

1990

Reauthorization: State Grant Formula (1990): Memorandum 02

Rex Arney

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_78

Recommended Citation

Arney, Rex, "Reauthorization: State Grant Formula (1990): Memorandum 02" (1990). *Reauthorization: State Grant Formula (1990)*. Paper 9.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_78/9

This Memorandum is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reauthorization: State Grant Formula (1990) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



Office of the General Counsel

July 12, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sandy Crary
FROM: Rex Arney *RA*
SUBJECT: NEH State Programs

I am enclosing the information you requested pertaining to the allocation of appropriated funds to State Programs for FY 1987 and 1988. On June 29th I sent you similar materials for FY 1989.

The information is provided in the same format as previously submitted. Sheet #1 shows all funds made available to the state humanities councils and committees in two categories - 44% and 22%. Also, a portion of the 34% discretionary category is shown on sheet #1. In addition, sheet #2 shows in the "Definite" column the remainder of the funds in the 34% category. Finally, sheet #3 shows the balance of funds awarded in the 34% discretionary, but which do not go directly to state councils. However, the awards shown on sheet #3 do benefit the various state councils.

You also requested an explanation of the "Exemplaries," "Merit Award" and "Other" in the 34% discretionary category. I am enclosing the explanation prepared by the Division of State Programs. I believe it will answer your questions.

Finally, you asked for copies of any guidelines which are used by the Endowment to determine who gets the money in the categories you asked about. I am enclosing two sets of guidelines - Guidelines for the State and REgional Exémplary Awards and Planning Grants and Guidelines for the preparation of Biennial Proposals with details on Merit Award funding on page 5.

Call me if you need anything further.



Congressional Research Service
The Library of Congress

Washington, D.C. 20540

June 21, 1990

TO : Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
Attention: Sandy Crary

FROM : Susan Boren
Specialist in Social Legislation
Education and Public Welfare Division

SUBJECT : **Alternative Distributions of National Endowment for
the Humanities State Grant Funds**

You have asked for analysis of several alternatives to the current distribution of funds for the National Endowment for the Humanities' (NEH) State grants program. These alternatives are the specific ones you requested.

- A -- current statute 34/44/22--34 percent chair's discretion, 44 percent distributed in equal amounts to States, 22 percent based on States population;
- B -- 30/48/22--30 percent chair's discretion, 48 percent equal amounts to States, 22 percent based on States population;
- C -- 25/50/25--25 percent chair's discretion, 50 percent equal amounts to States, 25 percent based on State population; and
- D -- 25/53/22--25 percent chair's discretion, 53 percent equal amounts to States, 22 percent based on State population.

The following charts and accompanying table show the dollar differences in a hypothetical case where the total program funds appropriation is at \$130 million for NEH. The calculations would be as follows and the individual State results appear in the table on page 5 of this memorandum.

Calculation A: Current Statute applied to a hypothetical amount for State grants of \$130,000,000 with \$26,000,000 being reserved for State programs.

NEH

20 percent of program funds for
State grants \$26,000,000

\$200,000 to each State and
territory \$11,200,000

34 percent of excess
(.34 x \$14,800,000) = \$5,032,000
for chairperson's discretion

44 percent of excess
(.44 x \$14,800,000) = \$6,512,000
distributed in equal amounts
to States \$6,512,000

22 percent to States on
basis of population \$3,256,000

See the table on page 5 to see how States fare under current statute.

Alternative B: In this alternative 30 percent of the excess of program funds would go toward the NEH's Chairman's discretion, 48 percent of the excess would go to the States in equal amounts, and 22 percent would go to States based on population.

NEH

20 percent of program funds for
State grants \$26,000,000

\$200,000 to each State and
territory \$11,200,000

30 percent of excess
(30 percent x 14,800,000) = \$4,440,000
for chairperson's discretion

48 percent of excess
(48 x \$14,800,000) = \$7,104,000
distributed in equal amounts to
States \$7,104,000

**Allotment for States Under the National Endowment for the Humanities:
Current Statute and Alternatives
(in thousands)**

State	Population	Percentage of the population	A Current statute amounts with formula 34/44/22	B Alternative with formula 30/48/22	C Alternative with formula 25/50/25	D Alternative with formula 25/53/22
Alabama	4,083	1.68	371	381	394	395
Alaska	525	0.22	323	333	340	347
Arizona	3,386	1.39	361	371	383	385
Arkansas	2,388	0.98	348	358	370	372
California	27,633	11.37	686	696	758	710
Colorado	3,296	1.35	360	370	381	384
Connecticut	3,211	1.32	359	369	380	383
Delaware	644	0.26	325	334	342	348
District of Columbia	622	0.26	325	334	342	348
Florida	12,023	4.94	477	487	515	501
Georgia	6,222	2.56	399	409	427	423
Hawaii	1,083	0.44	330	340	348	354
Idaho	998	0.41	329	339	347	353
Illinois	11,582	4.76	471	480	508	494
Indiana	5,531	2.27	390	400	416	414
Iowa	2,834	1.16	354	364	375	378
Kansas	2,476	1.02	349	359	370	373
Kentucky	3,727	1.53	366	375	389	390
Louisiana	4,461	1.83	376	385	400	400
Maine	1,187	0.49	332	342	350	356
Maryland	4,535	1.86	376	386	401	401

**Allotment for States Under the National Endowment for the Humanities:
Current Statute and Alternatives--Continued
(in thousands)**

State	Population	Percentage of the population	A	B	C	D
			Current statute amounts with formula 34/44/22	Alternative with formula 30/48/22	Alternative with formula 25/50/25	Alternative with formula 25/53/22
Massachusetts	5,855	2.41	394	406	421	418
Michigan	9,200	3.78	439	449	472	463
Minnesota	4,246	1.74	373	383	396	397
Mississippi	2,625	1.08	351	361	372	375
Missouri	5,103	2.10	384	394	410	408
Nebraska	1,594	0.65	337	347	356	361
Nevada	1,007	0.41	329	339	347	353
New Hampshire	1,057	0.43	330	340	348	354
New Jersey	7,672	3.15	419	428	448	442
New Mexico	1,500	0.62	336	346	355	360
New York	17,825	7.32	554	564	602	578
North Carolina	6,413	2.63	402	412	429	426
North Dakota	672	0.28	324	335	342	349
Ohio	10,784	4.43	460	470	496	484
Oklahoma	3,272	1.34	359	369	382	384
Oregon	2,724	1.12	352	362	373	376
Pennsylvania	11,936	4.90	475	485	513	499
Rhode Island	986	0.41	329	339	347	353
South Carolina	3,425	1.41	362	372	384	386
South Dakota	709	0.29	325	335	343	349

**Allotment for States Under the National Endowment for the Humanities:
Current Statute and Alternatives--Continued
(in thousands)**

State	Population	Percentage of the population	A Current statute amounts with formula 34/44/22	B Alternative with formula 30/48/22	C Alternative with formula 25/50/25	D Alternative with formula 25/53/22
Tennessee	4,855	1.99	380	390	406	405
Texas	16,789	6.90	541	551	587	564
Utah	1,680	0.69	338	348	358	362
Vermont	548	0.23	323	333	341	347
Virginia	5,904	2.43	395	405	422	419
Washington	4,538	1.86	377	387	401	401
West Virginia	1,897	0.78	341	351	361	365
Wisconsin	4,807	1.97	380	390	405	404
Wyoming	490	0.20	323	334	339	347
U.S. Total	243,400	100.00	--		--	--

CRS-7

NOTE: This table does not show the grant amounts for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, Northern Marianas, and Virgin Islands, each of which would receive a \$200,000 minimum grant plus portions from state allotments in equal amounts. They are also not factored in as part of the distribution of population portion.

NOTE: Population figures are in thousands and were derived from the *Statistical Abstract, 1989*.

Analysis:

Effects on the Chairperson--The chairperson would lose most under the 25/50/25 allotment formula (alternative C) or the 25/53/22 formula (alternative D). Both represent a 9 percent drop for the chair's discretion. In the hypothetical case discussed where the program funds totalled \$130,000,000, in this instance it would be a decrease of \$1,332,000. Alternative B would be a 4 percent drop for the chair's discretion, a decrease of \$592,000.

Effects on the States--Larger States would benefit most from alternative C whereby 50 percent of the excess would go to States equally and 25 percent of the excess would go to States based on population. Medium size and smaller States would benefit most from alternative D whereby 53 percent of the excess would go to States in equal amounts and 22 percent would be distributed by State population.

Examples are as follows:

Rhode Island:

Under current statute, Rhode Island would receive \$329,000 under current statute (A), \$339,000 under alternative B, \$347,000 under Alternative C, and \$353,000 under alternative D. Alternative D whereby 53 percent of the excess goes to States in equal amounts helps the smaller populated States the most.

Massachusetts:

Under current statute, Massachusetts would receive \$394,000 under current statute (a), \$406,000 under alternative B, \$421,000 under alternative C, and \$418,000 under alternative D. Massachusetts would benefit most from alternative C whereby 50 percent of the excess is distributed in equal amounts with 25 percent distributed on the basis of population.

See the table on p. 5 and 7. In any case in which a State's percentage of population is greater than 1.8 percent alternative C will benefit those States more than alternative D. In any case in which a State's percentage of population is below approximately 1.8 percent then alternative D will benefit those States more than alternative C.

We hope this proves useful.