FOIA Number: 2019-0568-F

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 Economic Council

Series/Staff Member: Gene Sperling

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 10093

FolderID:

Folder Title:
CATO Institute

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	17	4	7	2

CATO INSTITUTE

CATO INSTITUTE News Release

TEL: 202-842-0200
FAX: 202-842-3490
COMPUSERVE: 76464,505
INTERNET: cato@cato.org
WEB SITE: http://www.cato.org

1000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington, D.C. • 20001

June 12, 1996

CBPP is wrong: welfare is a rational choice for many
Cato scholars show welfare benefits often exceed wages for entry-level jobs

Welfare benefits available to a typical welfare household substantially exceed the amount a recipient could earn in an entry-level job in virtually every state, according to a briefing paper released today by Cato Institute scholars Michael Tanner and Naomi Lopez.

The paper was released in response to a critique written by Sharon Parrott of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) suggesting that actual welfare benefits are lower than Michael Tanner, Stephen Moore and David Hartman stated in a September Cato study (Policy Analysis no. 240).

The CBPP critique used only 2 of 77 federal welfare programs in its calculations—Aid to Families with Dependent Children and food stamps—while the initial Cato study used 7. "The CBPP attack is not supported by the data and seriously underestimates the actual value of the available welfare benefits package," says Tanner. "In fact, we may have understated the available welfare benefits in some cases because our study did not take into account state and local welfare assistance programs."

The CBPP paper rejects the inclusion of Medicaid as a benefit because "Medicaid payments cannot be used to meet basic family expenses such as food, clothing and shelter." Tanner assails that logic. "According to Parrott, *any* noncash benefit has no value to the recipient. After all, food stamps are not a cash benefit and cannot be used to pay for clothing or shelter. By the CBPP's interesting logic, there should be no problem with cutting—or even eliminating—Medicaid, since the loss of benefits would not reduce the income of recipients."

Briefing Paper no. 27

Contact: Dave Quast, director of public affairs, 202-789-5266

Cato Institute Policy Analysis

THE VALUE OF WELFARE

Cato vs. CBPP

BY MICHAEL TANNER AND NAOMI LOPEZ

No. 27 June 12, 1996

Executive Summary

In 1995 the Cato Institute released a study comparing the benefits available from entitlement programs with income available from work. In May 1996 the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities issued a critique of that study. A review of the original study published by Cato and the criticisms in the CBPP study shows that the Cato study remains an accurate appraisal of the level of welfare benefits.

The CBPP study fails to account for the value of non-cash welfare benefits such as Medicaid. In addition, the Cato study's inclusion of housing benefits more accurately reflects the work vs. welfare tradeoff for long-term welfare recipients. With the exception of a small error in the calculation of the value of food stamps in five states, the criticisms of the Cato study are unfounded.

Since the federal welfare benefits a typical welfare family would be eligible to receive exceed the wages for the type of entry-level job that most welfare recipients could expect, welfare remains a rational choice for many people.

THE VALUE OF WELFARE: CATO vs. CBPP

by Michael Tanner and Naomi Lopez

In September 1995 the Cato Institute released a study by Michael Tanner, Stephen Moore, and David Hartman that determined the value of the federal welfare benefits package available to a single nonworking mother with two children in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.[1] The authors of the Cato study described the available welfare benefits package and offered insights into

- why almost 65 percent of welfare recipients report that they are not actively seeking work[2] and

- why, as welfare benefits increase, women are more likely to leave the labor force and enroll in welfare programs instead.[3]

That study has recently been criticized by several supporters of the current welfare system, most notably the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Reexamination of the Tanner, Moore, and Hartman study confirms that it is an accurate appraisal of the true level of welfare benefits.

The CBPP study, in contrast, fails to adequately account for the value of noncash welfare benefits such as Medicaid. In addition, the Cato study's inclusion of housing benefits more accurately reflects the work vs. welfare tradeoff for long-term welfare recipients. With the exception of a small error in the calculation of the value of food stamps in five states, CBPP criticisms of the Cato study are unfounded.

Methodology and Major Findings

Because benefits vary dramatically depending on a variety of factors such as family size and composition and age of children, the Cato study used a profile of a typical welfare household consisting of a single mother over the age of 21 and two children, aged 1 and 4. No paternity was established for the children. The mother did not work and reported no outside income. Neither the mother nor either child was disabled. All were American citizens. Welfare

---

Michael Tanner is director of health and welfare studies and Naomi Lopez is a research assistant at the Cato Institute.

recipients may prefer welfare to work, thus increasing long-term dependency.

Recently, however, the CBPP has released a report, by Sharon Parrott, criticizing the Cato study and suggesting that the actual level of welfare benefits is far lower than Tanner, Moore, and Hartman stated.[9] According to the CBPP, the typical welfare recipient receives less than $9,000 in income, well below the poverty level and less than a minimum wage job pays.[10]

However, Parrott excludes from consideration certain welfare benefits, such as Medicaid. She believes that public health insurance should not be treated as a benefit because the welfare recipient does not receive a cash payment for health care. Furthermore, Parrott attacks the Cato study for allegedly underestimating the welfare benefits available to low-wage workers and their families and asserts that there is a strong financial incentive to move from welfare to work under the current system. Parrott's attack is not supported by the data, and she seriously underestimates the actual value of the available welfare benefits package.

What Benefits Should Be Included?

The primary distinction between the Cato and CBPP authors' methodology is found in the types of benefits included. Of 77 major federal welfare programs, the authors of the Cato study examined only 7. The author of the CBPP study includes only 2: AFDC and food stamps. In fact, the authors of the Cato study may have understated the available welfare benefits in some cases because they did not include state and local welfare assistance programs.

The authors of the Cato study included AFDC; food stamps; Medicaid; the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); utilities assistance under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP); housing assistance under a variety of programs, including public housing and Section 8 Rental Assistance; and the free commodities program.

While the Cato study's profile family is certainly eligible for numerous additional programs, Tanner, Moore, and Hartman selected, not only the most commonly used programs, but also the programs that provide things that are commonly purchased in the private sector. For example, job-training programs are widely available, but it is highly including a table detailing state-by-state housing assistance participation rates.

The authors of the Cato study concluded that, while nationwide only 23 percent of AFDC recipients received federal housing assistance, it was proper to include housing benefits for the following reasons.

1. The pool of AFDC recipients requiring housing assistance is actually far smaller than the total number of AFDC recipients. Focusing on the nationwide 23 percent participation rate implies that the remaining 77 percent of AFDC recipients are paying for housing out of their own pockets. In reality, however, a large proportion of welfare recipients is receiving free or reduced-cost housing from other sources, such as family or friends. For example, a study from the University of Tennessee found that 58.5 percent of AFDC households in that state spend nothing on monthly rent or mortgage payments.[14]

2. While only a minority of welfare recipients receives housing assistance, the percentage is still substantial. Nearly one-quarter of AFDC recipients nationwide receives housing benefits. If a disease were killing 25 percent of Americans, few would dismiss the epidemic as minor. Even in California, which has the lowest housing assistance participation rate, 80 thousand families participate in housing programs.[15]

3. The 23 percent figure is a nationwide average. The proportion of recipients receiving benefits in some jurisdictions, including several of the highest benefit jurisdictions, is considerably higher. For example, in the District of Columbia 50.1 percent of AFDC recipients receive housing assistance, in Massachusetts 42 percent receive housing assistance, and in Connecticut 40.5 percent do. The nationwide average is low primarily because of an extremely low participation rate in California (9.8 percent). In fact, 40 states, as well as the District of Columbia, have housing assistance participation rates higher than the nationwide average.[16]

4. Perhaps most important, there is generally a waiting list for housing assistance. The longer a person is on welfare, the more likely she is to receive housing assistance. Thus participation rates are reduced by people who may be on welfare for only a short time. Among long-term welfare recipients, the group most

Recalculation shows that in 45 states and the District of Columbia the food stamp allowances given in the Cato study were either correct or erred by less than ±$5 per month. In only one state, California, can the correction be considered significant. Table 1 gives the results of the new food stamp calculations. The detailed calculations, which took into consideration housing assistance and related federal

Table 1

Comparison of Monthly Food Stamp Benefit Calculations ($)

State	Tanner, Lopez Study (5/96)	Tanner, Moore, Hartman Study (9/95)	Difference per Month
Alaska	295	285	+10
California	186	214	-28
Colorado	282	289	-8
Connecticut	191	192	-1
District of Columbia	264	270	-7
Florida	294	295	-2
Hawaii	407	422	-16
Idaho	292	295	-3
Illinois	292	291	+1
Iowa	269	268	+1
Kansas	285	284	+1
Massachusetts	223	222	+1
Michigan	249	249	-1
Minnesota	237	236	+1
Nebraska	284	287	-3
Nevada	285	292	-7
New Jersey	277	276	+1
New Mexico	276	289	-14
North Dakota	274	273	+1
Oklahoma	294	295	-2
Oregon	294	293	+1
Rhode Island	269	268	+1
Utah	254	272	-18
Virginia	288	290	-2
Wisconsin	229	241	-12

Note: Values may appear to be inconsistent due to rounding.

Benefits for the Working Poor

Parrott accuses the authors of the Cato study of "ignor[ing] all means-tested benefits available to low-income working families."[25] Actually, Tanner, Moore, and Hartman not only considered the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which is considered the most important transitional welfare benefit, but also included a three-page discussion of benefits available to low-income workers, stating, "Of course, moving from welfare to work does not automatically mean that an individual loses all welfare benefits. In those states where the wage equivalent of welfare remains relatively low, an individual taking a job at that wage could still retain eligibility for some benefits."[26]

Benefits vary considerably from state to state and are time limited for many programs. Families moving from welfare to work could, in some states and regardless of income, continue to receive AFDC benefits for six months. All states are required to provide Medicaid benefits to beneficiaries for a period of one year.[27] Moreover, interviews with social welfare personnel indicated that, regardless of eligibility, actual participation rates for all programs drop once individuals enter the workforce. A recent study indicates that "most (68 percent) of the working poor who qualified for food stamps did not receive them; 36 percent of the working poor who were eligible for AFDC and 17 percent of those eligible for Medicaid did not receive benefits."[28] In part, that may be because an individual often must re-apply for benefits. Also, available funding for programs such as WIC, utilities assistance, and free commodities is allocated on the basis of need. Therefore, benefits may not be available for an individual who remains technically eligible. Finally, many working poor families are simply too proud to apply for government assistance.

Any additional welfare benefits available to the working poor are likely to be at least partially offset by additional costs associated with going to work, such as those of child care, transportation, and clothing.[29] The authors of the Cato study chose not to include such work-related costs. However, it should be understood that earning an income clearly entails additional costs that are not faced by the welfare recipient.

Finally, it should be noted that, even if the final income level remains unchanged, an individual moving from welfare to work will perceive some form of loss--if only a reduction in leisure time. Thus, as the Congressional Research Service has pointed out, is justified. Welfare remains a rational choice for many welfare recipients.

Notes

The authors of this study are deeply indebted to Dana Berliner, staff attorney at the Institute for Justice, for her time and assistance in reviewing the food stamp benefit regulations. We also appreciate tax research provided by Dean Stansel, fiscal policy analyst at the Cato Institute.

1. Michael Tanner, Stephen Moore, and David Hartman, "The Work vs. Welfare Trade-Off: An Analysis of the Total Level of Welfare Benefits by State," Cato Institute Policy analysis no. 240, September 19, 1995.

2. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, <u>1994 Greenbook: Overview of Entitlement Programs</u> (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1994), Table 10-28, p. 404.

3. M. Anne Hill and June O'Neill, "Underclass Behaviors in the United States: Measurement and Analysis of Determinants," Baruch College, City University of New York, March 1990, Table 5.9, p. 78.

4. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance, "Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of AFDC Recipients, FY 1992," 1993, pp. 1-4.

5. Calculations based on data in Robert Rector and William F. Lauber, <u>America's Failed $5.4 Trillion War on Poverty</u> (Washington: Heritage Foundation, 1995), pp. 47, 93.

6. Ibid., pp. 47, 93.

7. That assumes that the full value of the compensation for the jobs is $25,000 a year. The $25,000 could be provided entirely in cash salary or be made up of a combination of salary and benefits, such as health care insurance.

8. See, for example, Richard Vedder and Lowell Gallaway, "The War on the Poor," Institute for Policy Innovation, Lewisville, Texas, June 1992. According to Vedder and Gallaway, holding other factors constant, individuals below the poverty line who do not receive welfare are nearly two and a half times more likely to be out of poverty the following year than are individuals who do receive welfare.

27. U.S. House of Representatives, pp. 369-81; and National Governors' Association, "Final Report: The National Governors' Association Survey of State Welfare Reforms," Washington, July 1994, pp. A1-A9.

28. Marlene Kim and Thanos Mergoupis, "The Working Poor and Welfare Recipiency," Summary Working Paper no. 151, Jerome Levy Economics Institute, Bard College, Annandale-on-the-Hudson, N,Y. December 1995, p. 4. The authors of this study attribute nonparticipation to lack of awareness, administrative problems, inaccessibility, and lack of need.

29. See Jerry Hausman, "The Effects of Wages, Taxes, and Fixed Costs on Women's Labor Force Participation, Journal of Public Economics 14 (1980): 161-94.

30. Thomas Gabe and Gene Falk, "Welfare: Work (Dis)Incentives in the Welfare System," Congressional Research Service Report for Congress 95-105 EPW, January 10, 1995, p. 9.

Appendix B: Revised Pretax Wage Equivalent

The authors of the Cato study calculated the pretax wage equivalent of welfare benefits, taking into account the Earned Income Tax Credit, federal income tax, state income tax, and the FICA payroll tax. Based on the revised food stamp benefit levels, the following jurisdictions' pretax wage equivalents have been recalculated:

Alaska
California
Colorado
District of Columbia
Hawaii
Nevada
New Mexico
Utah
Wisconsin

For comparison purposes, the original calculations are included and are indicated by shading.

CALIFORNIA

Welfare Benefits	**$20,351**	**$20,687**	
1) pre-tax income	**$23,500**	**$24,100**	Federal AGI
Social Security tax			
2) 7.65% payroll tax	$1,798	$1,844	
Federal Income tax			
3) standard deduction	$5,600	$5,600	
4) personal exemptions			
1-single	$2,450	$2,450	
2-dependent	$4,900	$4,900	
5) Federal Taxable Income	$10,550	$11,150	= 1) - 3) - 4)
5.1) pre-EIC liability	$1,583	$1,673	$0 to $30,500: 15%
5.2) Earned Income Credit	$318	$212	EIC=$2,528 for AGI from $8,400-$11,000,
6) income tax liability	$1,265	$1,461	but is gradually phased-out as AGI exceeds $11,000 (=$0 for AGI of $25,296 and above)
State Income tax			
7) "starting point"	$23,500	$24,100	in CA: Federal AGI
8) standard deduction	$4,862	$4,862	
9) State Taxable Income	$18,638	$19,238	= 7) - 8)
10) pre-credit liability	$278	$290	$94.45 + 2% of amount b/w $9,445
11) personal exemptions			and $22,383
1-single	$65	$65	exemptions are tax credits
2-dependent	$130	$130	
12) income tax liability	$83	$95	= 10) - 11)
13) total taxes	$3,146	$3,400	= 2) + 6) + 12)
14) after-tax income	**$20,354**	**$20,700**	= 1) - 13)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Welfare Benefits	**$22,661**	**$22,745**	
1) pre-tax income	**$29,000**	**$29,100**	Federal AGI
Social Security tax			
2) 7.65% payroll tax	$2,219	$2,226	
Federal Income tax			
3) standard deduction	$5,600	$5,600	
4) personal exemptions			
1-single	$2,450	$2,450	
2-dependent	$4,900	$4,900	
5) Federal Taxable Income	$16,050	$16,150	= 1) - 3) - 4)
5.1) pre-EIC liability	$2,408	$2,423	$0 to $30,500: 15%
5.2) Earned Income Credit	$0	$0	EIC=$2,528 for AGI from $8,400-$11,000,
6) income tax liability	$2,408	$2,423	but is gradually phased-out as AGI exceeds $11,000 (=$0 for AGI of $25,296 and above)
State Income tax			
7) "starting point"	$29,000	$29,100	in DC: Federal AGI
8) standard deduction	$2,000	$2,000	
9) personal exemptions			
1-single	$1,370	$1,370	
2-dependent	$2,740	$2,740	
10) State Taxable Income	$22,890	$22,990	= 7) - 8) - 9)
11) income tax liability	$1,675	$1,684	$1,400 + 9.5% of amount over $20,000
12) total taxes	$6,301	$6,333	= 2) + 6) + 11)
13) after-tax income	**$22,699**	**$22,767**	= 1) - 12)

NEVADA

Welfare Benefits	**$18,372**	**$18,456**	
1) pre-tax income	**$20,100**	**$20,200**	Federal AGI
Social Security tax			
2) 7.65% payroll tax	$1,538	$1,545	
Federal Income tax			
3) standard deduction	$5,600	$5,600	
4) personal exemptions			
1-single	$2,450	$2,450	
2-dependent	$4,900	$4,900	
5) Federal Taxable Income	$7,150	$7,250	= 1) - 3) - 4)
5.1) pre-EIC liability	$1,073	$1,088	$0 to $30,500: 15%
5.2) Earned Income Credit	$919	$901	EIC=$2,528 for AGI from $8,400-$11,000,
6) income tax liability	$154	$187	but is gradually phased-out as AGI exceeds $11,000 (=$0 for AGI of $25,296 and above)
7) total taxes	$1,691	$1,732	= 2) + 6)
8) after-tax income	**$18,409**	**$18,468**	= 1) - 7)

UTAH

Welfare Benefits	**$17,622**	**$17,838**	
1) pre-tax income	**$19,400**	**$19,900**	Federal AGI
Social Security tax			
2) 7.65% payroll tax	$1,484	$1,522	
Federal Income tax			
3) standard deduction	$5,600	$5,600	
4) personal exemptions			
1-single	$2,450	$2,450	
2-dependent	$4,900	$4,900	
5) Federal Taxable Income	$6,450	$6,950	= 1) - 3) - 4)
5.1) pre-EIC liability	$968	$1,043	$0 to $30,500: 15%
5.2) Earned Income Credit	$1,042	$954	EIC=$2,528 for AGI from $8,400-$11,000,
6) income tax liability	-$75	$88	but is gradually phased-out as AGI exceeds
			$11,000 (=$0 for AGI of $25,296 and above)
State Income tax			
7) "starting point"	$19,400	$19,900	in UT: Federal AGI
8) standard deduction	$5,600	$5,600	same as federal
9) personal exemptions			
1-single	$1,838	$1,838	75% of federal
2-dependent	$3,676	$3,676	
10) Fed. Inc. Tax deductio	$484	$521	1/2 of liability is deductible*
11) State Taxable Income	$7,802	$8,265	= 7) - 8) - 9) - 10)
12) income tax liability	$353	$386	$330.75 plus 7.2% of amount over $7,500
13) total taxes	$1,762	$1,997	= 2) + 6) + 12)
14) after-tax income	**$17,638**	**$17,903**	= 1) - 13)

*Instructions for Utah state income tax refer to amount from Federal Form 1040, Line 46--that is, pre-EIC tax liability.

Appendix C: Wage Equivalent of Welfare, 1995 (revised)

Rank	Jurisdiction	Pretax Wage Equivalent ($)	Hourly Wage ($)
1	Hawaii	36,100	17.36
2	Alaska	32,350	15.55
3	Massachusetts	30,500	14.66
4	Connecticut	29,600	14.23
5	District of Columbia	29,000	13.94
6	New York	27,300	13.13
7	New Jersey	26,500	12.74
8	Rhode Island	26,100	12.55
9	California	23,500	11.30
10	Virginia	23,100	11.11
11	Maryland	22,800	10.96
12	New Hampshire	22,800	10.96
13	Maine	21,600	10.38
14	Delaware	21,500	10.34
15	Vermont	20,900	10.05
16	Minnesota	20,800	10.00
17	Colorado	20,700	9.95
18	Washington	20,700	9.95
19	Nevada	20,100	9.66
20	Michigan	19,700	9.47
21	Pennsylvania	19,700	9.47
22	Illinois	19,400	9.33
23	Utah	19,400	9.33
24	Oregon	19,200	9.23
25	Wisconsin	19,100	9.18
26	Wyoming	19,100	9.18
27	Indiana	19,000	9.13
28	Iowa	19,000	9.13
29	New Mexico	18,300	8.80
30	Florida	18,200	8.75
31	Idaho	18,000	8.65
32	Oklahoma	17,700	8.51
33	Kansas	17,600	8.46
34	North Dakota	17,600	8.46
35	Georgia	17,400	8.37
36	Ohio	17,400	8.37
37	South Dakota	17,300	8.32
38	Louisiana	17,000	8.17
39	Kentucky	16,800	8.08
40	North Carolina	16,800	8.08
41	Montana	16,300	7.84
42	South Carolina	16,200	7.79
43	Nebraska	15,900	7.64
44	Texas	15,200	7.31
45	West Virginia	15,200	7.31
46	Missouri	14,900	7.16
47	Arizona	14,100	6.78
48	Tennessee	13,700	6.59
49	Arkansas	13,200	6.35
50	Alabama	13,000	6.25
51	Mississippi	11,500	5.53

Note: This table may actually understate the hourly wage equivalent because it is based on a 52-week (2,080-hour) work year and assumes no vacation.

Column D: Additional exclusions

An additional income exclusion for utilities is available in nine states.

Column E: Income

Column C minus Column D

Column F: Housing subsidy

Housing subsidies are treated as vendor payments and are not calculated as shelter expenses.

Column G: Housing payment

This portion of the housing payment that is made by the recipient is treated as a shelter expense. The recipient pays 30 percent of income in rent.

Column H: Standard Utility Allowance (SUA)

The SUA is determined on a state-by-state basis. Participants in the LIHEAP utility assistance program may include the full SUA as a shelter expense.[2]

Column I: Total shelter expenses

Column G plus Column H

Column J: Income minus income exclusions

Same as Column E

Column K: Fifty percent of income minus income exclusions

---

[2]The SUAs were compiled from a Cato Institute telephone survey of the states on May 3 and 6, 1996. The SUAs are subject to change periodically and reflect the current allowance. This does not significantly alter the outcome of the calculations.

According to current federal regulation, Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) recipients may deduct the SUA as a shelter expense when calculating food stamp benefits. See 7 CFR 273.10 (d)(1)(i) and 7 CFR 273.10 (d)(6).

(e) Calculating net income and benefit levels--

(1) Net monthly income. (i) To determine a household's net monthly income, the State agency shall:

(A) Add the gross monthly income earned by all household members and the total monthly unearned income of all household members, minus income exclusions, to determine the household's total gross income.

(B) Multiply the total gross monthly earned income by 20 percent and subtract that amount from the total gross income; or multiply the total gross monthly earned income by 80 percent and add that to the total monthly unearned income, minus income exclusions.

(C) Subtract the standard deduction.

(E) Subtract allowable monthly dependent care expenses, if any, up to a maximum amount of $160 per dependent. If the household is entitled to an excess shelter deduction, compute the household's excess shelter deduction in accordance with paragraph (e)(1)(i)(F) of this section.

(F) Total the allowable shelter expenses to determine shelter costs. Subtract from total shelter costs 50 percent of the household's monthly income after all the above deductions have been subtracted. The remaining amount, if any, is the excess shelter cost. If there is no excess shelter cost, the net monthly income has been determined. If there is excess shelter cost, compute the shelter deduction according to paragraph (e)(1)(i)(G) of this section.

(G) Subtract the excess shelter cost up to the maximum amount allowed for the area (unless the household is entitled to the full amount of its excess shelter expenses) from the household's monthly income after all other applicable deductions. Households not subject to a capped shelter expense shall have the full amount exceeding 50 percent of their net income subtracted. The household's net monthly income has been determined.

(ii)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (a)(1), (e)(2)(iii) and (e)(2)(vi) or the paragraphs of this section, the household's monthly allotment shall be equal to the maximum food stamp allotment for the household's size reduced by 30 percent of the household's net monthly income as calculated in paragraph (e)(1) of this section.

Revised Monthly Food Stamp B

	A
Alabama	164
Alaska	923
Arizona	347
Arkansas	204
California	607
Colorado	356
Connecticut	680
Delaware	338
District of Columbia	420
Florida	303
Georgia	280
Hawaii	712
Idaho	317
Illinois	367
Indiana	288
Iowa	426
Kansas	429
Kentucky	228
Louisiana	190
Maine	418
Maryland	366
Massachusetts	579
Michigan	489
Minnesota	532
Mississippi	120
Missouri	292
Montana	401
Nebraska	364
Nevada	348
New Hampshire	550
New Jersey	424
New Mexico	357
New York	703
North Carolina	272
North Dakota	409
Ohio	341
Oklahoma	324
Oregon	460
Pennsylvania	421
Rhode Island	554
South Carolina	200
South Dakota	417
Tennessee	185
Texas	184
Utah	414
Vermont	638
Virginia	354
Washington	546
West Virginia	249
Wisconsin	517
Wyoming	360