MEMORANDUM   October 11, 2023

To: Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
                   Attention: Ryan Sweeney

From: Benjamin Collins, Analyst in Labor Policy, bcollins@crs.loc.gov, 7-7382
                 Isobel Sorenson, Research Assistant, isorenson@crs.loc.gov, 7-1170

Subject: **WIOA Youth Activities: Estimated Allotments under an Alternative Formula**

This memorandum responds to your request for a comparison of actual state allotments under the Youth
Activities program (YA) authorized by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) to state
allotment estimates under an alternative formula.[1] Specifically, you requested a comparison of actual
allotments, which consider three factors, to estimated allotments made wholly on the basis of the existing
"disadvantaged youth" factor. As you requested, the memorandum covers the PY2014-PY2023 period.[2]

This memorandum begins with background on how the Department of Labor (DOL) allots YA funds
under current law. Next, it describes the alternative formula that you requested, followed by the data
sources and methodology used in calculating the alternative estimates. It then describes the differences
between the estimates under the alternative formula and the actual grant levels. **Table 2** at the end of the
memo presents actual grants for each year in the reference period as well as estimated grants under the
alternative formula.

Information in this memorandum may be of general interest to Congress. As such, this information may
be provided by CRS to other congressional requesters, and may be published in CRS products for general
distribution to Congress at a later date. Your confidentiality as a requester would be preserved in all cases.

How Funds are Allotted Under Current Law

Under current law, YA funds are allotted on the basis of each state's relative share of three factors and
then adjusted for three limiting provisions.[3]

---

[1] WIOA defines "state" as the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. When this memorandum refers to "states," it
is referring to these 52 jurisdictions.

[2] WIOA was enacted in 2014 and took effect with program year 2015. The Youth Activities program authorized under WIOA has
the same formula as a Youth Activities under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA), which was replaced by WIOA. The
PY2014 funding and data in this memorandum reflect funds allotted under WIA. The formula factors and limiting provisions
under the Youth programs in WIA and WIOA are the same.

[3] The allotment formula is codified in Section 127(b)(1)(C) of WIOA. For a summary of the allotment process, see
(continued...)

For each state, an *initial grant* is calculated on the basis of each state's relative share of three equally-weighted factors:

- Unemployment in areas of substantial unemployment ("ASU factor");
- Excess unemployment ("EU factor"); and
- Disadvantaged youth, which is generally defined as individuals age 16 to 21 in specified income ranges ("DY factor").[4]

The ASU factor and EU factors are unemployment indicators that are specific to WIOA and are not youth-specific. The ASU and EU factor are also used in the WIOA Adult Activities formula grant program, which along with the Youth Activities program, is authorized under Title I of WIOA.

Each state's initial grant is subsequently adjusted for three limiting provisions:[5]

- *Minimum grant*. Each state's relative share of funding must equal at least 0.25% of the total funds allotted to states. In cases where a state's share of funding would be less than the minimum, the state's grant is increased to the minimum and other states' grants are ratably reduced.
- *Hold harmless*. Each state's relative share of funding must be at least 90% of the state's relative share of funding from the prior year. In cases where a state's share of funding would be less than the hold harmless threshold, the state's grant is increased to the hold harmless level and other states' grants are ratably reduced.
- *Maximum grant*. Each state's relative share of funding must be no more than 130% of the state's relative share of funding from the prior year. In cases where a state's share of funding would be more than the maximum grant, the state's grant is decreased to the maximum and other state's grants are ratably increased.

Alternative Allotment Formula

You requested estimated allotments under an alternative formula in which initial grants would be allotted wholly on the basis of the disadvantaged youth factor. Per your request, the alternative allotment formula retains the current law limiting provisions related to minimum grant levels, hold harmless, and maximum grants.

Data Sources

To allot funds on the basis of disadvantaged youth, CRS used the published disadvantaged youth (DY) factor data that that were used to allot one-third of the YA funding in each of PY2014 through PY2023.[6]

---

https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/budget/pdfs/FormDesc23.pdf. The allotment process is also described in CRS Report R44252, *The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and the One-Stop Delivery System*.

[4] Section 127(b)(2)(C) defines the disadvantaged youth formula factor as "an individual who is age 16 through 21 who received an income, or is a member of a family that received a total family income, that, in relation to family size, does not exceed the higher of (i) the poverty line; or (ii) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level." The statute subsequently states that DOL shall "to the extent practicable, exclude college students and members of the Armed Forces from the determination of the number of disadvantaged youth."

[5] The minimum and hold harmless provisions described in the memo text reflect the prior law provisions that were used in allotting the grants in each year under consideration. The applicable minimum and hold harmless provisions are established in Section 127(b)(1)(C)(iv)(IV), which specify that the minimum grant and hold harmless will follow prior law when funding for grants is below $1 billion. The funding for grants was below $1 billion in each year in the reference period, so the prior law minimum and hold harmless applied every year.

[6] Formula factor data, including the DY factor, for PY2015 through PY2023 are published at
(continued...)

The DY factor data are based on five-year periods and are only updated once every five years.[7] As such, the same factor data were used for each of PY2014 through PY2017 and PY2018 through PY2022. PY2023 marked the beginning of a new five-year period and used new disadvantaged youth data. See **Table 1** for reference periods and applicable program years.

Table 1. Date Reference Period for Disadvantaged Youth, PY2014-PY2023

Program Year	Data Reference Years
PY2014	
PY2015	
PY2016	2006-2010
PY2017	
PY2018	
PY2019	
PY2020	2011-2015
PY2021	
PY2022	
PY2023	2016-2020

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, "Data for Persons Defined as Disadvantaged Youth and Adults," https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/budget/formula/disadvantagedyouthadults.

Methodology

Using the specified data, CRS calculated estimated allotments under the alternative formula for each state for each year in the reference period. Estimated grants for PY2014 under the alternative formula were calculated using actual PY2013 funding under the Workforce Investment Act as the base for hold harmless and maximum grant levels. Estimated grants for subsequent years used the prior year's estimate under the alternative formula as the base for hold harmless and maximum grant levels. For example, the hold harmless levels for PY2019 were based on the estimate under the alternative formula for PY2018.

For each of the PY2014-PY2017 and PY2018-PY2022 periods, the formula factors were the same for each state in each year (see **Table 1**). As such, variations in grants within these periods were due to elements other than changes in the formula factors, such as changes in total funding for grants or changes due to reallocations to accommodate the limiting provisions.

Results of Alternative Allotment on the Basis of Disadvantaged Youth

Table 2 at the end of this memorandum presents states' actual grants under current law and estimates under the alternative allotment formula. For most states, the relationship between a given state's funding under current law and the alternative allotment formula was somewhat consistent throughout the reference period.

---

https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/budget/formula/state. Formula factor data for PY2014 were associated with the Workforce Investment Act and are published at https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/budget/formula/state/archive.

[7] The quintennial updates to the factor are accompanied by a DOL Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) that describes the calculation of the factors and related issues. The most recent is TEGL 01-23, see https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/advisories/tegl-01-23.

- Of the 52 states, 15 had a grant that was higher under the alternative formula in each of the 10 years and 6 states had a grant that was lower every year.
- Another 12 states had a grant that was higher under the alternative formula between seven and nine years and another 11 states had a grant that was lower under the alternative formula between seven and nine years.

The primary reason that states' grants under the alternative formula varied from their grants under current law was due to differences between a state's relative share of the DY factor and the state's relative share of the other two factors that are used to allot funds under current law. If a state's relative share of the DY factor was greater than its share of the current ASU and EU factors, the alternative formula would typically result in a larger grant under the alternative formula. Conversely, if the state's relative share of the DY factor was less than its relative share of the ASU and EU factors, the state's estimated grant under the alternative allotment formula would be less than its actual grant. Below are two contrasting examples from PY2022.[8]

- In PY2022, New York had approximately 8.1% of the ASU factor, 10.3% of the EU factor, and 6.1% of the DY factor. The average of these three factors was approximately 8.2%, which meant New York had an initial allotment under current law of about 8.2% of total funding for grants. When funds were allotted wholly on the basis of the DY factor, New York's initial allotment declined from about 8.2% of total funding for grants to its share of the DY factor (about 6.1%). After the application of the limiting provisions, New York's final allotment under the alternative allotment formula was approximately 19% lower than its actual grant under the current law formula.
- Conversely, in PY2022, Minnesota had approximately 1.1% of the ASU factor, 0.9% of the EU factor, and 1.8% of the DY factor. The average of these factors was approximately 1.3%, which meant that the state's initial allotment under current law was about 1.3% of total funding for grants. When funds were initially allotted solely on the basis of the DY factor, Minnesota's initial share of funding increased to about 1.8%. After the application of the limiting provisions, Minnesota's allotment under the alternative formula was more than 50% higher than its actual grant under the current law formula.

States' grants under the alternative formula were also impacted by the limiting provisions, especially in the early years of the estimation period. This smoothed the transition between the allotments under the formula in effect for PY2013 and the subsequent allotments under the alternative formula. For example, under the alternative allotment, New Jersey qualified for a hold harmless in each of PY2014 and PY2015. This means that when the formula shifted from three factors to the single DY factor, New Jersey's share of the formula factors declined even more than its funding. Conversely, gains for Nebraska under the alternative formula were limited by the maximum grant provision in each of PY2014 and PY2015.

The hold harmless and maximum grant provisions had declining impact in the later years of the time period under consideration due to the lack of change in the DY factor in most years. For example, between PY2018 and PY2022, the same DY factor was used to allot funds each year (see **Table 1**).

---

[8] PY2022 was used as the example year because it was late in the reference period and the last year that the DY factor that was initially used in PY2018 was used. In that year, there should be minimal influence of the hold harmless or maximum grant provisions because the single factor formula would be well-established and each state's relative share of the DY factor would not have changed since PY2018.

Table 2. Actual Grants for Youth Activities under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) and Estimated Grants under an Alternative Formula: PY2014 – PY2023

(Dollars in thousands)

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Alabama											
Actual Grant	$10,363	$10,974	$13,243	$16,017	$16,862	$15,195	$13,818	$12,514	$11,388	$10,412	$130,785
Alternative Formula Estimate	$12,267	$12,958	$13,713	$13,745	$13,739	$13,794	$13,940	$14,027	$14,184	$14,650	$137,018
Difference ($)[a]	$1,904	$1,984	$470	-$2,272	-$3,123	-$1,400	$122	$1,513	$2,796	$4,238	$6,233
Difference (%)[b]	18.4%	18.1%	3.6%	-14.2%	-18.5%	-9.2%	0.9%	12.1%	24.5%	40.7%	4.8%
Alaska											
Actual Grant	$2,010	$2,038	$2,296	$2,764	$3,259	$4,242	$5,076	$4,597	$4,183	$3,825	$34,289
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Difference ($)	$0	$0	-$157	-$624	-$1,042	-$2,022	-$2,834	-$2,341	-$1,902	-$1,507	-$12,429
Difference (%)	0.0%	0.0%	-6.8%	-22.6%	-32.0%	-47.7%	-55.8%	-50.9%	-45.5%	-39.4%	-36.2%
Arizona											
Actual Grant	$16,873	$18,380	$20,041	$22,040	$22,200	$25,686	$33,741	$30,555	$27,807	$25,423	$242,747
Alternative Formula Estimate	$17,404	$18,384	$19,456	$19,501	$21,582	$21,668	$21,898	$22,034	$22,280	$23,988	$208,197
Difference ($)	$531	$4	-$585	-$2,538	-$619	-$4,017	-$11,843	-$8,521	-$5,527	-$1,435	-$34,551
Difference (%)	3.1%	0.0%	-2.9%	-11.5%	-2.8%	-15.6%	-35.1%	-27.9%	-19.9%	-5.6%	-14.2%
Arkansas											
Actual Grant	$6,814	$7,694	$7,840	$7,056	$6,579	$5,929	$6,223	$6,463	$5,882	$5,544	$66,023
Alternative Formula Estimate	$8,048	$8,501	$8,996	$9,017	$8,816	$8,851	$8,945	$9,001	$9,101	$9,301	$88,579
Difference ($)	$1,234	$806	$1,157	$1,961	$2,237	$2,923	$2,722	$2,538	$3,220	$3,758	$22,555
Difference (%)	18.1%	10.5%	14.8%	27.8%	34.0%	49.3%	43.7%	39.3%	54.7%	67.8%	34.2%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
California											
Actual Grant	$119,123	$120,707	$128,788	$123,336	$122,795	$119,370	$134,927	$125,113	$141,613	$142,970	$1,278,742
Alternative Formula Estimate	$111,400	$101,658	$103,403	$103,645	$112,679	$113,131	$114,330	$115,040	$116,326	$109,291	$1,100,903
Difference ($)	-$7,723	-$19,049	-$25,386	-$19,691	-$10,116	-$6,239	-$20,597	-$10,073	-$25,287	-$33,678	-$177,839
Difference (%)	-6.5%	-15.8%	-19.7%	-16.0%	-8.2%	-5.2%	-15.3%	-8.1%	-17.9%	-23.6%	-13.9%
Colorado											
Actual Grant	$12,414	$11,835	$11,183	$10,065	$9,385	$8,457	$7,969	$10,424	$13,703	$12,528	$107,964
Alternative Formula Estimate	$10,932	$11,593	$12,268	$12,297	$12,913	$12,965	$13,103	$13,184	$13,331	$14,023	$126,610
Difference ($)	-$1,482	-$242	$1,085	$2,232	$3,529	$4,508	$5,133	$2,760	-$372	$1,494	$18,646
Difference (%)	-11.9%	-2.0%	9.7%	22.2%	37.6%	53.3%	64.4%	26.5%	-2.7%	11.9%	17.3%
Connecticut											
Actual Grant	$9,399	$9,635	$10,314	$10,905	$10,168	$10,741	$9,768	$8,846	$10,926	$12,066	$102,768
Alternative Formula Estimate	$7,683	$7,576	$8,017	$8,036	$8,795	$8,831	$8,924	$8,980	$9,080	$9,767	$85,687
Difference ($)	-$1,716	-$2,059	-$2,297	-$2,870	-$1,373	-$1,911	-$844	$133	-$1,846	-$2,299	-$17,081
Difference (%)	-18.3%	-21.4%	-22.3%	-26.3%	-13.5%	-17.8%	-8.6%	1.5%	-16.9%	-19.1%	-16.6%
Delaware											
Actual Grant	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,583	$2,351	$2,960	$22,898
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Difference ($)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	-$327	-$69	-$642	-$1,039
Difference (%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-12.7%	-3.0%	-21.7%	-4.5%
District of Columbia											
Actual Grant	$2,216	$2,330	$3,086	$3,064	$3,380	$4,344	$5,122	$4,638	$4,221	$3,859	$36,261
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,138	$2,259	$2,390	$2,396	$2,834	$2,846	$2,876	$2,894	$2,926	$2,887	$26,446
Difference ($)	-$78	-$71	-$696	-$668	-$546	-$1,499	-$2,246	-$1,745	-$1,295	-$972	-$9,815
Difference (%)	-3.5%	-3.1%	-22.6%	-21.8%	-16.1%	-34.5%	-43.9%	-37.6%	-30.7%	-25.2%	-27.1%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Florida											
Actual Grant	$45,067	$42,775	$49,788	$47,432	$51,074	$46,024	$41,855	$44,307	$42,903	$39,225	$450,449
Alternative Formula Estimate	$45,038	$41,099	$41,883	$41,981	$45,670	$45,854	$46,340	$46,628	$47,149	$44,754	$446,394
Difference ($)	-$29	-$1,676	-$7,905	-$5,452	-$5,403	-$170	$4,485	$2,321	$4,246	$5,529	-$4,055
Difference (%)	-0.1%	-3.9%	-15.9%	-11.5%	-10.6%	-0.4%	10.7%	5.2%	9.9%	14.1%	-0.9%
Georgia											
Actual Grant	$27,468	$27,631	$30,707	$27,639	$25,770	$23,222	$21,118	$19,124	$17,404	$15,912	$235,995
Alternative Formula Estimate	$23,676	$24,357	$25,776	$25,837	$28,710	$28,825	$29,131	$29,312	$29,639	$29,196	$274,458
Difference ($)	-$3,792	-$3,274	-$4,931	-$1,802	$2,940	$5,603	$8,012	$10,187	$12,235	$13,284	$38,463
Difference (%)	-13.8%	-11.8%	-16.1%	-6.5%	11.4%	24.1%	37.9%	53.3%	70.3%	83.5%	16.3%
Hawaii											
Actual Grant	$2,050	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,933	$3,856	$3,760	$25,593
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,480	$2,619	$2,772	$2,778	$2,820	$2,832	$2,862	$2,879	$2,912	$3,071	$28,025
Difference ($)	$430	$582	$633	$639	$604	$612	$619	-$54	-$944	-$689	$2,432
Difference (%)	21.0%	28.5%	29.6%	29.9%	27.2%	27.6%	27.6%	-1.8%	-24.5%	-18.3%	9.5%
Idaho											
Actual Grant	$3,415	$3,116	$2,944	$2,650	$2,471	$2,227	$2,242	$2,835	$2,580	$2,359	$26,840
Alternative Formula Estimate	$3,880	$4,099	$4,338	$4,348	$4,814	$4,834	$4,885	$4,915	$4,970	$5,548	$46,630
Difference ($)	$465	$983	$1,393	$1,698	$2,343	$2,607	$2,642	$2,080	$2,390	$3,189	$19,790
Difference (%)	13.6%	31.5%	47.3%	64.1%	94.8%	117.1%	117.8%	73.4%	92.6%	135.2%	73.7%
Illinois											
Actual Grant	$38,094	$42,336	$40,003	$45,494	$42,864	$41,897	$47,903	$43,380	$39,986	$43,578	$425,536
Alternative Formula Estimate	$31,830	$29,745	$31,479	$31,552	$32,163	$32,292	$32,634	$32,837	$33,204	$31,227	$318,962
Difference ($)	-$6,264	-$12,591	-$8,525	-$13,942	-$10,702	-$9,605	-$15,269	-$10,543	-$6,782	-$12,351	-$106,574
Difference (%)	-16.4%	-29.7%	-21.3%	-30.6%	-25.0%	-22.9%	-31.9%	-24.3%	-17.0%	-28.3%	-25.0%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Indiana											
Actual Grant	$17,756	$16,204	$17,065	$15,359	$14,321	$12,905	$13,242	$16,939	$15,415	$14,094	$153,300
Alternative Formula Estimate	$15,899	$16,795	$17,774	$17,815	$18,116	$18,188	$18,381	$18,495	$18,702	$20,847	$181,014
Difference ($)	-$1,857	$591	$709	$2,456	$3,795	$5,284	$5,139	$1,557	$3,287	$6,754	$27,714
Difference (%)	-10.5%	3.6%	4.2%	16.0%	26.5%	40.9%	38.8%	9.2%	21.3%	47.9%	18.1%
Iowa											
Actual Grant	$4,740	$4,781	$5,118	$5,068	$4,794	$4,320	$3,929	$5,139	$5,512	$5,652	$49,054
Alternative Formula Estimate	$6,358	$8,381	$9,711	$9,734	$10,010	$10,050	$10,157	$10,220	$10,334	$10,913	$95,870
Difference ($)	$1,619	$3,600	$4,593	$4,666	$5,216	$5,730	$6,228	$5,081	$4,822	$5,261	$46,816
Difference (%)	34.2%	75.3%	89.7%	92.1%	108.8%	132.6%	158.5%	98.9%	87.5%	93.1%	95.4%
Kansas											
Actual Grant	$5,399	$5,370	$5,166	$4,650	$5,187	$4,674	$4,251	$5,470	$4,978	$4,551	$49,695
Alternative Formula Estimate	$7,194	$7,599	$8,042	$8,061	$7,866	$7,898	$7,982	$8,031	$8,121	$9,583	$80,377
Difference ($)	$1,795	$2,229	$2,875	$3,410	$2,680	$3,224	$3,731	$2,562	$3,143	$5,032	$30,682
Difference (%)	33.3%	41.5%	55.7%	73.3%	51.7%	69.0%	87.8%	46.8%	63.1%	110.6%	61.7%
Kentucky											
Actual Grant	$12,119	$13,718	$12,962	$13,073	$13,812	$13,415	$14,588	$13,211	$12,023	$12,962	$131,882
Alternative Formula Estimate	$12,936	$13,665	$14,461	$14,495	$14,648	$14,706	$14,862	$14,955	$15,122	$16,975	$146,823
Difference ($)	$817	-$53	$1,499	$1,422	$835	$1,291	$274	$1,744	$3,099	$4,013	$14,941
Difference (%)	6.7%	-0.4%	11.6%	10.9%	6.0%	9.6%	1.9%	13.2%	25.8%	31.0%	11.3%
Louisiana											
Actual Grant	$9,327	$9,194	$12,548	$16,019	$17,218	$15,971	$18,662	$16,900	$15,380	$14,121	$145,341
Alternative Formula Estimate	$12,657	$13,370	$14,149	$14,182	$14,097	$14,154	$14,304	$14,393	$14,553	$15,957	$141,815
Difference ($)	$3,330	$4,176	$1,600	-$1,837	-$3,121	-$1,818	-$4,358	-$2,507	-$827	$1,836	-$3,526
Difference (%)	35.7%	45.4%	12.8%	-11.5%	-18.1%	-11.4%	-23.4%	-14.8%	-5.4%	13.0%	-2.4%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Maine											
Actual Grant	$3,245	$3,215	$3,209	$2,888	$2,693	$2,426	$2,242	$2,328	$2,579	$2,821	$27,646
Alternative Formula Estimate	$3,435	$3,628	$3,840	$3,849	$3,616	$3,630	$3,669	$3,692	$3,733	$3,749	$36,840
Difference ($)	$190	$413	$631	$960	$923	$1,204	$1,426	$1,364	$1,154	$928	$9,194
Difference (%)	5.8%	12.8%	19.7%	33.3%	34.3%	49.6%	63.6%	58.6%	44.8%	32.9%	33.3%
Maryland											
Actual Grant	$11,990	$12,364	$14,375	$13,420	$12,513	$14,589	$13,268	$12,015	$13,647	$18,023	$136,204
Alternative Formula Estimate	$10,480	$11,071	$11,716	$11,743	$11,262	$11,307	$11,427	$11,498	$11,627	$12,394	$114,525
Difference ($)	-$1,509	-$1,293	-$2,660	-$1,677	-$1,251	-$3,282	-$1,841	-$517	-$2,020	-$5,629	-$21,679
Difference (%)	-12.6%	-10.5%	-18.5%	-12.5%	-10.0%	-22.5%	-13.9%	-4.3%	-14.8%	-31.2%	-15.9%
Massachusetts											
Actual Grant	$14,507	$16,505	$15,595	$14,037	$13,088	$12,391	$11,269	$14,741	$19,377	$21,018	$152,528
Alternative Formula Estimate	$15,737	$16,623	$17,592	$17,633	$19,635	$19,714	$19,923	$20,047	$20,271	$21,974	$189,150
Difference ($)	$1,230	$119	$1,997	$3,597	$6,548	$7,323	$8,654	$5,306	$894	$956	$36,622
Difference (%)	8.5%	0.7%	12.8%	25.6%	50.0%	59.1%	76.8%	36.0%	4.6%	4.5%	24.0%
Michigan											
Actual Grant	$30,073	$31,250	$29,709	$26,740	$28,700	$34,981	$35,039	$37,127	$33,787	$34,409	$321,815
Alternative Formula Estimate	$30,073	$27,877	$29,502	$29,571	$30,261	$30,383	$30,705	$30,896	$31,241	$29,136	$299,646
Difference ($)	$0	-$3,373	-$207	$2,831	$1,562	-$4,599	-$4,334	-$6,231	-$2,547	-$5,272	-$22,170
Difference (%)	0.0%	-10.8%	-0.7%	10.6%	5.4%	-13.1%	-12.4%	-16.8%	-7.5%	-15.3%	-6.9%
Minnesota											
Actual Grant	$9,948	$9,078	$8,578	$8,674	$10,126	$9,124	$8,298	$10,854	$10,498	$9,598	$94,776
Alternative Formula Estimate	$13,396	$14,558	$15,406	$15,443	$15,605	$15,668	$15,834	$15,933	$16,111	$16,664	$154,618
Difference ($)	$3,448	$5,480	$6,829	$6,768	$5,480	$6,544	$7,536	$5,078	$5,613	$7,066	$59,842
Difference (%)	34.7%	60.4%	79.6%	78.0%	54.1%	71.7%	90.8%	46.8%	53.5%	73.6%	63.1%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Mississippi											
Actual Grant	$9,201	$9,151	$10,194	$10,703	$10,084	$10,427	$12,696	$11,497	$10,463	$9,566	$103,983
Alternative Formula Estimate	$9,665	$10,209	$10,804	$10,829	$10,405	$10,447	$10,558	$10,623	$10,742	$10,670	$104,952
Difference ($)	$464	$1,058	$610	$126	$321	$20	-$2,138	-$874	$279	$1,104	$969
Difference (%)	5.0%	11.6%	6.0%	1.2%	3.2%	0.2%	-16.8%	-7.6%	2.7%	11.5%	0.9%
Missouri											
Actual Grant	$12,877	$14,228	$16,473	$14,826	$14,109	$12,714	$11,562	$11,189	$10,183	$11,203	$129,365
Alternative Formula Estimate	$14,135	$14,931	$15,801	$15,838	$16,309	$16,375	$16,548	$16,651	$16,837	$16,853	$160,279
Difference ($)	$1,258	$703	-$671	$1,012	$2,200	$3,660	$4,986	$5,462	$6,654	$5,649	$30,914
Difference (%)	9.8%	4.9%	-4.1%	6.8%	15.6%	28.8%	43.1%	48.8%	65.3%	50.4%	23.9%
Montana											
Actual Grant	$2,152	$2,153	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,287	$2,258	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$22,201
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,866	$3,445	$3,646	$3,654	$3,407	$3,149	$3,183	$3,202	$3,238	$3,563	$33,354
Difference ($)	$714	$1,292	$1,507	$1,515	$1,191	$862	$925	$946	$957	$1,245	$11,153
Difference (%)	33.2%	60.0%	70.4%	70.8%	53.7%	37.7%	41.0%	41.9%	41.9%	53.7%	50.2%
Nebraska											
Actual Grant	$2,395	$2,425	$2,291	$2,445	$2,664	$2,871	$3,322	$3,213	$2,924	$2,674	$27,225
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,937	$3,871	$5,283	$5,441	$5,542	$5,565	$5,624	$5,658	$5,722	$6,085	$51,728
Difference ($)	$542	$1,446	$2,992	$2,996	$2,878	$2,693	$2,302	$2,445	$2,797	$3,412	$24,503
Difference (%)	22.6%	59.6%	130.6%	122.5%	108.0%	93.8%	69.3%	76.1%	95.7%	127.6%	90.0%
Nevada											
Actual Grant	$8,866	$9,035	$9,532	$9,964	$9,290	$9,951	$9,331	$12,205	$11,823	$10,810	$100,806
Alternative Formula Estimate	$8,866	$8,090	$7,644	$6,881	$7,058	$7,087	$7,162	$7,206	$7,287	$7,650	$74,930
Difference ($)	$0	-$944	-$1,887	-$3,083	-$2,232	-$2,865	-$2,169	-$4,999	-$4,536	-$3,160	-$25,875
Difference (%)	0.0%	-10.5%	-19.8%	-30.9%	-24.0%	-28.8%	-23.2%	-41.0%	-38.4%	-29.2%	-25.7%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
New Hampshire											
Actual Grant	$2,200	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,933	$2,669	$2,441	$23,238
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,613	$2,785	$2,947	$2,954	$3,410	$3,423	$3,460	$3,481	$3,520	$3,511	$32,104
Difference ($)	$412	$747	$808	$815	$1,193	$1,204	$1,217	$548	$851	$1,071	$8,866
Difference (%)	18.7%	36.7%	37.8%	38.1%	53.8%	54.3%	54.3%	18.7%	31.9%	43.9%	38.2%
New Jersey											
Actual Grant	$25,513	$23,282	$24,899	$22,410	$20,895	$24,107	$21,923	$24,956	$26,917	$26,581	$241,485
Alternative Formula Estimate	$20,188	$18,423	$17,408	$16,159	$16,598	$16,665	$16,842	$16,946	$17,136	$17,447	$173,811
Difference ($)	-$5,325	-$4,860	-$7,491	-$6,251	-$4,297	-$7,442	-$5,082	-$8,010	-$9,782	-$9,134	-$67,674
Difference (%)	-20.9%	-20.9%	-30.1%	-27.9%	-20.6%	-30.9%	-23.2%	-32.1%	-36.3%	-34.4%	-28.0%
New Mexico											
Actual Grant	$4,626	$5,250	$6,167	$7,523	$9,205	$9,152	$9,452	$8,559	$7,789	$8,662	$76,384
Alternative Formula Estimate	$5,711	$6,444	$6,819	$6,835	$7,048	$7,076	$7,151	$7,196	$7,276	$8,290	$69,846
Difference ($)	$1,085	$1,194	$652	-$687	-$2,157	-$2,076	-$2,300	-$1,364	-$513	-$372	-$6,538
Difference (%)	23.5%	22.7%	10.6%	-9.1%	-23.4%	-22.7%	-24.3%	-15.9%	-6.6%	-4.3%	-8.6%
New York											
Actual Grant	$52,012	$52,128	$54,004	$49,659	$50,377	$62,321	$56,676	$56,399	$68,508	$71,280	$573,363
Alternative Formula Estimate	$48,881	$51,634	$54,643	$54,771	$54,022	$54,239	$54,814	$55,154	$55,770	$54,790	$538,716
Difference ($)	-$3,131	-$495	$639	$5,112	$3,645	-$8,083	-$1,862	-$1,245	-$12,738	-$16,489	-$34,647
Difference (%)	-6.0%	-0.9%	1.2%	10.3%	7.2%	-13.0%	-3.3%	-2.2%	-18.6%	-23.1%	-6.0%
North Carolina											
Actual Grant	$28,872	$26,347	$25,235	$28,894	$27,817	$27,664	$26,248	$23,770	$22,180	$24,201	$261,228
Alternative Formula Estimate	$25,044	$23,722	$25,105	$25,164	$27,393	$27,503	$27,795	$27,967	$28,280	$28,003	$265,976
Difference ($)	-$3,828	-$2,625	-$131	-$3,730	-$424	-$161	$1,547	$4,197	$6,100	$3,802	$4,748
Difference (%)	-13.3%	-10.0%	-0.5%	-12.9%	-1.5%	-0.6%	5.9%	17.7%	27.5%	15.7%	1.8%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
North Dakota											
Actual Grant	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,100	$2,218	$2,348	$2,353	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,551	$22,786
Difference ($)	$90	$181	$208	$214	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$233	$926
Difference (%)	4.5%	8.9%	9.7%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.1%	4.2%
Ohio											
Actual Grant	$26,270	$28,593	$28,162	$30,284	$36,466	$41,750	$45,497	$41,201	$37,496	$34,281	$350,001
Alternative Formula Estimate	$28,465	$30,069	$31,821	$31,896	$32,502	$32,632	$32,978	$33,183	$33,554	$34,558	$321,658
Difference ($)	$2,195	$1,475	$3,658	$1,611	-$3,964	-$9,117	-$12,518	-$8,018	-$3,942	$276	-$28,343
Difference (%)	8.4%	5.2%	13.0%	5.3%	-10.9%	-21.8%	-27.5%	-19.5%	-10.5%	0.8%	-8.1%
Oklahoma											
Actual Grant	$6,259	$6,941	$6,559	$7,842	$9,607	$8,657	$7,873	$8,265	$7,522	$6,877	$76,400
Alternative Formula Estimate	$8,143	$9,913	$10,490	$10,515	$10,569	$10,611	$10,724	$10,791	$10,911	$12,720	$105,386
Difference ($)	$1,884	$2,972	$3,932	$2,673	$962	$1,955	$2,851	$2,526	$3,390	$5,843	$28,986
Difference (%)	30.1%	42.8%	59.9%	34.1%	10.0%	22.6%	36.2%	30.6%	45.1%	85.0%	37.9%
Oregon											
Actual Grant	$10,544	$10,431	$11,441	$10,298	$9,601	$8,652	$10,564	$10,931	$10,397	$9,505	$102,365
Alternative Formula Estimate	$9,331	$9,760	$10,328	$10,352	$10,992	$11,036	$11,153	$11,222	$11,348	$11,799	$107,321
Difference ($)	-$1,213	-$672	-$1,113	$55	$1,390	$2,384	$589	$291	$951	$2,293	$4,956
Difference (%)	-11.5%	-6.4%	-9.7%	0.5%	14.5%	27.6%	5.6%	2.7%	9.1%	24.1%	4.8%
Pennsylvania											
Actual Grant	$33,509	$30,984	$29,653	$32,430	$39,540	$36,623	$34,144	$42,232	$38,433	$42,913	$360,462
Alternative Formula Estimate	$31,401	$33,169	$35,102	$35,184	$35,363	$35,505	$35,882	$36,105	$36,508	$36,980	$351,199
Difference ($)	-$2,109	$2,185	$5,449	$2,755	-$4,177	-$1,118	$1,737	-$6,127	-$1,925	-$5,933	-$9,263
Difference (%)	-6.3%	7.1%	18.4%	8.5%	-10.6%	-3.1%	5.1%	-14.5%	-5.0%	-13.8%	-2.6%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Puerto Rico											
Actual Grant	$17,266	$19,490	$23,096	$25,305	$26,636	$29,914	$28,607	$25,906	$23,576	$21,555	$241,349
Alternative Formula Estimate	$19,989	$21,114	$22,345	$22,397	$20,883	$18,818	$18,896	$19,013	$19,226	$17,957	$200,638
Difference ($)	$2,723	$1,625	-$751	-$2,908	-$5,753	-$11,096	-$9,711	-$6,893	-$4,350	-$3,598	-$40,712
Difference (%)	15.8%	8.3%	-3.3%	-11.5%	-21.6%	-37.1%	-33.9%	-26.6%	-18.5%	-16.7%	-16.9%
Rhode Island											
Actual Grant	$3,743	$4,107	$3,881	$3,601	$3,357	$3,406	$3,097	$3,384	$3,633	$3,322	$35,530
Alternative Formula Estimate	$3,465	$3,367	$3,563	$3,572	$3,675	$3,690	$3,729	$3,752	$3,794	$3,715	$36,322
Difference ($)	-$278	-$740	-$318	-$29	$318	$284	$632	$369	$161	$393	$792
Difference (%)	-7.4%	-18.0%	-8.2%	-0.8%	9.5%	8.4%	20.4%	10.9%	4.4%	11.8%	2.2%
South Carolina											
Actual Grant	$12,574	$11,475	$14,637	$14,004	$13,057	$11,766	$10,700	$9,690	$8,819	$9,325	$116,048
Alternative Formula Estimate	$11,452	$12,274	$12,989	$13,020	$13,611	$13,665	$13,810	$13,896	$14,051	$14,353	$133,122
Difference ($)	-$1,123	$799	-$1,647	-$984	$554	$1,899	$3,110	$4,206	$5,233	$5,028	$17,075
Difference (%)	-8.9%	7.0%	-11.3%	-7.0%	4.2%	16.1%	29.1%	43.4%	59.3%	53.9%	14.7%
South Dakota											
Actual Grant	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,357	$2,490	$2,635	$2,641	$2,704	$2,715	$2,744	$2,761	$2,791	$3,141	$26,979
Difference ($)	$348	$452	$496	$502	$487	$496	$501	$504	$510	$823	$5,119
Difference (%)	17.3%	22.2%	23.2%	23.5%	22.0%	22.3%	22.3%	22.3%	22.3%	35.5%	23.4%
Tennessee											
Actual Grant	$16,496	$17,504	$18,911	$17,022	$17,557	$15,821	$14,388	$16,075	$14,788	$14,139	$162,701
Alternative Formula Estimate	$15,623	$16,503	$17,465	$17,506	$17,623	$17,694	$17,881	$17,993	$18,194	$18,531	$175,014
Difference ($)	-$873	-$1,000	-$1,446	$485	$66	$1,872	$3,493	$1,918	$3,406	$4,392	$12,312
Difference (%)	-5.3%	-5.7%	-7.6%	2.8%	0.4%	11.8%	24.3%	11.9%	23.0%	31.1%	7.6%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
Texas											
Actual Grant	$52,493	$54,915	$51,889	$58,588	$76,192	$68,658	$62,439	$66,979	$73,436	$91,790	$657,377
Alternative Formula Estimate	$61,934	$65,422	$69,235	$69,397	$70,945	$71,230	$71,984	$72,432	$73,241	$78,471	$704,290
Difference ($)	$9,441	$10,507	$17,346	$10,809	-$5,247	$2,571	$9,546	$5,453	-$195	-$13,319	$46,913
Difference (%)	18.0%	19.1%	33.4%	18.4%	-6.9%	3.7%	15.3%	8.1%	-0.3%	-14.5%	7.1%
Utah											
Actual Grant	$4,305	$3,928	$3,712	$3,341	$3,668	$3,549	$3,228	$4,222	$3,842	$3,513	$37,308
Alternative Formula Estimate	$6,210	$6,597	$6,982	$6,998	$7,998	$8,030	$8,115	$8,166	$8,257	$9,228	$76,582
Difference ($)	$1,906	$2,669	$3,270	$3,657	$4,330	$4,481	$4,888	$3,944	$4,415	$5,715	$39,274
Difference (%)	44.3%	67.9%	88.1%	109.5%	118.0%	126.3%	151.4%	93.4%	114.9%	162.7%	105.3%
Vermont											
Actual Grant	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,538	$22,080
Difference ($)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$221	$221
Difference (%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	1.0%
Virginia											
Actual Grant	$13,392	$13,326	$15,728	$14,156	$13,199	$11,894	$10,817	$12,963	$15,915	$14,551	$135,942
Alternative Formula Estimate	$14,576	$15,397	$16,294	$16,332	$17,698	$17,769	$17,958	$18,069	$18,271	$20,103	$172,467
Difference ($)	$1,183	$2,071	$566	$2,176	$4,499	$5,875	$7,141	$5,106	$2,356	$5,552	$36,525
Difference (%)	8.8%	15.5%	3.6%	15.4%	34.1%	49.4%	66.0%	39.4%	14.8%	38.2%	26.9%
Washington											
Actual Grant	$16,310	$15,946	$18,966	$18,656	$19,174	$21,214	$25,394	$22,997	$20,928	$19,134	$198,719
Alternative Formula Estimate	$15,444	$16,074	$17,011	$17,051	$17,538	$17,609	$17,795	$17,906	$18,106	$17,414	$171,947
Difference ($)	-$865	$128	-$1,956	-$1,606	-$1,635	-$3,606	-$7,599	-$5,091	-$2,823	-$1,720	-$26,772
Difference (%)	-5.3%	0.8%	-10.3%	-8.6%	-8.5%	-17.0%	-29.9%	-22.1%	-13.5%	-9.0%	-13.5%

State	PY2014	PY2015	PY2016	PY2017	PY2018	PY2019	PY2020	PY2021	PY2022	PY2023	Total, PY2014-PY2023
West Virginia											
Actual Grant	$3,958	$3,988	$5,350	$6,279	$5,855	$6,492	$7,299	$6,610	$6,015	$5,500	$57,345
Alternative Formula Estimate	$4,771	$5,040	$5,334	$5,346	$5,142	$5,163	$5,218	$5,250	$5,309	$5,955	$52,527
Difference ($)	$813	$1,052	-$17	-$933	-$712	-$1,329	-$2,081	-$1,360	-$706	$455	-$4,818
Difference (%)	20.6%	26.4%	-0.3%	-14.9%	-12.2%	-20.5%	-28.5%	-20.6%	-11.7%	8.3%	-8.4%
Wisconsin											
Actual Grant	$13,563	$14,042	$13,268	$12,047	$11,232	$10,122	$9,205	$12,040	$10,957	$10,018	$116,494
Alternative Formula Estimate	$14,707	$15,536	$16,441	$16,480	$16,399	$16,465	$16,639	$16,743	$16,930	$17,372	$163,712
Difference ($)	$1,145	$1,494	$3,173	$4,433	$5,167	$6,343	$7,435	$4,702	$5,972	$7,354	$47,218
Difference (%)	8.4%	10.6%	23.9%	36.8%	46.0%	62.7%	80.8%	39.1%	54.5%	73.4%	40.5%
Wyoming											
Actual Grant	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Alternative Formula Estimate	$2,010	$2,038	$2,139	$2,139	$2,216	$2,219	$2,242	$2,256	$2,282	$2,318	$21,860
Difference	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Difference (%)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Actual grants as published by DOL at https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/budget/formula/state. Grants under alternative formula calculated by CRS using the disadvantaged youth data available at the same site and the methodology described in the body of the memorandum.

Notes: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Percentages were calculated based on unrounded numbers. Actual grants for PY2014 were allotted using a formula under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 that is the same as the current law WIOA Youth Activities grant formula.

a. For each state, the "Difference ($)" cells equal the "Alternative Formula Estimate" minus the "Actual Grant" for each year. Positive numbers indicate instances where the alternative formula estimate is greater than the actual grant. Negative numbers indicate where the alternative formula estimate is less than the actual grant.

b. For each state, the "Difference (%)" cells equal the "Difference $" cell divided by the "Actual Grant" cell for each year.