

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 [5]

Stack:
S

Row:
66

Section:
1

Shelf:
9

Position:
1

South

All State Programs?

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
94ASCAL001 Alabama National & Community Service State Commission										
Competitive										
Birmingham AIDS Outreach	AL		13.0	\$13,420	\$87,792	\$64,368	\$19,427	15%	\$41,332	39%
Birmingham AIDS Outreach (BAO)	AL		29.0	\$13,787	\$195,844	\$154,234	\$43,338	15%	\$97,510	39%
Competitive Subtotal			42.0		\$355,672	\$218,602	\$62,765	15%	\$138,842	39%
Formula										
Alabama Council on Human Relations, Inc.	AL		20.0	\$12,913	\$135,065	\$88,937	\$29,881	15%	\$74,287	46%
Montgomery YMCA	AL		24.0	\$13,510	\$162,078	\$124,551	\$35,241	15%	\$68,120	35%
State Association of CASA	AL		21.0	\$9,008	\$81,039	\$88,425	\$17,779	15%	\$36,800	29%
The University of Alabama	AL		20.0	\$3,876	\$0	\$77,521	\$0	0%	\$49,503	39%
West Alabama Health Services, Inc.	AL		20.0	\$11,036	\$135,060	\$54,665	\$29,875	15%	\$24,659	31%
Formula Subtotal			105.0		\$635,828	\$434,099	\$112,776	12%	\$253,369	36%
Grantee Total	Alabama National & Community		147.0		\$991,500	\$652,701	\$175,541	13%	\$392,211	37%
94ASCAK002 Alaska State Community Service Commission										
Competitive										
South Alaska Guidance Association (SAGA)	Juneau AK		71.5	\$13,287	\$333,200	\$560,815	\$328,784	46%	\$988,571	64%
Competitive Subtotal			71.5		\$389,186	\$560,815	\$328,784	46%	\$988,571	64%
Formula										
Nine Star Enterprises, Inc.	Anchorage AK		9.0	\$16,079	\$61,172	\$68,795	\$13,739	15%	\$34,844	34%
Rural Alaska Community Action Program, Inc.	AK		9.0	\$17,291	\$60,777	\$80,066	\$52,210	41%	\$58,744	42%
Formula Subtotal			18.0		\$151,466	\$148,861	\$65,949	28%	\$93,588	38%
Grantee Total	Alaska State Community Service		89.5		\$540,652	\$709,676	\$394,733	34%	\$1,082,159	47%

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
94ASCAZ003 Arizona National and Community Service Commission										
Competitive										
AZ Board of Regents / Rural Health Office / Univ of AZ	AZ		22.0	\$14,663	\$148,970	\$138,749	\$33,522	15%	\$101,970	42%
Competitive Subtotal			22.0		\$183,839	\$138,749	\$33,522	15%	\$101,970	42%
Formula										
Arizona Center for Vocational & Technical Skills	AZ		28.5	\$11,946	\$186,324	\$134,647	\$36,318	15%	\$321,227	70%
AZ Council of Centers for Children & Adults (ACCCA)	AZ		24.0	\$12,254	\$162,072	\$90,737	\$35,890	15%	\$87,024	49%
City of Mesa, AZ	AZ		24.0	\$11,984	\$162,072	\$72,826	\$38,206	15%	\$56,512	44%
Formula Subtotal			76.5		\$623,973	\$298,210	\$110,414	15%	\$464,763	54%
Grantee Total	Arizona National and Community		98.5		\$807,812	\$436,959	\$143,936	15%	\$566,733	51%
94ASCAR004 Arkansas Commission on National and Community Service										
Formula										
Arkansas Family Network	AR		13.0	\$12,762	\$87,789	\$47,295	\$20,935	15%	\$17,376	27%
Southeast Arkansas Community Based Education Center	AR		10.0	\$15,023	\$67,533	\$66,705	\$14,739	15%	\$41,465	38%
Univ of Central Arkansas	AR		24.5	\$12,792	\$166,441	\$108,037	\$36,247	15%	\$77,998	42%
Formula Subtotal			47.5		\$407,489	\$222,037	\$71,921	15%	\$136,839	36%
Grantee Total	Arkansas Commission on National and		47.5		\$407,489	\$222,037	\$71,921	15%	\$136,839	36%
94ASCCA005 California Commission on Improving Life Through Service										
Competitive										
California Conservation Corps	Sacramento CA		117.5	\$14,016	\$641,535	\$766,601	\$587,326	40%	\$841,840	52%
County of Sacramento, Department of Parks and Recreation	CA		50.0	\$13,800	\$337,650	\$251,873	\$77,334	15%	\$190,732	43%
East Bay Conservation Corps	CA		126.0	\$17,778	\$773,798	?	\$230,241	19%	\$666,688	35%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS		Grantee Share %			
					A	B-F	Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Kern County Superintendent of Schools	CA		28.0	\$13,762	\$173,127	\$165,270	\$74,180	25%	\$99,387	38%
Los Angeles Conservation Corps	CA		142.0	\$15,273	\$965,278	\$958,839	\$252,752	17%	\$1,064,164	53%
Sacramento Child Abuse Prevention Council	CA		22.0	\$13,952	\$141,813	\$120,497	\$45,602	20%	\$157,243	57%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			<i>485.5</i>		<i>\$3,909,631</i>	<i>\$3,528,252</i>	<i>\$1,267,435</i>	<i>23%</i>	<i>\$3,020,054</i>	<i>46%</i>
<i>Formula</i>										
AD Care, Inc.	San Luis Obispo CA		29.0	\$12,160	\$199,371	\$108,938	\$43,005	15%	\$58,102	35%
Bay Area Youth Agency Consortium	CA		52.0	\$14,167	\$351,156	\$301,754	\$170,188	28%	\$400,388	57%
Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc.	CA		13.3	\$17,365	\$94,711	\$125,819	\$18,400	15%	\$63,161	33%
California Conservation Corps	CA		94.0	\$8,759	\$298,306	\$429,642	\$594,817	60%	\$707,011	62%
California Conservation Corps	CA		41.5	\$13,239	\$280,856	\$189,766	\$88,378	20%	\$1,216,222	87%
California Conservation Corps	CA		119.0	\$5,584	\$112,159	\$418,176	?	82%	\$953,105	70%
California Court Appointed Special Advocate Association	CA		24.0	\$14,488	\$162,078	\$138,399	\$36,938	15%	\$46,138	25%
Civic Center Barrio Housing Corporation	CA		24.0	\$14,566	\$166,841	\$150,770	\$35,034	15%	\$49,115	25%
Community Services & Employment Training, Inc. (C-SET)	CA		18.0	\$12,695	\$121,557	\$57,902	\$30,111	15%	\$47,949	45%
Constitutional Rights Foundation	CA		22.0	\$14,810	\$150,158	\$127,273	\$35,039	15%	\$121,978	49%
EYE Counseling and Crisis Services	CA		37.0	\$17,263	\$251,449	\$325,528	\$55,290	15%	\$128,250	28%
Imperial County Office of Education	CA		27.0	\$14,487	\$186,011	\$154,833	\$41,922	15%	\$92,406	37%
Partners In School Innovation	CA		14.0	\$17,656	\$94,542	\$134,278	\$126,257	53%	\$105,363	44%
Redwood Community Action Agency	CA		21.0	\$14,457	\$143,778	\$130,655	\$38,858	18%	\$128,411	50%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-C	B-G%
Sacramento County Office of Education	CA		21.5	\$16,949	\$145,386	\$193,543	\$35,018	17%	\$103,986	35%
San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council	CA		23.0	\$14,667	\$156,913	\$146,630	\$42,851	18%	\$80,134	35%
Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity	CA		21.0	\$14,507	\$144,200	\$110,495	\$37,331	16%	\$35,927	25%
The June Burnett Foundation	CA		48.0	\$14,768	\$336,065	\$323,612	\$91,182	19%	\$603,223	65%
Volunteer Center of San Francisco	CA		24.0	\$18,526	\$153,106	\$252,293	\$160,189	45%	\$185,150	42%
Yolo County Superintendent of Schools	CA		30.0	\$13,331	\$206,163	\$151,039	\$47,433	16%	\$102,802	40%
Formula Subtotal			703.3		\$4,777,418	\$3,971,345	\$2,817,886	26%	\$5,228,821	44%
Grantee Total	California Commission on Improving		1,188.8		\$8,687,050	\$7,499,597	\$4,085,321	25%	\$8,248,875	45%

94ASCCO006 Community Partnership Office										
Competitive										
Volunteers of America Colorado Branch, Inc.	CO		19.0	\$10,965	\$128,702	\$47,717	\$28,354	15%	\$15,693	25%
Competitive Subtotal			19.0		\$160,626	\$47,717	\$28,354	15%	\$15,693	25%
Formula										
Colorado Mountain College	CO		24.0	\$10,568	\$144,780	\$72,294	\$57,907	24%	\$25,276	26%
Larimer County Employment & Training Services	CO		17.0	\$13,776	\$114,805	\$89,984	\$25,449	15%	\$35,937	29%
Office of Rural Job Training	CO		14.0	\$13,512	\$0	\$189,173	\$169,987	100%	\$127,286	40%
Sheridan School District #2	CO		22.0	\$13,123	\$148,968	\$104,712	\$32,468	15%	\$250,598	71%
Formula Subtotal			77.0		\$509,535	\$456,163	\$285,811	39%	\$439,097	41%
Grantee Total	Community Partnership Office		96.0		\$670,161	\$503,880	\$314,165	34%	\$454,790	38%

94ASCCT007 Connecticut Commission on National & Community Service

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Competitive										
Bridgeport Police Department	CT		34.5	\$14,975	\$226,353	\$259,545	\$45,369	15%	\$198,300	43%
Community Action for Greater Middlesex County, Inc.	CT		33.0	\$13,755	\$222,849	\$175,912	\$49,071	15%	\$130,052	43%
Leadership, Education and Athletics in Partnership	CT		83.0	\$15,542	\$466,350	\$787,975	\$339,098	40%	\$955,206	55%
Southend Community Services, Inc.	CT		30.0	\$13,334	\$202,590	\$149,652	\$65,942	21%	\$95,812	40%
Competitive Subtotal			180.5		\$1,287,506	\$1,373,084	\$499,480	23%	\$1,379,370	45%
Formula										
City of Meriden, Connecticut	CT		20.0	\$9,695	\$89,280	\$92,933	\$122,583	55%	\$79,303	46%
Volunteer Center of Greater Bridgeport	CT		46.5	\$13,620	\$315,812	\$251,599	\$67,367	15%	\$104,958	29%
Formula Subtotal			66.5		\$482,711	\$344,532	\$189,950	35%	\$184,261	38%
Grantee Total	Connecticut Commission on National &		247.0		\$1,770,217	\$1,717,616	\$689,430	27%	\$1,563,631	43%

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

Formula										
Latin American Youth Center	Washington DC	DC	17.5	\$13,791	\$127,500	\$88,730	\$26,932	15%	\$71,409	45%
The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness		DC	0.0	?	\$0	\$30,000	\$0	0%	\$38,930	56%
Formula Subtotal			17.5		\$152,615	\$118,730	\$26,932	7%	\$110,339	51%
Grantee Total	D. C. Commission on National &		17.5		\$152,615	\$118,730	\$26,932	7%	\$110,339	51%

94ASCDE008 Delaware Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive										
Delaware Parent Aide & Resource Mother Coalition	DE		20.0	\$12,334	\$137,700	\$94,205	\$26,909	15%	\$34,020	27%
Competitive Subtotal			20.0		\$152,484	\$94,205	\$26,909	15%	\$34,020	27%

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Formula										
Dover Housing Authority	Dover	DE	20.0	\$13,700	\$135,065	\$104,687	\$29,878	15%	\$43,250	29%
Formula Subtotal			20.0		\$169,313	\$104,687	\$29,878	15%	\$43,250	29%
Grantee Total	Delaware Commission on National &		40.0		\$321,797	\$198,892	\$56,787	15%	\$77,270	28%

94ASCFL010 Florida Governor's Commission on Community Service

Competitive										
Frostproof Care Center, Inc.	FL		20.0	\$13,970	\$135,065	\$109,578	\$32,661	16%	\$129,207	54%
St. Petersburg Junior College	FL		40.0	\$13,720	\$270,130	\$212,362	\$59,369	15%	\$155,015	42%
Competitive Subtotal			60.0		\$506,249	\$321,940	\$92,030	16%	\$284,222	48%

Formula										
Centro Campesino-Farmworker Center, Inc	FL		22.0	\$13,888	\$148,566	\$118,700	\$34,325	16%	\$163,175	58%
City of Brooksville	FL		18.0	\$14,140	\$121,559	\$101,951	\$26,924	15%	\$34,060	25%
Escambia-Pensacola Human Relations Commission	FL		15.0	\$13,938	\$101,299	\$84,569	\$22,721	15%	\$91,889	52%
Greater Miami Service Corps	FL		30.0	\$13,427	\$202,598	\$167,564	\$44,530	16%	\$151,093	47%
Lake County Board of County Commissioners	FL		13.0	\$13,938	\$87,789	\$69,238	\$25,470	19%	\$66,013	49%
Legal Aid Service of Broward County, Inc.	FL		20.0	\$16,247	\$135,060	\$157,393	\$45,461	21%	\$65,307	29%
Okaloosa-Walton Community College	FL		20.0	\$13,624	\$135,065	\$103,704	\$29,783	15%	\$88,796	46%
The Center for Drug-Free Living, Inc	FL		20.0	\$15,201	\$135,065	\$137,551	\$29,375	15%	\$45,004	25%
United Way of Martin County	FL		20.0	\$13,938	\$135,065	\$101,341	\$117,662	40%	\$53,012	34%
United Way of the Big Bend	FL		20.0	\$15,201	\$135,060	\$134,546	\$31,096	16%	\$116,787	46%
Formula Subtotal			198.0		\$1,660,736	\$1,176,557	\$407,347	19%	\$875,136	41%

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Grantee Total	Florida Governor's Commission on		258.0		\$2,166,985	\$1,498,497	\$499,377	18%	\$1,159,358	42%
<hr/>										
94ASCGA011	GA Commission on National and Community Service									
<hr/>										
Competitive										
Georgia Dept. of Community Affairs	GA		60.0	\$13,800	\$405,195	\$340,328	\$98,149	17%	\$343,558	50%
Hands on Atlanta, Inc.	GA		77.0	\$12,508	\$520,000	\$320,183	\$113,465	15%	\$172,541	35%
YMCA of Metropolitan Atlanta, Inc.	GA		20.0	\$13,469	\$135,065	\$101,266	\$29,666	15%	\$71,615	41%
Competitive Subtotal			157.0		\$1,298,745	\$761,777	\$241,280	16%	\$587,714	42%
<hr/>										
Formula										
City of Macon/ Police Department	GA		20.0	\$13,785	\$135,065	\$107,149	\$32,568	16%	\$138,387	56%
Douglas/Coffee County Service Corps, Inc.	GA		23.0	\$13,465	\$160,418	\$122,806	\$32,981	15%	\$307,136	71%
Georgia School-Age Care Association, Inc.	GA		21.0	\$13,984	\$150,154	\$130,783	\$28,745	15%	\$133,775	51%
Metro Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless	GA		22.0	\$13,630	\$148,566	\$115,600	\$57,861	24%	\$85,195	42%
Mid State Children's Challenge Projects, Inc.	GA		24.0	\$13,507	\$166,841	\$130,916	\$34,104	15%	\$82,565	39%
Southwest Georgia Easter Seal Society, Inc.	GA		8.0	\$12,619	\$54,026	\$32,957	\$11,999	15%	\$33,135	50%
West Georgia Medical Center	GA		20.0	\$10,692	\$138,546	\$58,704	\$30,449	16%	\$38,724	40%
Formula Subtotal			138.0		\$1,118,985	\$698,915	\$228,707	17%	\$818,917	50%
Grantee Total	GA Commission on National and		295.0		\$2,417,730	\$1,460,692	\$469,987	16%	\$1,406,631	48%
<hr/>										
94ASCSD043	General Convention of Sioux YMCAs									
<hr/>										
Formula										
General Convention of Sioux YMCAs Dupree SD			12.0	\$13,493	\$64,499	\$80,524	\$16,762	17%	\$26,841	25%
Formula Subtotal			12.0		\$81,395	\$80,524	\$16,762	17%	\$26,841	25%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Grantee Total	General Convention of Sioux YMCAs		12.0		\$81,395	\$80,524	\$16,762	17%	\$26,841	25%
<hr/>										
94ASCMD021	Governor's Commission on Service									
Competitive										
Action for the Homeless, Inc.	MD		27.0	\$12,159	\$182,338	\$102,290	\$39,885	15%	\$98,744	49%
Maryland Conservation Corps (MD-DNR-Public Lands & Forestry)	MD		151.0	\$14,570	\$835,508	?	\$420,260	30%	\$770,150	39%
Maryland State Department of Education	MD		30.0	\$11,951	\$202,590	\$105,191	\$45,111	15%	\$69,300	40%
Montgomery County Government, Department of Police	MD		23.5	\$15,953	\$167,850	\$175,194	\$92,341	32%	\$208,279	54%
University of Maryland at Baltimore	MD		22.0	\$14,588	\$149,039	\$136,233	\$45,196	20%	\$112,735	45%
Volunteer Maryland/Governor's Office on Volunteerism	MD		120.0	\$13,794	\$810,360	\$660,512	\$664,358	40%	\$450,105	41%
Competitive Subtotal			373.5		\$2,842,633	\$2,395,282	\$1,307,151	25%	\$1,709,313	45%
<hr/>										
Formula										
Anne Arundel Community College	Arnold MD		20.0	\$15,790	\$79,028	\$226,644	\$15,733	15%	\$120,684	35%
Frostburg State University	MD		29.0	\$14,738	\$195,824	\$186,101	\$56,887	19%	\$83,226	31%
Salisbury State University	MD		20.0	\$12,066	\$128,307	\$83,641	\$27,831	15%	\$32,450	28%
University of Maryland at Baltimore	MD		22.0	\$14,588	\$149,039	\$136,233	\$45,196	20%	\$112,735	45%
Formula Subtotal			91.0		\$672,836	\$632,619	\$145,647	17%	\$349,095	35%
Grantee Total	Governor's Commission on Service		464.5		\$3,515,468	\$3,027,901	\$1,452,797	22%	\$2,058,408	41%
<hr/>										
94ASCOH036	Governor's Community Service Commission									
Competitive										
Greater Columbus Arts Council	OH		20.0	\$16,603	\$137,045	\$166,331	\$67,293	29%	\$151,410	48%
Neighborhood Centers Association	OH		20.0	\$13,245	\$139,034	\$97,418	\$29,556	15%	\$118,717	55%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			40.0		\$333,203	\$263,749	\$96,849	22%	\$270,127	51%
Formula										
Center for Alternative Resources	OH		21.0	\$17,190	\$144,200	\$184,696	\$31,112	15%	\$163,860	47%
Community Resource Center	OH		13.0	\$12,834	\$91,365	\$54,832	\$19,764	15%	\$18,518	25%
Ohio Coalition for the Homeless	OH		31.0	\$12,625	\$209,353	\$129,304	\$107,061	29%	\$204,439	61%
Ohio Department of Youth Services	OH		20.0	\$15,037	\$135,065	\$126,608	\$30,729	15%	\$143,958	53%
Ohio University	OH		28.0	\$13,886	\$189,091	\$142,610	\$43,446	15%	\$139,712	49%
Riverview Behavioral Healthcare Services, Inc.	OH		16.0	\$15,220	\$108,048	\$106,689	\$23,022	14%	\$59,419	36%
The Vietnam Veterans of America	OH		10.0	\$15,235	\$67,530	\$62,765	\$15,813	15%	\$143,979	70%
Toledo Area Private Industry Council	OH		25.5	\$12,003	\$175,979	\$87,108	\$38,640	15%	\$124,154	59%
University of Dayton - SWEAT, Inc.	OH		20.0	\$17,033	\$135,065	\$166,359	\$30,759	15%	\$117,645	41%
Youngstown State University	OH		10.0	\$11,600	\$67,530	\$28,746	\$17,550	17%	\$14,074	33%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			194.5		\$1,677,620	\$1,089,717	\$357,896	17%	\$1,129,758	47%
Grantee Total	Governor's Community Service		234.5		\$2,010,823	\$1,353,466	\$454,745	17%	\$1,399,885	48%

94ASCHI012 Hawaii State Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive										
Hawaii Lawyers Care	HI		22.5	\$14,488	\$151,600	\$156,274	\$42,762	20%	\$213,685	58%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			22.5		\$169,713	\$156,274	\$42,762	20%	\$213,685	58%
Formula										
AmeriCorps ACHIEVE Hawaii	HI		17.0	\$13,828	\$121,550	\$104,219	\$23,095	15%	\$91,504	47%
DLNR Youth Corps	HI		7.0	\$9,819	\$16,349	\$51,132	\$13,200	43%	\$95,464	65%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			24.0		\$148,449	\$155,351	\$36,295	29%	\$186,968	56%
Grantee Total	Hawaii State Commission on National		46.5		\$318,162	\$311,625	\$79,057	26%	\$400,653	57%
<hr/>										
94ASCID013 Idaho Commission for National & Community Service										
<i>Formula</i>										
Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation	ID		10.0	\$12,382	\$67,533	\$38,745	\$53,003	38%	\$86,550	69%
Lewis-Clark State College	ID		13.0	\$13,265	\$90,535	\$67,390	\$17,268	14%	\$100,736	60%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			23.0		\$190,124	\$106,135	\$70,271	26%	\$187,286	64%
Grantee Total	Idaho Commission for National &		23.0		\$190,124	\$106,135	\$70,271	26%	\$187,286	64%
<hr/>										
94ASCIL014 Illinois Commission on Community Service										
<i>Competitive</i>										
Cornerstone Services, Inc.	IL		20.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$323,200	100%	\$0	0%
Mid-America Chapter, American Red Cross	IL		26.0	\$14,465	\$175,585	\$156,747	\$38,706	15%	\$128,650	45%
Public Allies - Chicago	IL		40.0	\$11,283	\$245,960	\$164,567	\$419,333	59%	\$112,673	41%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			86.0		\$506,110	\$321,314	\$781,239	58%	\$241,323	29%
<hr/>										
<i>Formula</i>										
Asian Human Services of Chicago, Inc.	IL		0.0	?	\$0	\$29,000	\$0	0%	\$9,667	25%
Belleville Area College	IL		22.0	\$12,739	\$151,345	\$100,864	\$31,666	15%	\$33,465	25%
Chicago Commons Association	IL		20.0	\$15,631	\$135,060	\$146,021	\$29,405	15%	\$58,888	29%
City of Decatur, Illinois	IL		24.0	\$12,884	\$162,072	\$90,011	\$38,690	15%	\$30,014	25%
Illinois Department of Corrections	IL		0.0	?	\$0	\$29,828	\$0	0%	\$22,616	43%
Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources	IL		25.0	\$13,957	\$174,785	\$143,280	\$75,825	27%	\$48,110	25%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Latino Youth, Inc.	IL		15.0	\$15,656	\$101,298	\$113,600	\$23,918	16%	\$36,799	24%
Rend Lake College	IL		20.0	\$12,321	\$143,004	\$91,618	\$27,317	15%	\$30,257	25%
Rend Lake College	IL		25.0	\$14,012	\$170,810	\$154,190	\$34,617	15%	\$101,680	40%
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	IL		20.0	\$13,274	\$135,060	\$101,403	\$28,962	15%	\$58,566	37%
Travelers & Immigrants Aid	IL		0.0	?	\$0	\$28,699	\$0	0%	\$45,668	61%
United Way of Champaign County	IL		20.0	\$15,297	\$135,060	\$140,411	\$32,400	16%	\$111,476	44%
Uptown Habitat for Humanity	IL		9.0	\$12,731	\$60,779	\$21,030	\$16,509	15%	\$82,114	80%
Formula Subtotal			200.0		\$1,666,150	\$1,189,955	\$339,309	13%	\$669,320	37%
Grantee Total	Illinois Commission on Community		286.0		\$2,172,260	\$1,511,269	\$1,120,548	21%	\$910,643	36%
<hr/>										
94ASCIN015	Indiana Commission on Community Service									
<hr/>										
Competitive										
Marion County Family Advocacy Center, Inc.	IN		20.0	\$12,564	\$135,462	\$85,444	\$29,264	15%	\$92,939	52%
State Student Assistance Commission of Indiana (SSACI)	IN		27.0	\$12,706	\$182,338	\$114,288	\$40,373	15%	\$230,334	67%
Competitive Subtotal			47.0		\$394,613	\$199,732	\$69,637	15%	\$323,273	59%
<hr/>										
Formula										
City of Elkhart	IN		18.0	\$13,586	\$121,554	\$92,035	\$54,307	26%	\$96,316	51%
Community Centers of Indianapolis, Inc.	IN		20.0	\$11,318	\$135,065	\$59,625	\$29,425	15%	\$28,032	32%
Fort Wayne Community Schools	IN		10.0	\$13,573	\$69,517	\$55,563	\$14,149	15%	\$46,067	45%
Fort Wayne Parks & Recreation Department	IN		11.5	\$13,225	\$51,750	\$82,076	\$70,011	50%	\$154,390	65%
Hoosier Valley Economic Opportunity Corporation	IN		10.0	\$13,466	\$67,530	\$49,923	\$16,248	16%	\$33,232	40%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS		Grantee Share %			
					A	B-F	Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Martin University	IN		13.5	\$13,753	\$91,418	\$86,940	\$17,424	15%	\$29,656	25%
Middle Way House, Inc.	IN		10.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Mt. Vernon Community School Corporation	IN		10.0	\$13,740	\$67,530	\$54,504	\$16,792	17%	\$103,565	66%
Telamon Corporation	IN		8.5	\$15,511	\$60,777	\$58,146	\$13,004	15%	\$35,437	38%
Formula Subtotal			111.5		\$809,499	\$538,812	\$231,360	19%	\$526,695	40%
Grantee Total	Indiana Commission on Community		158.5		\$1,204,112	\$738,545	\$300,997	18%	\$849,968	44%

94ASCIA016 Iowa Commission on Community Service

Competitive										
Des Moines Independent Community School District	IA		20.0	\$12,110	\$141,412	\$82,484	\$33,417	17%	\$43,213	34%
Mid-Iowa Community Action, Inc.	IA		25.0	\$10,391	\$168,832	\$51,126	\$36,819	15%	\$23,500	31%
Competitive Subtotal			45.0		\$368,366	\$133,610	\$70,236	16%	\$66,713	33%
Formula										
Community Corrections Improvement Association	IA		22.5	\$12,083	\$152,538	\$81,321	\$33,632	15%	\$127,294	61%
Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence	IA		20.0	\$12,134	\$135,060	\$74,709	\$30,746	15%	\$34,664	32%
Iowa State University Extension	IA		14.0	\$15,219	\$83,003	\$129,444	\$14,757	15%	\$120,537	48%
Formula Subtotal			56.5		\$442,129	\$285,474	\$79,135	15%	\$282,495	47%
Grantee Total	Iowa Commission on Community		101.5		\$810,495	\$419,084	\$149,371	16%	\$349,208	41%

94ASCK017 Kansas Commission on National and Community Service

Competitive										
Kansas State University	KS		42.0	\$14,581	\$128,313	\$436,404	\$49,737	22%	\$305,559	41%
Topeka Youth Project	KS		28.0	\$14,906	\$178,998	\$199,871	\$54,864	20%	\$166,090	45%

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			70.0		\$393,484	\$636,275	\$104,601	21%	\$471,649	43%
Formula										
Fort Hays State Univ		KS	20.0	\$11,450	\$130,050	\$86,451	\$25,156	15%	\$75,710	47%
Mennonite Housing Rehabilitation Services Inc		KS	8.0	\$14,481	\$54,026	\$44,309	\$12,648	15%	\$14,572	25%
United Way of Wyandotte County		KS	21.0	\$12,048	\$131,808	\$99,422	\$40,823	21%	\$91,430	48%
Wichita State University		KS	0.0	?	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			49.0		\$367,667	\$230,182	\$78,627	13%	\$181,712	30%
Grantee Total	Kansas Commission on National and		119.0		\$761,151	\$866,457	\$183,228	16%	\$653,361	34%

94ascky018 Kentucky Community Service Commission

Competitive										
Homeless and Housing Coalition of Kentucky, Inc.		KY	40.0	\$12,506	\$270,120	\$160,127	\$78,955	19%	\$187,627	54%
Morehead State University		KY	31.0	\$13,800	\$209,351	\$169,558	\$45,572	15%	\$382,118	69%
Northern Kentucky United Way and Community Chest		KY	20.0	\$13,596	\$135,060	\$102,441	\$29,908	15%	\$98,285	49%
Simpson County Board of Education		KY	25.0	\$12,911	\$169,065	\$114,685	\$36,722	15%	\$37,738	25%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			116.0		\$975,936	\$546,811	\$191,157	16%	\$705,768	49%
Formula										
Christian County Public Schools		KY	18.0	\$13,269	\$121,554	\$78,986	\$28,217	15%	\$68,983	47%
Community Action Council		KY	18.0	\$13,269	\$121,559	\$88,512	\$26,530	15%	\$33,791	28%
Eastern Kentucky University		KY	22.0	\$12,164	\$149,600	\$93,803	\$30,670	15%	\$230,130	71%
The Neighborhood Place		KY	18.5	\$13,017	\$125,129	\$86,957	\$46,532	23%	\$26,474	23%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			76.5		\$637,840	\$348,258	\$131,949	17%	\$359,378	42%

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Grantee Total	Kentucky Community Service		192.5		\$1,613,776	\$895,069	\$323,106	17%	\$1,065,146	46%
<hr/>										
94ASCLA019	Louisiana Serve Commission									
Competitive										
New Orleans Youth Action Corps	LA		66.0	\$30	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Competitive Subtotal			66.0		\$0	\$2,000	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
<hr/>										
Formula										
Mid City Redevelopment Alliance	LA		40.0	\$14,825	\$270,130	\$256,439	\$61,618	15%	\$140,449	35%
Shreveport Green	LA		7.5	\$16,667	\$53,610	\$61,925	\$11,150	15%	\$88,176	59%
Tri-State Girls & Boys Club	LA		0.0	?	\$0	\$45,000	\$0	0%	\$16,400	27%
University of Southwestern Louisiana	LA		19.0	\$14,432	\$135,850	\$126,477	\$26,076	15%	\$80,462	39%
Vernon Community Action Council Inc	LA		6.0	\$12,169	\$40,518	\$22,998	\$9,185	16%	\$18,118	44%
Formula Subtotal			72.5		\$597,389	\$512,839	\$108,029	12%	\$343,605	41%
Grantee Total	Louisiana Serve Commission		138.5		\$597,389	\$514,839	\$108,029	10%	\$343,605	34%
<hr/>										
94ASCME020	Maine Commission on National & Community Service									
Competitive										
Portland West Neighborhood Planning Council	ME		20.0	\$13,800	\$135,065	\$118,570	\$34,644	18%	\$68,267	37%
Competitive Subtotal			20.0		\$157,430	\$118,570	\$34,644	18%	\$68,267	37%
<hr/>										
Formula										
Job Training Administrative Office	ME		22.0	\$14,523	\$102,888	\$189,468	\$83,837	39%	\$230,989	55%
Formula Subtotal			22.0		\$130,032	\$189,468	\$83,837	39%	\$230,989	55%
Grantee Total	Maine Commission on National &		42.0		\$287,462	\$308,038	\$118,481	29%	\$299,256	46%
<hr/>										
94ASCMA022	Massachusetts National & Community Service Commission									

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Competitive										
City Year Boston	MA		308.0	\$11,688	?	?	\$304,651	15%	\$1,960,593	51%
YouthBuild Boston, Inc.	MA		89.0	\$12,204	\$245,752	\$764,615	\$160,730	33%	\$1,027,162	57%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			397.0		\$2,047,943	\$2,638,257	\$465,381	24%	\$2,987,755	54%
Formula										
Berkshire Training and Employment Program	MA		11.0	\$4,199	\$16,365	\$19,599	\$78,674	75%	\$135,551	87%
Cambridge Community Services	MA		5.5	\$13,696	\$30,129	\$41,503	\$17,612	34%	\$63,970	61%
City of New Bedford	MA		0.0	?	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	0%	\$25,421	50%
Corporation for Public Management	MA		8.0	\$16,118	\$31,725	\$89,219	\$47,831	55%	\$145,502	62%
Greater Holyoke Foundation, Inc.	MA		18.0	\$11,886	\$103,602	\$79,929	\$44,776	25%	\$114,811	59%
Lawrence Youth Commission	MA		30.0	\$8,369	\$100,888	\$121,601	\$75,647	37%	\$504,261	81%
Lowell YWCA	MA		10.0	\$6,000	\$39,735	\$9,910	\$40,985	45%	\$124,545	93%
Old Colony Y Services Corps	MA		24.0	\$10,417	\$109,300	\$115,900	\$54,100	29%	\$163,600	59%
ROCA Inc.	MA		15.0	\$10,101	\$52,602	\$88,589	\$93,483	60%	\$206,524	70%
University of Massachusetts at Boston	MA		0.0	?	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	0%	\$20,697	45%
University of Massachusetts Boston	MA		9.0	\$11,973	\$51,000	\$56,760	\$9,131	15%	\$127,274	69%
Worcester Community Action Council	MA		30.0	\$7,399	\$143,182	\$52,957	\$86,587	34%	\$202,455	79%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			160.5		\$830,733	\$725,967	\$548,826	34%	\$1,834,611	68%
Grantee Total	Massachusetts National & Community		557.5		\$2,878,676	\$3,364,224	\$1,014,207	33%	\$4,822,366	66%

94ASCM1023 Michigan Community Service Commission

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Competitive										
The Regents of The University of Michigan	MI		32.0	\$10,913	\$215,300	\$95,006	\$77,248	23%	\$295,627	76%
United Way Community Services	MI		20.0	\$13,083	\$135,065	\$90,440	\$38,136	18%	\$47,373	34%
Competitive Subtotal			52.0		\$425,431	\$185,446	\$115,384	21%	\$343,000	55%
Formula										
American Youth Foundation-Miniwanca	MI		21.0	\$14,565	\$141,818	\$131,026	\$37,491	18%	\$60,884	32%
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Metropolitan Detroit	MI		16.0	\$15,934	\$108,048	\$122,313	\$30,067	18%	\$49,875	29%
Eastern Michigan University	MI		19.0	\$11,684	\$67,100	\$142,444	\$119,461	60%	\$195,528	58%
Ecumenical Project SAVE	MI		20.0	\$12,050	\$135,060	\$74,188	\$30,628	16%	\$68,497	48%
Grand Rapids Service Corps	MI		34.0	\$7,728	\$192,000	\$42,239	\$129,638	37%	\$226,485	84%
Marquette County Health Department	MI		12.0	\$14,095	\$81,039	\$67,464	\$17,945	15%	\$22,448	25%
Michigan State University	MI		8.0	\$14,272	\$33,891	\$77,525	\$6,469	15%	\$115,725	60%
Oakland University	MI		20.0	\$12,068	\$143,004	\$92,880	\$26,201	15%	\$61,557	40%
SOS Crisis Center	MI		20.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
United Way of Genesee and Lapeer Counties	MI		28.0	\$11,432	\$191,869	\$90,614	\$40,498	15%	\$118,654	57%
United Way of Saginaw County	MI		32.0	\$9,583	\$187,095	\$88,451	\$166,970	43%	\$124,312	58%
Formula Subtotal			230.0		\$1,508,833	\$929,144	\$605,368	23%	\$1,043,965	45%
Grantee Total	Michigan Community Service		282.0		\$1,934,264	\$1,114,590	\$720,752	23%	\$1,386,965	46%

94ASCMN024 Minnesota Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive										
City of Saint Paul	MN		63.5	\$13,646	\$426,218	\$344,486	\$96,583	16%	\$208,463	38%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS		Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
					A	B-F	Grantee A	A%		
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	MN		77.0	\$604	\$0	\$2,326	?	96%	\$594,412	100%
Southeastern Minnesota Initiative Fund	MN		55.0	\$13,025	\$371,429	\$253,883	\$103,150	18%	\$94,193	27%
Competitive Subtotal			195.5		\$1,028,797	\$600,695	\$1,224,840	43%	\$897,068	55%
Formula										
Minneapolis Public Schools- Family and Community Education	MN		25.0	\$11,251	\$163,269	\$80,828	\$45,284	18%	\$177,558	69%
Minnesota Department of Economic Security	MN		67.5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$695,352	100%	\$695,486	100%
Neighborhood House Association	MN		24.0	\$10,825	\$137,447	\$95,240	\$68,590	29%	\$261,429	73%
Pillsbury Neighborhood Services, Inc.	MN		26.0	\$10,753	\$135,061	\$116,257	\$87,913	35%	\$111,214	49%
Two or More, Inc.	MN		25.0	\$14,012	\$167,930	\$134,946	\$39,145	15%	\$244,831	64%
Formula Subtotal			167.5		\$743,701	\$427,271	\$936,284	40%	\$1,490,518	71%
Grantee Total	Minnesota Commission on National &		363.0		\$1,772,498	\$1,027,966	\$2,161,124	41%	\$2,387,586	65%
94ASCMS025 Mississippi Commission for National & Community Service										
Formula										
North Mississippi Regional Center (NMRC)	MS		13.5	\$10,596	\$94,940	\$34,174	\$19,234	15%	\$23,789	41%
Operation Shoestring, Inc.	MS		27.0	\$11,211	\$182,338	\$85,749	\$38,284	15%	\$153,940	64%
Southern Coalition for Educational Equity	MS		15.0	\$15,123	\$101,295	\$99,689	\$23,271	15%	\$94,050	49%
Formula Subtotal			55.5		\$452,963	\$219,612	\$80,789	15%	\$271,779	51%
Grantee Total	Mississippi Commission for National		55.5		\$452,963	\$219,612	\$80,789	15%	\$271,779	51%
94ASCMO026 Missouri Commission on Community Service										
Competitive										
American Youth Foundation	MO		43.0	\$14,615	\$290,389	\$273,573	\$79,385	18%	\$335,839	55%

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
American Youth Foundation	MO		28.0	\$13,516	\$189,090	\$145,381	\$49,905	18%	\$219,680	60%
Grace Hill Neighborhood Services	MO		20.0	\$13,761	\$135,050	\$108,091	\$29,769	15%	\$93,167	46%
Competitive Subtotal			91.0		\$755,094	\$527,045	\$159,059	17%	\$648,686	54%
Formula										
Inter/Serv	MO		23.3	\$12,797	\$141,811	\$126,503	\$32,583	16%	\$89,464	41%
Lincoln Univ	MO		8.0	\$13,776	\$57,200	\$48,620	\$10,880	15%	\$27,939	36%
Southeast Missouri State University	MO		27.5	\$14,518	\$128,312	\$236,271	\$28,760	15%	\$125,823	35%
YMCA of Greater Kansas	MO		15.0	\$13,604	\$87,167	\$92,932	\$36,237	25%	\$143,850	61%
YouthNet of Greater Kansas City	MO		24.5	\$12,948	\$148,710	\$143,470	\$148,274	46%	\$142,965	50%
Formula Subtotal			98.3		\$680,459	\$647,796	\$256,734	23%	\$530,041	45%
Grantee Total	Missouri Commission on Community		189.3		\$1,435,553	\$1,174,841	\$415,793	21%	\$1,178,727	48%

94ASCMT027 Montana Community Services Advisory Council										
Competitive										
Montana Conservation Corps, Inc.	MT		118.5	\$7,574	\$384,333	\$386,025	\$731,212	59%	\$1,006,859	72%
The University of Montana	MT		5.0	\$8,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$8,960	100%	\$67,696	63%
Competitive Subtotal			123.5		\$511,475	\$426,025	\$740,172	79%	\$1,074,555	68%
Formula										
Missoula Aging Services, Inc.	MT		23.0	\$14,073	\$156,302	\$128,744	\$34,048	15%	\$66,018	34%
Formula Subtotal			23.0		\$194,940	\$128,744	\$34,048	15%	\$66,018	34%
Grantee Total	Montana Community Services		146.5		\$706,415	\$554,769	\$774,220	58%	\$1,140,573	56%

94ASCNC034 NC State Commission on National & Community Service										
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Competitive										
North Carolina State University		NC	30.0	\$13,678	\$195,360	\$199,263	\$37,250	15%	\$142,839	42%
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro		NC	35.0	\$12,261	\$202,055	\$171,940	\$85,729	25%	\$232,088	57%
Competitive Subtotal			65.0		\$468,273	\$371,203	\$122,979	20%	\$374,927	50%
Formula										
AIDS Service Agency of North Carolina, Inc.		NC	66.0	\$3,052	\$94,545	\$71,642	\$22,906	15%	\$230,566	76%
City of Wilmington, Wilmington Police Department		NC	14.0	\$11,473	\$98,512	\$47,811	\$23,250	17%	\$24,953	34%
Day Care Services Association		NC	22.0	\$12,186	\$145,953	\$86,538	\$39,050	18%	\$50,748	37%
Lutheran Family Services in the Carolinas		NC	21.3	\$9,407	\$106,602	\$72,298	\$22,663	15%	\$80,882	53%
NC Center for the Study of Black History		NC	17.0	\$11,850	\$121,554	\$67,290	\$23,675	15%	\$24,150	26%
NC Low Income Housing Coalition		NC	22.0	\$13,007	\$148,572	\$100,693	\$61,603	25%	\$276,589	73%
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill		NC	24.5	\$13,463	\$150,640	\$165,471	\$68,419	29%	\$158,341	49%
University of North Carolina at Charlotte		NC	12.5	\$7,592	\$0	\$94,903	\$0	0%	\$47,280	33%
Formula Subtotal			199.3		\$1,036,524	\$706,646	\$261,566	17%	\$893,509	48%
Grantee Total	NC State Commission on National &		264.3		\$1,504,797	\$1,077,849	\$384,545	17%	\$1,268,436	48%

94ASCNE028 Nebraska Commission for National and Community Service

Competitive										
Lincoln Action Program		NE	3.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Competitive Subtotal			3.0		\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Formula										
Community Action of Nebraska, Inc.		NE	24.0	\$13,975	\$162,078	\$127,986	\$36,602	15%	\$42,663	25%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Indian Centers, Inc.		NE	6.0	\$13,795	\$40,520	\$30,970	\$9,140	15%	\$21,330	41%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			30.0		\$259,214	\$158,956	\$45,742	15%	\$63,993	33%
Grantee Total	Nebraska Commission for National		33.0		\$259,214	\$158,956	\$45,742	10%	\$63,993	22%
<hr/>										
94ASCNV029	Nevada Commission for National & Community Service									
<i>Formula</i>										
Battle Mountain Band Council	Battle Mountain	NV	0.0	?	\$0	\$7,500	\$0	0%	\$2,539	25%
St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church		NV	10.0	\$13,332	\$67,533	\$49,995	\$14,704	15%	\$19,912	28%
University of Nevada, Las Vegas		NV	17.5	\$13,405	\$130,200	\$86,465	\$37,029	20%	\$61,785	43%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			27.5		\$231,440	\$143,960	\$51,733	12%	\$84,236	32%
Grantee Total	Nevada Commission for National &		27.5		\$231,440	\$143,960	\$51,733	12%	\$84,236	32%
<hr/>										
94ASCNH030	New Hampshire Commission on National & Community Service									
<i>Competitive</i>										
NH Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence		NH	32.0	\$13,016	\$202,590	\$166,534	\$44,115	15%	\$97,600	39%
Student Conservation Association, Inc.		NH	20.0	\$19,901	\$54,825	\$314,701	\$14,704	15%	\$142,400	31%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			52.0		\$333,298	\$481,235	\$58,819	15%	\$240,000	35%
<i>Formula</i>										
Newfound Area School District		NH	0.0	?	\$10,350	\$9,650	\$3,450	25%	\$6,675	41%
Tri-County Community Action Program, Inc.		NH	23.5	\$12,921	\$159,127	\$110,705	\$34,198	15%	\$37,935	26%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			23.5		\$203,288	\$120,355	\$37,648	20%	\$44,610	33%
Grantee Total	New Hampshire Commission on		75.5		\$536,586	\$601,590	\$96,467	18%	\$284,610	34%
<hr/>										
94ASCNJ031	New Jersey Commission on National & Community Service									

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Competitive										
Edison Youth Service Corps, Inc.	NJ		5.0	\$400	\$0	\$2,000	\$49,264	100%	\$41,292	95%
New Jersey Youth Corps	NJ		101.5	\$14,534	\$676,888	\$650,796	\$272,280	25%	\$666,241	51%
Urban Schools Service Corps	NJ		144.5	\$13,729	\$756,336	?	\$159,019	15%	\$413,866	28%
Competitive Subtotal			251.0		\$1,725,356	\$1,735,795	\$480,563	47%	\$1,121,399	58%
Formula										
Catholic Community Services	NJ		16.3	\$12,193	\$110,632	\$63,220	\$23,812	15%	\$29,318	32%
Community Agencies Corporation	NJ		23.5	\$12,082	\$81,039	\$172,335	\$19,694	15%	\$113,247	40%
International Institute of New Jersey	NJ		20.0	\$12,349	\$137,446	\$82,767	\$28,980	15%	\$102,758	55%
New Jersey Community Development Corporation	NJ		22.0	\$15,301	\$135,060	\$163,372	\$43,140	20%	\$68,200	29%
New Jersey Public Interest Research Foundation	NJ		22.5	\$12,322	\$135,065	\$108,422	\$38,585	19%	\$43,228	29%
Prevent Child Abuse--New Jersey Chapter	NJ		17.5	\$16,625	\$119,554	\$144,258	\$30,375	17%	\$57,899	29%
Rutgers University	NJ		20.7	\$12,097	\$146,112	\$86,686	\$29,024	15%	\$116,299	57%
Union City Day Care Program, Inc.	NJ		20.0	\$10,133	\$13,506	\$185,543	\$3,022	15%	\$251,886	58%
Formula Subtotal			162.4		\$1,079,925	\$1,006,603	\$216,632	16%	\$782,835	41%
Grantee Total	New Jersey Commission on National &		413.4		\$2,805,281	\$2,742,398	\$697,195	25%	\$1,904,234	46%
94ASCNM032 New Mexico Commission for National & Community Service										
Competitive										
National Indian Youth Leadership Development Project Inc	NM		20.0	\$14,440	\$135,060	\$137,743	\$26,664	15%	\$45,021	25%
Competitive Subtotal			20.0		\$151,059	\$137,743	\$26,664	15%	\$45,021	25%

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Formula										
Siete del Norte Community Development Corporation		NM	21.5	\$14,845	\$148,028	\$155,377	\$28,905	15%	\$71,728	32%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			21.5		\$163,793	\$155,377	\$28,905	15%	\$71,728	32%
Grantee Total	New Mexico Commission for National		41.5		\$314,852	\$293,120	\$55,569	15%	\$116,749	28%

94ASCNY033 New York Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive										
Aspira of New York, Inc.		NY	83.0	\$13,800	\$560,519	\$460,440	\$120,875	15%	\$252,720	35%
City Volunteer Corps, Inc		NY	120.0	\$12,950	\$441,288	?	\$123,992	19%	\$570,283	35%
New York City Police Department		NY	43.5	\$11,547	\$172,484	\$316,631	\$178,874	49%	\$319,899	50%
New York State Corps Collaboration		NY	132.0	\$13,800	\$810,578	\$819,538	\$217,328	18%	\$804,415	50%
RF/CUNY on behalf of New York City Technical College		NY	12.5	\$2,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	0%	\$47,295	65%
Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families		NY	65.0	\$10,740	\$438,945	\$132,913	\$99,756	15%	\$173,737	57%
The Institute for Human Services, Inc.		NY	20.0	\$13,800	\$135,065	\$103,440	\$34,731	17%	\$192,360	65%
<i>Competitive Subtotal</i>			476.0		\$3,125,976	\$2,896,399	\$775,556	19%	\$2,360,709	51%

Formula										
Bedford Stuyvesant Community Conference Inc.		NY	20.0	\$13,800	\$135,065	\$122,051	\$27,167	15%	\$76,201	38%
Bronx Youth Conservation Corps (BYCC)		NY	35.0	\$12,432	\$221,500	\$165,878	\$165,120	38%	\$123,452	43%
Clinton County Youth Bureau		NY	15.0	\$11,190	\$67,533	\$84,481	\$14,711	15%	\$30,550	27%
Health Association of Niagara County, Inc. (HANCI)		NY	20.0	\$13,800	\$135,065	\$109,041	\$29,463	15%	\$271,110	71%
Monroe Community College		NY	94.0	\$12,094	\$634,806	\$318,781	\$144,362	15%	\$328,932	51%
New York State Corps Collaboration c/o YRDC		NY	50.0	\$13,800	\$317,234	\$300,141	\$72,642	16%	\$240,598	44%

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS		Grantee Share %			
					A	B-F	Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
New York State Council on Children and Families	NY		20.0	\$12,675	\$135,065	\$78,106	\$30,950	15%	\$89,869	54%
Phoenix House Foundation, Inc.	NY		91.5	\$9,960	\$506,494	\$280,961	\$196,765	24%	\$582,655	67%
YMCA of Greater New York: AmeriCorps Project	NY		20.0	\$13,773	\$135,060	\$103,590	\$71,435	29%	\$134,106	56%
Youth Resource Development Corporation (YRDC)	NY		20.0	\$13,793	\$130,139	\$105,029	\$39,144	19%	\$41,425	28%
Formula Subtotal			385.5		\$3,029,875	\$1,668,059	\$791,759	20%	\$1,918,898	48%
Grantee Total	New York Commission on National &		861.5		\$6,155,851	\$4,564,458	\$1,567,315	20%	\$4,279,607	49%

94ASCOK037 Oklahoma Community Service Commission

Formula										
Literacy Coalition for Metro Tulsa Inc	OK		24.0	\$11,026	\$162,078	\$65,840	\$35,079	15%	\$143,008	68%
OK State Service Council - American Red Cross	OK		20.0	\$10,069	\$135,065	\$41,906	\$39,900	20%	\$79,932	66%
Rural Health Projects, Inc.	OK		22.0	\$15,645	\$148,968	\$160,276	\$32,456	15%	\$115,960	42%
Formula Subtotal			66.0		\$542,165	\$268,022	\$107,435	17%	\$338,900	59%
Grantee Total	Oklahoma Community Service		66.0		\$542,165	\$268,022	\$107,435	17%	\$338,900	59%

94ASCOR038 Oregon Community Service Commission

Competitive										
COCC (Central Oregon Community College Foundation)	Bend OR		18.8	\$13,956	\$127,682	\$120,615	\$24,924	15%	\$76,635	39%
Forest Grove School District	OR		16.0	\$125	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Maple Elementary School/School District #19, Springfield	OR		10.0	\$200	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	0%	\$15,308	88%
Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence	OR		21.0	\$15,815	\$141,813	\$156,615	\$33,944	16%	\$53,642	26%
Competitive Subtotal			65.8		\$316,561	\$281,230	\$58,868	8%	\$145,585	38%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Formula										
Friends of the Children	Portland	OR	20.0	\$15,930	\$135,065	\$157,900	\$28,358	15%	\$104,302	40%
Multnomah County District Attorney's Office		OR	20.0	\$11,646	\$131,460	\$70,014	\$51,637	24%	\$24,595	26%
OR Dept of Human Resources (DHR)		OR	20.0	\$12,305	\$135,065	\$78,889	\$29,509	15%	\$24,985	24%
Formula Subtotal			60.0		\$490,815	\$306,803	\$109,504	18%	\$153,882	30%
Grantee Total	Oregon Community Service Commission		125.8		\$807,376	\$588,033	\$168,372	12%	\$299,467	35%

94ASCPA039 PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service										
Competitive										
PA Association of Colleges and Universities		PA	50.0	\$15,898	\$337,650	\$391,641	\$86,412	18%	\$136,425	26%
Competitive Subtotal			50.0		\$403,260	\$391,641	\$86,412	18%	\$136,425	26%

Formula										
Appalchia Intermediate Unit 8-PA Mountain Service Corps		PA	52.0	\$13,994	\$351,169	\$293,756	\$76,580	15%	\$167,154	36%
Butler Regional Family Treatment Program Service		PA	26.5	\$14,825	\$135,060	\$222,123	\$31,282	15%	\$83,727	27%
City of Philadelphia, Fairmount Park Commission		PA	5.0	\$11,731	\$40,000	\$8,936	\$34,768	41%	\$60,256	87%
County of Allegheny Department of Federal Program		PA	20.0	\$13,434	\$135,060	\$101,275	\$29,550	15%	\$32,975	25%
Energy Coordinating Agency of Philadelphia, Inc.		PA	25.0	\$13,769	\$168,831	\$132,384	\$37,383	15%	\$257,226	66%
Keystone School District		PA	31.0	\$13,562	\$203,872	\$176,477	\$43,050	15%	\$62,056	26%
Pennsylvania Campus Compact/PACU		PA	35.0	\$16,679	\$235,620	\$316,481	\$47,168	15%	\$166,760	35%
Union-Snyder Office of Human Resources		PA	21.5	\$10,526	\$145,681	\$56,957	\$29,886	15%	\$83,890	60%
Visions International, Inc.		PA	50.0	\$7,437	\$216,887	\$78,216	\$213,848	42%	\$880,919	92%
YouthBuild Pittsburgh, Inc.		PA	35.0	\$13,656	\$236,355	\$191,716	\$50,517	15%	\$64,166	25%

Atlantic

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Formula Subtotal			301.0		\$2,294,130	\$1,578,321	\$594,032	20%	\$1,859,129	48%
Grantee Total	PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of		351.0		\$2,697,390	\$1,969,962	\$680,444	20%	\$1,995,554	46%
<hr/>										
94ASCP040		Puerto Rico State Commission of Community Service								
Competitive										
Centros Sor Isolina Ferre, Inc.	PR		20.0	\$14,000	\$135,065	\$116,078	\$28,929	15%	\$70,296	39%
Competitive Subtotal			20.0		\$163,923	\$116,078	\$28,929	15%	\$70,296	39%
Formula										
The Office of Arroyo Mayor	PR		21.0	\$13,004	\$141,638	\$95,630	\$31,959	15%	\$41,895	30%
University of the Sacred Heart	PR		20.0	\$13,301	\$139,035	\$103,283	\$28,719	15%	\$80,487	44%
Youth Service Center, Arecibo	PR		30.0	\$12,283	\$202,598	\$135,844	\$40,607	15%	\$81,596	38%
Formula Subtotal			71.0		\$572,843	\$334,757	\$101,285	15%	\$203,978	37%
Grantee Total	Puerto Rico State Commission of		91.0		\$736,766	\$450,835	\$130,214	15%	\$274,274	38%
<hr/>										
94ASCR1041		Rhode Island Commission for National and Community Service								
Competitive										
City Year, Inc.	RI		66.0	\$12,717	\$311,355	\$468,309	\$65,469	15%	\$392,953	46%
Public Education Fund	RI		28.5	\$15,439	\$200,469	\$197,915	\$86,710	26%	\$207,656	51%
The Rhode Island Children's Crusade for Higher Education	RI		32.0	\$15,454	\$216,096	\$228,026	\$83,575	24%	\$117,891	34%
Competitive Subtotal			126.5		\$879,575	\$894,250	\$235,754	22%	\$718,500	44%
Formula										
City of Pawtucket	RI		19.0	\$15,789	\$128,311	\$139,093	\$28,396	15%	\$88,126	39%
Formula Subtotal			19.0		\$160,907	\$139,093	\$28,396	15%	\$88,126	39%
Grantee Total	Rhode Island Commission for National		145.5		\$1,040,482	\$1,033,343	\$264,150	20%	\$806,626	42%

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
94ASCSC042 South Carolina Commission on National & Community Service										
Formula										
Benedict College		SC	20.0	\$11,787	\$135,060	\$69,948	\$30,448	16%	\$24,500	26%
Lander University & Upper Savannah Cons. for Child & Family		SC	16.0	\$15,162	\$98,573	\$122,728	\$20,305	14%	\$76,305	38%
South Carolina Victim Assistance Network		SC	24.0	\$12,298	\$147,849	\$109,463	\$32,767	15%	\$43,163	28%
University of South Carolina		SC	28.0	\$11,267	\$135,999	\$152,403	\$28,323	15%	\$117,023	43%
Formula Subtotal			88.0		\$634,414	\$454,542	\$111,843	15%	\$260,991	34%
Grantee Total	South Carolina Commission on		88.0		\$634,414	\$454,542	\$111,843	15%	\$260,991	34%

94ASCTN044 Tenn. Commission on National & Community Service										
Competitive										
Memphis City Schools		TN	18.3	\$18,328	\$133,075	\$178,034	\$27,082	15%	\$131,808	43%
Nashville Healthcare Partnership/Middle Tennessee		TN	40.0	\$13,657	\$270,120	\$207,258	\$62,210	16%	\$557,620	73%
NashvilleREAD, Inc.		TN	21.0	\$13,560	\$141,818	\$106,809	\$31,402	15%	\$61,248	36%
Porter-Leath Children's Center		TN	20.0	\$12,015	\$128,359	\$80,069	\$28,275	15%	\$69,706	47%
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga		TN	20.0	\$13,426	\$135,065	\$99,041	\$29,906	15%	\$69,580	41%
Competitive Subtotal			119.3		\$1,004,651	\$671,211	\$178,875	15%	\$889,962	48%

Formula										
Appalachia Habitat for Humanity		TN	8.0	\$10,956	\$54,026	\$19,863	\$11,962	15%	\$226,532	92%
Auxiliary Probation Service, Juvenile Court of Memphis & She		TN	25.0	\$64	\$0	\$1,600	\$0	0%	\$115,648	99%
Exchange Club Center for the Prevention of Child Abuse		TN	17.5	\$15,353	\$67,532	\$182,967	\$15,125	15%	\$283,414	61%
Knoxville-Knox County Community Action Committee		TN	20.0	\$13,800	\$137,049	\$96,387	\$31,694	15%	\$100,033	51%

South

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS		Grantee Share %			
					A	B-F	Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
North Tennessee Private Industry Council, Inc.	TN		20.0	\$11,800	\$135,060	\$70,005	\$29,299	15%	\$92,970	57%
TN Dept. of Mental Health/Health Retardation	TN		5.0	\$14,220	\$0	\$70,071	\$182	15%	\$33,640	32%
Upper Cumberland County Community Health Agency	TN		10.0	\$11,755	\$61,200	\$49,715	\$11,970	15%	\$58,830	54%
Vanderbilt University Medical Center/Center for Health Servi	TN		20.0	\$13,829	\$135,065	\$107,849	\$29,786	15%	\$107,322	50%
Formula Subtotal			125.5		\$736,683	\$598,457	\$130,018	13%	\$1,018,389	62%
Grantee Total	Tenn. Commission on National &		244.8		\$1,741,334	\$1,269,668	\$308,893	14%	\$1,908,351	57%

94ASCTX045 Texas Commission for National & Community Service

Competitive										
American Institute for Learning	TX		95.0	\$13,750	\$406,700	\$777,675	\$296,143	36%	\$991,174	56%
Children's Association for Maximum Potential (CAMP)	TX		20.0	\$1,535	\$0	\$30,690	\$0	0%	\$26,494	46%
City Year Inc	TX		65.0	\$12,588	\$283,050	\$475,793	\$60,426	15%	\$425,589	47%
Dallas Youth Services Corps	TX		90.0	\$8,292	\$337,650	\$320,587	\$121,160	22%	\$108,580	25%
Greater Dallas Community of Churches	TX		43.0	\$13,753	\$294,359	\$236,996	\$73,436	17%	\$220,009	48%
Mental Health Association in Texas	TX		84.0	\$11,770	\$572,434	\$280,309	\$125,023	15%	\$210,554	43%
Serve Houston	TX		109.8	\$11,873	\$549,324	\$605,668	\$211,379	23%	\$263,959	30%
Workreation Inc	TX		21.1	\$14,078	\$143,405	\$119,195	\$31,387	15%	\$81,546	41%
Competitive Subtotal			527.9		\$3,235,513	\$2,846,913	\$918,954	18%	\$2,327,905	42%
Formula										
Armed Services YMCA	TX		20.0	\$13,033	\$135,065	\$89,072	\$30,283	15%	\$29,026	25%
City Year Inc	TX		0.0	?	\$0	\$2,240	\$0	0%	\$2,000	47%

Southwest

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Middle Earth Unlimited Inc - Dba Youth Options	TX		26.0	\$13,485	\$178,761	\$138,480	\$37,433	15%	\$45,561	25%
Project Vida	TX		19.5	\$11,089	\$135,061	\$55,950	\$28,288	15%	\$18,742	25%
School of Social Work - Univ of TX at Arlington	TX		31.3	\$13,779	\$176,724	\$229,437	\$35,501	15%	\$80,332	26%
Serve Houston	TX		25.2	\$11,874	\$125,993	\$138,916	\$48,482	23%	\$60,542	30%
Texas Agricultural Extension Service	TX		46.0	\$13,299	\$236,363	\$330,094	\$348,851	55%	\$134,465	29%
Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	TX		46.5	\$6,255	\$0	\$290,851	\$0	0%	\$243,604	46%
The Capitol Area Foster Parents Association	TX		20.0	\$11,554	\$135,065	\$51,410	\$31,706	15%	\$88,538	63%
The University of Texas at Austin	TX		51.3	\$7,446	\$0	\$258,467	\$21,745	15%	\$91,281	26%
The University of Texas at El Paso	TX		12.0	\$12,334	\$71,500	\$65,063	\$14,755	15%	\$23,217	26%
Workreation Inc	TX		22.9	\$14,050	\$155,326	\$129,103	\$33,997	15%	\$88,324	41%
Youth Harvest Community Services Program	TX		50.0	\$13,800	\$325,125	\$327,389	\$63,990	15%	\$107,600	25%
Formula Subtotal			370.6		\$2,127,995	\$2,106,472	\$695,031	16%	\$1,013,232	33%
Grantee Total	Texas Commission for National &		898.5		\$5,363,508	\$4,953,385	\$1,613,985	17%	\$3,341,137	37%
94ASCUT046 Utah Commission on National & Community Service										
Competitive										
Association for Utah Community Health	UT		18.0	\$12,563	\$114,750	\$84,905	\$47,073	25%	\$47,286	36%
Competitive Subtotal			18.0		\$141,220	\$84,905	\$47,073	25%	\$47,286	36%
Formula										
Davis County	UT		10.0	\$10,841	\$68,850	\$32,520	\$13,391	15%	\$124,038	79%
Dixie College	UT		8.0	\$10,550	\$43,987	\$35,007	\$21,795	31%	\$40,608	54%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-C	B-G%
Grand County Council	UT		8.5	\$12,052	\$55,036	\$37,370	\$42,015	39%	\$115,608	76%
Ogden City Corporation	UT		0.0	?	\$0	\$24,999	\$0	0%	\$8,415	25%
Salt Lake County - YOUTH FORCE	UT		15.0	\$11,343	\$101,295	\$42,219	\$30,904	19%	\$26,813	39%
Formula Subtotal			41.5		\$318,272	\$172,115	\$108,105	21%	\$315,482	55%
Grantee Total	Utah Commission on National &		59.5		\$459,492	\$257,020	\$155,178	22%	\$362,768	51%

94ASCVT048 Vermont Commission on National & Community Service

Formula										
Lyndon State College	VT		22.5	\$13,321	\$152,940	\$110,427	\$33,405	15%	\$87,094	44%
Formula Subtotal			22.5		\$189,290	\$110,427	\$33,405	15%	\$87,094	44%
Grantee Total	Vermont Commission on National &		22.5		\$189,290	\$110,427	\$33,405	15%	\$87,094	44%

94ASCVA049 Virginia Commission on National & Community Service

Formula										
Fredricksburg City Public Schools	VA		20.0	\$10,687	\$135,860	\$62,731	\$26,649	15%	\$28,549	31%
Northern Virginia Urban League, Inc.	VA		20.0	\$16,048	\$135,065	\$154,596	\$29,356	15%	\$135,027	47%
Southwest Virginia Community College	VA		20.0	\$11,002	\$0	\$220,041	\$0	0%	\$60,790	22%
Urban League of Hampton Roads	VA		15.0	\$6,413	\$0	\$96,188	\$0	0%	\$59,000	38%
Virginia Commonwealth University	VA		20.0	\$11,995	\$130,917	\$93,333	\$25,865	15%	\$34,195	27%
Formula Subtotal			95.0		\$463,937	\$626,889	\$81,870	9%	\$317,561	33%
Grantee Total	Virginia Commission on National &		95.0		\$463,937	\$626,889	\$81,870	9%	\$317,561	33%

94ASCWA047 Washington Commission on National & Community Service

Competitive										
Department of Ecology	WA		100.0	\$593	\$0	\$3,200	?	95%	\$861,340	100%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %		Grantee B-G	B-G%
							Grantee A	A%		
Employment Security Department	WA		384.3	\$9,096	?	?	?	51%	\$928,818	36%
Kitsap Community Action Program (KCAP)	WA		29.0	\$12,531	\$195,837	\$133,930	\$40,504	15%	\$64,437	32%
Competitive Subtotal			513.3		\$2,097,125	\$1,820,584	\$3,050,235	54%	\$1,854,595	56%
Formula										
Community Youth Services	WA		32.5	\$11,028	\$219,104	\$89,475	\$67,123	20%	\$30,000	25%
Educational Service District 101	WA		22.0	\$14,654	\$104,292	\$193,664	\$93,068	42%	\$143,639	43%
Neutral Zone	WA		20.0	\$12,210	\$137,040	\$91,131	\$56,181	27%	\$58,209	39%
Pasco School District #1	WA		20.0	\$13,841	\$132,804	\$112,060	\$34,677	17%	\$99,298	47%
YMCA of Snohomish County	WA		20.0	\$12,975	\$140,618	\$94,487	\$42,400	20%	\$88,700	48%
Formula Subtotal			114.5		\$880,491	\$580,817	\$293,449	25%	\$419,846	40%
Grantee Total	Washington Commission on National		627.8		\$2,977,616	\$2,401,401	\$3,343,684	36%	\$2,274,441	46%

94ASCWI051 Wisconsin National & Community Service Board

Competitive										
Kenosha Voluntary Action Center II	WI		11.0	\$13,404	\$73,594	\$69,914	\$29,610	28%	\$70,518	50%
Milwaukee Community Service Corps	WI		37.0	\$7,669	\$128,307	\$128,396	\$79,956	34%	\$44,663	26%
Competitive Subtotal			48.0		\$232,890	\$198,310	\$109,566	31%	\$115,181	38%
Formula										
Catholic Charities Bureau, Inc.	WI		0.0	?	\$0	\$7,606	\$0	0%	\$23,116	75%
Community Adolescent Program, Inc.	WI		16.0	\$15,335	\$98,900	\$119,070	\$35,236	22%	\$123,660	51%
Kenosha Voluntary Action Center	WI		11.0	\$13,953	\$73,594	\$69,914	\$30,675	27%	\$70,518	50%
NorthCentral Technical College	WI		27.0	\$9,781	\$158,696	\$73,157	\$35,129	16%	\$33,800	32%

North Central

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
Open Door Community Center, Inc.	WI		12.0	\$15,138	\$82,620	\$88,125	\$16,439	15%	\$29,375	25%
Operation Fresh Start, Inc.	WI		16.0	\$10,817	\$108,040	\$30,490	\$36,115	20%	\$92,543	75%
Western Wisconsin Private Industry Council, Inc.	WI		20.0	\$10,851	\$135,065	\$60,429	\$33,635	18%	\$20,158	25%
Formula Subtotal			102.0		\$793,483	\$448,791	\$187,229	17%	\$393,170	48%
Grantee Total	Wisconsin National & Community		150.0		\$1,026,373	\$647,101	\$296,795	20%	\$508,351	45%
<hr/>										
94ASCWV050	WV Commission for National & Community Service									
Competitive										
West Virginia Research Corp	Morgantown	WV	13.3	\$13,317	\$60,077	\$112,593	\$56,322	46%	\$248,279	69%
Competitive Subtotal			13.3		\$64,967	\$112,593	\$56,322	46%	\$248,279	69%
Formula										
Regional Family Resources Network (RFRN)	Charleston	WV	15.0	\$10,705	\$102,486	\$37,286	\$23,735	16%	\$53,277	59%
Southern Appalachian Labor School		WV	15.0	\$7,050	\$68,000	\$30,950	\$58,849	44%	\$254,854	89%
West Virginia Coalition Against Domestic Violence		WV	12.0	\$16,979	\$81,039	\$103,397	\$20,162	17%	\$34,223	25%
Formula Subtotal			42.0		\$298,442	\$171,633	\$102,746	26%	\$342,354	58%
Grantee Total	WV Commission for National &		55.3		\$363,409	\$284,226	\$159,068	31%	\$590,633	60%
<hr/>										
94ASCWY052	Wyoming Commission for National & Community Service									
Competitive										
Wyoming Crime Victims Compensation Commission		WY	20.0	\$13,745	\$135,060	\$105,074	\$29,974	15%	\$35,500	25%
Competitive Subtotal			20.0		\$169,817	\$105,074	\$29,974	15%	\$35,500	25%
Formula										
Laramie County Community College		WY	11.3	\$9,360	\$0	\$105,300	\$0	0%	\$40,561	28%
Wyoming Congress of Parents and Teachers (dba Wyoming PTA)		WY	20.5	\$9,498	\$146,575	\$34,464	\$28,282	15%	\$12,136	26%

Pacific

Subgrantee	City	State	FTEs	CNS share per FTE	CNS A	CNS B-F	Grantee Share %			
							Grantee A	A%	Grantee B-G	B-G%
<i>Formula Subtotal</i>			31.8		\$160,236	\$139,764	\$28,282	8%	\$52,697	27%
Grantee Total	Wyoming Commission for National &		51.8		\$330,053	\$244,838	\$58,256	10%	\$88,197	26%
Total	364 Programs		10,726.2		\$72,858,619	\$57,750,253	\$26,884,566	21%	\$56,387,301	45%

CNS Total \$130,608,872

Grantee Total \$83,271,867

Shirley
need to discuss exactly
what you need but this is
my interpretation. *huket*

	Corporation		Grantee		Total	
	Share	%	Match	%		%
AmeriCorps*State						
A. Member Support Costs	\$72,952,228	55.6%	\$25,834,345	31.8%	\$98,786,573	46.5%
B through F Costs	\$58,247,624	44.4%	\$55,348,401	68.2%	\$113,596,025	53.5%
Total	\$131,199,852		\$81,182,746		\$212,382,598	
AmeriCorps*National (except Federals)						
A. Member Support Costs	\$21,098,778	48.4%	\$11,675,083	31.7%	\$32,773,861	40.8%
B through F Costs	\$22,514,534	51.6%	\$25,115,808	68.3%	\$47,630,342	59.2%
Total	\$43,613,312		\$36,790,891		\$80,404,203	
AmeriCorps*Tribes and Territories						
A. Member Support Costs	\$1,439,725	51.0%	\$721,764	37.7%	\$2,161,489	45.6%
B through F Costs	\$1,382,544	49.0%	\$1,190,998	62.3%	\$2,573,542	54.4%
Total	\$2,822,269		\$1,912,762		\$4,735,031	
Total AmeriCorps*State and AmeriCorps*National & AmeriCorps*Tribes and Territories (except Federals)						
A. Member Support Costs	\$95,490,731	53.8%	\$38,231,192	31.9%	\$133,721,923	44.9%
B through F Costs	\$82,144,702	46.2%	\$81,655,207	68.1%	\$163,799,909	55.1%
Total	\$177,635,433		\$119,886,399		\$297,521,832	

1996 REAUTHORIZATION COMMENTS: MATCH-RELATED

Shirley - your request. TR

SENDER	ORGANIZATION	State	Program Source	TOPIC AREA	COMMENT
Betty Hicks	Arkansas Commission	AR	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Should set match requirement to economic indices for different areas w/different resources; 2) Clarify fundraising/donation solicitation limits
John Wedemeyer, Director	YMCA/CSU PRYDE AmeriCorps Consortium	CA	AC* N/S	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Reduce 15% match requirement to 5% for greater innovative & fiscal flexibility; 2) Allow programs to use resources for other fed/state agencies for cash match requirement; 3) Retain 25% combined cash/in-kind match requirement as is
Roger Landrum, President	Youth Service America	DC	T/TA	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Provide only matching, competitive grants; 2) Make federal match less than 50% of costs
David Pierce, President	American Association of Community Colleges	DC	L&S	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Increase nonfederal share -- Service-learning programs can be self-sustaining within 3 years of inception
Jim Pitofsky, President	National and Community Service Coalition	DC	N/A	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Maintain current levels of match requirements
Jim Pitofsky, President	National and Community Service Coalition	DC	N/A	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Devote more time to aiding grantees to secure non-federal support (e.g. thru T/TA on securing & sustaining support)
Kathleen Selz, Executive Director	(NASCC)	DC	T/TA	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Retain current match requirements as a minimum; 2) Offer incentives (e.g. funding priority) to programs that can provide more state or local cash match
Patricia Kells	Kansas Office for Community Service	KS	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Require increased match by year for AmeriCorps subgrantees; 2) Continue increased match required for L&S grantees
Dave Crowley, Director	Kentucky Community Service Commission	KY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Clarify max. time period for receipt of CNS funds; 2) Increase match requirement (e.g. 15% - 25% - 33% - 50% - 75%); 3) Allow programs to tap into other fed. funding streams for non-CNS match
Dave Crowley, Director	Kentucky Community Service Commission	KY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Create challenge grant system; 2) Or, guarantee dollar for dollar matching on funds the legislature designate for implementation for the State plan
Massachusetts Commission	Massachusetts Commission	MA	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Mandate minimum 10% <i>state</i> cash match for all program funds awarded by CNS to state
Fran Rothstein, Washington Rep.	AmeriCorps/Youth Volunteer Corps of America	MD	AC* Natl	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Increase non-federal match (including in-kind) to 50% of program costs; 2) Maintain current match requirements for stipends
Gregory C. Piazzn	(In support of) Oakland University	MI	N/A	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Reduce match requirements; 2) Broaden types of funds that can be used for match; 3) Open dialogue w/business assoc. & foundations for funding contributions

1996 REAUTHORIZATION COMMENTS: MATCH-RELATED

SENDER	ORGANIZATION	State	Program Source	TOPIC AREA	COMMENT
Betty Marver		MO		Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Localize identity of programs to encourage community investment
Ryan Tolleson Knee & Andrea Vernon	Montana Campus Corps/Montana Campus Compact, U. of Montana	MT	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Require a hard cash match from each program
Ellen Edwards Mushinski & Rowena Madden	New Jersey Commission on National and Community Service	NJ	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Give corporations more flexibility to sponsor teams or entire programs
Sandee Jourden, Director	RSVP/Village of Ruidoso	NM	RSVP	Match	<i>Recommendations:</i> 1) Streamline finances at national and state level; 2) Timetable for increasing match requirements depends on public perception and awareness of national service
	Clinton County AmeriCorps	NY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Eliminate matching grant requirements
	The Institute For Human Services	NY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations:</i> 1) Don't increase match requirements; 2) Give businesses who fund programs free publicity
	The Institute For Human Services	NY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Change to overall in-kind match of 25%
Gary Bogle, Executive Director	AmeriCorps/Save A Generation, Bronx Youth Conservation Corps	NY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations:</i> 1) Create a bridge/network to create job training related to objectives of funders; 2) Match timetable of 3-year projects not as attractive to corporations who make projections based on 3-5 years
Gary Bogle, Executive Director	AmeriCorps/Save A Generation, Bronx Youth Conservation Corps	NY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> 75%/25% 1st year; 70%/30% 2nd year; 50%/50% 3rd year
Nikki Smith, on behalf of Commission	New York Commission	NY	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendations:</i> 1) Don't increase non-federal match requirements; 2) Wean programs off federal share in 3rd year to make programs self-sustaining
Richard Pinner, Program Director	AmeriCorps/"I Have a Dream" Foundation	NY	AC* Natl.	Match	<i>Recommendations:</i> 1) Phase in increases to match requirement; 2) Change time frame for applications & awards to facilitate solicitation of private sector funding
Karen Scheid, Executive Director	VISTA/The Ohio Literacy Network	OH	Vista	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Create a sliding scale for cost share
Glenn C. Odenbrett, Director	AmeriCorps, L&S/Ofc. of Student Community Service, CWRU	OH	AC* N/S, L&S	Match	<i>Recommendation:</i> Give preference to programs that agree to highest allowable federal share - 75% for programs affiliated w/nonprofits

1996 REAUTHORIZATION COMMENTS: MATCH-RELATED

SENDER	ORGANIZATION	State	Program Source	TOPIC AREA	COMMENT
Jerry Gabay for Jon Stewart, Director	AmeriCorps/NorthWest Service Academy	OR/WA	AC* Natl.	Match	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Allow programs to seek matching federal funds when working w/federal partners; 2) Include more TA w/program analysis if federal dollars disallowed for match
Julie Ley, VISTA volunteer	VISTA/One to One Philadelphia	PA	Vista	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Ask programs to match 50% of VISTA's living allowance and ed award
Sonia M. Gigliotti	L&S Sponsor/Rouse-Warren County Home	PA	L&S	Match	<i>Comment</i> : Federal share of funding for programs (e.g. L&S) leads to local matching funds and commitment
David Karoff, Executive Director	Rhode Island State Commission	RI	AC* State	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Establish concrete incentives for raising private sector funds (e.g. dollar for dollar match for funds raised beyond requirements)
Lynda Diane Mull, Executive Director	AmeriCorps/AFOP	VA	AC* Natl.	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Do not increase match requirements
Patricia Bollin, Coordinator	VISTA/Washington-Oregon Housing Authorities	WA	Vista	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : Make cost share equitable at 50-50 level for CNS programs to be recognized as resources for the community
Donald J. Eberly, Founding Director	National Service Secretariat		N/A	Match	<i>Recommendation</i> : (Includes a formula for a rationale for cost-sharing and determining the degree of decision-making by all parties contributing to cost of AmeriCorps)
Lynn Thornton, Executive Director	Georgia Commission	GA	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation</i> : Allow a percentage of time for programs, members, & State Commissions for fundraising
Patricia Kells	Kansas Office for Community Service	KS	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Allow 15% of ACMs' time to be spent on fundraising (15% member costs currently paid by grantee); 2) Allow %-age proportionate to matching funds of State Commission staff time to be engaged in fundraising
Lynn Bopp	Maryland Governor's Commission on Service	MD	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) More public recognition (perhaps by White House); 2) Guarantee efficient use of private sector funds for purposes specified by funder; 3) Explain to funders that natl. service stretches their charity dollars
Lynn Bopp	Maryland Governor's Commission on Service	MD	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendations</i> : 1) Open service doors to funder's employees; 2) Use private sector's human resources - In-kind contributions; 3) Offer programs opportunities to meet & get to know private funders
Lynn Bopp	Maryland Governor's Commission on Service	MD	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation</i> : Create ways for individuals to contribute (e.g. PSA campaign followed by direct ask, opportunity to support service on federal tax forms from refund)
Andrea Breen	AmeriCorps Pillsbury Neighborhood Services	MN	AC* N/S	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation</i> : Put together a nationwide campaign so that large national companies provide national support to AmeriCorps, not just local.

1996 REAUTHORIZATION COMMENTS: MATCH-RELATED

SENDER	ORGANIZATION	State	Program Source	TOPIC AREA	COMMENT
Andrea Breen	AmeriCorps Pillsbury Neighborhood Services	MN	AC* N/S	Fundraising	<i>Comment:</i> Some Programs that are part of larger agencies that contain many programs are restricted in who they may approach for funds because donors may already be funding other programs in the agency.
Ryan Tolleson Knee & Andrea Vernon	Montana Campus Corps/Montana Campus Compact, U. of Montana	MT	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Allow directors to solicit private funds
Richard Pinner, Program Director	AmeriCorps/"I Have a Dream" Foundation	NY	AC* Natl.	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Codify scope of fundraising ban
Glenn C. Odenbrett, Director	AmeriCorps, L&S/Ofc. of Student Community Service, CWRU	OH	AC* N/S, L&S	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Require State Commissions/Offices to include "funders' forums" in state plans to highlight successes & explain rationale/technicalities of non-fed. match requirement
Advisory Board	AmeriCorps/Serve with Energy and Talent (SWEAT)	OH	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Create incentives to increase private funding wherever possible
Jerry Gabay for Jon Stewart, Director	AmeriCorps/NorthWest Service Academy	OR/ WA	AC* Natl.	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Liberalize guidelines for fundraising to help programs w/large funding match requirements & encourage private-sector participation
Pat Jones, Director	RSVP/Centerville Clinics, Inc.	PA	RSVP	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Give outside funders earned tax credits for assisting NSSC programs
R. Benjamin Wiley, Executive Director	Greater Erie Community Action Committee	PA	RSVP FGP	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Provide tax break, national recognition to local organizations involved in CNS programs
Lori J. Rank, Project Director	RSVP/Lebanon & Lancaster County	PA	RSVP	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Establish fund development trainings for programs
Elan Welter Lewis, Director, & Kristin Karsh, Coordinator	AmeriCorps/Butler Memorial Hospital Family Services Corps, Butler County	PA	AC* State	Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Will use the evaluation process to determine effective usage of public/private funds & will communicate cost savings to public at local level to increase "buy in"
Jennifer MJ Yim, former VISTA		UT		Fundraising	<i>Recommendation:</i> Increase partnerships w/ local businesses & foundation arms of corporations for collaboration on sponsoring national service & training
Gordon Richins, VISTA Member	VISTA/OPTIONS' for Independence	UT	Vista	Fundraising	<i>Comments:</i> 1) Successful programs should be able to attract community donations and private sector grants on their own; 2) Give programs more information on availability of non-federal funds

Sagawa, Shirley

From: Potter, Lance
To: Sagawa, Shirley
Subject: reform proposal notes
Date: Wednesday, February 14, 1996 6:09PM

Some comments on your reform proposal notes.

- 1) very impressive cranking it out.
- 2) on the living allowance: one thing we missed is that HWs proposal for \$100/wk looks a lot more like a wage than the current structure. On the other hand, it would actually reduce the cost of living allowance more than it appears because many programs run, say 40 to 45 weeks, not 52. Full-time, it only takes 42.5 weeks to do the 1700 (would we keep that?), so with a couple of weeks for sick and vacation (would they be paid?) its still more like 45 weeks, or 43 if you're not paying leave, so 4300-4500 may be more accurate. Of course, it only makes the situation worse for the programs re: match.
- 3) on the Vol MD! e.g., I'd say that it would be in the interest of the program to increase their contribution by \$1300/member (so that they get the full CNS share) and one likely way they will do that is by inflating the value of their soft match.
- 4) on the challenge grant issue: it seems to me that there is, in fact, a problem with the first version, which is that at present we require that some of the match be in cash and be available on a quarterly basis to pay living allowance, etc. If they could use all our cash before they raise all their match, they are more likely to get in trouble and/or pad.
- 5) beginning in the program design section and continuing into the ed-award-only section, I'd toy with the tone if this is going to HW. We were pretty dismissive of the ed-award-only idea, for good reason, but he's more likely to see our point if we don't seem defensive. It's not bad, but we've got a track record to compete against...

Dear Senator Grassley:

Thank you for your recent letter summarizing your concerns about AmeriCorps. It is never pleasant to hear criticism but it is usually edifying, especially when the spirit is constructive. I very much appreciate your interest in improving the quality of this program, as you have done with so many other government programs in the past.

After carefully reviewing our operations, I've decided we can make several changes that accommodate your concerns -- and go much farther. Taken together, these changes would not only make AmeriCorps more cost-effective but increase its impact as well.

To reduce costs, we will take the following steps:

Terminate grants to federal agencies – The Corporation will no longer provide AmeriCorps program grants to federal government service programs. This alone should cut Corporation costs roughly \$1,000 [ck] per person.

Impose a per-person limit on federal contribution for program costs -- Unless they can make a powerful argument for special treatment, no program will receive more than \$5,000 [?] per member in federal funds for management and overhead.

Increase the proportion of spending going to AmeriCorps members instead of program management – We will establish a target that at least 75% percent of total spending on programs should go to Corps members.

Increase the number of education-award-only slots – We will set aside 25% [?] of the Trust Fund for service scholarships not connected with program grants. [better way of expressing?]

Increase private sector contributions – We have announced that starting in this funding cycle, all programs must secure some private contributions. Furthermore, we will establish a goal that by 2002 [?] one half of AmeriCorps program resources will come from non-federal sources and one third [?] will be from the private sector. We will immediately craft a plan for meeting those goals.

We estimate that the net effect of these changes will be to reduce the average federal taxpayer cost for AmeriCorps from \$19,000 [?] down to \$15,000 [?] per person in three years.

We have also adopted a plan to reduce costs at the National Civilian Community Corps by 25 percent [?] over five years. That initiative would

In addition to these cost-cutting efforts, we will improve the management of AmeriCorps by taking these significant steps:

Should take credit for cost reduction steps already taken - velocity - planning - 10% cut - etc.

True? No these are 5-yr goals if we do -

dollar for dollar match don't like this

(circled)

Reform the grant-making process – As recommended by the Inspector General, we will.....

Reduce Washington control over state decisions – We have announced that State commissions will have much greater latitude in deciding which programs get national service money. For instance, tk tk tk tk.

Increase the emphasis on programs that leverage volunteers – We have instructed programs to give greater emphasis to those programs working with and assisting traditional volunteer programs. This will dramatically increase the impact of each AmeriCorps dollar and ensure that AmeriCorps continues to compliment and assist the millions of Americans who serve as volunteers without monetary compensation at all.

Strengthen legislative safeguards against political advocacy among programs – To remove any ambiguity that might exist, we have further strengthened our already tight constraints against political advocacy. Programs have been reminded that. “.....”

Expand evaluation efforts – I’ve established a special working group on evaluation to examine ways we can strengthen our evaluation, monitoring and quality-assurance operations.

These steps are just the beginning. I look forward to working closely with you to ensure that the program improves, survives, and, indeed, grows so that all Americans – regardless of political party – can be proud of how AmeriCorps members are serving their communities and nation.

I am intensely proud of what the Corporation for National Service – and the 500 locally-based, state-supervised, non-profit-run programs – have accomplished in just two years. Whether its raising reading scores in elementary schools or fishing garbage out of polluted rivers, AmeriCorps members have shown extraordinary resourcefulness and energy. I am excited that, with your leadership, AmeriCorps will be able to do even more.

Sincerely,

Harris Wofford
CEO
Corporation for National Service

1996 APPLICATION PROCESS Match Options

ASSUMPTION:

- For the 1996 Renewal Process, which is the third year of a three year cycle, we would only apply minor reforms, if any. More radical reforms would occur with reauthorization.

OPTION #1: Increase the Program match from 25% to 30%.

Pros:

- Significant increase in match.
- Can be in-kind, so should not be an undue burden on most programs.

Cons:

- Could negatively impact some quality programs.
- Does not change the cash match requirements.

OPTION #2: Increase the Member Costs match from 15% to 16% and the Program match from 25% to 30%.

Pros:

- All match requirements are increased.

Cons:

- Could over-burden programs who are already finding a difficult fundraising environment because of the political uncertainty around AmeriCorps. Some programs might have to drop out of AmeriCorps.

OPTION #3: Do not change the match requirements this year.

Pros:

- Does not change our requirements on short notice.
- Allows us the time to make well-considered changes with reauthorization.

Cons:

- No symbolic increase on match.

20%
40% } w/ waivers
OR
up to state to
meet out
or
15%
50%

1996 RENEWAL APPLICATION PROCESS
Cost per Member Options

ASSUMPTIONS:

- For every option, all programs would be asked to target no more than \$13,800 as a cost per Member.
- For the 1996 Renewal Process, we would only apply minor reforms. More radical reforms would occur with reauthorization.

*20,000 cgo
plus...*

OPTION #1: All programs with a FY95 per member cost of more than \$13,800 will be required to cut at least 10% in their FY96 per member cost.

Pros:

- Clear and simple to administer.

Cons:

- Inflexible. Does not allow State Commissions any discretion.
- Could negatively effect the quality of programs who cannot efficiently run with any less money and cannot easily fundraise the difference.

$$\begin{array}{r} 16,660 \\ - 1,666 \\ \hline 14,990 \end{array}$$

OPTION #2: State Commissions will be requested to bring down by at least an average of 10% the FY96 per Member costs of all programs with a FY95 per member cost of more than \$13,800.

$$\begin{array}{r} 20000 \\ 4725 \\ \hline 15275 \end{array}$$

Pros:

- Allows State Commissions maximum flexibility in working to bring down the costs of their high end programs.

Cons:

- Since it is at the discretion of the State Commission, some programs could retain a very high per Member cost, with a less than 10% decrease.

$$\begin{array}{r} 17,000 \\ - 1,700 \\ \hline 15,300 \end{array}$$

OPTION #3: No program may have a per Member cost of more than \$17,000. In addition, State Commissions will be requested to bring down by at least an average of 10% the FY96 per Member costs of the programs with a FY95 per member cost of more than \$13,800.

Pros:

- Brings all programs below a certain level. (This would also apply to new programs.)
- But allows State Commissions some flexibility in working to bring down the costs of their high end programs.

Cons:

- At \$17,000 per Member, cost with educational award is still more than \$20,000.
- The 10% decrease in costs would only be an average.

*Total grant +
ed award +
10% of award
= 26,000*

Memo To: State Commission Executive Directors
Memo From: Diana Rodriguez Algra
Subject: AmeriCorps Guidelines for 1996 State Program Funding
Date:

Thank you for your input over the months regarding ways in which the Corporation, working with State Commissions, could streamline the AmeriCorps renewal and reporting systems in the coming year. Based on commissions' recommendations and our goal to devolve more responsibility to the states, I am pleased to provide an overview of the 1996 program funding process.

Please note that at the time of this writing, the Fiscal Year 1996 appropriation for the Corporation remains unresolved as part of the larger budget negotiations between the Administration and Congress. We will keep you apprised of any congressional directives which may require some changes to the program and/or renewal process in the coming year.

CHANGES IN 1996

- Increased State Commission Role. The Corporation is aware of how familiar state commissions are with their programs through regular monitoring and the renewal process. Therefore, the Corporation will accord greater weight in 1996 to the state commissions' renewal process and recommendations. This places the primary responsibility for review of renewal requests on the states.
- New and Renewal Programs. Because the Corporation does not anticipate increased funding for the fiscal year 1996, it will not accept any new competitive applications. A state may choose to accept new applications for its formula funds and, if quality standards are met, include new applications in its formula pool.
States will not be able to move existing formula programs for consideration into the competitive pool. If a competitive program is not renewed, a state may consider funding the program from its formula pool. If the Corporation determines that it has excess competitive funds, it will consider using those funds to support some 1996 grantees for two years.
- State Peer Reviews for New Formula Programs. States which choose to recommend new formula programs must undertake a competitive grant

improvement

more specific

Volunteer generator

app review
Expire A

Leadership app team leaders

Internet
Part 1
app
Forms

+

application process which includes a peer review. Enclosed is a document on the grant application review process [this will be ready for internal distribution on Monday.] Corporation staff is also available to provide technical assistance.

- Expansion of Programs. Keeping in mind that ^{although} the Corporation does not anticipate increased funding for the fiscal year 1996, the Corporation will consider reasonable requests for expansion. +
- Planning Grants. No new planning grants ^{will be funded} are allowed in 1996. Planning grants funded in 1995 can only be considered for operating grants if the commission intends to run a competition for new formula programs. In this instance, a planning grantee must submit a new program application. +
- Objectives Development Assistance. The Corporation is sponsoring Project STAR -- Support and Training for Assessing Results. If programs need assistance in developing revised or new objectives before submitting their renewal request, they may contact Project STAR at 1-800-548-3656.
- Relocation Costs. No Corporation funds may be used for relocation costs. +
- Final Decisions. To help ensure that renewed programs have sufficient time for orderly start-ups in year two/three and that grants are awarded in a timely fashion, the Corporation anticipates making final internal decisions no later than June 30, 1996. Grant award letters may be issued on a rolling basis.

Make more of this part

RENEWAL REQUEST

Contents:

The Renewal Request packet should contain the following items in the following order:

- The State Title Page Form.
- A brief (3-5 pages) narrative describing the commission's renewal review process and program monitoring strategies.
- A summary of the commission's funding recommendations.
- A one-page summary sheet for each program which the commission recommends for renewal placed on top of each program's Renewal Request. This summary must include an analysis of the program's progress, recommendations for improvement and a recommended funding level.
- A budget analysis check list for each program which the commission recommends for renewal placed immediately after the one-page summary sheet and on top of the program's Renewal Request.
- The program's Renewal Request. Each program must use the enclosed Title Page Form, Budget Forms and Objectives Forms.

Commission Renewal Process:

It is each state commission's responsibility to design a sound renewal process that will allow it to accurately evaluate each program's progress and upcoming year plans and make recommendations for funding to the Corporation. The Corporation will evaluate the process each state followed to review their programs' renewal requests and reach funding recommendations. If the review process is sound and funding recommendations seem reasonable, the Corporation will accept the commission's recommendations. However, the Corporation reserves the right to question commission funding recommendations if the review process does not appear thorough or if the Corporation does not find that the recommended program meets the selection criteria states were required to follow.

Criteria for Review:

For 1996, the Corporation, in general, is committed to renewing 1995 grants, if programs meet quality standards. Primary criteria for determining which programs will be renewed are the quality of the program's progress to date and of their year two/three plans. Commissions should also consider site visit reports and any other relevant documentation concerning a program in determining quality. Programs should be candid about problems and issues encountered during this year and efforts to address them.

Criteria to determine renewal decisions should include:

- **Progress to Date**

In this section each program should complete the program progress report form

- **Year Two/Three Plans** (this section will include expanded language by Monday. Also we will refer states to the 1995 guidelines)

Program Design

Organizational Capacity

NEW FORMULA PROGRAMS

State Review Process:

If the state chooses to accept new applications, the state must establish and conduct a peer review process to evaluate the quality of proposed programs. It is each state commission's responsibility to design a sound peer review and staff review process

that will allow it to accurately evaluate each proposed program's application and make recommendations for funding to the Corporation. The Corporation is willing to provide technical assistance on developing a peer review process.

Any new formula program recommended for funding by commissions must adhere to the AmeriCorps Program Guidelines and Requirements and Statutory Requirements and Restrictions detailed in the AmeriCorps State Guidelines for 1995 Applicants (copy enclosed.)

The peer review process must include the following selection/evaluation criteria: (this section will include expanded language by Monday)

IMPACT

- Getting Things Done
- Strengthening Communities
- Developing Members

OTHER QUALITY ISSUES

- Organizational Capacity
- National Identity (WE HAVE TO CHANGE THIS NAME)
- Evaluation and Continuous Improvement
- Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability

Proposed programs must address either 1995 National Issue Area Priorities or any priority previously established by the State. The State priorities must be within the four statutorily-mandated issue areas of education, public safety, human and environmental needs.

Contents:

The new formula recommendation packet should contain the following items in the following order:

- A brief (3-5 pages) narrative describing the commission's peer review process.
- A summary of the commission's funding recommendations.
- A one-page summary sheet placed on top of each program's application. This sheet must include a program summary, an analysis of the program and a recommended funding level.
- A budget analysis check list for each program placed immediately after the one-page summary sheet and on top of the program application.
- The program's application. Each program must use the enclosed Title Page Form, Budget Forms and Objectives Forms.

SUBMISSION PROCEDURES

The State must submit an unbound original and seven copies of a "Renewal Request " packet. The Renewal Request packet must be received by the Corporation no later than 3:30 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, May 1, 1996. Applications must be mailed or hand-delivered to the Corporation for National Service, 1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Box AS, Washington, D.C. 20525. Facsimiles will not be accepted.

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

The State submission to the Corporation should be presented in the following order:

- Renewal Request
 - Formula Programs
 - Competitive Programs

- New Formula Applications (if applicable)

GRANTS GUIDANCE

Each budget that is submitted should reflect a well-thought-out program and should clearly support the program design. Renewal applicants should demonstrate that efforts have been made to incorporate modifications in this year's budget that are based upon prior experience in operating an AmeriCorps program. The budget component should be sufficient to perform the tasks described in the proposal narratives. It should not contain unexplained amounts for miscellaneous or contingency costs, or unallowable line items such as entertainment costs.

Detailed budget narratives should be organized in the same order as the budget forms and clearly identify requested Corporation share and grantee share. The grantee share of specific items should meet at least the minimum requirements set forth by the Corporation. The narrative must be completed for funds requested from the Corporation and for all other matching funds.

For each of the line items contained on the budget forms, a full explanation must be provided in the budget narrative that specifies the purpose, cost basis and calculation.

Programs must comply with all applicable OMB circulars for grant management and federal laws, including the supplementation, nonduplication, and nondisplacement provisions set forth in 45 CFR 2506.2. Non-profit organizations must comply with the independent audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133. The Corporation will provide copies of OMB Circulars to applicants that do not have access to such materials.

A budget analysis check-list has been provided to help evaluate the program budgets. A check-list should be prepared on behalf of each AmeriCorps Program that is submitted for renewal to ensure that programs are in compliance with the guidance that is provided.

Please remember that the check-list is merely guidance. It should be used in conjunction with the grant provisions which provide detailed information about compliance.

Note: The following guidance will be included and/or changed within this piece as decisions are made at the Corporation:

- *Match requirements*
- *Cost-per-Member guidelines*
- *Living allowance amounts*

BUDGET ANALYSIS CHECK-LIST

Legal Applicant: _____

Please ensure that all budgets meet the following criteria before they are submitted to the Corporation. Read the guidance carefully in the right column when reviewing each program's application. A check should be placed in the left column that indicates **compliance** on the part of the program.

MEMBER SUPPORT COSTS

- Yes ___ No ___ All budget items under Member Support Costs (living allowance, FICA workers' compensation, health care) have, at a minimum, a 15% **cash** match. Except for health care, matches cannot be made with other federal funds.
- Yes ___ No ___ Full-time AmeriCorps Members are receiving the minimum living allowance of \$ _____. Programs in existence prior to September 21, 1993 may offer a lower living allowance than the Minimum. If such a program chooses to offer a living allowance, it is exempt from the minimum requirement but not from the maximum requirement. Programs are not required to pay part-time members living allowances but if they do, they could prorate the full-time living allowance.
- Yes ___ No ___ Living allowances are not paid on an hourly basis. They may be calculated using service hours and program length to derive a weekly or bi-weekly distribution amount. The distribution should occur in equal increments that are not based on a specified number of hours worked.
- Yes ___ No ___ Correct FICA calculation. All programs must pay FICA for any Member receiving a living allowance. FICA should be calculated at 7.65% of the total amount of the living allowance and must be prorated in the same proportion as the Corporation and Grantee match.

Yes ___ No ___ Correct Workers' Compensation calculation. Some States require workers' compensation for their AmeriCorps Members. Programs must check with their State Department of Labor or State Commission to determine if the program is required to pay workers' compensation and at what level. Programs that are not required to pay workers' compensation need to cover their Members for on-the-job-injuries through their own existing coverage or a new policy purchased in accordance with normal procedures.

Yes ___ No ___ Health care provided for full-time AmeriCorps Members only (unless part-time serving for a sustained full-time period of time such as summer service). If a program chooses to provide health care to other part-time Members, Corporation funds may not be used to help pay for any portion of the cost. Programs must provide health care coverage to all full-time members who do not have adequate health care coverage at the time of enrollment or who lose coverage due to participation in the program. In addition, programs must provide coverage if a full-time Member loses coverage during the term of service through no deliberate act of his or her own. If programs already carry minimum benefits at a reasonable cost, they may use existing policies to cover Members.

The corporation will not cover health care costs for family members.

Yes ___ No ___ Each program should budget \$32.00 per Member for the Member Identification Package. The Corporation will pay for the standard package and up to \$150.00 per Member for additional safety apparel or specialized item that are necessary to perform daily service. A justification for these additional items must be provided in the budget narrative.

STAFF

Yes ___ No ___ Staff costs are attributed directly to the operation of the AmeriCorps program/project. Examples include costs for staff who recruit, train, place, or supervise Members.

Yes ___ No ___ Staff that is indirectly involved in the management or operation of the applicant organization is funded through the administrative cost section of the budget. Examples of administrative costs include legal staff, central management and support functions.

Yes ___ No ___ An AmeriCorps staff member's time and related expenses may not be charged to the Corporation or Grantee share of the Grant while engaged in organized fund raising. Expenses incurred to raise funds may be paid out of the funds raised. Development officers and fund-raising staff are not allowable expenses.

OPERATIONAL

Yes ___ No ___ Funds for the purchase of equipment (does not include general office use equipment) are limited to 10% of the total grant amount.

Yes ___ No ___ All single equipment items over \$500 are specifically listed.

Yes ___ No ___ Justification/explanation of equipment items is included.

Note: Equipment purchases should be at a minimum for renewal programs. Therefore, the Corporation is discouraging equipment purchases such as computers and printers unless a unique situation is demonstrated.

Yes ___ No ___ Corporation funds may not be used to pay relocation expenses of AmeriCorps Members.

ADMINISTRATION

Yes ___ No ___ The maximum Corporation share of Administrative costs cannot exceed 5% of total Corporation funds. (Multiply total Corporation funds by .0526)

Yes ___ No ___ Administrative costs include the following: (1) indirect costs such as legal staff, central management and support functions; (2) costs for financial, accounting, auditing, internal evaluations, and contracting functions; (3) costs for insurance that protects the entity that operates the program; and (4) the portion of the salaries and benefits of the director and any other program administrative staff equal to the portion of time that is not spent in support of specific project objectives.

OTHER

- Yes ___ No ___ All "Operational Costs" (anything other than Member Support Costs) are matched at least 25% by the grantee with cash or in-kind services.
- Yes ___ No ___ The estimated number of eligible Members and children requiring child care assistance is included.
- Yes ___ No ___ The number of new full-time and part-time Members receiving education awards is included.
- Yes ___ No ___ Programs meet the "Cost Per Member" guidelines. (If not, a justification is provided to explain a higher cost program).

Shirley,

~~I would recommend~~
Concerning the 'up to \$5,000' matching funds in the 'Harris' Americorps model, I would suggest the following:

- a. Match, cash & in-kind, amount to be identified in the proposal & reviewed for feasibility
- b. The Americorps grantee, after award, he paid on a monthly basis a fixed amount per Member

7,000
+ 5,000 (up to) program match

12,000 per Member
12/ months (or lower)

\$1,000 per Member identified on board
per month

- c. Simplicity - no. of members on board x Fixed rate
- 4 financial report reporting
match

in ket

- d. ~~not~~ cost reimbursable - expenditure of Fed. funds in areas necessary - not detailed accounting but rather performance accounting for # of members, service accomplishments.

APPENDIX I

Survey of the Field

To obtain input from the field, a survey of selected programs and commissions was conducted. The sample included AmeriCorps*State programs from each of the five clusters, a few Directs, urban and rural programs, urban and rural youth corps, and selected State Commissions from each of the five clusters.

Below is a summary of the survey's major findings.

State Commissions

Percent of programs currently meeting their match requirements.

All state commissions contacted reported that all of their programs are meeting their match requirements, except two in one state (one new program and one large, complex program).

Percent of programs which are over-matched.

Many of the state programs are exceeding their match. (Several in California, over 50% in Washington, 100% in Kansas, 75% in Georgia, 100% in Massachusetts, and 95% in Maryland.)

Some sponsors have a higher match on the living allowance, but the larger extent of the over-match is in-kind.

Characteristics of those programs having difficulty meeting their match.

Community based non-profit organizations.

Extent of Federal and other public funds in the match.

The extent of the use of other non-CNS federal funds varies (from 1/3 of programs in California to very few in Kansas). The commissions report that the traditional sources of federal funds are diminishing -- Forest Service, JTPA. Many programs, however, have a significant level of matching funds from state and local public sources. In a number of cases, the programs have a 100% match from these sources.

Potential difference in impact on types of programs from an increased match.

The commissions advise that any increase in match will have a greater impact on the following types of programs: corps, sponsors in economically less developed communities, rural programs (away from metropolitan centers, foundations, corporations), smaller communities, new start-up programs, and community-based non-profit organizations.

Maximum amount of match increase (cash and in-kind) which continues 75 percent of existing AmeriCorps sponsors.

While the numbers vary across state commissions, the general conclusion is a minimal increase in cash and 30-50% increase in operating (including in-kind).

Calif.	15% cash; 30% in-kind (in first year). provide challenge grants.
Georgia	up to 40% cash and in-kind.
Kansas	50% cash; 50% in-kind.
Maryland	35% cash; 35% operating with at least 10% cash (phase up to 50%)
Mass.	15% cash; 30% in-kind.
Wash.	20% cash; 50% in-kind and cash (over 5 years).

Most realistic timeframe for reaching the new match levels.

Most commissions advise that sponsors could reach an increase in the match in the first year, but suggest that three to five years be provided for meeting a higher level, such as 50%.

Calif.	Year One -- 30% (in-kind).
Georgia	3 years for urban programs; sliding scale up to 5 years for rural and new programs.
Kansas	50% cash; 50% in-kind.
Maryland	2 years.
Mass.	1-2 years to reach 40%.
Wash.	up to 50% over 5 years.

Additional steps to increase private sector support.

Suggestions provided by the commissions to increase private sector support include: institute an incentive/challenge approach (Calif.); decrease politicization which drives big foundations away; CNS to build strong public-private partnerships; CNS to bring foundations together; push for long-term (10 year) commitments; assist sponsors target major companies in rural areas;

clarification of fundraising rules (allow staff who are paid, in part, by local funds to fundraise on that time; allow Members to fundraise on their own time without uniforms); CNS to improve its promotion of what it does (change to one program, not different 'streams of service' which confuses the public); CNS should not compete against states or local programs for foundation funding; CNS to work with state commissions on developing relationships with funders at the state and national levels; commissions to designate a staff member for 'resource development and sustainability'; and CNS to prepare a basic packet for local sponsors on resource identification.

AmeriCorps Sponsors (State and National Directs)

REFORM

Reduce average [federal?] taxpayer cost to \$15,000 [?] per person – This would happen through a combination of steps:

Terminate grants to federal agencies – The Corporation would no longer provide program grants to federal government service programs.

Increase proportion of spending going to AmeriCorps members instead of program management – Establish a goal of tk% going to corps members

Increase the number of education-award-only slots – Set aside 25% of the Trust Fund for service scholarships not connected with program grants.

Increase private sector contributions – Require that all programs secure some private contributions immediately and establish a goal that by 2002 half of money spent on AmeriCorps programs will come from non-governmental sources.

Impose a per-person cap limiting federal contribution to program costs -- #??????

Reform grant-making process – Adopt all appropriate recommendations from the Inspector General about improving the grant-making process.

Reduce Washington control over state decisions – State commissions will have much greater latitude in deciding which programs get national service money.

Increase the emphasis on programs that leverage volunteers

Strengthen legislative safeguards against political advocacy among programs

Eliminate federal funds for relocation expenses.

Dramatically expand evaluation efforts.

BOLD REFORM

Reconfiguring AmeriCorps in order to:

- Dramatically expand the size of the Corps

2/14/96/

Shirley,

I have no suggestions on the paper. We could discuss the numbers endlessly, and the reality is that our cost data at this stage of the program are not very good. The data are based on budgets and estimates, and as a result will be soft. Further, preoccupation with the numbers as the way to drive policy is a mistake. We should attempt, with the Congress, to decide what we want to do, what type of program will achieve it, and then reach agreement on a cost effective approach to carrying it out.

[One minor point on the paper: reducing our support of Members' living allowances to \$100/week raises equity issues (VISTA and NCCC, plus among grant programs themselves)].


I fully agree with your approach to identify several areas for negotiation at this point, leaving a resolution of the major issues to reauthorization.

For what it's worth, my "bottom line" negotiating position would be to commit to the following at this point:

1. Eliminate federal grants.
2. Commit to a cap of no more than \$5,000 per Member in each grant for program costs as part of the current renewal process. State that the average will be less. This will allow us to say that the total Corporation costs in these grants will not exceed \$18,000, including the education award, and that the average should approach somewhere between \$17,000-\$17,500. State also that we agree to target our resources on direct Member support, with over 70% of each grant going for this purpose, unless the local program is covering all costs of the stipend. Agree fully that this will be reviewed further during reauthorization.
3. Commit to clear and demonstrable greater private sector support for the program that will be fleshed out in reauthorization.
4. Commit to doing a program of education award only grants of between 4-5,000 Members. Seek their involvement in the design and implementation. [As your paper points out, this cannot be restricted to private support, but we must have flexibility in how this is done.] Program will be up and running by the end of the year.

I'd start by offering no. 1 only....and then proceed to offer nos. 1 and 2, etc.....

I'm not sure what else they want (haven't seen the letter). Anything more (e.g., limit local costs, private sector match of 50%, etc.), other than trivial nonsense, at this stage is simply not negotiating in good faith, undercuts Kassenbaum and reauthorization, could depart too much from the President's program, and would threaten what is a very fragile service infrastructure. We simply do not know that Grassley speaks for the Congress on national service.

Not much help....but let me know if there is anything specific you need.  gary

- Strengthen the link between service and education
- Increase the ethic of sacrifice and service, ensuring that AmeriCorps is not viewed as a jobs program
- Reduce the per person costs to accommodate Republican concerns
- Align the program more closely with the original Clinton plan

Specifically, AmeriCorps would:

Pay \$100 a week in stipend, roughly equivalent to the Jesuit Volunteer corps and other missionary programs. Local programs could, if they chose, supplement the stipend up to \$100 a week extra.

Provide the same educational award of \$4,725

Provide program operating money only on a matching basis. We give a dollar for every dollar the program puts in – a true match – up to \$5,000 in federal money.

Dramatically expand the numbers of “scholarship only” awards to citizens performing full-time rigorous service outside of AmeriCorps-financed programs.

These steps taken together would allow us to increase the number of people earning college aid by serving their country from 25,000 up to 100,000 **per year. [ck]**

It would effectively establish a cap on Corporation spending of \$15,000 per AmeriCorps member and would reduce our average cost to xx,xxx per person.

It would force programs to more aggressively seek private funding.

REALLY BOLD REFORM

To establish the Corporation for National Service as non-governmental entity by the year 2000.

Require that the Board of Directors of the Corporation be bipartisan.

Triple the number of NCCC of Slots.

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: Shirley
RE: Analysis of reform proposal
DATE: February 12, 1996

Attached are my notes summarizing our free-form discussion of the reform proposal. 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. Therefore, the numbers seem high relative to what we know to be the overall average per FTE amounts. Please review the analysis and let me know what is wrong with it, missing, etc. I need to fill in the examples, and haven't looked carefully at the specific examples we pulled to discern trends.

Comments asap.

Distribution:

Mike R
Mike K
Gary
Tracy
Diana A
Lance
David

Current program -- full time members

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

Reform proposal -- 52-week full-time members

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

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

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

***Corporation costs are a very rough calculation that includes federal administration, 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.

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.

Assuming that many programs end up dropping to the minimum amount and not augmenting 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 x to x, with the average being x. 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 would want to "pad" 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.

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

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

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

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.

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)?

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?

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

Education award only issues

A key part of this proposal is that "education awards only" programs would become a significant part of the AmeriCorps portfolio. Currently, the Corporation has 7 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 co-mingled 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.

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.

Shirley,

With the 'Harris' model, we assume that grantee matches now in the budget as Member costs (A) now become part of the 'up to \$5,000' match. So we should examine circled Grantee FTE Costs (Budget lines A to F) and compare to circled CNS cost (Budget lines B to F)

Many programs have low Grantee Match \$ and low CNS \$ or have PT/FT members and/or understaffed FT.

AMERICORPS*STATE BUDGETS

EDIT/ENTRY VIEW

GranteeName: New Mexico Commission for National & Community Service
 SubgranteeName: National Indian Youth Leadership Development Project Inc
 e: SubgranteeState: NM SubgranteeZip:
 SubgranteeCity:
 ProgramTitle: Competitive New Operating AmeriCorps*State
 ProgramType: Southwest GrantNumber: 94A\$0M002 \$0 \$10,000

Cluster:	Subtotal B through E	\$125,969	\$41,346	\$167,315
F. Administration	Program State	\$11,774	\$1,360	\$13,134
	Commission	\$0	\$2,315	\$2,315
	Subtotal B through F	\$11,774	\$3,675	\$15,449
	Match % for B through F	\$137,743	\$45,021	\$182,764
		75.37%	24.63%	100.00%
	TOTAL A through F	\$288,802	\$71,685	\$360,487

G. Child Care	Estimated # of Children	6	Grantee Share	\$0
	Match % for B through G	75.37%	24.63%	100.00%

H. Educational Awards	Full Time	20	\$94,500
	Part Time	0	\$0
	Part Time Continuing	0	

Renewal Information	94 Award Amount	\$50,000
	Total Amount of Carryover	\$0
	Amount of Formula Carryover	\$0

Budget Analysis	CNS	GranteeName	Total	
Cost per FTE	\$14,440	\$3,584	\$18,024	Cost/FTE
FICA %	7.65%	7.65%	7.65%	OK
FT1700 Living Allowance (<\$6,753)	\$6,753	\$1,192	\$7,945	Living
PT900 Living Allowance (<\$3,575)	?	?	?	
PT450 Living Allowance (<\$1,787)	?	?	?	
PT300 Living Allowance (<\$1,191)	?	?	?	
AmeriCorps Health Care per member	\$1,020	\$180	\$1,200	OK
Alt Health Care per member	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
Equipment %	3.32%	2.09%	3.08%	Health Care
Administration %				OK



Senator Chuck Grassley (Iowa)

Senate Hart Building, Room SH-135

Washington, D.C. 20510-1501

(202) 224-3744

DATE: _____

TO: Gene S...

OF: _____

FROM: _____

2/9/96
From DEAN Zerbe
Copy to Deb
Gene
Shirley

TYPE OF DOCUMENT

Total Number of Pages, Including Cover Sheet: 4

February 9, 1996

The Honorable Harris Wofford
Chief Executive Officer
Corporation for National and
Community Service
1201 New York Ave. NW
Washington, D.C. 20525

Dear Mr. Wofford:

I am writing to follow-up on our recent meeting. I appreciated the opportunity to have a frank discussion with you about the Corporation for National and Community Service's (CNCS) AmeriCorps program.

As I testified before the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities last year, I believe that AmeriCorps must implement several reforms if the program is going to meet the administration's own cost and performance goals. I stated that if CNCS implemented such reforms, AmeriCorps would be on the road to earning my support and that of other responsible critics.

I'm pleased that in public statements and in our private discussions you have agreed that reforms must be brought to the AmeriCorps program.

My August 29, 1995 letter to President Clinton outlined the specific cost reforms that I believe should be put in place to ensure that the taxpayers' money is spent effectively. They include provisions which would ensure:

- Average total costs per full-time AmeriCorps participant \$17,000;
- 50% funding match from the private sector; and,
- Federal taxpayer dollars targeted to students rather than federal, state and grantee administrative overhead and support.

As I stated in my earlier testimony, I do not consider these reforms definitive. For example, I appreciate the argument that costs for extraordinary expenditures for supplies and equipment, such as a Habitat for Humanity program, should be exempted from a dollar cap. However, while there may be a need to sharpen pencils on the specifics of these reforms, there should be no

question about the principles these reforms establish: lower overall costs, a greater private sector investment, and taxpayers' dollars directed at students.

Along with these cost-reduction reforms, my letter to the President suggested two additional program changes:

- Eliminating funding to other federal agencies.
- Targeting AmeriCorps dollars to young people who are attending college or accredited vocational programs.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) report stated that while the average program cost was \$26,654 per participant for 10 months of service, the average cost per federal AmeriCorps program was over \$31,000. Clearly, elimination of grants to federal agencies would lower costs substantially.

In addition, the elimination of grants to federal agencies has broad bipartisan support -- it was proposed in the amendment offered by Senator Mikulski to restore funding for AmeriCorps. It is clear that Congress does not view funding to other federal agencies as an appropriate use of limited funds by CNCS.

President Bill Clinton has repeatedly stated that AmeriCorps is about helping young people pay for college. Notwithstanding these statements, AmeriCorps provides significant numbers of jobs to individuals who will not be attending college or who graduated from college several years ago. I would recommend that CNCS consider careful targeting of scarce education dollars to assist young people who will use the funds to attend college or accredited vocational programs. For example, the program might increase the number of grants that provide only educational awards.

While I did not address this issue in my letter to President Clinton, I would also encourage you to take immediate steps to reform the CNCS grant-making process.

The Inspector General (IG) for CNCS will soon complete a report on the grant-making process at CNCS that was done at the request of Sen. Kit Bond (R-MO) and myself. It is my understanding that the IG report will indicate serious weaknesses in the grant-making process at CNCS and suggest several reforms. I would strongly recommend that CNCS at a minimum implement all appropriate reforms suggested by the IG.

In addition, I would ask that you consider having the IG perform a continual audit of the CNCS grant-making process -- similar to that currently performed by the IG at the National Science Foundation.

These actions would go far in addressing the justifiable concerns about the integrity of the grants-making process at

CNCS, especially the awarding of National Direct AmeriCorps grants. These concerns have been raised by Sen. Bond and myself.

Lastly, I would ask that you give serious review to cost-cutting in the National Civilian Community Corp (NCCC) program. I have been told that the total costs of this program per participant for CNCS and the Department of Defense are excessively high.

I believe the reforms outlined in this letter would help CNCS meet the goals intended by the administration when this program was first proposed. These reforms are very much in keeping with the spirit of Vice President Al Gore's National Performance Review -- which I have strongly supported.

I am confident that we can work together during the coming weeks to craft a meaningful and substantial reform package that contains measurable performance goals. It is my strong desire to see such a comprehensive reform package implemented because it would both benefit students and ensure the taxpayers' money is spent wisely.

If we could achieve agreement on which reforms should be implemented, on a plan for implementation, and on measurable performance goals, I would be pleased to voice my support for FY 1996 funding for AmeriCorps.

However, in order to determine what AmeriCorps funding might be, I would encourage you to work with the administration to provide Senator Bond, Chairman of the VA/HUD Appropriations subcommittee, with recommendations of where program funding within the subcommittee could be reduced to pay for CNCS programs.

cc: President Bill Clinton
Senator Kit Bond

MAGIC ME AMERICORP				
PROJECTED SOURCES OF FUNDING				
For Grant Period 6/24/94 - 9/30/95				
			Total	FTE
			Program	AC Mbrs
			Funding	Volunteer
				25
				212
Federal				(a)
AmeriCorp			734,401	29,376
GDAAC			63,000	2,520
TOTAL FEDERAL			797,401	31,896
Md State/Local schco. support			40,000	1,600
Md State Dept of Education			25,000	1,000
San Joaquin Probation Dpt			71,390	2,856
MA State Service Commission			500	20
TOTAL ST/LOCAL			136,890	5,476
Public Contributions (Foundations & Corporations)			225,176	9,007
TOTAL FUNDING **			1,159,467	45,379
<i>**not including public in-kind</i>				
(a) Key factors				
AmeriCorp volunteers				25 FTE volunteers
Youth & Elderly volunteers	2660 at 2.5 hours per week X 33 wks=219450 hrs\1700 hrs=			129 FTE volunteers
Interns	500 interns at 6 hours per week X 33 wks=99000\1700 hrs=			58 FTE volunteers
	TOTAL LEVERAGED AND AMERICORP VOLUNTEERS			212 FTE volunteers

1994

29 FTE'S \$ 734,000 \$ 25,310.00

1995

43 FTE'S \$ 850,000 \$ 19,767.00



MAGIC ME®

Learning to serve . . . Serving to learn

MAGIC ME AMERICA® AMERICORPS RENEWAL 1995-1996

1) BUDGET REVISION

The revised budget for fiscal year 1996 represents a good-faith effort to make the maximum reductions possible, without jeopardizing the integrity of the program or diminishing program quality. Cuts were made to the Corporation side of the budget, while the MAGIC ME contribution was increased.

The revised budget represents significant reductions to the Corporation's contribution:

- an overall 12% cut from the original FY '96 budget, a 27% cut from the FY '95 budget.
- a decrease of per Member costs from \$25,324 in FY '95, \$20,891 proposed for FY '96, to \$18,409.
- a 34% reduction of Member-related costs from the original FY '96 budget, 52% less than the FY '95 budget.
- an 8% reduction in administrative costs compared with the original FY '96 budget, a 51% cut from the FY '95 budget.

- truncated operating costs, down 23% from the original FY '96 budget, and 52% less than the FY '95 budget.

- a pared down all-inclusive per Member and staff cost of \$460 to attend the MAGIC ME AmeriCorps National Training Institute, compared with \$721 proposed for FY '96, and \$1,000 in FY '95.

The impact of the revised budget will be felt at all Sites and the Parent Organization:

- The Member/staff ratio was 1:5 in FY '95, in FY '96 it will be 1:7.

- The length of the National Training Institute will be shorter, and evening programming will be eliminated to trim the need for overnight accomodation of local Members and staff.

MAGIC ME staff will have additional responsibilities for conducting the training, since funds for consultants were eliminated.

- Funds to pay external evaluators were greatly reduced, which will place an additional burden on MAGIC ME staff to ensure continued high standards for program evaluation.

MAGIC ME requires a per participant cost above the Corporation benchmark for several important reasons:

- The operation of the program requires bus transportation, supplies, and extensive communication. Although schools and service sites are being asked to share these costs, in many cases MAGIC ME is working in the poorest communities, where essential needs are not being met and resources are not available.

- Prior to conducting the program, any MAGIC ME Affiliate staff must attend a 4-5 day Training Institute, where they are certified as Group Leaders. AmeriCorps Members must similarly undergo this certification process prior to conducting the program. The position

of MAGIC ME Group Leader requires knowledge usually found at a Masters degree level in education or social work. Since most Members are without formal training in this field, more extensive training, nationally and locally is needed. Staff supervision and monitoring in the field are critical to the success of the program.

2) FUND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

MAGIC ME America: Strategies to Support the Whole Organization

Research: Parent Organization staff are researching foundation and corporation grant opportunities. The Director of Development at the Parent Organization is currently attending the Foundation Center's (Washington, D.C.) seminar series titled *Grantsmanship Part I & II* which includes a session on research. The Director of Development has also added The Foundation Directory and the National Guide to Funding for Children, Youth and Families to the Parent Organization's library of funding sources. These steps will enable the Parent Organization to be more effective in identifying funding sources and making referrals to Sites.

Marketing: The Parent Organization is currently planning a national cause-related marketing campaign. ¹ This campaign will aim to increase name recognition of MAGIC ME nationally, as well as generate income. Enhanced visibility of MAGIC ME will aid local fundraising efforts.

¹ MAGIC ME America Renewal, Parent Organization Narrative. page 19

Recruitment

171.8 m recruitment Staff costs (plus 1 emere)
 Proposed 1.626m + staff

Preside H
 Eval. H
 Recruit H
 Public/A C

196 75% of previous yr's quarter

Pubs	325 + 145	22.5 m
headers	August 1 -	.5
Learn+Serve Visibility	March 1 -	.3
Presidio		.5
Recruitment		1.5
Federal Partnershp		.1 SHP
L+S T/A	L+S (includes NYLC)	2.5
Automation ?	75,000 ?	.075
NCC Teamleaders ?		.4
PL/PA	?	.3
Disability forums	?	2.5
		.1
(T/A		
Tribes + Territories conference		
Olympics		.8 ✓
NYLC	2 m	2
DC Initiative		.1
VISTA Leaders Training		.05
Leadership Summit	○	-
Senior Summit	40,000	.04 ✓
Management Evaluate Teams	250 250,000	.250
Volunteer week/launch/Handbook		

12.3
 plus T/A
 March 10
 Dec 10

22.5
 12.3
 10.2

2.56
 Dec 10

Sagawa, Shirley

From: Kowalczyk, Gary
To: Sagawa, Shirley; Kenefick, Mike@CNCS MS Mail Se; Algra, Diana@CNCS MS Mail Serv; Heinaru, Peter@CNCS MS Mail Se; Rosenberry, Peg@CNCS MS Mail S
Subject: RE:
Date: Thursday, January 25, 1996 1:07PM

Some minor points. 1) not true that our grant award covers at least 75% of program costs--should read "at most", as long as you are including in-kind contributions as a program cost (totally separate debate)... 2) The \$2,000 figure for State commission et. al. is okay for internal purposes, but is not an amount we have given out anywhere...our testimony last year on the hill addressed all of AmeriCorps and totalled \$1,300 for overhead, but did not include recruitment, training t/a, etc. 3) I agree that the cap options all say the same thing, but we can't give grantees a cap on costs that are not attributable to them (state commissions and federal overhead). Therefore, if we impose a cap, it needs to apply to the amounts in the grants per fte and perhaps the education award...there may also be huge issues about imposing a cap on local costs, particularly if it is to include in-kind amounts--i'm assuming that is not on the table... 4) A certification system in advance is not doable...gao would never agree to doing it, and I suspect the IG would not as well. If someone is really considering this, we need a reality check here....5) a point that needs to be made somewhere is that equal caps for all programs is not an equitable system...there are huge differences in types of programs, as well as regional cost variations....

Not my call, but I prefer a target much like what we did last year, with the guidance being that in the aggregate we anticipate providing federal support that is 5-10% per fte less than in the prior year.

From: Sagawa, Shirley
To: Kowalczyk, Gary; Kenefick, Mike@CNCS MS Mail Se; Algra, Diana@CNCS MS Mail Serv; Heinaru, Peter@CNCS MS Mail Se; Rosenberry, Peg@CNCS MS Mail S
Date: Thursday, January 25, 1996 10:43AM

Please review the following for accuracy -- This is for Harris so he can give us guidance on the renewal guidelines.

Cost options:

Keep in mind that the Corporation funding for AmeriCorps*State/National includes the following components:

Grant award (covers roughly 85% of living allowance, health care, and at least 75% of program costs -- last year's average was \$12,185 for state and \$10,071 for national direct)

Ed award (\$4,725)

State commission and federal administration, recruitment, t/ta etc. (about \$2,000)

Keep in mind that we reduced the per FTE grant amount from \$13,800 to about \$12,000 this year (this has not been publicized).

Also keep in mind that it is difficult to monitor per FTE costs with precision because of the constant adding and dropping of Members that occurs during the year -- it is much easier to use the "per FTE grant amount" than the actual federal cost. Also, keep in mind that we do not have the capacity at this time to track total federal cost or total available resources. Any certification system (in which the IG or GAO, for example, had to approve the grants before they could be awarded) would delay the awards significantly and could jeopardize the program.

Option 1 -- impose a cap

The following options are all different ways of saying the same thing. The effect would require the 34 state and 8 national direct programs that exceed \$15,000 per FTE in their grant to cut by up to 10%, with 8 state and 5 national direct programs needing to cut more than 10%.

Cap of \$17,000 per Member of Corporation funds (not including the education award -- includes grant plus state and federal overhead)

OR

Cap of \$15,000 per Member of Corporation funds (not including the education award or state/federal overhead)

OR

Cap of \$22,000 per Member of Corporation funds (includes all)

OR

Cap of \$20,000 per Member of Corporation funds (includes ed award but not federal/state overhead)

Option 2 -- mandate a percentage reduction

Require all programs with a grant of more than \$13,800 to cut at least 10% (affects 131 programs)

OR

Require state commissions to bring down by an average of 10% the per FTE grant amounts of their programs (note -- this goes along with the idea of giving states more control, but may be unfair to high cost states like California and Alaska)

OR

Provide guidance to states commissions and programs that they should shoot for a 10% cut for programs over \$13,800, but don't mandate (or make waivable); commit that through budget negotiations, the Corporation will achieve an overall cut of 5% (on top of last year's cut of about 12% from the original \$13,800 number). This would represent about a 17% cut in per FTE grant amounts; it is unclear whether changes in the federal agency portfolio will make this difficult to achieve, however.

Note -- the cap and average reduction options could be combined; mandates can be made waivable; numbers can be adjusted. We do not recommend that the percentage cut be increased or the cap reduced below that proposed above.