
MIGRANT HEALTH PROGRAM

**AN ATLAS OF
STATE PROFILES
WHICH ESTIMATE NUMBER OF
MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS
AND MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILIES**

**M
H**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OEI position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Public Health Service
Health Resources and Services Administration
Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance

MIGRANT HEALTH PROGRAM

AN **ATLAS** OF
STATE PROFILES
WHICH ESTIMATE NUMBER OF
MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS
AND MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILIES

MARCH 1990



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Public Health Service
Health Resources and Services Administration
Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance
Division of Primary Care Services
Migrant Health Branch
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

PREFACE

The goal of the Migrant Health Program is to improve the health status of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFWs) and their families. To achieve this goal the Office of Migrant Health provides support to organizations which arrange or directly deliver primary health care services to MSFWs. In order to plan, monitor, and evaluate service delivery systems, information is needed on the numbers and distribution of the target population at the national, state, and local levels. Moreover, the legislation which authorizes the Migrant Health Program, Section 329 of the Public Health Service Act, requires that priorities for assistance be assigned to areas where the greatest need exists. Therefore, the Migrant Health Program periodically seeks to obtain updated information about MSFWs; where they work, where they winter over, whether or not non-working family members travel with them, etc. The last time that such a data collection effort was undertaken was in 1979 (the results were published in April 1980 in a report entitled 1978 Migrant Health Program Target Population Estimates) and, so, by 1987 it was time to do it again.

Because of the difficulties of counting transient migrant farmworker populations and because of the definitional problems in identifying seasonal farmworkers, there is no comprehensive and reliable national source of regularly updated quantitative information. Therefore, each state with any Migrant Health Program activity was asked to prepare a state profile estimating how many MSFWs were present in the state, and showing where they worked and/or resided. Limited available resources restricted profile development to utilization of secondary data sources. Since the available data and the nature of the MSFW population characteristics varied among the states, the methodologies for deriving the estimates also varied. However, a generic "scope of work" identifying the parameters to be reported was distributed to those organizations preparing profiles. This atlas presents data based on and summarized from the individual state profiles.

Because the state profiles represent estimates prepared by a variety of organizations using different methodologies, it was necessary for purposes of consistency to review submissions for compliance with the generic scope of work and to validate each submission. This process was carried out by Ben Duggar of the Center for Health Policy Studies in Columbia, Maryland, through an arrangement with the East Coast Migrant Health Project. In some cases it has been necessary to "adjust" the state profile estimates to correct for differences in the definitions or assumptions which were used. We have also separated the migrant from the seasonal farmworker populations when this was not done in the profiles, since planning for health services varies, depending on whether the population resides in the area year round. The reader should note that the estimates presented in this atlas represent duplicated counts of migrant farmworkers (e.g., migrant farmworkers were identified and counted at every location where they reside, even if only for a brief period).

The original state profiles should be consulted to quantify the fluctuations in the migrant farmworker population by month of the year, or to determine the proportion of each population which consists of agricultural workers versus non-working dependents. Sources to contact for access to the original profiles, and the instructions provided to groups performing the

profiles, appear in this publication. It is intended that the state profiles will be updated by the original authors from time to time as migration patterns, crops, and farm workforce needs and numbers change. Readers may wish to provide their comments concerning state estimates directly to the listed sources so that future estimates may improve. It is our hope and expectation that all federal, state, local public and private entities providing services to MSFWs will use this atlas and their respective state profiles to plan, develop, and implement improved services to these populations.

We gratefully acknowledge the efforts of the many groups across the nation that have made this atlas possible. Our thanks extend not only to those who directly prepared the profiles, but also to those who supported the effort in other ways, such as participation on committees and review groups which planned and monitored the profile development for their states.

Sonia M. Leon Reig
Director
Office of Migrant Health
Division of Primary Care Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
CHAPTER 1 - HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT.	1
PURPOSE.	2
DEFINITIONS.	3
CONTENTS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE ATLAS OF STATE PROFILES.	3
CHAPTER 2 - PROFILE SUMMARY TABLES.	7
PROFILE DEVELOPMENT STATUS	8
PROFILE SUMMARY TABLES	8
TABLE I.	9
EXPLANATION OF COLUMNS IN THE SUMMARY TABLE.	11
ADJUSTED STATE PROFILES, TABLE II.	13
CHAPTER 3 - INDIVIDUAL STATE TABLES AND MAPS.	14
STATE TABLES AND MAPS.	15
PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW AND VALIDATION OF STATE PROFILES	16
ALABAMA	18
Adjustments to Alabama Profile.	21
ARIZONA	22
Adjustments to Arizona Profile.	25
CALIFORNIA.	26
Adjustments to California Profile	30
COLORADO.	31
CONNECTICUT	34
Adjustments to Connecticut Profile.	37
DELAWARE.	38
Adjustments to Delaware Profile	41
FLORIDA	42
Adjustments to Florida Profile.	46
GEORGIA	47
IDAHO	54
Adjustments to Idaho Profile.	57
ILLINOIS.	58
Adjustments to Illinois Profile	62
INDIANA	63
Adjustments to Indiana Profile.	66
IOWA.	67
Adjustments to Iowa Profile	70
KANSAS.	71
MAINE	74
MARYLAND.	77
Adjustments to Maryland Profile	80
MASSACHUSETTS	81
Adjustments to Massachusetts Profile.	84
MICHIGAN.	85
Adjustments to Michigan Profile	89
MINNESOTA	90
MISSOURI.	93
MONTANA	96
Adjustments to Montana Profile.	99

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

	<u>PAGE</u>
NEBRASKA100
NEW HAMPSHIRE103
Adjustments to New Hampshire Profile106
NEW JERSEY107
NEW MEXICO110
Adjustments to New Mexico Profile113
NEW YORK114
NORTH CAROLINA117
Adjustments to North Carolina Profile122
NORTH DAKOTA123
Adjustments to North Dakota Profile126
OHIO127
Adjustments to Ohio Profile130
OREGON131
Adjustments to Oregon Profile134
PENNSYLVANIA135
PUERTO RICO138
RHODE ISLAND141
Adjustments to Rhode Island Profile144
SOUTH CAROLINA145
TENNESSEE148
Adjustments to Tennessee Profile152
TEXAS153
Adjustments to Texas Profile159
UTAH160
Adjustments to Utah Profile163
VERMONT164
Adjustments to Vermont Profile167
VIRGINIA168
Adjustments to Virginia Profile171
WASHINGTON172
Adjustments to Washington Profile175
WEST VIRGINIA176
Adjustments to West Virginia Profile179
WISCONSIN180
Adjustments to Wisconsin Profile183
WYOMING184
CHAPTER 4 - SOURCES OF INFORMATION CONCERNING	
STATE PROFILES187
INTRODUCTION188
SOURCES FOR STATE PROFILES188
APPENDIX A - HISTORICAL ESTIMATES AND COMPARATIVE UTILIZATION DATA194
MIGRANT HEALTH MATRIX, TABLE III195
MIGRANT HEALTH MATRIX, NOTES AND REFERENCES199
APPENDIX B - PROFILE REVIEW ISSUES202
APPENDIX C - SCOPE OF WORK FOR PROFILE DEVELOPMENT (REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL)207

CHAPTER 1 - HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

Purpose

This document is designed to facilitate planning for services for migrant and seasonal farmworkers (MSFWs) and for evaluating the extent to which existing programs are reaching the target population. The expected users and uses are:

- Migrant Health Centers (MHCs) should use the state profile data to identify logical service area boundaries, to prepare "needs assessments", and to assess the success with which they are reaching components of their target population.
- Other local organizations serving MSFWs may use these data to plan and coordinate services with existing MHCs or, in areas without a MHC, to support an application for Migrant Health Program funding for the delivery of health services to unserved MSFWs.
- State and regional organizations should use the profiles to identify pockets of potentially unserved MSFWs, analyze the need for reallocation of resources to match the distribution of the target population, and develop statewide or substate regional strategic plans for meeting MSFW primary health care needs.
- Federal agencies which support programs for MSFWs may use the profiles as additional sources of state estimates on the numbers and distributions of MSFWs, and as tools to foster interagency coordination and, where feasible, program integration among and within those local organizations which they support.
- The Migrant Health Program will use these data to meet the legislative mandate contained in Section 329.(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act to determine the need for migrant health services and to assign priorities for provision of assistance to projects and programs consistent with such needs. The Migrant Health Program will also use the state profiles to evaluate the appropriateness of the service area boundaries proposed by MHCs, to monitor the effectiveness with which MHCs are reaching their target populations, to evaluate the impact of migrant health activities, and to assist in the development of comprehensive statewide integrated plans for providing health services to MSFWs.

As a result of the needs for current data, and because the last time that comprehensive estimates of the Migrant Health Program target population were collected was in 1979, the Office of Migrant Health requested that arrangements be made for the development of state estimates of MSFWs. These estimates, developed during the period 1987-1989, became known as "state profiles" and provide the basis for the present document. The Migrant Health Program currently funds health care delivery activities in 41 states and Puerto Rico, and priority was assigned to these states for profile

development. Data from all but one of these priority states are included in the 41 states plus Puerto Rico presented in the Atlas. It is anticipated that most of the remaining states will also engage in the "profiling" process in the future (Chapter 2 details the profile status for the remaining states). It is also anticipated that the state profiles will be updated from time to time as crops and patterns of migration change.

Additional information on the methodologies used to develop the profiles can be found in the notes to the profile data displayed for each state in Chapter 3, and in the introduction to Chapter 4.

Definitions

The legislation which authorizes the Migrant Health Program (contained in Section 329 of the Public Health Service Act) defines a "migratory agricultural worker" as "an individual whose principal employment is in agriculture on a seasonal basis, who has been so employed within the past twenty-four months, and who establishes for the purpose of such employment a temporary abode". A seasonal agricultural worker is defined as "an individual whose principal employment is in agriculture on a seasonal basis and who is not a migratory agricultural worker". The legislation provides a restrictive definition of "agriculture" which has been interpreted to exclude those working in the fishing, lumber, dairy, cattle, or poultry industries and those working in food processing plants unless the processing is performed "on a farm incident to or in conjunction with --- the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any commodity grown on, in, or as an adjunct to or part of a commodity grown in or on, the land". Individuals formerly employed as migratory agricultural worker who "can no longer meet the requirements --- because of age or disability and members of their families" retain eligibility indefinitely.

Migratory agricultural workers, local seasonal agricultural workers, and members of their families, as defined above, represent the target population for the Migrant Health Program. However, it is recognized that other federal and state programs also serving migrant and/or seasonal farmworkers and/or family members (e.g., Department of Education's Migrant Education Program, Department of Labor's Job Training, Department of Agriculture's Migrant Women, Infant and Children Supplemental Food Program, Department of Health and Human Service's Migrant Head Start, etc.) may have different definitions for their target populations. Although these differences may be of little consequence for some programs and/or geographic areas, they may also represent the reasons for large discrepancies among comparative estimates of target populations for other areas or programs.

Contents and Limitations of the Atlas of State Profiles

A major purpose for the state profile development initiative has been to meet planning needs of state agencies, state primary care associations, individual migrant health centers (MHCs) and other programs serving MSFWs. Data needed for planning health services for MSFWs include the following:

- Year round (seasonal) versus short-time populations (migrants)
- Numbers of farmworkers versus non-working family members
- Months the migrant farmworkers are present
- Both the peak numbers and numerical range of MSFWs in an area.

These data can be used to refine the MHC delivery systems to increase service utilization, to identify needs for new access points, and for development of statewide strategic plans which leverage the input from Section 329 funding to improve the utilization and access to primary health care services by MSFWs.

The reader should be aware that each migrant farmworker family is counted in multiple locations and that the total numbers of MSFWs present throughout the nation at any given time will be substantially less than the totals of MSFWs counted throughout the year at all locations. The figures which appear in the Atlas represent annual aggregates for each state and include inter and intrastate migration, turnover among migrant farmworkers during the agricultural season, local seasonal farmworkers who do not migrate, MSFWs and family members who sought but could not obtain agricultural work, and those who formerly but no longer engage in seasonal farm work due to age or disability. The peak number of migrant farmworkers present will be less than the annual aggregate number, while the seasonal farmworker peak and aggregate population will be identical. Differences between the peak and aggregate estimates for migrant farmworkers are small in areas with short harvest seasons and in which few migrant farmworker families reside during the winter.

Adjusting certain of the state profile data was necessary before incorporating them into this report. Such adjustments render the data more useful to the Office of Migrant Health by improving the comparability of definitions and assumptions used among the individual state profiles. The summary information presented in this document includes for most states:

- Information on numbers of MSFWs disaggregated by county or agricultural area.
- Separate migrant and local seasonal farmworker population data.
- Maps which display the distribution of MSFWs, crop areas, and locations of all MHCs and selected community health centers (CHCs).¹
- Other state level data (distribution of Section 329 funding by state, numbers of MSFW users of MHCs located within the state, impact ratios

¹ Community Health Centers (CHCs) are health centers which receive federal funding support under Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act. They serve all individuals, including MSFWs, residing in the CHC's service area, but are not funded to provide the special services designed to meet the unique needs of the MSFW population.

of MHC users to target population data derived from the state profiles, and agricultural business data).

- Comparison information on target population estimates (earlier estimates from the Migrant Health Program, from other sources, and user data from other programs serving MSFWs).

Estimates of MSFWs and members of their families are presented at three levels in this document. The first level consists of the summary table in Chapter 2. This table provides the estimated aggregate MSFW population, including non-working family members, for each state which submitted a state profile, including Puerto Rico. The table includes for each state the proportion of the national MSFW estimate, information on the numbers of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and family members who were reported to have received one or more services from a migrant health center located in that state, information on the aggregate of the Migrant Health Program funds awarded to MHCs located in the state, and information on the agricultural industry in each state. Because some MHCs serve migrants who work or reside in contiguous states, the state level data on the proportion of the target population served must be cautiously interpreted.

Chapter 3 contains maps for each of 41 states and Puerto Rico. The maps display the distribution of the MSFW population for each state, location of major crop areas and seasons, locations of MHCs, and locations of selected CHCs. The map for each state is followed by a list of the community and migrant health centers (C/MHCs) which appear on the map, and information on the season and category of crops corresponding to each of the major crop areas drawn on the map. This information is followed by a table which presents detailed numerical data on the distribution of MSFWs, generally at the county or agricultural district level, identical to the figures on the map. The migrant farmworker population is listed separately from the local seasonal farmworker population on the map and in the table. The data in the tables and on the maps were developed directly from the profiles submitted from each state, although in a number of cases it was necessary to "adjust" the profile data for comparability of definitions or assumptions, or to correct for mathematical errors. A brief explanation of the adjustment methodology follows each state table to which an adjustment was made. The tables represent duplicated counts of migrant farmworkers, and each migrant farmworker family may be counted in several of the county totals, depending on whether they engaged in intrastate migration. Readers who wish to examine these data at a further disaggregated level (e.g., migrant farmworkers with and without non-working family members), to identify the crops which employed differing numbers of MSFWs, or to determine the period of the year when differing numbers of migrant farmworkers were present must consult the original state profile. Sources from which the complete state profile can be obtained are listed in Chapter 4.

Some of the profiles from which the data in Chapter 3 were derived represent extensive and detailed reports running to several hundreds of pages. In other cases the original profiles were simple compilations of data from a number of programs which served or provided estimates of the numbers of migrants or seasonal farmworkers for all or portions of the states. In the

case of incomplete profiles submitted for several states, whenever possible the Office of Migrant Health devised algorithms to estimate the MSFW population profile from the raw data included in the submission. Because of the major differences in the methodologies used for developing profiles in the different states, modest differences in the numbers from state to state may represent artifacts of the methodologies rather than true differences in numbers of MSFWs. However, each state's methodology was consistently applied throughout the state, and the relative distributions of MSFWs among the counties within a state are considered reliable. Thus, these data can be used to identify pockets of unserved MSFWs, the relative magnitude of the target population for specific migrant health centers, and the approximate distribution between migrant and local seasonal agricultural workers and members of their families.

Chapter 4 describes the information requested by the Office of Migrant Health to be included in state profiles (the generic scope of work used for requests for proposals) and lists the "source" of the profile prepared for each state. In some cases the source listed actually prepared the profile, in other cases the listed source sponsored the profile development through a contract. By contacting the listed profile source the reader may be able to obtain the original state profile document, including additional information on the methodology, disaggregated figures by month of year, agricultural workers versus family members, etc. If the total population figures in the original profile differ from those tabulated in this document, adjustments have been made and the reader should consult the notes in Chapter 3 to determine how the Office of Migrant Health made the adjustments.

CHAPTER 2 -- PROFILE SUMMARY TABLES

PROFILE SUMMARY TABLES

This chapter contains two summary tables covering all states for which profile data are available. Certain states do not appear in these tables because completed profiles have not been submitted, or the state reports no migrant farmworker activity. However, comparative data for some of these "missing" states can be found in Appendix A.

Profile Development Status

As of the date of publication of this Atlas the Office of Migrant Health had received the following:

- Complete profiles, or sufficient information to permit estimation of the MSFW population, from 41 states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
- Information from the state health department in Arkansas indicating that a profile is in the process of being developed, but will not be completed in time for inclusion in this Atlas.
- Correspondence from the respective state health departments in Kentucky, Mississippi, and South Dakota indicating that there are not sufficient migrant farmworkers in these states to warrant development of a full profile.

No correspondence or communications were received regarding MSFWs in the states of Alaska, Hawaii, Louisiana, Nevada, Oklahoma or the District of Columbia.

Based on information from other federal programs serving MSFWs in Kentucky, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma, a significant number of MSFWs are present in these five states for at least portions of the year (e.g., the Migrant Education program in Kentucky reported serving 1468 currently migrant agricultural workers' children and 2,137 formerly migrant agricultural workers' children during the 1986-1987 school year). Therefore, it is expected that profiles will be developed at some future time for these states, and possibly for others as well.

Profile Summary Tables

The first of the two summary tables appears on the two pages which follow and contains state level data concerning the MSFW population, utilization of MHCs, Migrant Health Program funding, and the agricultural industry. The table is followed by explanations for each column, including the sources and years represented by the data. The second summary table provides separate tabulations, by state, of the migrant farmworker and the seasonal farmworker populations. The "total MSFW" column in the second table is identical to the first column in the first summary table described above.

MARCH 6, 1990

TABLE I

STATE	STATE PROFILE		MSFW USERS		IMPACT RATIO	SECTION 329 FUNDS		AGRICULTURE - GROSS PRODUCT		
	MSFW POP. (1)	% MSFW POP. (2)	NO. MSFW USERS (3)	% MSFW USERS (4)		FY88 \$* (6)	% \$ (7)	\$ (MILLION) (8)	% STATE IND (9)	% AGRIC. IND. (10)
ALABAMA	6,483	0.16%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,331	2.42%	1.43%
ALASKA		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	317	1.62%	0.34%
ARIZONA	31,795	0.76%	9,370	1.79%	29.47%	650,011	1.61%	1,122	2.11%	1.21%
ARKANSAS		0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,087	5.97%	2.03%
CALIFORNIA	1,362,534	32.66%	107,267	20.51%	7.87%	6,607,069	16.41%	11,282	2.11%	12.13%
COLORADO	49,347	1.18%	26,374	5.04%	53.45%	2,017,909	5.01%	1,517	2.56%	1.63%
CONNECTICUT	9,421	0.23%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	484	0.69%	0.52%
DELAWARE	5,397	0.13%	5,027	0.96%	93.14%	881,440	2.19%	251	2.71%	0.27%
FLORIDA	435,373	10.44%	77,173	14.75%	17.73%	5,947,653	14.78%	4,432	2.49%	4.77%
GEORGIA	93,604	2.24%	1,598	0.31%	1.71%	143,258	0.36%	2,136	2.08%	2.30%
HAWAII		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	454	2.35%	0.49%
IDAHO	119,968	2.88%	12,935	2.47%	10.78%	465,026	1.16%	1,195	9.07%	1.29%
ILLINOIS	20,840	0.50%	5,894	1.13%	28.28%	454,985	1.13%	3,943	1.88%	4.24%
INDIANA	7,716	0.18%	5,022	0.96%	65.09%	460,870	1.14%	2,266	2.67%	2.44%
IOWA	34,230	0.82%	1,734	0.33%	5.07%	171,961	0.43%	4,827	11.01%	5.19%
KANSAS	18,533	0.44%	925	0.18%	4.99%	165,218	0.41%	2,961	6.97%	3.18%
KENTUCKY		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,910	3.59%	2.05%
LOUISIANA		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	904	1.21%	0.97%
MAINE	8,660	0.21%	230	0.04%	2.66%		0.00%	397	2.29%	0.43%
MARYLAND	4,267	0.10%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	931	1.22%	1.00%
MASSACHUSETTS	7,813	0.19%	100	0.02%	1.28%	78,000	0.19%	846	0.73%	0.91%
MICHIGAN	67,227	1.61%	26,676	5.10%	39.68%	2,535,192	6.30%	1,995	1.30%	2.15%
MINNESOTA	13,344	0.32%	9,254	1.77%	69.35%	863,660	2.15%	3,575	4.73%	3.84%
MISSISSIPPI		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,089	3.42%	1.17%
MISSOURI	20,327	0.49%		0.00%	0.00%	130,346	0.32%	2,197	2.63%	2.36%
MONTANA	13,026	0.31%	3,641	0.70%	27.95%	250,172	0.62%	1,009	8.30%	1.09%
NEBRASKA	18,756	0.45%	1,422	0.27%	7.58%	224,475	0.56%	3,322	12.53%	3.57%
NEVADA		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	168	0.86%	0.18%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	726	0.02%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	150	1.14%	0.16%
NEW JERSEY	13,522	0.32%	3,314	0.63%	24.51%	182,710	0.45%	952	0.62%	1.02%

6

MARCH 6, 1990

TABLE 1 (CONT.)

STATE	STATE PROFILE		MSFW USERS		IMPACT RATIO	SECTION 329 FUNDS		AGRICULTURE - GROSS PRODUCT		
	MSFW POP. (1)	% MSFW POP. (2)	NO. MSFW USERS (3)	% MSFW USERS (4)		FY88 \$* (6)	% \$ (7)	\$ (MILLION) (8)	% STATE IND (9)	% AGRIC. IND. (10)
NEW MEXICO	9,255	0.22%	1,081	0.21%	11.68%	104,197	0.26%	513	2.17%	0.55%
NEW YORK	30,811	0.74%	3,617	0.69%	11.74%	381,164	0.95%	2,161	0.76%	2.32%
NORTH CAROLINA	344,944	8.27%	25,353	4.85%	7.35%	1,477,681	3.67%	2,422	2.40%	2.60%
NORTH DAKOTA	15,000	0.36%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,587	14.79%	1.71%
OHIO	11,621	0.28%	3,483	0.67%	29.97%	540,000	1.34%	2,348	1.33%	2.53%
OKLAHOMA		0.00%	1,597	0.31%	0.00%	193,468	0.48%	1,822	3.66%	1.96%
OREGON	128,564	3.08%	22,682	4.34%	17.64%	1,449,900	3.60%	1,629	3.95%	1.75%
PENNSYLVANIA	24,711	0.59%	5,126	0.98%	20.74%	601,000	1.49%	2,414	1.32%	2.60%
PUERTO RICO	231,889	5.56%	73,271	14.01%	31.60%	3,595,126	8.93%	N.A.	N.A.	0.00%
RHODE ISLAND	459	0.01%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	170	1.12%	0.18%
SOUTH CAROLINA	18,560	0.44%	4,050	0.77%	21.82%	558,008	1.39%	613	1.37%	0.66%
SOUTH DAKOTA		0.00%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,557	15.88%	1.67%
TENNESSEE	6,571	0.16%	741	0.14%	11.28%	125,000	0.31%	1,383	1.91%	1.49%
TEXAS	500,138	11.99%	42,116	8.05%	8.42%	5,221,106	12.97%	5,865	1.93%	6.31%
UTAH	8,983	0.22%	2,957	0.57%	32.92%	289,825	0.72%	400	1.67%	0.43%
VERMONT	1,785	0.04%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	274	3.17%	0.29%
VIRGINIA	15,079	0.36%	-	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	1,305	1.25%	1.40%
WASHINGTON	42,444	10.61%	31,247	5.97%	7.06%	2,658,441	6.60%	2,841	3.66%	3.06%
WEST VIRGINIA	2,700	0.06%	2,825	0.54%	104.63%	300,000	0.75%	225	0.93%	0.24%
WISCONSIN	8,199	0.20%	2,193	0.42%	26.75%	364,293	0.91%	3,384	4.40%	3.64%
WYOMING	6,800	0.16%	2,754	0.53%	40.50%	161,756	0.40%	219	1.88%	0.24%
TOTAL	4,171,419	100.00%	523,049	100.00%	12.54%	40,250,920	100.00%	92,982		100.00%

NOTE: *THE TOTAL FUNDING SHOWN FOR FY 88 UNDER SECTION 329 DOES NOT REFLECT THE MULTISTATE, HOSPITAL, & MISC. AWARDS WHICH EQUAL \$3,215,080. THE GRAND TOTAL FOR FY 88 IS \$43,466,000.

10