



Serving Idaho’s Children, Youth and Young Adults: Tracking ARRA Spending in Idaho

February 2010

By Judith L. Brown¹

The January tracking report² analyzed Idaho’s use to date of specific funding streams under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). This tracking report compares Idaho’s track record in terms of accessing and using ARRA funds to that of the other states. This comparison is followed by several miscellaneous comments about ongoing activities related to ARRA, including identifying several streams of stimulus funding that are being extended beyond the original ARRA timeline.

Idaho lags other states in accessing ARRA funds: Idaho’s progress in accessing and using ARRA funds was first compared to the other states’ progress in September 2009, just over six months after ARRA was enacted.³ At that time, Idaho was slower than all the other states but one (New Mexico) in applying for and receiving ARRA funds. After its applications were approved, Idaho was again somewhat slow in spending, or “paying out” ARRA moneys; Idaho’s rank was 20th in paying out its funds, meaning 18 states and the District of Columbia were slower than Idaho and 31 states were faster. Overall, from the time funds were announced to the time funds were spent, Idaho ranked ninth-slowest of the 50 states and D.C. in taking advantage of opportunities to stimulate Idaho’s economy through ARRA.

Not a lot has changed in the succeeding five months. See Table 1 on the last page. One year after enactment of ARRA, Idaho is now the slowest of all 50 states and D.C. in applying for and receiving ARRA funds. Once Idaho receives ARRA funds, it has picked up the pace with which it spends those funds, now ranking 20th-fastest (which is the same as 31st-slowest) instead of 20th-slowest. Overall, from the time funds are announced to the time funds are spent, Idaho now ranks tenth-slowest instead of ninth-slowest—not a significant change.

Table 1 also shows that Idaho is drawing down a smaller percentage of the ARRA funds it was originally estimated to be eligible for than are other states. To date Idaho has received just 86 percent of the ARRA funding it was originally estimated to be eligible for. All but six states have by now received *more* in ARRA funding than originally anticipated and several states (Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey) have received more than 50 per cent more than originally anticipated.

As shown in the January tracking report, Idaho has received more in ARRA funding for Unemployment Insurance claims than originally anticipated. Given the severity of the recession, this is likely to be the case in most if not all states. On the other hand, Idaho has failed to access ARRA funds through TANF (either the Emergency Contingency Fund, which is still accepting applications from states, or the Supplemental Grant Extension, which has now expired), may be slow and/or late in taking advantage of Head Start/Early Head Start funds and College Work-Study funds, and has not been fully transparent in identifying ARRA funding for food stamps. Furthermore, Idaho has also declined to draw down all the enhanced Medicaid matching funds it could.⁴

Overall, Idaho's performance in terms of taking advantage of opportunities through ARRA to stimulate its economy and speed the recovery has been lackluster. This is doubly unfortunate given that Idaho's recovery is expected to lag the nation's.⁵

Other ARRA-related news: Most ARRA funding has to be committed if not fully spent by the end of FY 2011. With state legislatures all around the country now setting budgets for FY 2011, policy makers are beginning to look at maintaining and strengthening the recovery after ARRA funds run out. Most economists believe the recession has officially ended, probably as of December 2009, but the numbers of unemployed remain high and job growth remains very anemic. Likewise state budgets continue to face big gaps between incoming revenues from tax receipts and demands for services like Medicaid, Unemployment Insurance, and public and higher education. As a result, Congress is beginning to provide additional funding for some ARRA streams beyond the end of FY 2011. An attempt will be made to note these extensions in these tracking reports, although technically speaking these additional funds are authorized under new legislation and are not part of ARRA. Additional funding presently under consideration in Congress includes

- \$66 billion for Unemployment Insurance, to provide additional months of unemployment checks for people who have been out of work for more than six months.⁶
- \$25 billion to help states meet the continuing demands on their Medicaid programs by maintaining the enhanced matching rate for Medicaid through June 2011. ARRA originally provided for the enhanced matching rate to expire at the end of 2010.⁶
- \$10 billion to continue a 65 percent health insurance premium subsidy for the unemployed under the COBRA program.⁶
- an effort to put an additional \$2.5 billion in the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund. This effort is struggling to garner the support it needs and as of this writing appears likely to fail or be significantly scaled back. However, the original ARRA allocation to the TANF Emergency Contingency Fund is not yet all expended and states may continue to submit applications for these funds until September 1, 2010.⁷

Idaho's proposal under the "Race to the Top" funding stream of competitive grants for improving public education has been rejected.⁸ A second round of applications will be accepted in June 2010; Idaho plans to compete in that round too.

One final note: Idaho's recovery website, www.accountability.idaho.gov, has not been updated since January. Other recovery websites, such as the federal government's www.recovery.gov are updated in close to real time. Idahoans wanting more transparency and accountability regarding uses of ARRA funds in Idaho should provide feedback through the "Contact Us" feature at www.accountability.idaho.gov or through other means.

Endnotes

- ¹Judith L. Brown is a consulting economist with interests in poverty reduction, economic development and tax policy. She has master's degrees in both economics and agricultural economics from Michigan State University, and for 10 years was director of the nonpartisan Idaho Center on Budget and Tax Policy.
- ²Idaho KIDS COUNT (January 2010), "Serving Idaho's Children, Youth and Young Adults: Tracking ARRA Spending in Idaho—January 2010," by Judith L. Brown at http://www.idahokidscount.org/downloads/library/downloads/primary_research/ARRA_report_Jan_2010.pdf.
- ³This table is available at http://www.idahokidscount.org/downloads/library/downloads/primary_research/Small_Faces/SmallFacesSupportingDataTables.pdf and is discussed further on page 3 of "Making Use of Economic Recovery Funds: Opportunities for Idaho to Better Serve Youth and Young Adults," by Judith L. Brown for Idaho KIDS COUNT, May 2009, at http://www.idahokidscount.org/downloads/library/downloads/primary_research/Small_Faces/SmallFacesPart5.pdf.
- ⁴"It's not a bargain if we don't have the money to pay for it," *Lewiston Tribune*, February 26, 2009, p. 1A.
- ⁵"Idaho may lag nation in recovery from recession," pp. 15-16 in Idaho Department of Labor, *Idaho Employment* newsletter, August 2009; available online at <http://labor.idaho.gov>.
- ⁶"Jobless aid clears hurdle," *Lewiston Tribune*, March 10, 2010, p. 4A.
- ⁷E-mail communication from Liz Scott, Senior Fellow, Welfare Reform and Income Support Division, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, to tanfnet listserv, March 4, 2010; Center on Law and Social Policy, "TANF Emergency Fund: State Applications Approved as of January 27, 2010," by Elizabeth Lower-Basch and Josh Bone, available at www.clasp.org/TANFEmergencyFund.
- ⁸"Idaho is out in first round of 'Race to the Top'," *Lewiston Tribune*, March 5, 2010, p. 2D.

**Table 1. ARRA Investments by State
as of 3/2/10**

State	Announced	Made Available	Paid Out	Avail/Ann		Pd/Avail		Pd/Ann	
				%	rank	%	rank	%	rank
Alabama	\$ 3,026,767,750	\$ 4,076,305,502	\$ 1,929,079,697	135%	37	47%	13	64%	23
Alaska	\$ 1,393,888,037	\$ 1,295,039,992	\$ 422,035,075	93%	5	33%	2	30%	1
Arizona	\$ 5,240,163,886	\$ 6,208,788,653	\$ 3,761,586,643	118%	22	61%	41	72%	30
Arkansas	\$ 2,221,481,024	\$ 2,591,135,059	\$ 1,342,376,221	117%	19	52%	20	60%	19
California	\$ 25,772,848,281	\$ 36,122,945,161	\$ 23,904,747,544	140%	41	66%	50	93%	49
Colorado	\$ 3,723,889,880	\$ 4,240,244,043	\$ 2,422,062,122	114%	16	57%	29	65%	24
Connecticut	\$ 2,585,068,274	\$ 3,760,851,356	\$ 2,265,148,017	145%	46	60%	37	88%	46
Delaware	\$ 811,853,099	\$ 1,051,065,233	\$ 483,402,927	129%	31	46%	1	60%	2
D.C	\$ 2,489,807,538	\$ 3,216,000,574	\$ 909,033,184	129%	32	28%	9	37%	18
Florida	\$ 11,933,104,938	\$ 15,655,622,697	\$ 8,465,266,792	131%	33	54%	22	71%	29
Georgia	\$ 6,242,098,752	\$ 8,351,090,203	\$ 4,950,141,824	134%	35	59%	34	79%	38
Hawaii	\$ 1,384,001,227	\$ 1,328,381,145	\$ 573,327,202	96%	7	43%	7	41%	3
Idaho	\$ 1,616,022,943	\$ 1,386,786,641	\$ 798,516,921	86%	1	58%	31	49%	10
Illinois	\$ 10,922,690,260	\$ 13,422,539,461	\$ 8,523,182,980	123%	25	63%	46	78%	37
Indiana	\$ 4,900,873,896	\$ 6,744,881,687	\$ 4,086,812,335	138%	40	61%	42	83%	41
Iowa	\$ 2,273,573,780	\$ 2,705,412,768	\$ 1,761,473,564	119%	23	65%	49	77%	35
Kansas	\$ 1,892,735,773	\$ 2,320,259,004	\$ 1,312,051,668	123%	24	57%	26	69%	27
Kentucky	\$ 3,062,055,558	\$ 3,835,621,905	\$ 2,171,142,906	125%	27	57%	27	71%	28
Louisiana	\$ 3,474,258,705	\$ 3,855,723,977	\$ 1,804,849,694	111%	14	47%	12	52%	13
Maine	\$ 1,385,563,800	\$ 1,532,207,846	\$ 910,366,880	111%	13	59%	36	66%	25
Maryland	\$ 4,648,491,027	\$ 5,102,316,236	\$ 2,497,127,789	110%	11	49%	15	54%	15
Massachusetts	\$ 5,942,248,485	\$ 9,078,010,547	\$ 5,140,551,784	153%	49	57%	28	87%	44
Michigan	\$ 7,415,806,537	\$ 11,478,193,565	\$ 6,940,957,797	155%	50	60%	38	94%	50
Minnesota	\$ 3,900,181,729	\$ 5,246,242,774	\$ 3,339,748,626	135%	36	64%	47	86%	43
Mississippi	\$ 2,350,852,134	\$ 2,682,048,232	\$ 1,445,926,612	114%	17	54%	21	62%	22
Missouri	\$ 4,270,349,290	\$ 5,285,939,771	\$ 3,102,389,253	124%	26	59%	33	73%	31
Montana	\$ 1,324,258,332	\$ 1,142,181,419	\$ 551,033,946	86%	2	48%	14	42%	4
Nebraska	\$ 1,165,123,266	\$ 1,357,539,143	\$ 536,459,391	117%	18	40%	4	46%	8
Nevada	\$ 1,867,592,925	\$ 2,760,890,510	\$ 1,692,501,375	148%	48	61%	43	91%	47
New Hampshire	\$ 932,170,526	\$ 1,093,473,468	\$ 565,306,544	117%	20	52%	19	61%	21
New Jersey	\$ 5,497,575,155	\$ 9,281,416,431	\$ 6,267,843,183	169%	51	68%	51	114%	51
New Mexico	\$ 2,107,414,712	\$ 2,013,417,827	\$ 934,792,648	96%	6	46%	11	44%	6
New York	\$ 17,735,081,142	\$ 24,153,088,926	\$ 14,098,769,780	136%	39	58%	32	79%	39
North Carolina	\$ 5,828,435,014	\$ 8,426,554,682	\$ 5,096,767,573	145%	45	60%	39	87%	45
North Dakota	\$ 721,883,928	\$ 758,633,683	\$ 336,359,087	105%	9	44%	8	47%	9
Ohio	\$ 8,122,720,389	\$ 10,750,656,667	\$ 6,027,135,498	132%	34	56%	25	74%	34
Oklahoma	\$ 2,635,464,142	\$ 3,321,276,727	\$ 1,820,610,798	126%	29	55%	23	69%	26
Oregon	\$ 3,206,592,850	\$ 4,037,836,071	\$ 2,585,544,520	126%	28	64%	48	81%	40
Pennsylvania	\$ 9,199,730,474	\$ 13,030,205,147	\$ 7,152,266,908	142%	44	55%	24	78%	36
Rhode Island	\$ 981,064,011	\$ 1,379,181,415	\$ 834,751,028	141%	42	61%	40	85%	42
South Carolina	\$ 4,571,086,254	\$ 4,030,608,653	\$ 2,061,456,791	88%	3	51%	17	45%	7
South Dakota	\$ 896,642,164	\$ 913,724,125	\$ 392,406,349	102%	8	43%	6	44%	5
Tennessee	\$ 5,271,403,698	\$ 5,576,146,446	\$ 3,191,548,779	106%	10	57%	30	61%	20
Texas	\$ 18,133,735,034	\$ 20,397,215,733	\$ 10,003,747,239	112%	15	49%	16	55%	17
Utah	\$ 1,734,330,863	\$ 2,040,368,493	\$ 1,279,735,338	118%	21	63%	45	74%	33
Vermont	\$ 605,183,861	\$ 852,966,592	\$ 439,674,976	141%	43	52%	18	73%	32
Virginia	\$ 5,000,767,894	\$ 5,517,776,338	\$ 2,561,580,698	110%	12	46%	10	51%	12
Washington	\$ 7,016,495,049	\$ 6,362,381,180	\$ 3,775,558,894	91%	4	59%	35	54%	16
West Virginia	\$ 1,550,635,114	\$ 2,103,304,119	\$ 781,858,418	136%	38	37%	3	50%	11
Wisconsin	\$ 3,795,381,051	\$ 5,591,361,781	\$ 3,497,457,750	147%	47	63%	44	92%	48
Wyoming	\$ 487,710,787	\$ 615,585,109	\$ 253,932,158	126%	30	41%	5	52%	14