competitive

West Virginia Research Corp	Morgantown WV		13.3	\$177,560	\$13,317	46% 69%	\$304,601
-----------------------------	---------------	--	------	-----------	----------	---------	-----------

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Grantee Share % A% B-G%		Grantee Share in \$\$
Competitive Subtotal			13.3	\$177,560		46%	69%	\$304,601
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 &		55.3	\$647,635		31%	60%	\$749,701
94ASCWY052	Wyoming Commission for National & Community Service							
Competitive								
Wyoming Crime Victims Compensation Commission		WY	20.0	\$274,891	\$13,745	15%	25%	\$65,474
Competitive Subtotal			20.0	\$274,891		15%	25%	\$65,474
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 &		51.8	\$574,891		10%	26%	\$146,453
Total	364 Programs		10,726.2	\$130,608,873		21%	45%	\$83,271,867

\$12,184 ave
cost per FTE

AU AC* State Programs with Cost/FTE >\$15800

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and 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	10	9.0	\$144,707	\$16,079	15%	34%	\$48,583
Rural Alaska Community Action Program, Inc.		AK	9	9.0	\$155,620	\$17,291	41%	42%	\$110,954
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			19	18.0	\$300,327		28%	38%	\$159,537
Grantee Total			19	18.0	\$300,327		28%	38%	\$159,537
94ASCAR004 Arkansas Commission on National and Community Service									
Formula									
Southeast Arkansas Community Based Education Center		AR	10	10.0	\$150,225	\$15,023	15%	38%	\$56,204
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			10	10.0	\$150,225		15%	38%	\$56,204
Grantee Total			10	10.0	\$150,225		15%	38%	\$56,204
94ASCAZ003 Arizona National and Community Service Commission									
Competitive									
AZ Board of Regents / Rural Health Office / Univ of AZ		AZ	23	22.0	\$322,588	\$14,663	15%	42%	\$135,492
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			23	22.0	\$322,588		15%	42%	\$135,492
Grantee Total			23	22.0	\$322,588		15%	42%	\$135,492
94ASCCA005 California Commission on Improving Life Through Service									
Competitive									
California Conservation Corps	Sacramento	CA	140	117.5	\$1,646,894	\$14,016	40%	52%	\$1,429,166
County of Sacramento, Department of Parks and Recreation		CA	50	50.0	\$690,000	\$13,800	15%	43%	\$268,066
East Bay Conservation Corps		CA	126	126.0	\$2,240,000	\$17,778	19%	35%	\$896,929
Los Angeles Conservation Corps		CA	158	142.0	\$2,168,716	\$15,273	17%	53%	\$1,316,916

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
Sacramento Child Abuse Prevention Council	CA		22	22.0	\$306,935	\$13,952	20%	57%	\$202,845
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			496	457.5	\$7,052,545		22%	48%	\$4,113,922
Formula									
Bay Area Youth Agency Consortium	San Francisco	CA	52	52.0	\$736,678	\$14,167	28%	57%	\$570,576
Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc.	CA		53	13.3	\$230,084	\$17,365	15%	33%	\$81,561
California Court Appointed Special Advocate Association	CA		24	24.0	\$347,723	\$14,488	15%	25%	\$83,076
Civic Center Barrio Housing Corporation	CA		36	24.0	\$349,580	\$14,566	15%	25%	\$84,149
Constitutional Rights Foundation	CA		26	22.0	\$325,823	\$14,810	15%	49%	\$157,017
EYE Counseling and Crisis Services	CA		41	37.0	\$638,722	\$17,263	15%	28%	\$183,540
Imperial County Office of Education	CA		27	27.0	\$391,160	\$14,487	15%	37%	\$134,328
Partners In School Innovation	CA		14	14.0	\$247,190	\$17,656	53%	44%	\$231,620
Redwood Community Action Agency	CA		26	21.0	\$303,600	\$14,457	18%	50%	\$167,269
Sacramento County Office of Education	CA		31	21.5	\$364,401	\$16,949	17%	35%	\$139,004
San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council	CA		27	23.0	\$337,338	\$14,667	18%	35%	\$122,985
Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity	CA		27	21.0	\$304,640	\$14,507	16%	25%	\$73,257
The June Burnett Foundation	CA		78	48.0	\$708,880	\$14,768	19%	65%	\$694,405
Volunteer Center of San Francisco	CA		24	24.0	\$444,619	\$18,526	45%	42%	\$345,339
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			486	371.8	\$5,730,438		22%	39%	\$3,068,126
Grantee Total			982	829.3	\$12,782,983		22 %	42 %	\$7,182,049

94ASCCT007

Connecticut Commission on National & Community Service

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A %	B-G%	
Competitive									
Bridgeport Police Department	CT		72	34.5	\$516,644	\$14,975	15%	43%	\$243,669
Leadership, Education and Athletics in Partnership	CT		166	83.0	\$1,290,000	\$15,542	40%	55%	\$1,294,304
Competitive Subtotal			238	117.5	\$1,806,644		28%	49%	\$1,537,973
Grantee Total			238	117.5	\$1,806,644		28 %	49 %	\$1,537,973

94ASCFL010 Florida Governor's Commission on Community Service

Competitive									
Frostproof Care Center, Inc.	FL		20	20.0	\$279,404	\$13,970	16%	54%	\$161,868
Competitive Subtotal			20	20.0	\$279,404		16%	54%	\$161,868
Formula									
Centro Campesino-Farmworker Center, Inc	FL		22	22.0	\$305,525	\$13,888	16%	58%	\$197,500
City of Brooksville	FL		18	18.0	\$254,520	\$14,140	15%	25%	\$60,984
Escambia-Pensacola Human Relations Commission	FL		15	15.0	\$209,070	\$13,938	15%	52%	\$114,610
Lake County Board of County Commissioners	FL		13	13.0	\$181,194	\$13,938	19%	49%	\$91,483
Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Inc.	FL		20	20.0	\$324,932	\$16,247	21%	29%	\$110,768
The Center for Drug-Free Living, Inc	FL		20	20.0	\$304,010	\$15,201	15%	25%	\$74,379
United Way of Martin County	FL		20	20.0	\$278,760	\$13,938	40%	34%	\$170,674
United Way of the Big Bend	FL		20	20.0	\$304,010	\$15,201	16%	46%	\$147,883
Formula Subtotal			148	148.0	\$2,162,021		20%	40%	\$968,281
Grantee Total			168	168.0	\$2,441,425		19%	41%	\$1,130,149

94ASCGA011 GA Commission on National and Community Service

South

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
Formula									
Georgia School-Age Care Association, Inc.		GA	42	21.0	\$293,670	\$13,984	15%	51%	\$162,520
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			42	21.0	\$293,670		15%	51%	\$162,520
Grantee Total			42	21.0	\$293,670		15%	51%	\$162,520
94ASCHI012 Hawaii State Commission on National & Community Service									
Competitive									
Hawaii Lawyers Care		HI	35	22.5	\$325,987	\$14,488	20%	58%	\$256,447
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			35	22.5	\$325,987		20%	58%	\$256,447
Formula									
AmeriCorps ACHIEVE Hawaii		HI	34	17.0	\$235,068	\$13,828	15%	47%	\$114,599
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			34	17.0	\$235,068		15%	47%	\$114,599
Grantee Total			69	39.5	\$561,055		18%	52%	\$371,046
94ASCIA016 Iowa Commission on Community Service									
Formula									
Iowa State University Extension		IA	56	14.0	\$213,069	\$15,219	15%	48%	\$135,294
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			56	14.0	\$213,069		15%	48%	\$135,294
Grantee Total			56	14.0	\$213,069		15%	48%	\$135,294
94ASCIL014 Illinois Commission on Community Service									
Competitive									
Mid-America Chapter, American Red Cross		IL	26	26.0	\$376,097	\$14,465	15%	45%	\$167,356
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			26	26.0	\$376,097		15%	45%	\$167,356
Formula									
Chicago Commons Association		IL	20	20.0	\$312,610	\$15,631	15%	29%	\$88,293

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources	IL		40	25.0	\$348,925	\$13,957	27%	25%	\$123,935
Latino Youth, Inc.	IL		25	15.0	\$234,838	\$15,656	16%	24%	\$60,717
Rend Lake College	IL		30	25.0	\$350,312	\$14,012	15%	40%	\$136,297
United Way of Champaign County	IL		20	20.0	\$305,931	\$15,297	16%	44%	\$143,876
Formula Subtotal			135	105.0	\$1,552,616		18%	32%	\$553,118
Grantee Total			161	131.0	\$1,928,713		17%	35%	\$720,474

94ASCIN015 Indiana Commission on Community Service

Formula									
Telamon Corporation	IN		17	8.5	\$131,842	\$15,511	15%	38%	\$48,441
Formula Subtotal			17	8.5	\$131,842		15%	38%	\$48,441
Grantee Total			17	8.5	\$131,842		15%	38%	\$48,441

94ASCKS017 Kansas Commission on National and Community Service

Competitive									
Kansas State University	KS		96	42.0	\$612,395	\$14,581	22%	41%	\$355,296
Topeka Youth Project	KS		40	28.0	\$417,364	\$14,906	20%	45%	\$220,954
Competitive Subtotal			136	70.0	\$1,029,759		21%	43%	\$576,250
Formula									
Mennonite Housing Rehabilitation Services Inc	KS		8	8.0	\$115,849	\$14,481	15%	25%	\$27,220
Formula Subtotal			8	8.0	\$115,849		15%	25%	\$27,220
Grantee Total			144	78.0	\$1,145,608		19%	37%	\$603,470

94ASCLA019 Louisiana Serve Commission

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A %	B-G%	
Formula									
Mid City Redevelopment Alliance	LA		40	40.0	\$592,998	\$14,825	15%	35%	\$202,067
Shreveport Green	LA		30	7.5	\$125,000	\$16,667	15%	59%	\$99,326
University of Southwestern Louisiana	LA		38	19.0	\$274,214	\$14,432	15%	39%	\$106,538
Formula Subtotal			108	66.5	\$992,212		15%	44%	\$407,931
Grantee Total			108	66.5	\$992,212		15 %	44 %	\$407,931
94ASCMA022 Massachusetts National & Community Service Commission									
Formula									
Corporation for Public Management	MA		15	8.0	\$128,943	\$16,118	55%	62%	\$193,333
Formula Subtotal			15	8.0	\$128,943		55%	62%	\$193,333
Grantee Total			15	8.0	\$128,943		55 %	62 %	\$193,333
94ASCMD021 Governor's Commission on Service									
Competitive									
Maryland Conservation Corps (MD-DNR-Public Lands & Forestry)	MD		151	151.0	\$2,200,000	\$14,570	30%	39%	\$1,190,410
Montgomery County Government, Department of Police	MD		37	23.5	\$374,889	\$15,953	32%	54%	\$300,620
University of Maryland at Baltimore	MD		22	22.0	\$320,937	\$14,588	20%	45%	\$157,931
Competitive Subtotal			210	196.5	\$2,895,826		27%	46%	\$1,648,961
Formula									
Anne Arundel Community College	Arnold MD		36	20.0	\$315,798	\$15,790	15%	35%	\$136,417
Frostburg State University	MD		29	29.0	\$427,409	\$14,738	19%	31%	\$140,113
University of Maryland at Baltimore	MD		22	22.0	\$320,937	\$14,588	20%	45%	\$157,931
Formula Subtotal			87	71.0	\$1,064,144		18%	37%	\$434,461

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$
							A %	B-G %	
Grantee Total			297	267.5	\$3,959,969		22 %	42 %	\$2,083,421
94ASCME020	Maine Commission on National & Community Service								
Formula									
Job Training Administrative Office			22	22.0	\$319,500	\$14,523	39%	55%	\$314,826
	ME								
Formula Subtotal			22	22.0	\$319,500		39%	55%	\$314,826
Grantee Total			22	22.0	\$319,500		39 %	55 %	\$314,826
94ASCM1023	Michigan Community Service Commission								
Formula									
American Youth Foundation-Miniwanca			21	21.0	\$305,863	\$14,565	18%	32%	\$98,375
	MI								
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metropolitan Detroit			16	16.0	\$254,947	\$15,934	18%	29%	\$79,942
	MI								
Marquette County Health Department			12	12.0	\$169,145	\$14,095	15%	25%	\$40,393
	MI								
Michigan State University			32	8.0	\$114,179	\$14,272	15%	60%	\$122,194
	MI								
Formula Subtotal			81	57.0	\$844,134		17%	36%	\$340,904
Grantee Total			81	57.0	\$844,134		17 %	36 %	\$340,904
94ASCMN024	Minnesota Commission on National & Community Service								
Formula									
Two or More, Inc.			25	25.0	\$350,307	\$14,012	15%	64%	\$283,976
	MN								
Formula Subtotal			25	25.0	\$350,307		15%	64%	\$283,976
Grantee Total			25	25.0	\$350,307		15 %	64 %	\$283,976
94ASCMO026	Missouri Commission on Community Service								
Competitive									
American Youth Foundation			43	43.0	\$628,457	\$14,615	18%	55%	\$415,224
	MO								
Competitive Subtotal			43	43.0	\$628,457		18%	55%	\$415,224

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
Formula									
Southeast Missouri State University		MO	36	27.5	\$399,241	\$14,518	15%	35%	\$154,583
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			36	27.5	\$399,241		15%	35%	\$154,583
Grantee Total			79	70.5	\$1,027,698		17%	45%	\$569,807
94ASCMS025 Mississippi Commission for National & Community Service									
Formula									
Southern Coalition for Educational Equity		MS	15	15.0	\$226,838	\$15,123	15%	49%	\$117,321
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			15	15.0	\$226,838		15%	49%	\$117,321
Grantee Total			15	15.0	\$226,838		15%	49%	\$117,321
94ASCMT027 Montana Community Services Advisory Council									
Formula									
Missoula Aging Services, Inc.		MT	23	23.0	\$323,684	\$14,073	15%	34%	\$100,066
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			23	23.0	\$323,684		15%	34%	\$100,066
Grantee Total			23	23.0	\$323,684		15%	34%	\$100,066
94ASCNE028 Nebraska Commission for National and Community Service									
Formula									
Community Action of Nebraska, Inc.		NE	24	24.0	\$335,400	\$13,975	15%	25%	\$79,265
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			24	24.0	\$335,400		15%	25%	\$79,265
Grantee Total			24	24.0	\$335,400		15%	25%	\$79,265
94ASCNH030 New Hampshire Commission on National & Community Service									
Competitive									
Student Conservation Association, Inc.		NH	20	20.0	\$398,024	\$19,901	15%	31%	\$157,104
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			20	20.0	\$398,024		15%	31%	\$157,104

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A %	B-G %	
Grantee Total			20	20.0	\$398,024		15 %	31 %	\$157,104
94ASCNJ031	New Jersey Commission on National & Community Service								
Formula									
New Jersey Community Development Corporation		NJ	22	22.0	\$336,620	\$15,301	20%	29%	\$111,340
Formula Subtotal			22	22.0	\$336,620		20%	29%	\$111,340
Grantee Total			22	22.0	\$336,620		20 %	29 %	\$111,340
94ASCNM032	New Mexico Commission for National & Community Service								
Competitive									
National Indian Youth Leadership Development Project Inc		NM	20	20.0	\$288,802	\$14,440	15%	25%	\$71,685
Competitive Subtotal			20	20.0	\$288,802		15%	25%	\$71,685
Formula									
Siete del Norte Community Development Corporation		NM	66	21.5	\$319,170	\$14,845	15%	32%	\$100,633
Formula Subtotal			66	21.5	\$319,170		15%	32%	\$100,633
Grantee Total			86	41.5	\$607,972		15 %	28 %	\$172,318
94ASCOH036	Governor's Community Service Commission								
Competitive									
Greater Columbus Arts Council		OH	25	20.0	\$332,054	\$16,603	29%	48%	\$218,703
Competitive Subtotal			25	20.0	\$332,054		29%	48%	\$218,703
Formula									
Center for Alternative Resources		OH	27	21.0	\$360,995	\$17,190	15%	47%	\$194,972
Ohio Department of Youth Services		OH	20	20.0	\$300,741	\$15,037	15%	53%	\$174,687
Ohio University		OH	28	28.0	\$388,803	\$13,886	15%	49%	\$183,158
Riverview Behavioral Healthcare Services, Inc.		OH	16	16.0	\$243,520	\$15,220	14%	36%	\$82,441

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
The Vietnam Veterans of America		OH	10	10.0	\$152,346	\$15,235	15%	70%	\$159,792
University of Dayton - SWEAT, Inc.		OH	20	20.0	\$340,659	\$17,033	15%	41%	\$148,404
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>121</i>	<i>115.0</i>	<i>\$1,787,064</i>		15%	49%	\$943,454
Grantee Total			146	135.0	\$2,119,118		17 %	49 %	\$1,162,157

94ASCOK037 Oklahoma Community Service Commission

Formula									
Rural Health Projects, Inc.		OK	23	22.0	\$344,185	\$15,645	15%	42%	\$148,416
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>23</i>	<i>22.0</i>	<i>\$344,185</i>		15%	42%	\$148,416
Grantee Total			23	22.0	\$344,185		15 %	42 %	\$148,416

94ASCOR038 Oregon Community Service Commission

Competitive									
COCC (Central Oregon Community College Foundation)	Bend	OR	69	18.8	\$261,677	\$13,956	15%	39%	\$101,559
Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence		OR	21	21.0	\$332,114	\$15,815	16%	26%	\$87,586
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>90</i>	<i>39.8</i>	<i>\$593,791</i>		16%	32%	\$189,145
Formula									
Friends of the Children	Portland	OR	20	20.0	\$318,597	\$15,930	15%	40%	\$132,660
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			<i>20</i>	<i>20.0</i>	<i>\$318,597</i>		15%	40%	\$132,660
Grantee Total			110	59.8	\$912,388		15 %	35 %	\$321,805

94ASCPA039 PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service

Competitive									
PA Association of Colleges and Universities		PA	50	50.0	\$794,901	\$15,898	18%	26%	\$222,837
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>50</i>	<i>50.0</i>	<i>\$794,901</i>		18%	26%	\$222,837

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
Formula									
Appalchia Intermediate Unit 8-PA Mountain Service Corps	PA		52	52.0	\$727,709	\$13,994	15%	36%	\$243,734
Butler Regional Family Treatment Program Service	PA		36	26.5	\$392,860	\$14,825	15%	27%	\$115,009
Pennsylvania Campus Compact/PACU	PA		140	35.0	\$583,764	\$16,679	15%	35%	\$213,928
Formula Subtotal			228	113.5	\$1,704,333		15%	33%	\$572,671
Grantee Total			278	163.5	\$2,499,234		16%	31%	\$795,508
94ASCPR040 Puerto Rico State Commission of Community Service									
Competitive									
Centros Sor Isolina Ferre, Inc.	PR		20	20.0	\$280,001	\$14,000	15%	39%	\$99,225
Competitive Subtotal			20	20.0	\$280,001		15%	39%	\$99,225
Grantee Total			20	20.0	\$280,001		15%	39%	\$99,225
94ASCRI041 Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service									
Competitive									
Public Education Fund	Providence RI		38	28.5	\$440,000	\$15,439	26%	51%	\$294,366
The Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education	RI		32	32.0	\$494,525	\$15,454	24%	34%	\$201,466
Competitive Subtotal			70	60.5	\$934,525		25%	43%	\$495,832
Formula									
City of Pawtucket	RI		24	19.0	\$300,000	\$15,789	15%	39%	\$116,522
Formula Subtotal			24	19.0	\$300,000		15%	39%	\$116,522
Grantee Total			94	79.5	\$1,234,525		22%	41%	\$612,354
94ASCSC042 South Carolina Commission on National & Community Service									
Formula									
Lander University & Upper Savannah Cons. for Child & Family	SC		20	16.0	\$242,591	\$15,162	14%	38%	\$96,610

South

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A %	B-G%	
Formula Subtotal			20	16.0	\$242,591		14%	38%	\$96,610
Grantee Total			20	16.0	\$242,591		14 %	38 %	\$96,610
94ASCTN044	Tenn. Commission on National & Community Service								
Competitive									
Memphis City Schools			35	18.3	\$336,008	\$18,328	15%	43%	\$158,890
	TN								
Competitive Subtotal			35	18.3	\$336,008		15%	43%	\$158,890
Formula									
Exchange Club Center for the Prevention of Child Abuse			25	17.5	\$268,670	\$15,353	15%	61%	\$298,539
	TN								
TN Dept. of Mental Health/Health Retardation			20	5.0	\$71,101	\$14,220	15%	32%	\$33,822
	TN								
Vanderbilt University Medical Center/Center for Health Servi			20	20.0	\$276,573	\$13,829	15%	50%	\$137,108
	TN								
Formula Subtotal			65	42.5	\$616,344		15%	48%	\$469,469
Grantee Total			100	60.8	\$952,352		15 %	46 %	\$628,359
94ASCTX045	Texas Commission for National & Community Service								
Competitive									
Workreation Inc			23	21.1	\$297,056	\$14,078	15%	41%	\$112,933
	TX								
Competitive Subtotal			23	21.1	\$297,056		15%	41%	\$112,933
Formula									
Workreation Inc			25	22.9	\$321,749	\$14,050	15%	41%	\$122,321
	TX								
Formula Subtotal			25	22.9	\$321,749		15%	41%	\$122,321
Grantee Total			48	44.0	\$618,805		15 %	41 %	\$235,254
94ASCVA049	Virginia Commission on National & Community Service								
Formula									
Northern Virginia Urban League, Inc.			20	20.0	\$320,950	\$16,048	15%	47%	\$164,383
	VA								

South

Subgrantee	City	State	ACMs and FTEs		CorpShare	CNS share per FTE	Match %		Match in \$\$
							A%	B-G%	
Formula Subtotal			20	20.0	\$320,950		15%	47%	\$164,383
Grantee Total			20	20.0	\$320,950		15%	47%	\$164,383
94ASCWA047 Washington Commission on National & Community Service									
Formula									
Educational Service District 101	Spokane	WA	22	22.0	\$322,379	\$14,654	42%	43%	\$236,707
Pasco School District #1		WA	20	20.0	\$276,824	\$13,841	17%	47%	\$133,975
Formula Subtotal			42	42.0	\$599,203		30%	45%	\$370,682
Grantee Total			42	42.0	\$599,203		30%	45%	\$370,682
94ASCWI051 Wisconsin National & Community Service Board									
Formula									
Community Adolescent Program, Inc.		WI	16	16.0	\$245,357	\$15,335	22%	51%	\$158,896
Kenosha Voluntary Action Center		WI	11	11.0	\$153,481	\$13,953	27%	50%	\$101,193
Open Door Community Center, Inc.		WI	24	12.0	\$181,651	\$15,138	15%	25%	\$45,814
Formula Subtotal			51	39.0	\$580,489		21%	42%	\$305,903
Grantee Total			51	39.0	\$580,489		21%	42%	\$305,903
94ASCWV050 WV Commission for National & Community Service									
Formula									
West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence	Sutton	WV	12	12.0	\$203,750	\$16,979	17%	25%	\$54,385
Formula Subtotal			12	12.0	\$203,750		17%	25%	\$54,385
Grantee Total			12	12.0	\$203,750		17%	25%	\$54,385
Total 106 Programs			3,710	2,832.3	\$42,837,042		19%	41%	\$22,169,302

Sagawa, Shirley

From: Lee, Myung
Sent: Tuesday, March 05, 1996 9:17 AM
To: Sagawa, Shirley
Subject: living allowance

what if we say the following: "cns will only give you 50% (whatever %age you and Harris want) of the minimum living allowance. If you can't come up with the match and want a waiver of the minimum living allowance requirement, you have to demonstrate that the requirement is inconsistent with the objectives of the program and that the reduced amount of living allowance is sufficient to meet the cost of living..."

let me know what you think....

Sagawa, Shirley

From: Rymph, David
To: Sagawa, Shirley
Subject: Rural Programs and Travel, Transportation, and Match
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 1996 3:24PM

First, all of the analysis is on State Formula and Competitive. The Grants database will not easily permit this analysis for national directs.

I used an outlier analysis. We calculated the costs for travel per FTE, transportation per FTE, and percent of total budget matched by grantee. We then arrayed the data from the most expensive per FTE to the least expensive for travel and transportation. And, for the match, from the lowest percentage provided by the grantee to the highest percentage. We focused our analysis on the top ten percent, or the most expensive/lowest match programs.

Travel: The average (mean) cost of travel per FTE for all State programs is \$ 226.06. The range is from \$ 0 to \$ 2,923. The top ten percent, the outlier group (35 programs), is from \$ 531 to \$ 2,923. Results -- 12 percent of all rural programs are in the outlier group, 16 percent of those coded as both rural and urban, and only 3 percent of the urban programs. Conclusion -- Rural programs budget more for travel per FTE. In other words, a rural program is four times more likely than an urban program to be among the most costly programs in terms of travel.

Transportation: The average (mean) cost of transportation per FTE for all State programs is \$ 428.07. The range is from \$ 0 to \$ 5,874 per FTE. The top ten percent, the outlier group (35 programs), is from \$ 960 to \$ 5,874. Results -- 12 percent of all rural programs are in the outlier group, 13 percent of those coded as both rural and urban, and 8 percent of the urban programs. Conclusion -- Rural programs budget more for transportation per FTE than do urban projects. In other words, a rural program is fifty percent more likely than an urban program to be among the most costly programs in terms of transportation costs..

Match: The average (median) portion of the total budget paid for by grantees is 30.5 percent. The range is from 17.2 percent to 98.6 percent. The top ten percent, the outlier group (35 programs), is from 17.2 percent to 20.1 percent. Results -- 15 percent of all rural programs are in the outlier group, 8 percent of those coded as both rural and urban, and 6 percent of the urban programs. Conclusion -- Rural programs pay a lower portion of the program costs than do urban programs. Or, a rural program is almost three times as likely as an urban program to be among the programs providing the lowest portion of the program budget as a match.

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.

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 grantees provide the minimum matching funds for Member support, and the actual "average" costs on program support. *That the reform program* 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.

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

- o to decrease the cost per FTE for AmeriCorps Members significantly *among federal* below the GAO-reported average of \$
- o to increase the proportion of federal funds going to member support v. program support
- o potentially, to decrease the average Member living allowance so that it is clear that AmeriCorps Members are making a sacrifice

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 (+) <i>for more</i>	7,945 (+) <i>or more</i>
FICA*	516	92 (+) <i>or more</i>	608 (+) <i>or more</i>
Health care	1,020	180	1,200
Child care**	250	0	250
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	13,264	1,464	14,728
Program grant	5,511	5,236	10,747
(state average)			
State Commission	400	100	500
Corporation***	1,600	0	1,600
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	7,511	5,336	12,847
TOTAL	20,775	6,800	27,575

Reform proposal -- 52-week full-time members

(programs operating for less than 52 weeks would have correspondingly 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
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	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
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	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, training and technical assistance, 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. *we are checking.*

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, ~~we would want to revisit 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 to the minimum amount ~~and~~ *by* not augmenting it the living allowance, 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 only *x* 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:

City Year 510 0 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"?

d Smaller programs (20 people) would not achieve the economies of scale that larger programs would. But the higher matching requirements would make it difficult for many programs to grow significantly.

City Year 23,383 (only 12,121 corp) 0 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. There are, of course exceptions . . . *make the 23,495 11,443 corp*

d Geographically dispersed programs tend to have high travel costs. For example, 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 demand that Members gather, and use of technology (such as internet)? *require travel*

0 Corps and team-based programs tend to have higher staff costs than individual placement models. For example, Evaluation results suggest that corps and team-based programs do better at building esprit de corps than individual placement models, and are less likely to run into problems regarding the type of service performed (when the individual Members are supervised at the site rather than by a staff member of the AmeriCorps program, they are more likely to become adjunct administrative staff). Some of the cost differential could be offset if team-based programs use second year Members as team leaders. However, a likely result of the fixed-price grant might be to increase programs that essentially act as "placement agencies" at the expense of those with more coherent program designs. Could these risks be offset by aggressive promotion of team leader models, emphasize on "single issue" individual placement programs, and a more clear "volunteer generator" niche?

*Grand Rapids 2147
Volunteer 3,024
I have 7,630
Earl Bay 7454*

0 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

*Training Mont Co 2686
Earl Bay 2395
Grand Rapids 1944*

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 ~~x~~ education awards only programs in AmeriCorps*State and National and 40 A*VISTA cost share agreements (covering 600 A*VISTAs). Staff estimate that more than 90% of 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 -- if too many organizations wanted to participate, we would not be able to monitor them. 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.

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, ~~although it may be difficult to track whether the funds are really state funds and not federal block grant funds commingled with state appropriations.~~ 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 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 funds: We have not fully explored whether school districts, police, and municipalities might be a source of cost-share funds. 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.

and another 13
in which the Corp rate
provides only minimal program
support + no member
support. In addition, there
are currently

The fact that the
part-time programs
tend to be lower
quality than
full-time

currently, municipal funds
are a source
in a few select award
only programs

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.

- ⑤ o We should come to terms with what kind of assignment appropriately constitutes an AmeriCorps assignment.
- ⑥ o We should develop a plan to market and manage more education award-only programs and A*VISTA cost-share partnerships.
- ⑦ 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.
- ③ o We should consider differential matching rates or dedicated "pots" of funding for certain types of programs and funding, i.e. a higher matching rate on private sector funding than other types; for rural programs; for start-up programs, etc. Providing these kinds of incentives could mitigate against unintended negative effects on the portfolio of programs.
- ④ o We should phase-in the plan.
- ② o We should develop a plan for consulting with our constituency groups about the proposal.
- ① o We should do a legal review

⑤ Spell out

0-1 Federal

2-1 Private, hardships

1-1 Gov

2-1 hardships (in rural, (25%))

3-1 start up

(0%)

(33%)

(50%)

(33%)

(25%)

5000

8

MATCH REQUIREMENTS AmeriCorps Option Paper

The team which compiled this Option Paper included Mike Russell (Chair), Diana Algra, AnnMaura Connolly, Mark Feldman, Mike Kenefick, Hank Oltmann, Lance Potter, and Terry Russell.

The group's charge is to answer the following questions:

What is the maximum amount in-cash and in-kind non-federal, non-Corporation funds that an AmeriCorps sponsor can be expected to raise to ensure that at least 75% of current sponsors could continue to participate in AmeriCorps? What is a realistic period of time to reach these goals?

BACKGROUND

As conveyed in a recent memorandum on match options, '[c]urrently, there are two required matches in the statute. Programs must pay at least 15% of the living allowance (and any amount that exceeds 85% of the average living allowance of \$7,945) and at least 15% of health insurance (which costs \$1,200). This amount must be from nonfederal funds and be in cash. Currently, state programs are averaging from 20 to 30% matches on the living allowance, but about half of state programs pay only the minimum match.

"The other match is on program costs. Programs must pay at least 25% of program costs in cash or in kind, and may count other federal funds toward the match. The current average is from about 45% to 50%, although 80 state and 7 national direct programs pay less than 30%.

"It is often assumed that the majority of AmeriCorps*State/National programs raise private sector funds. In fact, only one-third have cash contributions from businesses or foundations, and the median investment was only \$7,500."¹

¹¹¹ Memorandum of January 25, 1996, from Executive Director Shirley Sagawa to Chief Executive Officer Harris Wofford, Corporation for National Service.

CURRENT MATCH REQUIREMENTS

The Statute

The National Service and Community Trust Act of 1993 addresses the match issue as follows:

(1) Requirements

Except as provided in section 12594 of this title [living allowances], the Federal share of the cost of carrying out a national service program ... may not exceed 75 percent of such cost.²

(2) Calculation

In providing for the remaining share of the cost of carrying out a national service program, the program -- (A) shall provide for such share through a payment in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including facilities, equipment, or services; and (B) may provide for such share through State sources, local sources, or other Federal sources (other than the use of funds made available under the national service laws).³

(3) Cost of health care

In providing a payment in cash ... as part of providing for the remaining share of the cost of carrying out a national service program, the program may count not more than 85 percent of the cost of providing a health care policy ... toward such share.⁴

The statute also requires that the annual living allowance which AmeriCorps Members receive "shall not exceed 85 percent of the total average annual provided to VISTA volunteers"⁵

Although the Corporation does not currently operate a Challenge Grants program (discussed in the Options section below), the statute specifically authorizes such an approach.⁶ The statute authorizes a one to one match:

A challenge grant under this subsection may provide not more than \$1 of assistance ... for each \$1 in cash raised by the national service program from private sources in excess of amounts required to be provided by the program to satisfy matching funds requirements⁷

² 42 USCA § 12571(e)(1).

³ *Id.* at (2).

⁴ *Id.* at (3).

⁵ *Id.* § 12594(a)(2).

⁶ *Id.* § 12576(c)(1).

⁷ *Id.* at (c)(3).

In a challenge grant program, the Corporation is required to establish a ceiling on the amount of assistance which would be provided.⁸

AmeriCorps Requirements

Living Allowance: 85 (CNS) - 15 (sponsor). In 1995, the Corporation advised programs that they "must provide a living allowance between \$7,945 and \$15,890 per year to their full-time Members."⁹ The Corporation's share "may not exceed 85% of the minimum living allowance, which equates to approximately \$6,753."¹⁰ The sponsor must meet a minimum of 15% non-Federal cash match.¹¹

Health Care: 85 (CNS) - 15 (sponsor). The Corporation pays up to 85% of the cost of a sponsor's policy that meets CNS requirements. There is an available AmeriCorps health policy which costs \$1,200 (a maximum of \$1,080 for the CNS share and \$120 for the grantee share).¹² The sponsor must provide a cash match.¹³ (The use of other Federal funds is allowable in this line item.)

Operational Costs: 75 (CNS) - 25 (sponsor). The sponsor is required to provide a match of "at least 25%"¹⁴ for other Member support costs, staff and operational expenses (travel, transportation, supplies, equipment, administrative, uniforms, training, education, and other allowable costs). The sponsor's match can be cash, in-kind, other Federal funds, State funds, or other funds.¹⁵

Education Award: 100 (CNS) - 0 (sponsor). The Corporation provides an education award of \$4,725 for full-time Members and \$2,362.50 for part-time Members who successfully complete their terms of service.

Child Care: 100 (CNS) - 0 (sponsor). The Corporation funds child care directly for income-eligible Members and will pay up to the local market rate for child care services.¹⁶ (The Corporation follows established state guidelines.)

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *AmeriCorps State Guidelines for 1995 Applicants* at 20.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 21.

¹¹ *Id.* at 28.

¹² *Id.* at 22.

¹³ *Id.* at 30.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ See AmeriCorps@CARE Child Care Benefits Program Fact Sheet

PROPOSED MATCH REQUIREMENTS: 1996 STATE APPLICATIONS

[insert]

CURRENT PROGRAM MATCH LEVELS

In a recent review of match levels conducted by Mike Kenefick and his staff, the following data were compiled:

Program Type	Required Match	Average Match
State Formula		
<i>Living Allowance</i>	15%	20-24%
<i>Operating Costs</i>	25%	45-51%
State Competitive		
<i>Living Allowance</i>	15%	24-30%
<i>Operating Costs</i>	25%	45-48%
National Non-profits		
<i>Living Allowance</i>	15%	35-40%
<i>Operating Costs</i>	25%	53-55%

(based on proposed FTE level and proposed match as reflected in the 1995 applications.)

Cost per FTE

Program Type	Average Cost/FTE (excluding ed awards)
State (Formula and Competitive)	\$12,184
106 out of 364 over \$13,800	
Directs (44)	\$10,071
25 over \$13,800, including:	
4 -- 13,801 - 14,000	
8 -- 14,000s	
4 -- 15,000s	

ISSUES

- What level of matching funds can be reached over a period of years?
- What will the funders "buy" for their investments?
- Would raising the match requirement reduce or eliminate indirect service programs because they are not as quantifiable (*e.g.*, linking doctors with health clinics)?
- Would raising the match requirement favor those programs with a fundraising infrastructure, strong boards, and more sophisticated public relations capability?
- Will raising the match at the same time federal funds are withdrawn have a disproportionate impact on some programs?
- What is the impact on those programs which may lose 30 to 50 percent of their match when the federal funds are withdrawn?
- Is there a disproportionate impact on certain grassroots programs which raise money over time versus local public agencies (police departments) which have public funds up front?
- To what extent does the match depend on the program model (*e.g.*, centralized payroll)?
- The impact of raising the match will vary across program type -- national non-profits, grassroots organizations, public agencies.

CNS/AMERICORPS ROLES

- Provide a clear federal presence
- Organize high-profile events
- Provide Training and Technical Assistance
- Recruit Members with specialized skills
- Convene fora in issue areas
- Manage volunteers
- Identify and provide information on cutting issues

SOURCES OF MATCHING FUNDS

- Corporations
- Corporate Foundations
- Local businesses
- Foundations
- Federal government (other agencies)
- State government
- Local government
- Non-profit organizations
- Individuals
- Fee for service

- United Ways
- Product development

Based on an internal staff review, the majority of matching funds are not being raised, but rather "traded" (provided by public agencies as part of their annual budgets or by individual host sites which pay for living allowances through one fiscal agent).

According to the GAO report, the percentage of private money raised for the match is small. The GAO reports that only 12 percent of matching funds is raised from private sector sources.¹⁷ The GAO also analyzes the sources of total program funds (\$351 million in 1994 ???) as follows:

- \$260 million Federal (\$150m -- AmeriCorps; \$110 million from other federal programs)
- \$50 million State & local governments
- \$41 million Non-governmental (corporate, foundations, religious, education, and non-profit)

As outlined above, more of the matching funds comes from public rather than private sources. The fact that many AmeriCorps programs are sponsored by public agencies (police departments, district attorneys, city agencies) raises the following implications:

- the programs have the money up front when they apply
- the applicant, in some cases, may have greater capacity to obtain and expand funding from the same source by inclusion of the program in its budget and/or reprogramming agency funds.

The advantages of public sponsors include:

- secure funding
- ability to meet payroll.

The main disadvantage is that the source of funds is taxpayers' dollars.

The working group believes that the private sector could be encouraged to support:

- 1) sponsorship of teams of AmeriCorps Members or individual Members
- 2) training
 - a) to do service
 - b) leadership training

¹⁷ General Accounting Office Report at 6.

- c) program materials
- d) curriculum development
- 3) equipment to perform service
- 4) uniforms (with corporate logo, similar to Olympics uniforms)
- 5) computer support.
- 6) printed materials (program manuals, brochures, stationery)
- 7) team sponsorships and other creative arrangements
- 8) volunteer generation activities.

SURVEY RESULTS: SPONSORS AND STATE COMMISSIONS

[underway -- insert]

ISSUES RAISED BY CONGRESS

1. Senator Grassley

In 1995 during Senate consideration of the FY 1996 VA-HUD appropriations bill, a possible Grassley Amendment was expected (but never offered) which would have "require[d] grantees to provide a 50% private sector match and prohibit[ed] grantees from using any other federal funds to support AmeriCorps programs."¹⁸

On October 24, 1995, Senator Grassley testified before the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and expressed his concern that "instead of a partnership with the private sector, the taxpayers are having to meet 92 percent of the cost"¹⁹ of AmeriCorps programs. The Senator referred to his August 1995 letter to the President in which he urged specific reforms of AmeriCorps be adopted, including "to make sure that the private sector contributed the amount of money that the program ... intended that the private sector contribute."²⁰

In conclusion of his testimony, Senator Grassley stated, without being definitive at that point, that "at a minimum, if we can get this cost down to \$17,000 per participant, and if we can have 50 percent of it come from the private sector, I think that the administration will well be on the road to my support for the reauthorization of this program."²¹

¹⁸ Expected Amendment by Senator Grassley to the FY 1996 VA-HUD appropriations bill (1995).

¹⁹ Statement of Senator Charles Grassley, *quoted in Hearing on AmeriCorps*, Unofficial Transcript, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities (October 17, 1995) at 19 [hereinafter cited as House Hearing].

²⁰ *Id.* at 20-21.

²¹ *Id.* at 22.

2. *House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations*

Congressman Hoekstra, who chaired the House subcommittee hearing in October 1995, expressed concern regarding the cost per AmeriCorps Member.²²

In response to a question posed by Congressman Scott, CEO Harris Wofford discussed a proposal by former Governor George Romney's son, Mitt, who proposed that the match be increased from approximately 15 to 50 percent over a five year period. Mr. Wofford testified that the Corporation would "look and see to what extent and how fast"²³ the match can be increased. While in general agreement with the notion of raising the match, nevertheless, Congressman Scott cautioned that "we don't want to make the local share so high that we start losing programs because they can't afford it."²⁴

3. *Senator Kassebaum*

In 1993, Senator Nancy Kassebaum introduced national service legislation which authorized the following match requirements:

- *Operating costs:* (1) Operating programs would be responsible for a 40% match; (2) federally operated programs would be responsible for a 50% match; and (3) planning and replication programs would be responsible for a 25% match. The match in each of these categories could comprise federal, state and/or other cash and/or in-kind sources.
- *Living Allowance:* Programs would be responsible for a 15% match which must be from non-federal sources (CNS and other federal agencies). The entire federal share could not exceed the lesser of the prevailing minimum wage in the area where the program is conducted and 85% of the annual living allowance as established by the program. (However, if the local prevailing minimum wage is less than the federal minimum wage, then the federal level is used.)²⁵

²² *Id.* at 6.

²³ *Id.* at 72.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ Conversation of January 29, 1996, with Myung Lee, Office of General Counsel, Corporation for National Service.

4. Congressional Staff

Youth Service America and the Coalition for National and Community Service recently convened a panel of Republican congressional staff members to discuss the future of national service. The staff member from the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee identified as a key question for reauthorization: "How are matches made? What % is private, what % is public?"²⁶ Similarly, a Senator Grassley's staff member referenced "increasing the private sector match" as a major issue,²⁷ Congressman Chris Shays' representative indicated that "[t]he federal matching requirements could be changed,"²⁸ and the panel's wrap-up concluded that "the match issue is central."²⁹

OPTIONS

Option #1: Status quo with increased match for program and living allowance. The policy question is how much should the match in each of the two categories be raised?

Pros:

Cons:

Option #2: Develop only one match. The policy question is how much should the match be raised?

Pros:

Cons:

Option #3: Fund the total living allowance and require some match from programs.

Pros:

Cons:

²⁶ Statement by Ms. Mary Elizabeth Larson, referenced in *National Service: A Republican Perspective*, a Panel Discussion on 1/19/96, January Minutes, Working Group on National and Community Service Policy, Hosted by Youth Service America and the Coalition for National and Community Service at 3.

²⁷ Statement by Mr. Dean Zerbe, referenced in *id.* at 5.

²⁸ Statement by Ms. Katy Anderson, referenced in *id.* at 6.

²⁹ Statement by Dr. Roger Landrum, referenced in *id.* at 12.

Option #4: Convert to a challenge grant mechanism and require the match up front.

Pros:

Cons:

Option #5: "Modified Kassebaum" -- [insert]

Pros:

Cons:

Option #6: "Ed Awards Plus" -- Provide education awards and require a match of a certain percentage per Member.

Pros:

Cons:

Option #7: "Ed Awards Only" -- Provide education awards; sponsors are responsible for all other program costs.

Pros:

Cons: