

Table W-4
Approval and Implementation Dates of Earnings Disregard Policy Changes, 1992 – 98

| State | Increased earnings disregard | | TANF Policy | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|--|-----------|---------|-----------|--------|--------|
| | Approved | Implemented | TANF Implemented | | Flat | Percent | Flat | Percent | months | months |
| | | | Official | Actual | disregard | remainder | percent | remainder | | |
| Alabama | | | 11-15-96 | | – | 100 | 3 | – | 20 | 4-60 |
| Alaska | | | 7-1-97 | | \$150 | 33 | 1-12 | \$150 | 33 | 13-24 |
| Arizona | | | 10-1-96 | | \$90 | 30 | all | – | – | – |
| Arkansas | | | 7-1-97 | | 20% | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| California | 10-29-92 | 12-1-92 | 11-26-96 | 1-1-98 | \$225 | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Colorado | | — ¹ | 7-1-97 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Connecticut | 8-29-94 | 1-1-96 | 10-1-96 | | 100% of earnings below poverty | | | | | |
| Delaware | 5-8-95 | 10-1-95 | 3-10-97 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Dist. of Columbia | | | 3-1-97 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Florida | | — ² | 10-1-96 | | – | 100 | 3 | – | – | – |
| Georgia | 6-24-94 | | 1-1-97 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Hawaii | 8-16-96 | 2-1-97 | 7-1-97 | | 20% then \$200 then 36% of remainder | | | | | |
| Idaho | | | 7-1-97 | | – | 40 | all | – | – | – |
| Illinois | 11-23-93 | 11-23-93 | 7-1-97 | | – | 67 | all | – | – | – |
| Indiana | | | 10-1-96 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Iowa | 8-13-93 | 10-1-93 | 1-1-97 | | 20% | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Kansas | | | 10-1-96 | | \$90 | 40 | all | – | – | – |
| Kentucky | | | 10-18-96 | | 100% for 2 mn; \$120 + 33% for 2 mn; \$120 for 7 mn; \$90 | | | | | |
| Louisiana | | | 1-1-97 | | \$1,020 | – | 6 | \$120 | – | 7-60 |
| Maine | | | 11-1-96 | | 8 counties 20% + \$134; other 8 \$150 + 50% under poverty | | | | | |
| Maryland | 8-16-96 | 10-1-96 | 12-9-96 | | – | 26 | all | – | – | – |
| Massachusetts | 8-4-95 | 11-1-95 | 9-30-96 | | \$120 | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Michigan | 8-1-92 | 10-1-92 | 9-30-96 | | \$200 | 20 | all | – | – | – |
| Minnesota | | — ³ | 7-1-97 | | – | 36 | all | – | – | – |
| Mississippi | | — ⁴ | 10-1-96 | 7-1-97 | – | 100 | 6 | \$90 | – | – |
| Missouri | | — ⁵ | 12-1-96 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Montana | 4-18-95 | — ⁶ | 2-1-97 | | \$200 | 25 | all | – | – | – |
| Nebraska | 2-27-95 | | 12-1-96 | | – | 20 | all | – | – | – |
| Nevada | | | 12-3-96 | | 100% for 3 mn; 50% for 9 mn; larger of \$90 or 20% thereafter | | | | | |
| New Hampshire | 6-18-96 | | 10-1-96 | | – | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| New Jersey | 7-1-92 | | 2-1-97 | 7-1-97 | – | 100 | 1 | – | 50 | 13-60 |
| New Mexico | | | 7-1-97 | | \$150 | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| New York | | | 12-2-96 | 11-1-97 | \$90 | 42 | all | – | – | – |
| North Carolina | | | 1-1-97 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| North Dakota | | — ⁷ | 7-1-97 | | 27% + additional disregard based on family size & earnings | | | | | |
| Ohio | 3-13-96 | 7-1-96 | 10-1-96 | | \$250 | 25 | 18 | – | – | – |
| Oklahoma | | | 10-1-96 | | \$120 | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Oregon | | | 10-1-96 | | – | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Pennsylvania | | | 3-3-97 | | – | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Rhode Island | | | 5-1-97 | | \$170 | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| South Carolina | | | 10-12-96 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| South Dakota | | | 12-1-96 | | \$90 | 20 | all | – | – | – |
| Tennessee | 7-25-96 | 9-1-96 | 10-1-96 | | \$90 | – | all | – | – | – |
| Texas | | | 11-5-96 | | <i>no change from AFDC – \$120 + 33% 4 mn; \$120 for months 5-12; \$90</i> | | | | | |
| Utah | 10-5-92 | — ⁸ | 10-1-96 | | \$100 | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| Vermont | 4-12-93 | 7-1-94 | 9-20-96 | | \$150 | 25 | all | – | – | – |
| Virginia | 7-1-95 | — ⁹ | 2-1-97 | | 100% so long as earnings + benefit not greater than poverty | | | | | |
| Washington | | | 1-10-97 | | – | 50 | all | – | – | – |
| West Virginia | | | 1-11-97 | | disregard varies with income; averages 40% | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | | — ¹⁰ | 9-30-96 | 9-1-97 | – | 100 | 3 | – | – | – |
| Wyoming | | | 1-1-97 | | \$200 single parents & \$400 married couples | | | | | |

Note: Implementation dates are arbitrarily stated as of the first of the month absent specific information to the contrary. The “actual” dates for TANF implementation are based on communications from Urban Institute staff.

Source: Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, *Setting the Baseline: A Report on State Welfare Waivers* and other unpublished documents.

Table W-4 (Endnotes)
Approval and Implementation Dates of Earnings Disregard Policy Changes, 1992 – 98

1. Colorado began an Increased Earnings Disregard policy in five counties beginning in June 1994.
2. Florida began an Increased Earnings Disregard policy of \$200 plus one-half the remainder in eight counties beginning in February 1994.
3. Minnesota began to implement its “Minnesota Family Investment Program” in seven counties in April 1994; this program included increasing the earned income disregard to 38 percent.
4. Mississippi began an Increased Earnings Disregard policy in two counties beginning in October 1995.
5. Missouri received approval January 15, 1993 for and began implementing the \$30 plus one-third income disregard for up to 48 months in Kansas City beginning in July 1994.
6. Montana’s Increased Earnings Disregard policy of \$200 plus 25 percent for recipients in unsubsidized jobs (\$100 for recipients in Community Service Program) began in eight counties in February 1996 and was phased in statewide by February 1997.
7. North Dakota’s began an Increased Earnings Disregard policy in ten counties beginning in October 1996.
8. Utah implemented an Increased Earnings Disregard policy of \$100 and 45 percent in seven counties in January 1993 and later expanded statewide.
9. Virginia’s time limit, JOBS exemptions change, JOBS sanctions, and Increased Earnings Disregards policies (100 percent up to the federal poverty guideline income level, current recipients only) began in five counties in July 1995 and were expanded to the entire state by October 1997.
10. Wisconsin’s Increased Earnings Disregard policy of the first \$200 plus one-half the remainder for new applicants under age 20, approved April 10, 1992 , began to be implemented in July 1994. Beginning in January 1995 in two counties, Wisconsin implemented an Increased Earnings Disregard policy for all those under its “Work Not Welfare.”