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Government support in America is a growing trend1 largely observable in broken households,2 creating “a nation of welfare families”3
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1 See Michael Tanner, CATO INST., THE AMERICAN WELFARE STATE: HOW WE SPEND NEARLY $1 TRILLION A YEAR FIGHTING POVERTY—AND FAIL 1 (2012), available at http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PAS694.pdf (“[T]his year the federal government will spend more than $668 billion on at least 126 different programs to fight poverty. And that does not even begin to count welfare spending by state and local governments, which adds $284 billion to that figure. In total, the United States spends nearly $1 trillion every year to fight poverty.”). For example, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or food stamps, will be a cost focus of this Article. The Congressional Budget Office (“CBO”) stated in 2012 that food stamp expenditures have increased by seventy percent over the last four years and are expected to continue to rise until 2014. See Damian Paletta, Food Stamp Rolls to Grow Through 2014, CBO Says, WSJ BLOGS (Apr. 19, 2012, 1:58 PM), http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2012/04/19/food-stamp-rolls-to-grow-through-2014-cbo-says/?mod=e2tw.

45 million people in 2011 received Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program [SNAP] benefits, a 70% increase from 2007. [The CBO] said the number of people receiving the benefits, commonly known as food stamps, would continue growing until 2014.

Spending for the program, not including administrative costs, rose to $72 billion in 2011, up from $30 billion four years earlier. The CBO projected that one in seven U.S. residents received food stamps last year. Id. For the CBO report on SNAP, see CONG. BUDGET OFFICE, THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (2012), available at http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/04-19-SNAP.pdf. For a historical summary of United States welfare policy, see Michael D. Tanner, The Poverty of Welfare: Helping Others in Civil Society 13–34 (2003). Suggesting that the best solutions are fueled by American innovation and ingenuity, George Mason Associate Professor of Economics Alex Tabarrok discusses his concern about America’s welfare problem in Alexander Tabarrok, Launching the Innovation Renaissance: A New Path to Bring Smart Ideas to Market Fast, at Innovation Nation Versus the Warfare-Welfare State (TED Books 2011) (“Together the warfare and welfare states, counting only the big four of defense, Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security, eat up $2.2 trillion, or nearly two-thirds of the U.S. federal budget.”).

2 CONG. BUDGET OFFICE, supra note 1, at 1 (“By fiscal year 2022, CBO projects, 34 million people (or about 1 in 10 U.S. residents) will receive SNAP benefits each month . . . and SNAP expenditures, at about $73 billion, will be among the highest of all non-health-related federal support programs for low-income households.”). Moreover, “[t]he food stamp program is old and fossilized. Aside from enormous increases in cost, it has remained basically unchanged since its creation in the 1960s. Unaffected by welfare reform
that are fragmented and relying on state and federal financial assistance. The cost of family fragmentation was first studied and published in 2008 (“2008 Report”). The 2008 Report found that family breakdown had cost American taxpayers $112 billion per year. The 2008 Report, detailing for the first time the enormous expense of divorce and unwed childbearing, revealed that broken families are no longer simply about individual privacy choices. The economics of family fragmentation has a price tag.


“[b]earing babies irresponsibly is simply wrong.” See id. at 16.

1. STEPHANIE COONTZ, A NATION OF WELFARE FAMILIES, HARPER’S MAG., Oct. 1992, at 13, 13. Although Coontz’s article suggests that government aid does not harm families, its title affirms the existence of a trend toward national household reliance on government assistance. See id. at 16.


5. SCAFIDI, supra note 4. The study states that the “$112 billion figure represents a ‘lower-bound’ or minimum estimate. Given the cautious assumptions used throughout this analysis, we can be confident that current high rates of family fragmentation cost taxpayers at least $112 billion per year.” Indeed, these taxpayer costs total “more than $1 trillion each decade.” Id.

6. See Crary, supra note 4. According to Institute for American Values President David Blankenhorn, “[w]e keep hearing this from state legislators, ‘Explain to me why this is any of my business? Aren’t these private matters?’ . . . Take a look at these numbers and tell us if you still have any doubt.” Id.

Individualism and the rights that stem from that concept are part of the American identity. Individualism is such a fundamental concept that it is endorsed by the courts—especially with regard to the liberty interest of the individual. See L.M. KOHM, FAMILY MANIFESTO: WHAT WENT WRONG WITH THE MORAL BASIS FOR THE FAMILY AND HOW TO RESTORE IT 29–31 (2006).

One of the most infamous discussions of the intersection of personal choice with family fragmentation was then Vice President Dan Quayle’s remarks on Murphy Brown. The title character in a CBS sitcom intentionally made a lifestyle choice to have a child as a single parent, and Quayle remarked that “mocking the importance of fathers” and “[b]earing babies irresponsibly is simply wrong.” See Isabel Sawhill, Why Dan Quayle Was Right About Murphy Brown, WASH. POST, May 27, 2012, at B3.

Twenty years later, Quayle’s words seem less controversial than prophetic. The number of single parents in America has increased dramatically: The proportion of children born outside marriage has risen from roughly 30 percent
Family fragmentation occurs when individuals experience domestic breakdown caused by divorce or non-marital childbearing. The 2008 Report stated that “[t]o the extent that the decline of marriage increases the number of children and adults eligible for and in need of government services, costs to taxpayers will grow.” These calculations were based on differences in poverty rates by household types, which reveal that those headed by a single female have relatively high poverty rates, which lead to higher spending on welfare, health care, criminal justice, and education.

Although it is already a well-documented fact that family fragmentation is harmful to children, the 2008 Report highlighted that in 1992 to 41 percent in 2009. For women under age 30, more than half of babies are born out of wedlock. A lifestyle once associated with poverty has become mainstream.

Recent articles indicate this phenomenon has somewhat set down roots. See Kevin Hartnett, When Having Babies Beats Marriage, HARVARD MAG., July–Aug. 2012, at 11, 11–12 (“The decoupling of marriage from childbearing among lower-income Americans is arguably the most profound social trend in American life today . . ..”); W. Bradford Wilcox, Father’s Day: Are Dads Really Disposable?, DESERET NEWS (June 14, 2012, 2:34 PM), http://www.deseretnews.com/article/print/865557457/Fathers-Day-Are-dads-really-disposable.html (discussing women having children without fathers and the social science research that indicates children are less likely to thrive without fathers).

Family fragmentation falls within two categories: broken families are caused by divorce or a separation of cohabiting adults while unformed families occur in unwed childbearing where one parent is not living with the child, causing the family to never form, or producing a lack of family formation. We, like the 2008 Report, use the term “family fragmentation” to encompass both broken families and families that never formed.

The study noted that “Public debate on marriage in this country has focused on the ‘social costs’ of increases in divorce and unmarried childbearing; in contrast, the 2008 Report focused on real costs, actual expenditures, and lost tax revenue caused by fragmented families.” Id. at 8.

See SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 12, 31; see also Maria Cancian & Deborah Reed, Family Structure, Childbearing, and Parental Employment: Implications for the Level and Trend in Poverty, in CHANGING POVERTY, CHANGING POLICIES 92, 109 (Maria Cancian & Sheldon Danziger eds., 2009).

Indeed, the “$112 billion annual estimate includes the costs of federal, state, and local government programs and foregone tax revenues at all levels of government.” Id. at 17.

A broken family brings higher rates of childhood poverty, government intervention, child distress, inadequate education, substance abuse, teen crime, and teen pregnancy, among other results. NAT’L COMM’N ON AM.’S URBAN FAMILIES, FAMILIES FIRST 1, 4, 32–33, 36 (1993).

The family trend of our time is the deinstitutionalization of marriage and the steady disintegration of the mother–father childrearing unit. This trend of family fragmentation is reflected primarily in the high rate of divorce among parents and the growing prevalence of parents who do not marry. No domestic
reducing the costs of family fragmentation “is a legitimate concern of government, policymakers, and legislators.”12 While the 2008 Report did not offer specific formal recommendations, it did mention some state initiatives,13 suggesting that state and federal lawmakers consider investing more money in programs intended to bolster marriages to be a combatant to the costs of family fragmentation.14 As an incentive for reducing the rate of family fragmentation, the 2008 Report advised that “even very small increases in stable marriage rates would result in very large returns to taxpayers. For example, a mere 1 percent reduction in rates of family fragmentation would save taxpayers $1.12 billion annually.”15

Now, nearly five years later, we set out to discover if that research was heeded in some way by the various states. This Article provides a more recent snapshot of the costs of family fragmentation on a state-by-state basis by examining states’ efforts to correct the rising costs of family fragmentation. It reviews basic family-welfare costs and legislative and public-policy initiatives directed at reducing family

---

12 SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 20.

13 For example, it mentions some federal government-funded programs, an Oklahoma marriage-skills initiative, and Texas marriage-strengthening initiatives. Indeed, no fewer than “nine states have publicly adopted a goal of strengthening marriage.” SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 8–9, 20.


15 SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 20 (emphasis omitted).
fragmentation by state. Consulting with influential persons in the field and utilizing almost the same measurements and indicators originally used to compile the 2008 Report, but not being economists, we endeavor to report the facts and any observable difference in law and policy made in these past five years.

This Article begins with an explanation in Part I of the research included in this study, giving descriptors and indicators for each expense category calculated. Part II offers an overview of various available federal, state, and private-sector family-strengthening initiatives. Part III then examines the raw information by state, providing some straightforward analysis of this raw data. Findings are not necessarily prescriptive but seek to highlight the basic policies that states are using to strengthen families, which can result in decreased family fragmentation costs. Although this brief survey cannot make direct connections, Part IV offers a general analysis as a catalyst for states to appropriately alter policies toward family-strengthening policies. The great expense to states of family fragmentation, whether from divorce or unwed childbearing, reveals that broken families are not simply fixed by providing more federal funding or protecting individual privacy choices but, rather, are a matter of authentic concern for researchers, taxpayers, legislatures, and government officials.

I. FAMILY FRAGMENTATION INDICATORS

“[T]he smooth functioning of families [is] vital for the success of any society.”

Healthy marriages tend to foster happiness in individuals.

---

16 Telephone Interview with Chris Gersten, Co-Chairman, Coal. for Divorce Reform (June 8, 2012); Telephone Interview with Alan Hawkins, Professor, Brigham Young Univ. (June 8, 2012); Telephone Interview with Randy Hicks, President, Ga. Fam. Council (June 2, 2012); Telephone Interview with Benjamin Scafidi, Assoc. Professor, Ga. Coll. (June 8, 2012); E-mail from W. Bradford Wilcox, Assoc. Professor, Univ. of Va. (June 7, 2012, 3:57 PM) (on file with the Regent University Law Review).

17 See SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 12–13.

18 DAVID CHEAL, FAMILY AND THE STATE OF THEORY 4 (1991) (describing—although not endorsing—the functionalist theory, which claims, in part, that functional families are essential to an efficacious society). The family unit in the law, or, as Professor Janet L. Dolgin uses the term, the “traditional family,” is “a social construct, forged in the early years of the Industrial Revolution. . . . Ironically, this construct of family was actualized most firmly in the United States during the 1950s, just before it was widely challenged by alternative constructs.” Janet L. Dolgin, Choice, Tradition, and the New Genetics: The Fragmentation of the Ideology of Family, 32 CONN. L. REV. 523, 524 (2000) (discussing the relationship between reproductive technologies and the legal family). Professor Dolgin also notes that alternative constructs are based in individual liberty. “[S]ociety and law invoke certain aspects of the ideology of traditional families in some contexts, but not in others. Other aspects are forgotten almost completely in deference to the contemporary obsession in the United States with the preservation of liberty and choice.” Id. at 525. That obsession has apparently led to vast family fragmentation.
while simultaneously perpetuating a society with children who will be responsible individuals in future generations.\textsuperscript{19} Despite this fact, the legal system in America has unwittingly aided in the breakdown of the family.\textsuperscript{20} The welfare system attempts to bridge expense gaps created by family fragmentation.\textsuperscript{21} The process of family breakdown, however, is fueled by a subtle devaluing of the family unit, particularly as less significant than individual rights, as evidenced by the high numbers of unwed cohabitants, unwed childbearing, and divorce rates.\textsuperscript{22} Expansion

We offer, however, that while the family may be a socio-legal construct useful for family law, it is more ontological in nature by Supreme design. See Lynne Marie Kohm, \textit{Response: Reply to Arthur S. Leonard, in Marriage and Same-Sex Unions: A Debate} 78, 80 (Lynn D. Wardle et al. eds., 2003); Lynne Marie Kohm, \textit{Essay Two: Marriage by Design, in Marriage and Same-Sex Unions: A Debate}, supra, at 81.

\textsuperscript{19} An anthropological perspective views a family relationship as one of “enduring, diffuse solidarity.” \textit{David M. Schneider, American Kinship: A Cultural Account} 52 (2d ed. 1980).

\textit{Solidarity} because the relationship is supportive, helpful, and cooperative; it rests on trust and the other can be trusted. \textit{Diffuse} because it is not narrowly confined to a specific goal or a specific kind of behavior. Two athletes may cooperate and support each other for the duration of the game and for the purpose of winning the game, but be indifferent to each other otherwise. Two members of the family cannot be indifferent to one another, and since their cooperation does not have a specific goal or a specific limited time in mind, it is \textit{enduring}.

\textit{Id.} \textsuperscript{20}

\textit{See, e.g.,} Bruce C. Hafen, \textit{Individualism and Autonomy in Family Law: The Waning of Belonging}, 1991 \textit{BYU L. Rev.} 1, 7–30 (discussing the constitutionally developed concept of autonomy and the decline of family interests toward a favoring of contractual relationships in family law). \textit{See generally June Carbone, From Partners to Parents: The Second Revolution in Family Law}, at xiii, xv (2000) (mentioning the participation of family law in marriage breakdown). “Today, courts and legislatures have largely abolished the definitions of parenthood that depend on marriage, and the law—together with the rest of society—is struggling, one piece at a time, to rebuild the idea of obligation to children.” \textit{Id.} at xiii.


\textsuperscript{21} Those expense gaps include lost support from an absent spouse or parent. \textit{See McLanahan \& Sandefur, supra} note 11, at 23–26 (explaining the lack of economic resources in single-parent families).

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{See Helen M. Alvaré, Saying “Yes” Before Saying “I Do”: Premarital Sex and Cohabitation as a Piece of the Divorce Puzzle, 18 NOTRE DAME J.L. ETHICS \& PUB. POLY} 7, 9 (2004) (discussing the connections among divorce, cohabitation, and premarital sex as well as the growing belief that sexual choices are inherently private). Professor Dolgin also notes that alternative family constructs are based in individual liberty: “[S]ociety and the law invoke certain aspects of the ideology of traditional families in some contexts, but not in others. Other aspects are forgotten almost completely in deference to the contemporary obsession in the United States with the preservation of liberty and choice.” \textit{Dolgin, supra} note 18, at 525.
of individual rights has, therefore, resulted in an increased demand for “state interference” and an increased reliance on state funds.

Designed by the federal government, many of these support programs meant to stand in the gap for fragmented families are implemented by the states via federal mandate and have become a regular part of states’ budgets. As will be seen in Part IV, taxpayer costs are driven by increases in poverty from family fragmentation, the “most widely accepted and best quantified consequence of divorce and unmarried childbearing.” These programs result in an increase of expenditures at all levels—local, state, and federal—and present direct costs to taxpayers. “In fiscal year 2011, total federal expenditures on [the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program]—$78 billion—and participation in the program . . . were the highest they have ever been. In an average month that year, nearly 45 million people (or one in seven U.S. residents) received SNAP benefits.” This is just one of the programs considered as a cost of family fragmentation.

In addition to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (“SNAP”) (previously known as “food stamps”), taxpayer-funded programs designated as indicators of family fragmentation, as discussed

23 KOHM, supra note 6, at 28.

24 As already discussed, individualism has contributed toward undermining the family. See supra note 6 and accompanying text. Of course, this creates demand for state funds. See infra Part IV.


26 SCAPIDI, supra note 4, at 13 (“It is important to recognize that if family fragmentation has additional negative effects on child and adult well-being that operate independently of income—and if these effects increase the numbers of children or adults who need and are served by taxpayer-funded social programs—then our methodology will significantly underestimate taxpayer costs.”). For further discussion of costs associated with government programs, see id. at 13–16.

27 CONG. BUDGET OFFICE, supra note 1, at 1. States typically implement SNAP through the use of Electronic Benefit Transfers or EBT cards, disseminating the benefits electronically; beneficiaries can often make cash ATM withdrawals using these cards. U.S. GOV’T ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, GAO-12-535, TANF ELECTRONIC BENEFIT CARDS: SOME STATES ARE RESTRICTING CERTAIN TANF TRANSACTIONS, BUT CHALLENGES REMAIN 1 (2012). Due to reports that individuals were using EBT benefits at liquor stores, adult businesses, or casinos, the federal government and some states have acted to reduce the possibility of abuse. Id. at 1–2. In addition, some food stamp recipients unlawfully sell their cards and then request replacements, causing the government to incur even more costs. Sam Hananel, USDA Cracking Down on Food Stamp Fraud, WASH. POST, May 29, 2012, at A9.

28 CONG. BUDGET OFFICE, supra note 1, at 1.
below, include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (“TANF”); Housing Assistance; Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program; Medicaid; Women, Infants, and Children assistance (“WIC”); Children’s Health Insurance Program (“CHIP”); Child Welfare programs; Head Start; School Lunch and Breakfast Programs; and the Justice System.

32 See W. Bradford Wilcox, Suffer the Little Children: Marriage, the Poor, and the Commonweal, in The Meaning of Marriage: Family, State, Market, and Morals 242, 252 (Robert P. George & Jean Bethke Elshtain eds., 2006) (observing that estimates of welfare spending would be significantly larger if they included “the costs of family breakdown for medicaid, housing, family courts, and the criminal justice system”). The recent Supreme Court decision regarding the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 has left states with the option of choosing whether to opt into the Medicaid expansion program. Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius, 132 S. Ct. 2566, 2608 (plurality opinion) (Roberts, C.J., op.); see id. at 2666–67. (Scalia, Kennedy, Thomas, and Alito, J.J., dissenting). Medicaid expansion would be paid by the federal government for the first several years. Id. at 2601 (Roberts, C.J., op.). With such an expansion, it could cost states more when the number of people receiving Medicaid benefits greatly increases. In response, several states are weighing their options and have indicated they will not be opting into the program. Robert Pear & Michael Cooper, Reluctance in Some States over Medicaid Expansion, N.Y. Times, June 30, 2012, at A1.
38 See Scafidi, supra note 4, at 12–13. Scafidi did not feel comfortable including other costs of family fragmentation “such as” the Earned Income Tax Credit, remedial school programs, and special education programs” because reasonable estimates of costs were not possible based on available literature. Id. at 41 n.26.
39 Specifically regarding the justice system, one report “infer[s] that the annual incidence of crime attributable to poverty is . . . 20 percent.” Harry J. Holzer et al., The
In considering the cost fluctuations of family fragmentation, we chose to focus on three main programs. Table A includes TANF costs by state over the past five years, Table B details SNAP costs, and Table C details WIC costs. Each program has unique requirements and objectives in providing resources for fragmented families.

TANF was created by the 1996 welfare-reform legislation. TANF was created by the 1996 welfare-reform legislation. Intended to replace previous welfare plans known as the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training program, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, and the Emergency Assistance program, TANF is a federal block grant to states, territories, and Native American tribes.

TANF has four purposes: (1) “assisting needy families so that children can be cared for in their own homes”; (2) “reducing the dependency of needy parents by promoting job preparation, work and marriage”; (3) “preventing out-of-wedlock pregnancies”; and (4) “encouraging the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.” Effectuating these four main goals through various means, TANF also has a work requirement such that recipients of TANF funds “must work as soon as they are job-ready or no later than two years after coming on assistance.”

With a general five-year maximum benefit period for participants, TANF also requires states to have programs such as on-the-job training, assistance in job searching and job preparedness, community-service opportunities, vocational training, or even child-care services for community-service participants.

SNAP, formerly known as the “Food Stamps Act,” is run by the Department of Agriculture and has existed in some form since May 16, 1939. The program has adapted throughout its lifespan to meet the nation’s changing demands, but providing assistance to needy people

---


39 Office of Family Assistance, supra note 29, at 1.
40 Id.
41 Id. at 1–2.
42 Id. at 2 (describing work requirements of thirty hours a week for a single parent, twenty hours a week for a single parent with a child under the age of six, thirty-five hours a week for a two-parent household, and fifty-five hours a week for a two-parent household that receives Federal child care assistance).
43 Id. at 2–3.
and families has remained SNAP’s primary goal.\textsuperscript{45} For example, the Farm Bill of 2008 renewed commitment of federal funds to food assistance with a $10 billion increase over the next ten years\textsuperscript{46} and changed the name of the program from the “Food Stamp Act” to the “Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program” to decrease what Congress felt was an increasing stigmatization of recipients.\textsuperscript{47} “[N]early 45 million people (or one in seven U.S. residents) received SNAP benefits” in 2011 for a national cost of $78 billion.\textsuperscript{48}

WIC was established as a pilot program in 1972 and made permanent in 1975.\textsuperscript{49} WIC’s mission is “to safeguard the health of low-income women, infants, and children up to age 5 who are at nutritional risk, by providing nutritious foods to supplement diets, nutrition education, and referrals to health care and other social services.”\textsuperscript{50} WIC is offered to a subsection of SNAP recipients, including low-income pregnant, breastfeeding, and non-breastfeeding postpartum women who need additional assistance in the form of food, healthcare referrals, and nutrition education.\textsuperscript{51}

The 2008 Report included several other indicators of family fragmentation.\textsuperscript{52} Although very valuable, such indicators are not included here purely to simplify the understanding of three of the most basic and substantial state costs of family fragmentation.\textsuperscript{53} Reviewing the initiatives becomes the next focus.

**II. AN OVERVIEW OF THE INITIATIVES**

Several private entities have taken the lead in studying the problem of family fragmentation.\textsuperscript{54} Through research, analysis, and education,
these private actors influence and shape state public policy.\textsuperscript{55} Some government agencies have noted the value of grass-root efforts advocating family-strengthening public policy and proposing ways to curb family fragmentation.\textsuperscript{56} As shown in Part III, a few initiatives have led the way.

Federally-funded family programs are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) through the Administration for Children and Families (“ACF”).\textsuperscript{57} The federal Healthy Marriage Initiative (“HMI”) is featured in the quest to make family strengthening a federal priority.\textsuperscript{58} National programs offer resources across the United States through the National Healthy Marriages Resource Center.\textsuperscript{59} A specific example of one of these national programs is the HMI for African–American families by which the federal government recognized the need for minority-family support and provided initiatives focused on strengthening families.\textsuperscript{60}


The Family Research Council is one of the most active private family policy groups with organizations in a vast majority of states. See Family Research Council, 25 Pro-Family Policy Goals for the Nation, at Introduction (2008), available at http://downloads.frc.org/EF/EF08H78.pdf. The Family Foundation of Virginia has been very active in legislation relating to families and their strength or instability. See About The Family Foundation of Virginia, The Family Found. VA., http://familyfoundation.org/about/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012).

\textsuperscript{55} See infra Part III.

\textsuperscript{56} See Admin. for Children & Families, Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., Justification of Estimates for Appropriations Committees 1 (2012).


\textsuperscript{59} “The [African American Healthy Marriage Initiative (‘AAHMI’)] is a component of the ACF Healthy Marriage Initiative and more specifically promotes a culturally competent strategy for fostering healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood, improving child well-being, and strengthening families within the African American Community.”
From HMIs to Responsible Fatherhood Initiatives, ACF has worked to provide a framework for public education and public support. Various grants have provided the support necessary to develop Fatherhood Initiatives across the country. Fatherhood programs have existed since the late 1980s and there have been significant studies to evaluate the effect of these and other programs. One study in particular found positive associations between marital stability and strong fathering. The National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse, established by the HHS, has launched several state affiliates. Other private national initiatives have been influential in public policy debates surrounding family strengthening, foremost among which has been the National Fatherhood Initiative, a community resource designed to support fatherhood for the betterment of children’s lives. Using facts, statistics, and research to show the effect of father absence in the lives of children, the National Fatherhood Initiative has called absent father the “most consequential social problem of our time.”

---


61 See ALAN J. HAWKINS & THEODORA OOMS, NAT’L HEALTHY MARRIAGE RES. CTR., WHAT WORKS IN MARRIAGE AND RELATIONSHIP EDUCATION? A REVIEW OF LESSONS LEARNED WITH A FOCUS ON LOW-INCOME COUPLES 2, 4–5, 8 (n.d.).


63 Id. at 7.


67 JUSTPARTNERS, supra note 66 (“National Fatherhood Initiative . . . works in every sector and at every level of society to engage fathers in the lives of their children.”).


Children who live absent their biological fathers are, on average, at least two to three times more likely to be poor, to use drugs, to experience educational, health, emotional and behavioral problems, to be victims of child
research programs reveal the financial impact of absentee fathers, individual programs fight for specific goals, such as the rehabilitation of incarcerated fathers. The National Center for Fathering, a private resource, research, and educational organization based in Kansas City, Missouri, has established programs around the country that promote responsible fatherhood. The Family Strengthening Policy Center, funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is another private national initiative focusing on child welfare. In addition, independent private actors influence new approaches for social and economic stability for families.

Research and policy-relevant studies for family strength are underway, followed by requests for more inquiry and analysis. “The association between marriage and well-being has led to policies that promote marital interventions and discourage divorce,” including “federal initiatives specifically targeting poor couples and couples of color.” Informative and instructive research is still needed in the quest for reform and to engage in criminal behavior than their peers who live with their married, biological (or adoptive) parents.


75 Matthew D. Johnson, Healthy Marriage Initiatives: On the Need for Empiricism in Policy Implementation, 67 AM. PSYCHOLOGIST 296, 296 (2012) (detailing concerns with past initiatives that have largely focused on empirical evidence from white middle-class
to understand how family fragmentation affects future national strength. A review of various state initiatives and basic costs of family fragmentation is informative and allows government officials to evaluate past successes and determine a state’s future direction.

III. STATE BY STATE

States have created their own programs in an effort to address the issue of increasing fragmentation of households and the documented rising costs to taxpayers incurred as a result. This Part gives an overview of legislation and public policy initiatives in each state that are directly dedicated to addressing the issue of family fragmentation. This research is not meant to be an exhaustive list of all programs in each state. Rather, this information is offered as a picture of state activity addressing marriage strength, divorce reduction, and needs of father-absent households in efforts to tackle family-fragmentation concerns. Using the same coefficient as the 2008 Report’s research presupposing that family fragmentation is responsible for 31.7% of the costs expended, we calculate the overall cost of family fragmentation for each state for the three categories of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for the past five years.

---

families and recommending ways to “enhance the effectiveness” of initiatives for poor and minority couples; see generally AAHMI, supra note 60, at 2, 4 (recognizing efforts made by ACF, as part of the HHS, to work with AAHMI).

76 SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 14.

[T]he proportion of poverty that can be attributed to family fragmentation is equal to the proportion of expenditures on a variety of government programs that are caused by family fragmentation. . . . If marriage would lift 60 percent of single-mother households out of poverty, then the total number of persons in poverty would decline by 31.7 percent and the total number of children in poverty would decline by 36.1 percent. By virtue of [this assumption], marriage would reduce the costs of some government programs by 31.7 percent and the costs of government programs that are exclusively for children by 36.1 percent. Put another way, this assumption suggests that family fragmentation is responsible for 31.7 percent of the costs of government antipoverty programs and is responsible for 36.1 percent of the costs of government programs that are exclusively for children.

Id. (footnotes omitted). The 2008 Report also notes that this “crucial assumption seems cautious not only because single-parent households have higher rates of poverty and other negative outcomes but also because, at the same income level, single-parent households are much more likely than married households to make use of government benefits.” Id. As the 2008 Report clarifies, these costs are conservative and more likely are lower than actual costs. Id. We use the 31.7% coefficient because our statistics are tracking anti-poverty programs.

77 In other words, we have calculated the costs by state and then multiplied that total by 31.7% to get a closer (but very conservative) measure of the costs that family fragmentation is responsible for in each state. See infra Table D.
Alabama

Alabama has a marriage and family initiative known as the “Alabama Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education Initiative.” The initiative, formerly known as the “Alabama Community Healthy Marriage Initiative,” was started in 2002 due to Alabama’s “persistent history of high levels of marital and family instability.” The initiative has been funded by several grants from the HHS Office of Family Assistance and is “a partnership between Auburn University, Family Resource Centers, Mental Health Centers, and many other agencies and individuals at the [s]tate and [l]ocal levels who have joined together to build and sustain healthy relationships and stable marriages throughout Alabama.” The research arm of Auburn University has been integral in addressing state concerns and operates in conjunction with national research scholars focusing on marriage and relationship education. In 2004, the Governor’s Task Force to Strengthen Alabama Families was created through a grant from the Annie E. Casey Foundation to “redesign and strengthen” health and human services. That task force recommended “the creation of family service centers in every Alabama county” for ease of resource distribution. “Six state agencies in these counties are using an automated common benefits and services screening tool to create a one-stop entry point for services regardless of which

79 Id.
81 The Initiative, supra note 78. Its objectives have been to invest in curricula to target at-risk populations for training in building healthy relationships for strong marriages and strong families. Amy Weaver, Auburn’s College of Human Sciences Receives $7.5 Million Grant to Continue Alabama Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education Initiative, Auburn Univ. (Oct. 12, 2011, 9:27 AM), http://wireagle.auburn.edu/news/3919.
82 Auburn was awarded a three-year $7.5 million grant in 2011 to continue the Healthy Marriage and Relationship Education Initiative, which follows a 2006 grant for $9.2 million, with an additional $1 million grant, all from the HHS. Weaver, supra note 81.
85 Id. at 1–2.
agency a family first contacts.”\footnote{Id. at 2.} Alabama has also made efforts to strengthen African–American families.\footnote{See Ala. CMTY, HEALTHY MARRIAGE INITIATIVE, HAPPY, ENDURING AFRICAN AMERICAN MARRIAGES (2010), available at http://www.alabamamarriage.org/documents/lovenotes/africanamericanmarriages.pdf (discussing how to deal with family-related stress, and how to see marriage as a source of strength).} The Alabama Legislature has made some proposals to strengthen families by putting forward legislation toward these ends. For example, one resolution proposed recognition of a “National Marriage Week”\footnote{H.R. Res. 75, 2012 Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2012) (recognizing “the sacred bond that enhances personal growth, mutual fulfillment, and family well-being”). This seems to offer more legitimate authority as a “State Marriage Week,” but we did not make the proposal.} while another bill proposed the creation of covenant marriage in the state.\footnote{S. 270, 2012 Reg. Sess. (Ala. 2012), available at http://alisondb.legislature.state.al.us/acas/searchableinstruments/2012rs/bills/sb270.htm. Although the concept has not created a sustained legislative movement, covenant marriage generally consists of four elements including an oath of lifetime declaration, premarital counseling, pre-divorce counseling, and an extended waiting period for no-fault divorce. Alabama’s proposal includes all of these elements with a two-year waiting period. Id. For a comprehensive review of the concept of covenant marriage and related state legislation, see Lynne Marie Kohm, A Comparative Survey of Covenant Marriage Proposals in the United States, 12 REGENT U. L. REV. 31 (1999); Samuel Pyeatt Menefee, The “Sealed Knot”: A Preliminary Bibliography of “Covenant Marriage,” 12 REGENT U. L. REV. 145 (1999). Other states have considered covenant marriage legislation as well. See James L. Musselman, What’s Love Got to Do with It? A Proposal for Elevating the Status of Marriage by Narrowing Its Definition, While Universally Extending the Rights and Benefits Enjoyed by Married Couples, 16 DUKE J. GENDER L & POL’Y 37 (2009); Daniel W. Olivas, Comment, Tennessee Considers Adopting the Louisiana Covenant Marriage Act: A Law Waiting to Be Ignored, 71 TENN. L. REV. 769 (2004). For another view on marriage-strengthening efforts, see James Herbie DiFonzo, Customized Marriage, 75 IND. L.J. 875 (2000).} Additionally, the Alabama Policy Institute studies and publishes reports to strengthen families.\footnote{See About Us, ALA. POL’Y INST., www.alabamapolicy.org/about.php (last visited Oct. 18, 2012).} Since 2007, Alabama had a 21% increase in TANF expenditures,\footnote{See infra Table A.} households had a 148% increase in annual SNAP,\footnote{See infra Table B.} and the state had an 18% increase in food costs for WIC.\footnote{See infra Table C.} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Alabama is $1,862,132,119.\footnote{See infra Table D.}
Alaska

In 2006, Alaska touted the federal TANF award to assist families,\textsuperscript{95} and it appears the state had some movement to promote a healthy-marriage initiative in 2004 through its Department of Public Assistance.\textsuperscript{96} Also, some efforts for strengthening marriages among Native Americans were put forth in 2008.\textsuperscript{97} Our research, however, did not reveal any other relevant initiatives to report. Since 2007, Alaska had a 23% decrease in TANF expenditures,\textsuperscript{98} households had a 105% increase in annual SNAP costs,\textsuperscript{99} and the state had a 10% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{100} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Alaska is $274,886,637.\textsuperscript{101}

Arizona

Arizona adopted covenant-marriage legislation in 1998 in an effort to strengthen marriage.\textsuperscript{102} The Center for Arizona Policy advocates implementation of family-strengthening policies.\textsuperscript{103} During the past decade, Arizona has also offered financial-literacy services in Phoenix through its Department of Human Services, mostly designed to educate residents on using their Earned Income Tax Credit refunds to pay off


\textsuperscript{98} See infra Table A.

\textsuperscript{99} See infra Table B.

\textsuperscript{100} See infra Table C.

\textsuperscript{101} See infra Table D.

\textsuperscript{102} ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. §§ 25-901 to -906 (2011); see also CTR. FOR ARIZ. POLICY, \textit{HOW TO: PROMOTE COVENANT MARRIAGE IN ARIZONA}; ARIZ. SUPREME COURT, \textit{COVENANT MARRIAGE IN ARIZONA} 1, available at http://www.supreme.state.az.us/hr/pdf/covenant.pdf.

\textsuperscript{103} CTR. FOR ARIZ. POLICY, \textit{MARRIAGE AND FAMILY: WHY MARRIAGE MATTERS} (2011), available at http://www.azpolicypages.com/wp-content/uploads/Marriage-Family_WhyMarriageMatters.pdf (“[The center] successfully supported legislation that requires marital status to be considered in adoption placements and establishes a preference for children to be adopted by a married man and woman when all other relevant factors are equal.”).
debt and “potentially move toward economic stability.” Since 2007, Arizona had a 16% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 155% increase in annual SNAP, and the state had a 27% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Arizona is $2,354,438,823.

Arkansas

The National Extension Relationship and Marriage Education Network started the Arkansas Healthy Marriage Initiative. Past efforts include the 2006–2008 Marriage and Fatherhood Education for Arkansans project and the 2005–2006 Arkansas Healthy Marriage Study, both through the state’s Cooperative Extension System. Additionally, the Arkansas Family Council promotes family-strengthening public policies. Since 2007, Arkansas had a 12% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 75% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 32% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Arkansas is $1,097,417,263.

California

The California Healthy Marriage Coalition has achieved significant results in marriage education and family strengthening by providing resources and tools for couples and families and by being awarded with...
large federal grants accordingly.\textsuperscript{117} Another private program in California is the Family Independence Initiative (“FII”), a group founded by a researcher and adapted for a small group of struggling families.\textsuperscript{118} “[I]ts approach is radically different from the American social service model. Although it is still quite small—working with a few hundred families—its results are so striking that the White House has taken notice.”\textsuperscript{119} FII provides “a structure for families that encourages the sense of control, desire for self-determination, and mutual support that have characterized the collective rise out of poverty for countless communities in American history”\textsuperscript{120} in order to strengthen struggling families economically and socially. Similarly, the California Family Council is a private, not-for-profit, family-strengthening policy organization.\textsuperscript{121} Since 2007, California had a 13\% increase in TANF expenditures,\textsuperscript{122} households had a 152\% increase in annual SNAP costs,\textsuperscript{123} and the state had a 51\% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{124} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for California is $13,889,399,807.\textsuperscript{125}

\textbf{Colorado}

Colorado participated in a demonstration for Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood with ACF,\textsuperscript{126} developing a “Partner Up” program.\textsuperscript{127} In 2008, Colorado received federal funding for the Promoting Responsible Fatherhood programs, which have yielded some fairly good results in terms of “increas[ing] father involvement through

\begin{footnotes}
\item[118] \textit{See Stuhldreher & O’Brien, supra note 73, at 1–3.}
\item[120] Id.; \textit{see also Stuhldreher & O’Brien, supra note 73, at 1.}
\item[121] \textit{About CPC, CAL. FAM. COUNCIL}, http://www.californiafamilycouncil.org/about-us (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (“Our mission is to protect and promote Judeo–Christian principles in California’s culture for the benefit of its families.”).
\item[122] \textit{See infra} Table A.
\item[123] \textit{See infra} Table B.
\item[124] \textit{See infra} Table C.
\item[125] \textit{See infra} Table D.
\item[126] \textit{See Pamela Joshi et al., U.S. DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., PILOTING A COMMUNITY APPROACH TO HEALTHY MARRIAGE INITIATIVES IN FIVE SITES: MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA; LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY; NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA; ATLANTA, GEORGIA; AND DENVER, COLORADO, at ES-1, ES-6 (2010), available at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/piloting_five.pdf.}
\item[127] Id. at ES-6.
\end{footnotes}
relationship- and parenting-skills education.”128 The Colorado Department of Human Services launched the “Be There for Your Kids” campaign in 2007 to promote healthy parent stability and provide web resources and hotline support.129 The private Colorado Family Institute offers public-policy guidance,130 and Focus on the Family, a national, privately funded organization located in Colorado Springs, provides “help and resources for couples to build healthy marriages.”131 Since 2007, Colorado had a 66% increase in TANF expenditures,132 households had a 146% increase in annual SNAP costs,133 and the state had a 41% increase in food costs for WIC.134 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Colorado is $1,133,294,089.135

Connecticut

Connecticut’s Fatherhood Initiative is part of the national family-strengthening effort promoted by ACF.136 Connecticut has also focused on child-support enforcement137 and made efforts to lower expenditures for family programs as well as for other social services to women,


132 See infra Table A.

133 See infra Table B.

134 See infra Table C.

135 See infra Table D.


137 See S. 791, Jan. 2011 Sess. (Conn. 2011) (“To establish a network of private employers and other entities to help noncustodial parents meet their child support obligations.”).
children, and families (in addition to other government services delivery). The private Family Institute of Connecticut encourages implementation of “marriage strengthening projects, educational efforts, and research.” Our research, however, did not reveal any other relevant initiatives to report. Since 2007, Connecticut had only a 4% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 156% increase in annual SNAP costs, but the state had only a 7% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation for TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Connecticut is $1,130,062,178.

Delaware

Delaware has followed the model for building family financial stability by establishing several programs offering financial education to satisfy the work activity requirement for TANF recipients as well as programs promoting economic self-sufficiency by adopting “an economic self-sufficiency standard to calculate what it takes to raise a family without any public support.” Since 2007, Delaware had a 28% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 175% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 52% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Delaware is $274,502,219.

District of Columbia

Washington, D.C. was the other beneficiary of a 2008 federal grant for the strengthening of families and the father–child relationship. Current research on funding for HMIs has indicated positive outcomes of marriage education, particularly for Washington D.C. residents. The

---

140 See infra Table A.
141 See infra Table B.
142 See infra Table C.
143 See infra Table D.
145 See infra Table A.
146 See infra Table B.
147 See infra Table C.
148 See infra Table D.
149 See FRESHINK supra note 128.
private Coalition for Marriage, Family and Couples Education is located in Washington, D.C. and focuses on making marriage education “user-friendly, affordable, and accessible.” Since 2007, the District of Columbia had a 45% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 121% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the District of Columbia had a 31% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for the District of Columbia is $418,487,815.

**Florida**

In 2003, Florida passed Senate Bill 480 to promote healthy family initiatives throughout the state, but that program was abandoned in 2008 due to budgetary constraints. Notwithstanding such budgetary constraints, help for low- and moderate-income families is available in Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties to offer tax preparation and educational assistance for families to encourage investment in safe housing and to eliminate debt. Similarly, the Florida Family Policy Council advocates family-strengthening public policy. Florida also “mandates relationship education for high-school students with the hope of helping youth set a positive trajectory toward a healthy marriage in the future.” Since 2007, Florida had a 7% increase in TANF

Cumulative per capita funding for HMIs between 2005–2010 was positively associated with small changes in the percentage of married adults in the population and children living with two parents, and it was negatively associated with the percentage of children living with one parent, non-marital births, and children living in poverty.

Id. at 2.


152 See infra Table A.

153 See infra Table B.

154 See infra Table C.

155 See infra Table D.


158 NAT’L HUMAN SERVS. ASSEMBLY, supra note 84, at 5.

159 Who We Are, FLA. FAM. POL’Y COUNCIL, http://ffamily.org/who-we-are/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (“Our mission is to strengthen Florida’s families through public policy education, issue research, and grassroots advocacy.”).

expenditures,\textsuperscript{161} households had a massive 268\% increase in annual SNAP costs,\textsuperscript{162} and the state had a 22\% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{163} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Florida is $6,094,667,526.\textsuperscript{164}

\textit{Georgia}

The Georgia Family Council (“GFC”), a private, not-for-profit organization,\textsuperscript{165} led the way in family, marriage, and fatherhood initiatives long before it provided the impetus to the 2008 Report.\textsuperscript{166} Before the release of the 2008 Report, the GFC initiated the Georgia Healthy Marriage Initiative, partnering with Georgia’s Department of Human Services to secure state funding for marriage education and to develop strategies for providing fragmented families with services and resources.\textsuperscript{167} The GFC took the lead with a host of state agencies involved in the project.\textsuperscript{168} Pivotal in this effort was the community of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See infra Table A.
\item See infra Table B.
\item See infra Table C.
\item See infra Table D.
\item See JOSHI ET AL., supra note 126, at ES-5.
\item See, e.g., Randy Hicks, \textit{Mr. President, Please Tell the Whole Story}, GA. FAM. COUNCIL, http://www.georgiafamily.org/press/column/mr-president-please-tell (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (discussing the message of marriage as essential to the message of healthy fatherhood); see also Telephone Interview with Benjamin Scafidi, supra note 16.
\item See JOSHI ET AL., supra note 126, at ES-5, 5-3, 5-12. See id. at 5-5 fig. 5-1, for a flow chart illustrating the partnership and its objectives.
\item HHS describes the efforts of GFC:
\begin{quote}
The Georgia Healthy Marriage Initiative (GAHMI) is a first-time partnership between the Georgia Department of Human Services (DHS), Division of Child Support Services (DCSS), and the Georgia Family Council (GFC), which is based in Atlanta. The GFC is a nonprofit research and education organization that engages in family-focused public policy development and advocacy, disseminates information about marriage and families in the media, and develops community coalitions and organizational capacity focused on healthy marriage and relationship educational services. The GFC leads responsibility for carrying out the project.
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
The GFC's approach to the Community Healthy Marriage Initiative (CHMI) program focused on developing a large-scale community saturation effort of healthy marriage and relationship (HMR) services in multiple counties utilizing three core strategies:
\begin{itemize}
\item using media outlets and public information campaigns, raise individual and community awareness about family issues, such as the negative consequences of divorce and out-of-wedlock births;
\item coordinating and building capacity among local communities to provide HMR educational activities known as the “My Thriving Family” program; and
\item building a network of certified HMR trainers.
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
faith-based participants. 169 In addition, the state court system has implemented policies to help fragmented families. In 2006, the Georgia Supreme Court, then under the leadership of Chief Justice Leah Ward Sears, established the Georgia Supreme Court Commission on Children, Marriage and Family Law, to deal more effectively and comprehensively with broken families in the judicial context. 170 Since 2007, Georgia had a 19% increase in TANF expenditures, 171 households had a 157% increase in annual SNAP costs, 172 and the state had a 53% increase in food costs for WIC. 173 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation in TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Georgia is $4,003,132,943. 174

Hawaii

Established in 2003, 175 Hawaii’s Commission on Fatherhood operates without any government funding and provides numerous resources to promote healthy families. 176 The not-for-profit Hawaii Family Forum encourages implementation of family-strengthening public policy. 177 Since 2007, Hawaii held the line on TANF costs with a 0.3% decrease in TANF expenditures, 178 but households had a 164% increase in annual SNAP costs, 179 and the state had an 8% increase in food costs for WIC. 180

Reflecting the GFC philosophy that “there is no one-size-fits-all approach” to HMR service delivery, the GAHMI emphasizes tailoring initiatives to reflect community needs. 181

Id. at 5-1 (footnotes omitted). Atlanta and several surrounding Georgia counties were targeted communities. Id. at 5-3.

169 Id. at 5-1 tbl.5-2.

170 Leah Ward Sears, The “Marriage Gap”: A Case for Strengthening Marriage in the 21st Century, 82 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1243, 1263 (2007). These types of court-affiliated programs are very likely to produce positive results. See generally Tamara A. Fackrell et al., How Effective are Court-Affiliated Divorcing Parents Education Programs? A Meta-analytical Study, 49 Fam. Ct. Rev. 107 (2011) (noting that, given the success of divorcing-parents education programs, “we probably know enough to justify continuing and even increasing support for this recent social policy innovation”).

171 See infra Table A.

172 See infra Table B.

173 See infra Table C.

174 See infra Table D.

175 H.R. 689, 26th Leg. (Haw. 2011).


177 HAW. FAM. FORUM, http://www.hawaiifamilyforum.org/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (“Our Mission is to strengthen and defend Hawaii’s families . . . by mobilizing Hawaii’s Christian churches and people of good will through research, education and communication.”).

178 See infra Table A.

179 See infra Table B.
food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{180} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Hawaii is $649,633,231.\textsuperscript{181}

\textit{Idaho}

The not-for-profit Cornerstone Family Council in Idaho works “to provide...up-to-date resources that target issues affecting the family.”\textsuperscript{182} but our research did not reveal any relevant initiatives to report. Since 2007, Idaho had a strong 47\% decrease in TANF expenditures;\textsuperscript{183} households, however, had the highest increase in SNAP expenditures at a shocking 277\% increase,\textsuperscript{184} and the state had a 37\% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{185} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Idaho is $402,577,760.\textsuperscript{186}

\textit{Illinois}

The Illinois legislature made some comprehensive amendments to several state acts for more efficient and economical delivery of social services, particularly to children.\textsuperscript{187} The private, not-for-profit Illinois Family Institute “works to reduce the[] factors that threaten family stability and strives to create a political and social environment where families can thrive and prosper.”\textsuperscript{188} Similarly, the Illinois Fatherhood Initiative is a private organization “promoting responsible fatherhood.”\textsuperscript{189} Since 2007, Illinois had an 11\% increase in TANF expenditures,\textsuperscript{190} households had a 91\% increase in annual SNAP costs,\textsuperscript{191} and the state had a 27\% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{192} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Illinois is $4,804,827,434.\textsuperscript{193}

\textsuperscript{180} See infra Table C.
\textsuperscript{181} See infra Table D.
\textsuperscript{183} See infra Table A. It is not clear what factors may have worked to bring about this substantial decrease.
\textsuperscript{184} See infra Table B. These substantial increases may have resulted from TANF decreases, but that connection could not be made for certain from our research.
\textsuperscript{185} See infra Table C.
\textsuperscript{186} See infra Table D.
\textsuperscript{188} About, ILL. FAM. INST., http://illinoisfamily.org/about/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012).
\textsuperscript{190} See infra Table A.
\textsuperscript{191} See infra Table B.
\textsuperscript{192} See infra Table C.
\textsuperscript{193} See infra Table D.
Indiana

The Indianapolis Family Strengthening Coalition, funded by the city government, was designed to convene “Family Circles” to facilitate small community discussions on family strength in order to support health, safety, community engagement, and financial security for families. The ACF helped establish a Fatherhood Collaboration Network, which has led the way on strengthening family policy in Indiana with the Hoosier Family Fragmentation report, has been endorsed by the state of Indiana as a “collaborative partner” in administering the state’s federally funded Healthy Marriages program since 2008. Since 2007, Indiana had a 17% decrease in TANF expenditures, households had a 105% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 36% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Indiana is $2,029,611,213.

194 NAT’L HUMAN SERVS. ASSEMBLY, supra note 84, at 6.
196 See IND. FAMILY INST., INDIANA FAMILY REPORT 12.
197 IND. FAMILY INST., HOOSIER FAMILY FRAGMENTATION: IMAGINE INDIANA WITH STRONGER FAMILIES AND A STRONGER ECONOMY (2010), available at www.hoosierfamily.org/docs/Final-Report-4-30-10.doc. This very thorough task force report is complete with graphs, charts, statistics, findings, collaboration suggestions, state policy recommendations, and recommendations for the Indiana Family Institute to undertake; it was rendered almost in direct response to the 2008 Report and made some pointed suggestions for state government in the face of family fragmentation:

We suggest that because the bureaucracy to-date has compartmentalized social service programs and spending to certain committees, commissions, or departments and fiscal policy issues to others . . . this de-coupling effect has thwarted a complete picture as to the decimation of both families and the budget. We also do not adequately see the impact on families and children when we have allowed issues of political correctness to block discussion of one of the most fundamental reasons these programs are necessary: couples who have children do not marry or stay married. It is a costly denial on not just taxpayer wallets but Hoosier hearts.

Id. at 8. The report proffers that government programs like ACF have operated to further fragmented families. See id.
199 See infra Table A.
200 See infra Table B.
201 See infra Table C.
202 See infra Table D.
Iowa

The Iowa Family Policy Center, established by the Family Leader, appears to be the only active and relevant initiative in the state and educates in family breakdown. The center receives federal funds for its work on marriage in a program called “Marriage Matters.” The center also has created the Iowa Family PAC to help elect pro-family state officials. Since 2007, Iowa had a 25% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 113% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 19% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Iowa is $876,553,765.

Kansas

The Kansas Healthy Marriage Initiative is part of the Kansas Family Strengthening Coalition, a grassroots movement to “better support and improve the adult relationships that children depend on for positive futures.” In 2011, Governor Sam Brownback and executives at the Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services shared marriage program ideas to strengthen marriage and cut divorce rates, revealing that Kansas is at the beginning of a road toward family initiatives to decrease family-fragmentation costs. Since 2007, Kansas

204 Id.
207 See infra Table A.
208 See infra Table B.
209 See infra Table C.
210 See infra Table D.

had a 46% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 135% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 31% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Kansas is $678,390,943.

**Kentucky**

Kentucky’s Bluegrass Healthy Marriage Initiative (“BHMI”) “is a . . . partnership between the University of Kentucky’s (UK) Department of Family Studies, the Kentucky Cabinet of Health and Family Services’ (CHFS) Department of Income Support (DIS) Division of Child Support Enforcement (CSE),” and IDEALS of Kentucky, a nationally known “marriage education provider,” and has been heralded as a national model to some extent. The BHMI [aims] to improve family stability and child well-being by increasing access to marriage and relationship education, promoting awareness of the importance of healthy marriages and relationships among a coalition of community organizations, and improving child-support outcomes among program participants.” BHMI works with targeted families to develop strategies for strengthening those families within their communities rather than reacting to the crisis of an individual family. The Kentucky Marriage Movement, a private actor in the state, is also taking the initiative to strengthen marriages and the institution of marriage. Since 2007, Kentucky had a 22% increase in TANF expenditures, households had an 87% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had only a 4% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Kentucky is $1,886,020,365.

---

214 See infra Table A.
215 See infra Table B.
216 See infra Table C.
217 See infra Table D.
218 See JOSHI ET AL., supra note 126, at 3-1 to -23.
219 Id. at ES-3.
220 Id. at 3-22. These families were connected to the local police force and local National Guard civil servants. Id.
221 About, KY. MARRIAGE MOVEMENT, http://kentuckymarriage.org/about/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (explaining its mission to “serve couples, church and community leaders with the resources to strengthen marriage and reduce divorce and out-of-wedlock pregnancies”).
222 See infra Table A.
223 See infra Table B.
224 See infra Table C.
225 See infra Table D.
Louisiana

Louisiana’s Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood Community Demonstration Initiative participated in the ACF-sponsored program, Families Matter!, which provides low-income individuals with family-strengthening services through marriage and relationship education.226 “Based on research indicating that children in two-parent families have a lower incidence of childhood poverty, the [Families Matter!] educational program . . . was designed to improve relationships and family stability in low-income families.”227 Louisiana’s Department of Children and Families has submitted a funding request for commencing this program.228 In addition, the private, not-for-profit Louisiana Family Forum works on “issues affecting the family through research, communication and networking.”229 Since 2007, Louisiana had a 46% increase in TANF expenditures,230 households had an 86% increase in annual SNAP costs,231 and the state had a 41% increase in food costs for WIC.232 The conservative five-year cost of family

---

226 See JOSHI ET AL., supra note 126, at 4-1.

The Louisiana Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood Community Demonstration Initiative is a first-time partnership between the Louisiana Department of Social Services (DSS), Office of Family Support (OFS), Support Enforcement Services (SES), and Total Community Action (TCA) of New Orleans, a nonprofit community-based agency providing multiple services to low-income families. Families Matter! (FM), TCA’s healthy marriage and education program, uses a case management model to provide two principal services: (1) healthy marriage and relationship (HMR) educational classes for mothers, fathers, and couples with incomes below the Federal poverty line and (2) access to TCA’s comprehensive services and referrals.

227 Id.


Families Matter! Is [sic] a community demonstration project whose primary objective is to create a program and to continue providing services in the area that supports healthy relationships and healthy marriages, as well as, promote responsible fatherhood which will help ensure youths receive parental emotional support necessary for proper development and the financial support to which they are entitled. The overall goal is to increase the involvement of fathers and mothers in the emotional development of their children to provide healthier connections with their fathers and reduce the risk of early parenting, poor academic achievement, substance abuse, and juvenile delinquency.

229 Id.

230 See infra Table A.

231 See infra Table B.

232 See infra Table C.
fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Louisiana is $2,148,942,689.233

**Maine**

Maine implemented a pilot program to adopt a Children’s Cabinet and has worked to eliminate confusion and duplication over child and family welfare services.234 Similarly, the Christian Civic League of Maine advocates family-strengthening public policy.235 Our research, however, did not reveal any relevant marriage initiatives to report.236 Since 2007, Maine had a 27% increase in TANF expenditures,237 households had a 124% increase in annual SNAP costs,238 and the state had a 19% increase in food costs for WIC.239 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Maine is $589,978,032.240

**Maryland**

The private, not-for-profit Maryland Family Alliance advocates public policy to strengthen families.241 The City of Baltimore has established some programs designed to assist families in homeownership stability.242 Although our research did not reveal any relevant marriage

---

233 See infra Table D.
236 Maine’s marriage initiatives were all focused on and consumed with deciding whether to legalize gay marriage; the legislature passed a “gay marriage bill” in 2009 that was eventually overturned. The debate continues to consume Maine marriage energy. See Clarke Canfield, Obama’s Support for Same-Sex Marriage Adds Fuel to Debate, BANGOR DAILY NEWS (May 18, 2012, 3:42 PM), http://www.bangordailynews.com/2012/05/18/politics/obamas-support-for-same-sex-marriage-adds-fuel-to-debate/. For a review of what Maine is considering regarding marriage in the 2012 election, see Lynne Marie Kohm, Marriage and Grassroots Democracy in 2012, JURIST (June 26, 2012), http://www.jurist.org/forum/2012/06/lynne-kohm-marriage-referendum.php.
237 See infra Table B.
238 See infra Table C.
239 See infra Table D.
240 See infra Table D.
242 These programs were the Employee Homeownership Program, the Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative, and the Live Near Your Work Program. NAT’L HUMAN SERVS. ASSEMBLY, supra note 84, at 4.
initiatives to report. Maryland proposed legislation designed to encourage couples to seek premarital counseling. Since 2007, Maryland had a 7% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 190% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 52% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Maryland is $1,569,619,542.

Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Department of Public Health has some family initiatives but none that deal with family-fragmentation issues. The Massachusetts Family Institute, however, is dedicated to strengthening families. Since 2007, Massachusetts had a 7% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 174% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 7% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Massachusetts is $2,096,000,653.

Michigan

The Michigan Family Forum, a private organization promoting public policy to strengthen families in Michigan, encourages responsible fatherhood and advocates legislation to strengthen and encourage

---

243 Maryland is currently debating the definition of marriage and its constitutional protection, similar to Maine in 2009. See Rebecca Berg, In Maryland, Gay Marriage Seeks a ‘Yes’ at the Polls, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 26, 2012, at N16. For a review of what Maryland is considering regarding marriage in the 2012 election, see Kohn, supra note 236.

244 H.D. 57, 2000 Leg., Reg. Sess. (Md. 2000); see also Hawkins et al., supra note 160.

245 See infra Table A.

246 See infra Table B.

247 See infra Table C.

248 See infra Table D.


250 See About MFI, MASS. FAM. INST., http://www.mafamily.org/about-mfi/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (focusing on such initiatives as strengthening marriage and “[p]roviding resources to help fathers meet the financial and emotional needs of their young families”).

251 See infra Table A.

252 See infra Table B.

253 See infra Table C.

254 See infra Table D.

adoption of children by married couples. Michigan has dedicated some TANF funds to strengthening marriage. Since 2007, Michigan had a 12% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 130% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 27% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Michigan is $4,753,524,945.

**Minnesota**

Minnesota’s legislative work on family strengthening is a model approach for other states. The research of Professor William J. Doherty at the University of Minnesota has resulted in some important proposed legislation affecting family policy. Professor Doherty’s research received national recognition in the Research Triangle Institute’s 2010 report—regarding a community approach to healthy marriage initiatives—for its community approach:

The Minnesota Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood (HMRF) Initiative’s Family Formation Project (FFP) is a partnership between the University of Minnesota’s Department of Family Social Science and the Minnesota Department of Human Services’ Child Support Enforcement Division (CSED). The FFP aimed to improve child well-being, child support outcomes, and healthy marriages and relationships among couples who were unmarried when they enrolled in the program, were in committed relationships, had recently had a child and established paternity, and lived in the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. The program developers chose to target unmarried parents identified as “fragile families” because, despite their initial interest in maintaining their relationships, once their child is born, research shows that these couples are at high risk of breaking up.

The Second Chances Act, legislation to reduce unnecessary divorce and resulting family fragmentation, included three proposals to work toward that objective. The first was a bill to require a mandatory one-year waiting period for divorce, an effort to curb marital breakdown in

---

257 Hawkins et al., supra note 160, at 269. It is unclear whether there has been a sustained commitment to these efforts.
258 See infra Table A.
259 See infra Table B.
260 See infra Table C.
261 See infra Table D.
263 Joshi et al., supra note 126, at ES-2 to -3.
264 Doherty & Sears, supra note 262, at 42–47.
265 Id. at 42–44.
a move away from a unilateral rush to divorce. The second proposal—which became state law on July 1, 2010—was a bill to establish a center preventing unnecessary divorce, under the guidance and endorsement of the University of Minnesota, called the “Minnesota Couples on the Brink Project.” The third proposal was a bill on education requirements for divorcing parents designed to protect minor children by educating their divorcing parents on the harm of divorce to children and

266 John Crouch, An Early Warning/Prevention System for Divorce: The Divorce Early Warning and Prevention Act, AMS. FOR DIVORCE REFORM (June 24, 2005), http://www.divorcereform.org/CPAFull.html. This proposal discusses how it is “fundamentally different” from a waiting period and is designed to confront the culture of divorce. Id.

Awaiting [sic] period is typically a burden placed by the government on people who have already decided to do something, in hopes that they will change their minds. It is between the government and the individual. In contrast, the early warning and prevention period is mostly a social and legal duty that married people owe to each other, not to the state. It is a notice requirement, like the widely-accepted norms of two weeks' notice for quitting a job, or one month's notice for eviction. Thus it has the potential to move from the statute books into the realm of common law that people carry around in their heads, that they think of as the rules of life. That is our best hope for using the law to influence decisions people make in their private lives, before they come into contact with the legal system. Id.

This type of public policy is “intended to make individuals’ decisions be more deliberate, considered, and informed.” Id. Alteration of modern acceptable divorce structures also includes attempts to restore mutuality to the divorce bargain as a matter of fairness in the contractual dialogue of divorce. See, e.g., Lynne Marie Kohm, On Mutual Consent to Divorce: A Debate with Two Sides to the Story, 8 APPALACHIAN J.L. 35, 35 (2008) (discussing the mutual contractual obligation in marriage).

267 DOHERTY & SEARS, supra note 262, at 44.

268 MINN. STAT. ANN. § 137.32 (West 2011). For a description of the legislation, see Sheri Stritof & Bob Stritof, Minnesota Couples on the Brink Project, ABOUTMARRIAGE.COM (May 26, 2010), http://marriage.about.com/b/2010/05/26/minnesota-couples-on-the-brink-project.htm. For a fair scholarly discussion of the bill, see Minnesota “Couples on the Brink” Bill, FAM. LAW PROF BLOG (Apr. 20, 2010), http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/family_law/2010/04/minnesota-couples-on-the-brink-bill.html. “Doherty . . . said that with better training for counselors and clergy, 10 percent of couples headed for divorce might be able to restore their marriages,” while also noting that “[c]ouples with a history of domestic violence would not qualify” for the project. Id. It is also noteworthy that divorce lawyers in Minnesota would not back the project, arguing that “there are better uses for this public money. The Minnesota State Bar Association family lawyers narrowly voted against supporting Couples on the Brink, said Pamela Waggoner, chairwoman of the bar’s family law section.” Id. It is disingenuous not to recognize that family law and divorce lawyers tend to profit from family fragmentation, though it is laudable that apparently some (though not enough) in the Minnesota Bar saw the great public policy benefits to reducing family fragmentation through decreased divorce rates. This should cause one to consider honestly the inherent conflict of interest family law lawyers have with reducing state costs of family fragmentation due to their personal conflicting economic interest in the notions such projects present.
their families. Combined with additional legislation designed to encourage couples to seek premarital counseling, these efforts reveal that Minnesota is very active in promoting marriage legislation that strengthens families. The Minnesota Family Council also advocates family-strengthening public policy. Since 2007, Minnesota’s TANF expenditures decreased by 2%, households had a 136% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 24% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Minnesota is $1,228,507,696.275

**Mississippi**

Mississippi has a Healthy Marriage Initiative that supported legislation instituting a National Marriage Week. The initiative also works in cooperation with the Department of Human Sciences at Mississippi State University to provide family-strengthening resources. Mississippi proposed abstinence education designed to reduce unmarried pregnancy. In addition, the Mississippi Center for

---

269 Doherty & Sears, supra note 262, at 45–46. The proposed bill required divorcing parties to complete “a four-hour marriage dissolution education program.” Id. at 45. This section was also adopted by the Minnesota Legislature and would have been effective January 1, 2013. Id. at 48. However, Minnesota Senate Bill S.F. 1161 was referred to the Judiciary and Public Safety Committee rather than passed. See S. 1161, 87th Leg. Sess., (Minn. 2011); SF 1161 Status in Senate for Legislative Session 87, MINN. STATE LEGISLATURE, https://www.revisor.mn.gov/revisor/pages/search_status/status_detail.php?b=Senate&f=SF1161&ssn=0&y=2012 (last visited Oct. 18, 2012).

270 See Doherty & Sears, supra note 262, at 38. For a review of what Minnesota is considering regarding same-sex marriage in the 2012 election, see Kohm, supra note 236.

271 MINN. FAM. COUNCIL, IGNITE: AN ENDURING CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION (on file with Regent University Law Review) (promoting family strength through its primary tenets of education, legislation, and accountability).

272 See infra Table A. The causal connection between Minnesota’s marriage legislation and the small decrease in TANF may be related, but further monitoring over a greater length of time would be critical to support that surmise.

273 See infra Table B.

274 See infra Table C.

275 See infra Table D.


Public Policy promotes strong family policy initiatives. Since 2007, Mississippi had a 44% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 108% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 23% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Mississippi is $1,298,827,950.

Missouri

The Missouri Healthy Marriage Initiative is sponsored by the University of Missouri and Missouri Families, providing resources to strengthen marriages and families. Missouri’s Department of Social Services sponsored a Strengthening Families initiative as part of the Center for the Study of Social Policy, mostly designed to protect children from child abuse. Since 2007, Missouri had only a 3% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 93% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 35% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Missouri is $2,132,161,200.

Montana

The Montana Family Institute is a private organization dedicated to protecting and strengthening Montana’s families. Our research, however, did not reveal any other relevant initiatives to report. Since 2007, Montana had a 13% increase in TANF expenditures, households
had a 116% increase in annual SNAP costs,\(^\text{292}\) and the state had a 21% increase in food costs from WIC.\(^\text{293}\) The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Montana is $278,496,678.\(^\text{294}\)

**Nebraska**

Nebraska participates in the Families Matter Initiative sponsored by ACF\(^\text{295}\) and operated by the Nebraska Division of Children and Family Services.\(^\text{296}\) The Nebraska Children and Families Foundation is a federally funded private agency that protects against child abuse,\(^\text{297}\) and the Fatherhood-Family Initiative is a private community-education initiative that promotes the role of fathers in families.\(^\text{298}\) Both the Nebraska Family Forum and Nebraska Family First promote public policy initiatives for family strength.\(^\text{299}\) Since 2007, Nebraska had a national high 134% increase in TANF expenditures,\(^\text{300}\) households had a 103% increase in annual SNAP costs,\(^\text{301}\) and the state had a 29% increase in food costs for WIC.\(^\text{302}\) The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Nebraska is $386,563,774.\(^\text{303}\)

**Nevada**

Our research did not reveal any relevant family policy initiatives in Nevada. Since 2007, Nevada had a 35% increase in TANF expenditures,\(^\text{304}\) households had a 103% increase in annual SNAP costs,\(^\text{305}\) and the state had a 29% increase in food costs for WIC.\(^\text{306}\) The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Nevada is $386,563,774.\(^\text{307}\)

---

\(^{292}\) See infra Table B.

\(^{293}\) See infra Table C.

\(^{294}\) See infra Table D.


\(^{296}\) Id.


\(^{300}\) See infra Table A.

\(^{301}\) See infra Table B.

\(^{302}\) See infra Table C.

\(^{303}\) See infra Table D.
expenditures, households had a 272% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a national-high 85% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Nevada is $603,150,892.

New Hampshire

New Hampshire’s Child and Family Services is a private child welfare organization dedicated to protecting children and strengthening family life through child-advocacy legislation and public policy. The organization also promotes a Responsible Fatherhood Initiative. The Couch Family Foundation is a private research-grant organization dedicated to family welfare in New Hampshire, and Cornerstone Action advocates family-strengthening public policy. Since 2007, New Hampshire had a 0.1% decrease in TANF expenditures, households had a 160% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 4% decrease in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for New Hampshire is $258,125,286.

New Jersey

The State of New Jersey Department of Children and Families sponsors a “Father Time” program to encourage responsible fatherhood, and Compassion New Jersey, a faith-based organization,
coordinates a fatherhood program. Likewise, the New Jersey Family Policy Council encourages family-strengthening policy. Since 2007, New Jersey had a 12% decrease in TANF expenditures, households had a 151% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 50% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for New Jersey is $2,002,722,681.

New Mexico

New Mexico State University runs the Strengthening Families Initiative, and New Mexico is one of at least sixteen states to establish a Children’s Cabinet to increase the availability of child care to parents “working their way off welfare.” New Mexico established the Fatherhood Initiative Partnership coordinated by its Human Services Department in 2003. In 2010, the New Mexico Fatherhood Forum partnered locally with the New Mexico Alliance for Fathers and Families to hold a federally sponsored forum at the University of New Mexico. Since 2007, New Mexico had a 64% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 154% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 2% decrease in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for New Mexico is $875,294,005.
New York

New York City’s Department of Youth and Community Development implements a fatherhood initiative connected with the National Fatherhood Initiative.332 The Mayor of the City has worked to promote child support responsibility among fathers,333 and Forestdale Inc., a private foster-services agency, actively supports responsible fatherhood.334 In addition, the New York State Office of Children and Family Services conducts a fatherhood-education program.335 Since 2007, New York had a 7% increase in TANF expenditures,336 households had a 130% increase in annual SNAP costs,337 and the state had a 29% increase in food costs for WIC.338 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for New York is $9,948,102,542.339

North Carolina

With an objective of preventing child abuse, the Durham Family Initiative collaborates with the Duke Center for Child and Family Policy.340 Recent preliminary research findings by the Duke Center for Child and Family Policy show that economic standards act as a barrier to marriage, but not to fertility, when studying marriage and parenthood.

---

336 See infra Table A.
337 See infra Table B.
338 See infra Table C.
339 See infra Table D.
340 See Kenneth A. Dodge et al., The Durham Family Initiative: A Preventative System of Care, 83 CHILD WELFARE 109, 109–10 (2004). As a part of the university-based Child and Family Policy Consortium, the Duke Center for Child and Family Policy has noted that since the inception of its work with the Durham Family Initiative, child maltreatment has decreased by 50%. Their collaboration provides support for children and families by fostering integration of public and private services to effectively promote child wellbeing. Durham Family Initiative, DUKE CTR. FOR CHILD & FAM. POLY, http://childandfamilypolicy.duke.edu/project_detail.php?id=27 (last visited Oct. 18, 2012).
in the lives of adolescents and young adults. Likewise, the North Carolina Family Policy Council is a private, public-policy organization that promotes strengthening families. Since 2007, North Carolina had a 27% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 144% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 26% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for North Carolina is $3,235,401,330.

North Dakota

The North Dakota Family Alliance works to strengthen marriage and families, and the Dakota Fatherhood Initiative launched an annual summit conference in 2002. North Dakota appears to be at the forefront of foster-care reform to keep children out of foster care with a family-preservation initiative. Since 2007, North Dakota had a 3% decrease in TANF expenditures, households had an 85% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 9% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for North Dakota is $176,339,791.


342 About Us, N.C. FAM. POLY COUNCIL, http://ncfpc.org/who.html (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (“Our mission is to strengthen the family by educating North Carolinians on public policy issues that impact the family and equipping citizens to be voices of persuasion on behalf of traditional family values in their localities.”).
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347 NDFA Enhances Ability to Carry Out Mission, NDFA NEWS (N.D. Family Alliance, Fargo, N.D.), Sept. 2010, at 1, 4.
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Ohio

The Ohio Family and Children First Cabinet Council “was created in 1993 to help families and their children by coordinating existing government services.”354 Montgomery County committed $440,000 of TANF funds in 2006 for community outreach and education to reduce predatory lending.355 Ohio also has the Commission on Fatherhood designed to “enhance the well-being of Ohio’s children by increasing and promoting involved, nurturing and responsible fatherhood,”356 and Citizens for Community Values, based in Cincinnati, promotes family-strengthening public policy.357 Since 2007, Ohio had a 21% decrease in TANF expenditures,358 households had a 131% increase in annual SNAP costs,359 and the state had a 7% increase in food costs for WIC.360 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Ohio is $4,976,310,252.361

Oklahoma

Oklahoma has been a leader in family-strengthening through marriage initiatives and policy since 1999.362 For example, the Oklahoma Marriage Initiative (“OMI”)363 has been endorsed and followed by the federal government in several ways.364 It was funded through TANF

357 About Us, CITIZENS FOR COMMUNITY VALUES, http://www.ccv.org/about-us/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (focusing on efforts to “encourage and affect legislation that protects family[ly] and [to] oppose legislation that is harmful to those Judeo-Christian moral values upon which this country was founded”).
358 See infra Table A. This is a significant decrease that could warrant further study for causal connections with state policy.
359 See infra Table B.
360 See infra Table C.
361 See infra Table D.
362 See Rick Lyman, Prison Marriage Classes Instill Stability, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 16, 2005, at A10 (“Perhaps no state program is as ambitious or multifaceted as the Oklahoma Marriage Initiative....”).
364 Id. at 1.
funds to support marriage-strengthening strategies\textsuperscript{365} and has served as a model for many state and federal marriage initiatives.\textsuperscript{366} With ACF assistance, the OMI has provided workshops on how other states can begin marriage initiatives.\textsuperscript{367} Oklahoma has “dedicated noticeable amounts of TANF dollars to strengthening marriage,”\textsuperscript{368} passing legislation designed to encourage couples to seek premarital counseling\textsuperscript{369} and to foster better efficiency in benefits distribution.\textsuperscript{370} Oklahoma has accomplished many of its objectives through public policy implementation foremost under the Oklahoma Department of Health and Human Services and by working with other agencies.\textsuperscript{371} The OMI focus on marriage was based on a desire to make the State of Oklahoma “a more prosperous state.”\textsuperscript{372} Its programs are also educational in nature and are delivered in the form of workshops facilitated through pre-established public and private institutions.\textsuperscript{373} Oklahoma allocated TANF funds toward these initiatives “to strengthen marriage and reduce divorce.”\textsuperscript{374} Such initiatives become accessible by making and sustaining significant programs.\textsuperscript{375}

The Oklahoma Family Expectations program, an Oklahoma City-based service providing support to financially vulnerable families at the birth of a child, was also determined to be a national leader in family-policy impact, according to a national study on Building Strong Families.\textsuperscript{376} Family Expectations, a program designed to provide “relationship skills education throughout the state,” is administered by

\textsuperscript{366} See id. at 1.
\textsuperscript{367} See id. at 1–2.
\textsuperscript{368} Hawkins et al., supra note 160, at 269.
\textsuperscript{369} Id. at 266–67.
\textsuperscript{369} See The Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network, supra note 365.
\textsuperscript{369} Id. The Oklahoma Department of Health and Human Services was part of a state consolidation effort promoting better economic efficiency in state agencies. See H.R. 1220, 53d Leg., 1st Sess. (Okla. 2011).
\textsuperscript{372} Id.
the Oklahoma Department of Human Services. Since 2007, Oklahoma had a 22% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 106% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 19% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Oklahoma is $1,381,356,038.

Oregon

The Black Parent Initiative supports black families in Portland, Oregon by encouraging educational excellence for their children. Since 2007, Oregon had a 10% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 149% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 24% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Oregon is $1,687,572,911.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania has focused on economic initiatives to achieve family strength and has a fatherhood initiative in seventeen counties. The Pennsylvania Family Institute advocates for public policy to strengthen families. Since 2007, Pennsylvania had a 19% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 110% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 24% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Pennsylvania is $1,381,356,038.

---
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costs, and the state had a 53% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Pennsylvania is $4,035,892,088.

**Rhode Island**

The State of Rhode Island’s Office of Child Support Services has several fatherhood initiatives to educate and equip men for better fathering, and the Rhode Island Council for Muslim Advancement has established a Healthy Families Initiative. Since 2007, Rhode Island had a 7% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 207% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 16% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Rhode Island is $417,408,285.

**South Carolina**

Palmetto Family encourages implementation of family-strengthening public policy. Similarly, the South Carolina Center for Fathers and Families is a faith-based, private organization supporting strong families through successful fatherhood engagement. Since 2007, South Carolina had a 13% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 117% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 33% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for South Carolina is $1,850,403,452.

---
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399 See infra Table D.
400 See Palmetto Family, South Carolina Cultural Indicators, available at http://www.palmettofamily.org/Indicators.pdf (discussing Palmetto Family’s core values in light of cultural conditions in the state).
402 See infra Table A.
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South Dakota

The South Dakota Family Policy Council promotes public policy that strengthens families.406 There was a Dakota Fatherhood Initiative in 2002,407 and Fatherhood First is an active private, initiative connected with the National Fatherhood Initiative.408 Since 2007, South Dakota had a 12% increase in TANF expenditures,409 households had a 130% increase in annual SNAP costs,410 and the state had a 45% increase in food costs for WIC.411 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for South Dakota is $231,602,765.412

Tennessee

Tennessee passed legislation encouraging couples to seek premarital counseling.413 In addition, the Family Action Council of Tennessee advocates family-strengthening public policy,414 the Center for the Study of Social Policy has established the Strengthening Families initiative to prevent child abuse,415 and the Greer Campaign is working in conjunction with the National Fatherhood Initiative on education in fatherhood responsibility.416 Since 2007, Tennessee had a 68% increase in TANF expenditures,417 households had a 104% increase in annual SNAP costs,418 and the state had a 4% decrease in food costs for WIC.419 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Tennessee is $2,872,307,831.420

407 BROTHERSON, supra note 348, at 2.
409 See infra Table A.
410 See infra Table B.
411 See infra Table C.
412 See infra Table D.
413 Hawkins et al., supra note 160.
417 See infra Table A.
418 See infra Table B.
419 See infra Table C.
420 See infra Table D.
Texas

Texas allocated about one percent of unrestricted TANF funds toward “initiatives to strengthen marriage and reduce divorce,” primarily through premarital education.\textsuperscript{421} For example, in 2007, the Texas legislature passed legislation—funded by discretionary TANF funds—encouraging couples to seek premarital counseling by waiving the $60 marriage-license fee and the 72-hour waiting period for couples who participate in eight hours of premarital education by a state-approved counselor.\textsuperscript{422} Furthermore, a Family Strengthening Summit was held in Texas that highlighted the work of pre-established state and federal programs focused on family strength and asset-building.\textsuperscript{423} The Texas House of Representatives honored a delegation of the Texas Catholic Conference and Catholic Family Life Ministries for their work in building strong, healthy families.\textsuperscript{424} Texas also has the Faithful Fathering Initiative, which is designed “to encourage and equip men to be faithful fathers.”\textsuperscript{425} Since 2007, TANF expenditures in Texas increased by 17%,\textsuperscript{426} households had a 120% increase in annual SNAP costs,\textsuperscript{427} and the state had a 10% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{428} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Texas is $8,316,723,945.\textsuperscript{429}

Utah

From 2007 to 2011, Utah allocated about $750,000 per year in unrestricted TANF funds primarily to promote the use of premarital education services,\textsuperscript{430} and it has “dedicated noticeable amounts of TANF dollars to strengthening marriage.”\textsuperscript{431} As part of Utah’s Healthy Marriage Initiative, the Utah Commission on Marriage focuses on education and preparation in building strong and healthy marriages by working to “maintain two-parent families and prevent family

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Hawkins et al., \textit{supra} note 160, at 267 (noting the allocation of about $7.5 million each year from 2007 to 2011 for this purpose).
\item See H.R. Res. 1149, 82d Leg. Sess. (Tex. 2011).
\item \textit{About Us}, FAITHFUL FATHERING, http://www.faithfulfathering.org/ABOUT_US.htm (last visited Oct. 18, 2012) (defining “faithful fathers” as those “that prioritize physical presence, are engaged emotionally and lead spiritually by example”).
\item See \textit{infra} Table A.
\item See \textit{infra} Table B.
\item See \textit{infra} Table C.
\item See \textit{infra} Table D.
\item Hawkins et al., \textit{supra} note 160, at 267.
\item \textit{Id.} at 269.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
breakdown.” Another initiative is the Uplift Utah Families Foundation, which promotes solid parenting for strong families. Prevent Child Abuse Utah is an initiative to strengthen families against child abuse from birth. Moreover, the private, not-for-profit Foundation for Family Life promotes healthy families, and the Fathers & Families Coalition of Utah is an affiliate of a national coalition designed to encourage fatherhood development. Since 2007, Utah had a 36% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 201% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 55% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Utah is $585,142,665.

Vermont

A fairly new program, the Vermont Fatherhood Initiative, works to educate responsible fathers. Also, Vermont’s Department of Children and Families initiated the Sibling Bill of Rights for children in foster care to remain in sibling groups. Since 2007, Vermont’s TANF expenditures decreased by 0.04%, households had a 142% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 0.5% increase in food costs for

---
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The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Vermont is $222,809,577.\textsuperscript{446} Virginia

The Virginia Department of Social Services conducts a Strengthening Families Initiative to support responsible fatherhood and healthy families, marriages, and relationships.\textsuperscript{447} The Virginia Family Strengthening and Fatherhood Initiative is sponsored by the Virginia Department of Social Services to demonstrate the integrated “need for participation, of every division and office in working towards strengthening families and father engagement.”\textsuperscript{448} Within this program, the Richmond Family and Fatherhood Initiative has been the leader among Virginia cities in examining the social and financial impact of father absence and family fragmentation.\textsuperscript{449} The Family Foundation of Virginia is a private, public-policy organization involved in legislation to protect and strengthen families.\textsuperscript{450} Since 2007, Virginia had a 16% increase in TANF expenditures,\textsuperscript{451} households had a 142% increase in annual SNAP costs,\textsuperscript{452} and the state had a 22% increase in food costs for WIC.\textsuperscript{453} The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Virginia is $1,783,957,782.\textsuperscript{454}

\textsuperscript{445} See infra Table C. These numbers indicate that Vermont has unchanging levels of TANF and WIC compared to dramatic increases in SNAP expenditures.

\textsuperscript{446} See infra Table D.


\textsuperscript{449} See RICHMOND FAMILY & FATHERHOOD INITIATIVE, COST & SOLUTIONS TO FAMILY FRAGMENTATION & FATHER ABSENCE IN RICHMOND, VA (on file with the Regent University Law Review). Five cities have been targeted for state initiatives integrated with faith-based support for implementation of programs: Richmond, Alexandria, Norfolk, Petersburg, and Roanoke. The Child Advocacy Practicum of the Center for Global Justice, Human Rights and the Rule of Law at Regent University School of Law worked with the Virginia Department of Social Services to develop a model similar to the one in Richmond for the cities of Norfolk and Alexandria. This model is designed to assist the state in integrating resources and objectives with faith-based organizations in each city ready to work toward strengthening families and decreasing family fragmentation from father absence in their particular city.

\textsuperscript{450} About the Family Foundation of Virginia, FAM. FOUND. VA., http://familyfoundation.org/about/ (last visited Oct. 18, 2012).

\textsuperscript{451} See infra Table A.

\textsuperscript{452} See infra Table B.

\textsuperscript{453} See infra Table C.

\textsuperscript{454} See infra Table D.
Washington

Washington State’s Family Policy Council is a government arm partnering with Community Public Health and Safety Networks across the state to involve communities in finding ways to build thriving families.455 Similarly, the Family Policy Institute of Washington promotes public policy that strengthens families.456 Since 2007, Washington had a 45% increase in TANF expenditures,457 households had a 167% increase in annual SNAP costs,458 and the state had a 23% increase in food costs for WIC.459 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Washington is $2,327,683,510.460

West Virginia

The Family Policy Council of West Virginia promotes public policy to strengthen families.461 The West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources established a Healthy Families Initiative to foster good marriage and parenting462 and is connected with West Virginia University.463 Since 2007, West Virginia had a 91% increase in TANF expenditures,464 households had an 81% increase in annual SNAP costs,465 and the state had a 25% in food costs for WIC.466 The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for West Virginia is $845,688,010.467

---

457 See infra Table A.
458 See infra Table B.
459 See infra Table C.
460 See infra Table D.
464 See infra Table A.
465 See infra Table B.
466 See infra Table C.
467 See infra Table D.
Wisconsin

The Wisconsin State Legislature proposed legislation providing for better public school curriculum regarding sex education, abstinence, “personal responsibility, and the positive connection between marriage and parenting.” Wisconsin Fathers for Children and Families works to encourage two-parent families, and the Milwaukee Fatherhood Initiative has held annual summits and provides resources for male city residents to encourage fewer father-absent homes. The Wisconsin Family Council is a public policy organization that promotes strengthening families. Since 2007, Wisconsin had a 26% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 208% increase in annual SNAP costs, and the state had a 25% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Wisconsin is $1,169,252,320.

Wyoming

The Wyoming Healthy Marriage Initiative and the Strong Families, Strong Wyoming organization work to strengthen marriage and families. In the past, Wyoming has participated with HHS's national fatherhood initiative. Since 2007, Wyoming had a 69% increase in TANF expenditures, households had a 110% increase in annual SNAP

---

472 See infra Table A.
473 See infra Table B.
474 See infra Table C.
475 See infra Table D.
478 See infra Table A.
costs, the state had a 31% increase in food costs for WIC. The conservative five-year cost of family fragmentation of TANF, SNAP, and WIC for Wyoming is $101,532,134.

IV. GENERAL ANALYSIS

This survey is offered to states as a reference in considering and analyzing their expenditures and activities in relation to fragmented families. The information presented here does not necessarily allow for a cause-and-effect analysis, but states are free to make connections as they deem appropriate and are encouraged to use this information for internal analysis of the effectiveness of various programs. Although it is unclear whether family initiatives save taxpayer money, it can be safely assumed that the programs outlined here cost very little and are more likely to curb family fragmentation (than increase it), which will, in time, save state taxpayer money.

Some general insights, however, can be made. Stunning were the increases in SNAP expenditures over the past five years. Although SNAP is clearly a taxpayer cost of government support for fragmented families, University of Chicago economist Casey Mulligan links the recent rise in SNAP benefits to high unemployment in a recessed economy and monetary benefits provided under the 2009 Stimulus Act. Individuals in fragmented families are using SNAP at an incredible pace and at great expense to taxpayers in every state.

In difficult economic times, states are obviously forced to make difficult budgetary decisions. States that saw TANF decreases, namely Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New

479 See infra Table B.
480 See infra Table C.
481 See infra Table D.
482 Casey B. Mulligan, Food Stamps and Unemployment Insurance, N.Y. TIMES ECONOMIX (May 9, 2012, 6:00 AM), http://economixblogs.nytimes.com/2012/05/09/food-stamps-and-unemployment-insurance (citing to his work regarding the ease of qualifying for food stamps).

[F]ood-stamp eligibility rules have changed markedly in the last several years, bringing the program closer to unemployment insurance. Food stamps effectively no longer have an asset test. States have also received waivers from work requirements during the recession (for a while, the requirements were waived nationwide by the 2009 stimulus law).

As a result, food-stamp participation is now more common among the unemployed.
Id.; see also Casey B. Mulligan, Testing for Need, N.Y. TIMES ECONOMIX (Jan. 18, 2012, 6:00 AM), http://economixblogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/18/testing-for-need/.
Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, and Vermont, may have accomplished those results by state budget benefit reductions, but whether there are any links in those decreases to family initiatives would be useful for state policymakers to contemplate.

TANF funds have been used most widely for marriage education. Although research has not revealed definitively whether premarital education is effective, such initiatives are certainly not harmful but are unquestionably helpful and creditable. Cost-effective policies to strengthen marriage and reduce divorce rates are another way states are seeking to decrease the cost of family fragmentation. As this survey revealed, the five states that have pursued those policies were Florida, Maryland, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Tennessee. Several states were spotlighted by TANF for their activities supporting married, two-parent families: Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, and West Virginia. Allowing state discretion in allocation of TANF funds has clearly been helpful to the various state initiatives. It has empowered states to target family-fragmentation concerns unique to their citizenry.

Similar to TANF-funded programs that support healthy family initiatives, programs that target WIC recipients for marriage education and resulting marriage benefits can be beneficial. Because the recipients of WIC funding are pregnant women, mothers, and children, some of the most vulnerable people in the welfare system, marriage initiatives and family-strengthening programs would help to decrease that vulnerability by providing support where it is needed most. Strengthening and stabilizing the connections between the two programs makes sense. Furthermore, streamlining TANF, SNAP, and WIC programs together to give families more support for future strength presents a sagacious objective.

---

484 See infra Table A.
485 See SCHOTT & PAVETTI, supra note 483, at 2.
486 See Elizabeth B. Fawcett et al., Do Premarital Education Programs Really Work? A Meta-analytic Study, 59 Fam. Rel. 232, 233, 236 (2010) (“[T]he question of whether premarital education works is not as settled as program developers and practitioners might assume or like it to be.”). Fawcett also noted the need for more longitudinal research. Id. at 233.
Recognition and understanding of the problem of family fragmentation and its costly results in individual states is half of the battle. Legislative and policy initiatives, like those in Alabama, Georgia, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Utah, and Virginia indicate that those states want to be proactive in addressing needs presented by family fragmentation. Also, governors’ initiatives like those in Alabama, Georgia, Kansas, and Utah raise awareness of the issues. Likewise, court initiatives like that in Georgia indicate judicial recognition of the issue of family fragmentation and manifest a desire on the part of the state’s top justices to provide solutions that lead to family strengthening rather than habitually reordering broken families when those families may be seeking judicial intervention for alternatives to family fragmentation.

Private initiatives working to combat family fragmentation are supplemental pieces of the puzzle in that such initiatives prime the pump to begin the process of managing the cultural epidemic of domestic breakdown. These private initiatives inform and inspire the public and provide government accountability. Most importantly, they work with grass-root efforts in schools, faith-based organizations, and civic organizations to accurately assess and address the individual needs of the community, acting as the boots on the ground.

State resources do not necessarily rescue fragmented families, nor do those resources solve the problems presented to the states by family fragmentation. Economist Isabel Sawhill notes that “[t]he government has a limited role to play. It can support local programs and nonprofit organizations working to reduce early, unwed childbearing through teen-pregnancy prevention efforts, family planning, greater opportunities for disadvantaged youth or programs to encourage responsible relationships.”489 Others agree and see a need for integration of public and private efforts. “Government alone cannot change the culture. The private and faith-based communities do not have the resources to build the supports needed to strengthen marriage. But working together, government, community and faith-based organizations can reverse the trends that are destroying marriage.”490 Many of the initiatives outlined here have come about because of the collaboration between university

489 Sawhill, supra note 6; see also Ron Haskins & Isabel Sawhill, Creating an Opportunity Society 61–62, 125, 168, 186 (2009) (examining economic opportunity and proposing an agenda for creating opportunity for the young and disadvantaged).

490 Chris Gersten, Americans for Divorce Reform, A Long-Term Strategy to End Marital Breakdown of Traditional Marriage 1 (unpublished manuscript) (on file with the Regent University Law Review). The plan outlines an eight-year strategy for government, community, and faith-based organizations to work together to reduce various forms of family fragmentation. See id. at 7.
researchers, government officials, and privately funded pro-family advocates.\textsuperscript{491}

State resources may stand in the gap for women and children in need; however, those recipients and their children are restricted by the very benefits designed to assist them. Economist Derek Neal at the University of Chicago discussed this dilemma in 2001: “During the past four decades, the prevalence of single-parent families has increased dramatically in the United States. The decline of two-parent families is a potential cause for concern since two-parent families may make more efficient investments in their children.”\textsuperscript{492} Professor Neal developed a model showing the interaction between the expansion of welfare programs and the rise in single motherhood, pointing to the possibility that, prior to the expansion of aid to single mothers, never-married motherhood was not an attractive option, even for women who faced poor marriage prospects. \ldots imply[ing] that, without government aid, women who face the worst marriage market prospects may not have the resources required to raise children on their own. Seen in this light, the expansion of welfare programs during the 1960s may be the key event that made never-married motherhood among economically disadvantaged women possible.\textsuperscript{493}

Neal targets the key problem with too much reliance on government support for a fragmented family. “[W]elfare programs restrict the ability

\textsuperscript{491} An example is the Child Advocacy Practicum at Regent University School of Law, which was the impetus for this Article. The Child Advocacy Practicum is one of the classes offered at Regent through the Center for Global Justice, Human Rights, and the Rule of Law. The Child Advocacy Practicum offers students at Regent the ability to get firsthand experience working on projects that affect child welfare. LYNNE MARIE KOHM, REGENT UNIV., SCH. OF LAW, A SYLLABUS FOR CHILD ADVOCACY PRACTICUM 1 (2012) (on file with the Regent University Law Review).


\textsuperscript{493} Id. at 24.

However, once a system of aid was put in place, the drastic decline in the supply of marriageable, less educated, black men may have been the driving force behind the observed changes in family structure among black women. In short, while the existing literature puts forth government aid to single mothers and shortages of marriageable men as competing explanations for observed changes in observed family structures among black women, these two factors may have worked together over time to shape changes in black family structure.

of participants to use their financial and human wealth to finance private consumption." U.S. Labor Statistics mirror this principal: "In 2011, families maintained by women with no spouse present remained less likely to have an employed member (71.7 percent) than married-couple families (81.9 percent) or families maintained by men with no spouse present (80.2 percent)." In fact, 54.1% of families maintained by women had no employment in 2011. These labor statistics, combined with the increasing amounts of money states are spending, expose just how costly is the gap created by family fragmentation—and a large portion of that may be perpetuated by the welfare cycle. This research demonstrates that over the past five years, TANF, SNAP, and WIC family support alone has cost the states $110,747,439,379.

Trends of family fragmentation have taken decades to manifest themselves. Likewise, the restoration of the family will take time to accomplish. Reversing the trend must be a part of a long-term societal commitment. Harvard Law Professor Mary Ann Glendon was an early forecaster of the state of family fragmentation witnessed today when she noted that "[t]he tale currently being told by the law about marriage and family life is probably more starkly individualistic than the ideas and practices that prevail." Professor Bruce Hafen saw the correlation between the transformation of family law and the emergence of autonomous individualism, noting the repercussions of that individualism having "implications across the entire spectrum of legal subject matter and political theory" and arguing that autonomous individualism "is relevant to family law because the changes of the past generation have produced what Martha Minow calls ‘[a] body of family law that protects only the autonomous self.’" This individualism has led to what we now understand to be family fragmentation. Cultural currents combined with expanded individual-focused family law have had devastating results in terms of family strength.

In family law, as in family life, the individualistic cultural currents of the past quarter century have eroded the mortar of personal

494 Neal, supra note 492, at 9 (illustrating that the value of being on aid is greater than the value of being single without children).


496 See id. tbl.3; see also id. at 2 (noting that the unemployment rate for married mothers is 6% but 15% for mothers “with other marital statuses”).

497 See infra Table D.


commitment that traditionally held the building blocks of family life—people—together in intimate relationships.

To probe the assumptions underlying an entire generation of wrenching legal and social change is a daunting task for family law scholarship, if only because those assumptions now seem so widely, even if often uncritically, accepted.\footnote{Hafen, supra note 20, at 2–3.} Professor Hafen agrees with Professor Glendon, wisely noting that the "law is clearly not the primary cause of the broad and complex attitudinal changes on this subject during the past quarter century, even if the law’s acquiescence has influenced the pace and nature of change."\footnote{Hafen, supra note 20, at 42.} Glendon’s observations in 1989 about society are only more serious now; and, “[i]f in fact our society [is] producing too many individuals who are [not] capable . . . of sustaining personal relationships, it is probably beyond the power of law to reverse the process.”\footnote{Glendon, supra note 498.} While state and federal support is important, states do not need to perpetuate the process of family fragmentation in efforts to assist families in need.

This indicates that neither state nor federal governments can completely restore the family or civil society, as “no government program is likely to reduce child poverty as much as bringing back marriage as the preferable way of raising children.”\footnote{Sawhill, supra note 6.} Those states, however, which have made headway, are likely holding the line on increased damage. Most active among them in family strength initiatives are Alabama, Georgia, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Utah. State governments that have effectively set up frameworks conducive to family strength and personal responsibility work to incentivize both marriage and active fatherhood.\footnote{Self-government is the key to true freedom for the individual. This principle of self-government provides a way to establish meaning for the liberty and individual rights that courts struggle to consistently define. We hold that when individuals themselves turn from selfish individualism to a true liberty and freedom in Christ, change and restoration...}
CONCLUSION

States cannot force healthy family structure, but they can endorse it. Although there is no quick fix, staying the course should yield outcomes that will not only strengthen families but will yield future generations of healthier children and, as a result, provide significant savings to taxpayers and states. States may choose to use the work presented here as a resource to support initiatives toward future family strength and restoration.

This research reveals the great cost borne by each state from the family brokenness of its own citizens. More investigation would be helpful. Follow-up research could include a longitudinal study to discern links between family initiatives in individual states and spending-directions in family-welfare expenses. Studying percentage decreases in various states to discern causal connections with those changes would be helpful. Whether various factors other than family initiatives cause increases or decreases is important to understand as is how those other factors work with family initiatives to create a stronger society. Numbers as large as those presented here are difficult to grasp, and greater depth of study would be very helpful. This Article affords a beginning to providing further research on the results of family-strengthening initiatives. It is essential to remember that “even very small increases in stable marriage rates would result in very large returns to taxpayers,” and those small increases make large economic differences over time.

A nation of welfare families fragmented and relying on state and federal financial assistance cannot be sustained. Emergent trends in family fragmentation may be curbed by initiatives that educate individuals and communities on the significance of marriage and fatherhood and may work to present significantly less expense to individual states. Recognizing these facts makes for a great beginning to a stronger state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>$90,469,123</td>
<td>$81,478,709</td>
<td>$87,386,473</td>
<td>$140,474,963</td>
<td>$109,737,857</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$37,176,237</td>
<td>$25,379,222</td>
<td>$31,929,928</td>
<td>$21,344,523</td>
<td>$28,483,329</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>$202,261,794</td>
<td>$196,591,597</td>
<td>$245,599,194</td>
<td>$192,401,576</td>
<td>$234,417,720</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.</td>
<td>$62,110,116</td>
<td>$58,141,125</td>
<td>$72,564,744</td>
<td>$130,535,898</td>
<td>$69,485,642</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td>$3,067,231,614</td>
<td>$3,695,590,270</td>
<td>$3,346,865,619</td>
<td>$4,274,286,260</td>
<td>$3,457,463,001</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>$105,900,145</td>
<td>$131,117,032</td>
<td>$163,150,446</td>
<td>$203,175,965</td>
<td>$176,073,168</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>$235,787,331</td>
<td>$240,109,297</td>
<td>$240,109,297</td>
<td>$267,046,129</td>
<td>$245,487,055</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>$24,663,538</td>
<td>$18,003,999</td>
<td>$33,811,249</td>
<td>$38,883,044</td>
<td>$31,612,277</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>$74,035,532</td>
<td>$85,383,319</td>
<td>$96,664,795</td>
<td>$112,661,281</td>
<td>$107,505,423</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fla.</td>
<td>$400,321,679</td>
<td>$471,363,761</td>
<td>$467,842,357</td>
<td>$489,511,805</td>
<td>$427,834,778</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>$326,315,145</td>
<td>$441,602,340</td>
<td>$348,118,851</td>
<td>$388,889,958</td>
<td>$388,134,240</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haw.</td>
<td>$82,485,639</td>
<td>$103,873,921</td>
<td>$121,101,361</td>
<td>$157,999,693</td>
<td>$82,230,727</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$24,310,311</td>
<td>$21,711,605</td>
<td>$20,604,496</td>
<td>$21,746,124</td>
<td>$12,862,685</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>$545,388,784</td>
<td>$543,482,849</td>
<td>$545,384,739</td>
<td>$724,368,595</td>
<td>$606,847,837</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>$163,440,624</td>
<td>$175,590,731</td>
<td>$180,186,593</td>
<td>$178,162,404</td>
<td>$135,875,967</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$92,516,290</td>
<td>$89,355,179</td>
<td>$92,320,104</td>
<td>$123,162,660</td>
<td>$115,876,723</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan.</td>
<td>$62,123,777</td>
<td>$67,548,443</td>
<td>$64,854,859</td>
<td>$130,440,819</td>
<td>$90,439,375</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky.</td>
<td>$127,381,760</td>
<td>$120,983,785</td>
<td>$141,053,878</td>
<td>$194,813,708</td>
<td>$155,000,922</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
<td>$145,118,909</td>
<td>$136,046,047</td>
<td>$135,647,308</td>
<td>$172,950,395</td>
<td>$212,368,302</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me.</td>
<td>$64,182,205</td>
<td>$82,726,837</td>
<td>$75,999,004</td>
<td>$85,996,917</td>
<td>$81,296,694</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md.</td>
<td>$205,004,611</td>
<td>$227,856,047</td>
<td>$259,966,523</td>
<td>$323,403,001</td>
<td>$220,162,019</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>$322,423,235</td>
<td>$321,559,779</td>
<td>$458,393,121</td>
<td>$420,601,995</td>
<td>$344,528,334</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>$592,720,134</td>
<td>$439,706,506</td>
<td>$669,852,600</td>
<td>$1,086,304,097</td>
<td>$665,119,842</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### The Cost of Family Fragmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>$205,547,447</td>
<td>$176,582,884</td>
<td>$261,873,988</td>
<td>$268,920,842</td>
<td>$200,744,630</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss.</td>
<td>$63,007,521</td>
<td>$69,378,735</td>
<td>$78,994,750</td>
<td>$83,841,666</td>
<td>$88,117,247</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>$184,158,549</td>
<td>$174,072,498</td>
<td>$174,530,031</td>
<td>$212,395,384</td>
<td>$190,385,828</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont.</td>
<td>$26,383,934</td>
<td>$23,709,017</td>
<td>$27,581,024</td>
<td>$33,764,247</td>
<td>$29,921,743</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>$22,562,539</td>
<td>$35,592,060</td>
<td>$28,975,680</td>
<td>$33,939,675</td>
<td>$52,858,929</td>
<td>134%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nev.</td>
<td>$41,312,970</td>
<td>$48,679,947</td>
<td>$52,008,110</td>
<td>$55,652,188</td>
<td>$55,652,188</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td>$40,486,471</td>
<td>$38,635,243</td>
<td>$44,093,332</td>
<td>$45,982,042</td>
<td>$40,429,955</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>$345,892,443</td>
<td>$311,729,908</td>
<td>$309,503,590</td>
<td>$339,396,758</td>
<td>$52,858,929</td>
<td>134%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>$61,732,379</td>
<td>$86,624,362</td>
<td>$113,682,413</td>
<td>$143,757,300</td>
<td>$101,440,053</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>$2,100,310,257</td>
<td>$1,897,196,186</td>
<td>$2,019,103,408</td>
<td>$2,388,094,662</td>
<td>$2,245,285,831</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>$247,145,756</td>
<td>$243,406,301</td>
<td>$336,547,779</td>
<td>$248,603,866</td>
<td>$314,087,247</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>$20,055,143</td>
<td>$20,005,277</td>
<td>$17,213,697</td>
<td>$22,312,928</td>
<td>$25,861,453</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$91,995,010</td>
<td>$115,559,096</td>
<td>$158,264,840</td>
<td>$118,879,036</td>
<td>$112,513,400</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>$46,780,225</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>$159,703,149</td>
<td>$205,690,173</td>
<td>$178,845,763</td>
<td>$250,197,944</td>
<td>$175,138,560</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>$440,888,719</td>
<td>$501,863,848</td>
<td>$545,122,631</td>
<td>$534,980,209</td>
<td>$525,208,208</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>$70,219,217</td>
<td>$74,173,912</td>
<td>$75,201,738</td>
<td>$74,061,965</td>
<td>$75,313,611</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>$93,226,608</td>
<td>$111,974,400</td>
<td>$131,658,291</td>
<td>$129,827,974</td>
<td>$104,966,214</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>$20,055,143</td>
<td>$20,005,277</td>
<td>$17,213,697</td>
<td>$22,312,928</td>
<td>$22,544,340</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>$128,286,687</td>
<td>$144,806,682</td>
<td>$202,036,915</td>
<td>$218,505,666</td>
<td>$210,619,488</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>$469,191,827</td>
<td>$570,434,746</td>
<td>$554,214,846</td>
<td>$658,557,631</td>
<td>$550,059,409</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$63,163,183</td>
<td>$60,819,298</td>
<td>$85,987,738</td>
<td>$97,372,154</td>
<td>$85,982,970</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>$46,780,225</td>
<td>$33,939,789</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>$232,521,579</td>
<td>$230,618,463</td>
<td>$292,732,225</td>
<td>$434,934,155</td>
<td>$308,214,830</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Va.</td>
<td>$72,104,299</td>
<td>$80,735,391</td>
<td>$112,923,047</td>
<td>$164,415,692</td>
<td>$137,568,964</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisc.</td>
<td>$236,968,652</td>
<td>$239,389,316</td>
<td>$289,688,655</td>
<td>$318,029,970</td>
<td>$298,679,480</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyo.</td>
<td>$16,138,965</td>
<td>$17,723,276</td>
<td>$21,783,923</td>
<td>$19,699,008</td>
<td>$27,292,986</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE B: SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (“SNAP”):
AVERAGE YEARLY COSTS PER HOUSEHOLD\textsuperscript{508}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>$601,413,135</td>
<td>$663,901,057</td>
<td>$970,949,068</td>
<td>$1,228,018,708</td>
<td>$1,492,961,298</td>
<td>148%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$86,084,132</td>
<td>$94,262,437</td>
<td>$129,624,461</td>
<td>$159,413,978</td>
<td>$176,385,311</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>$64,765,000</td>
<td>$72,440,411</td>
<td>$1,223,845,635</td>
<td>$1,587,702,249</td>
<td>$1,648,821,864</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.</td>
<td>$412,440,801</td>
<td>$431,547,087</td>
<td>$569,987,431</td>
<td>$886,400,617</td>
<td>$722,195,899</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal.</td>
<td>$2,569,814,580</td>
<td>$2,905,179,522</td>
<td>$4,382,009,712</td>
<td>$5,891,851,784</td>
<td>$6,481,947,277</td>
<td>152%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>$330,583,892</td>
<td>$325,104,191</td>
<td>$502,657,149</td>
<td>$687,709,379</td>
<td>$762,800,608</td>
<td>146%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>$253,062,794</td>
<td>$284,829,257</td>
<td>$417,158,566</td>
<td>$569,684,382</td>
<td>$647,290,087</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>$74,729,045</td>
<td>$86,180,751</td>
<td>$129,088,106</td>
<td>$171,155,272</td>
<td>$205,304,944</td>
<td>170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>$103,950,879</td>
<td>$112,324,800</td>
<td>$159,500,975</td>
<td>$185,893,308</td>
<td>$229,250,674</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fla.</td>
<td>$1,400,153,858</td>
<td>$1,778,641,937</td>
<td>$2,968,374,682</td>
<td>$4,416,942,533</td>
<td>$5,144,715,738</td>
<td>268%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>$1,125,054,322</td>
<td>$1,276,750,088</td>
<td>$1,943,839,554</td>
<td>$2,565,169,527</td>
<td>$2,891,615,163</td>
<td>157%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haw.</td>
<td>$155,542,027</td>
<td>$184,612,461</td>
<td>$273,683,509</td>
<td>$338,144,853</td>
<td>$412,604,147</td>
<td>164%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$85,992,768</td>
<td>$116,567,714</td>
<td>$280,937,001</td>
<td>$299,552,014</td>
<td>$361,999,149</td>
<td>277%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>$1,565,198,255</td>
<td>$1,718,280,001</td>
<td>$2,322,771,336</td>
<td>$2,784,473,892</td>
<td>$2,995,469,012</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>$677,097,563</td>
<td>$729,893,186</td>
<td>$1,071,248,747</td>
<td>$1,291,225,153</td>
<td>$1,386,478,333</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$265,450,404</td>
<td>$305,653,259</td>
<td>$419,857,396</td>
<td>$526,119,310</td>
<td>$366,732,507</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan.</td>
<td>$192,850,959</td>
<td>$211,265,341</td>
<td>$301,563,664</td>
<td>$402,630,483</td>
<td>$452,767,878</td>
<td>155%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky.</td>
<td>$674,261,809</td>
<td>$742,037,605</td>
<td>$1,002,064,470</td>
<td>$1,186,291,238</td>
<td>$1,260,880,769</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
<td>$746,127,346</td>
<td>$1,025,192,241</td>
<td>$1,119,136,582</td>
<td>$1,286,198,597</td>
<td>$1,386,115,227</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me.</td>
<td>$170,584,745</td>
<td>$196,264,502</td>
<td>$292,704,585</td>
<td>$350,097,335</td>
<td>$382,131,426</td>
<td>124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md.</td>
<td>$357,244,132</td>
<td>$422,043,737</td>
<td>$668,682,585</td>
<td>$877,975,713</td>
<td>$1,035,175,750</td>
<td>190%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>$471,901,115</td>
<td>$586,587,498</td>
<td>$923,603,583</td>
<td>$1,163,807,744</td>
<td>$1,291,609,491</td>
<td>174%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>$1,367,629,622</td>
<td>$1,506,032,028</td>
<td>$2,106,871,076</td>
<td>$2,808,763,231</td>
<td>$3,151,479,174</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>$296,387,269</td>
<td>$329,569,307</td>
<td>$472,689,944</td>
<td>$624,886,794</td>
<td>$688,408,893</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss.</td>
<td>$443,797,523</td>
<td>$496,847,694</td>
<td>$691,067,947</td>
<td>$846,542,922</td>
<td>$921,109,139</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>$745,311,957</td>
<td>$810,471,619</td>
<td>$1,135,612,551</td>
<td>$1,361,300,993</td>
<td>$1,437,866,768</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont.</td>
<td>$89,698,694</td>
<td>$94,225,210</td>
<td>$134,564,381</td>
<td>$176,546,027</td>
<td>$193,310,950</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>$126,459,706</td>
<td>$140,752,738</td>
<td>$179,068,040</td>
<td>$237,577,180</td>
<td>$258,477,504</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nev.</td>
<td>$133,739,897</td>
<td>$160,714,444</td>
<td>$285,773,577</td>
<td>$414,596,369</td>
<td>$496,867,234</td>
<td>272%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td>$62,477,686</td>
<td>$71,404,026</td>
<td>$115,948,720</td>
<td>$151,813,784</td>
<td>$162,679,478</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>$483,425,319</td>
<td>$532,944,962</td>
<td>$750,159,374</td>
<td>$1,030,292,837</td>
<td>$1,213,993,288</td>
<td>151%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>$248,844,870</td>
<td>$269,188,961</td>
<td>$410,844,850</td>
<td>$541,806,403</td>
<td>$601,681,353</td>
<td>154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>$2,324,294,916</td>
<td>$2,572,842,848</td>
<td>$3,955,033,246</td>
<td>$4,984,900,302</td>
<td>$5,350,660,541</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>$972,290,890</td>
<td>$1,104,399,862</td>
<td>$1,625,487,467</td>
<td>$2,072,127,398</td>
<td>$2,377,063,020</td>
<td>144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>$51,891,080</td>
<td>$59,266,579</td>
<td>$79,564,871</td>
<td>$95,014,475</td>
<td>$95,918,344</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$1,292,695,103</td>
<td>$1,494,661,229</td>
<td>$2,167,118,474</td>
<td>$2,733,689,660</td>
<td>$2,986,317,777</td>
<td>131%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>$458,907,034</td>
<td>$491,362,648</td>
<td>$666,446,549</td>
<td>$899,655,548</td>
<td>$947,338,484</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>$618,164,263</td>
<td>$706,792,219</td>
<td>$811,153,110</td>
<td>$1,066,932,095</td>
<td>$1,189,269,261</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>$1,258,604,269</td>
<td>$1,386,964,117</td>
<td>$1,900,787,569</td>
<td>$2,332,575,204</td>
<td>$2,647,473,519</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>$89,354,659</td>
<td>$107,719,391</td>
<td>$170,463,586</td>
<td>$237,618,372</td>
<td>$274,796,117</td>
<td>207%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>$618,164,263</td>
<td>$706,792,219</td>
<td>$811,153,110</td>
<td>$1,066,932,095</td>
<td>$1,189,269,261</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>$70,614,077</td>
<td>$78,001,007</td>
<td>$111,278,093</td>
<td>$153,075,454</td>
<td>$162,135,500</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>$1,063,609,007</td>
<td>$1,114,791,337</td>
<td>$1,603,675,536</td>
<td>$1,966,107,581</td>
<td>$2,048,637,598</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>$2,718,158,343</td>
<td>$3,068,232,722</td>
<td>$4,399,125,072</td>
<td>$5,447,397,414</td>
<td>$5,993,125,493</td>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$133,204,438</td>
<td>$150,960,585</td>
<td>$263,258,185</td>
<td>$366,903,456</td>
<td>$401,261,439</td>
<td>201%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vt.</td>
<td>$55,659,902</td>
<td>$62,169,303</td>
<td>$99,238,170</td>
<td>$124,311,833</td>
<td>$134,856,526</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>$551,446,240</td>
<td>$610,021,737</td>
<td>$922,879,649</td>
<td>$1,213,496,417</td>
<td>$1,335,038,906</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>$600,647,715</td>
<td>$680,799,184</td>
<td>$1,046,740,870</td>
<td>$1,386,585,884</td>
<td>$1,602,557,358</td>
<td>167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Va.</td>
<td>$274,884,537</td>
<td>$304,122,744</td>
<td>$408,456,434</td>
<td>$486,939,521</td>
<td>$497,390,191</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis.</td>
<td>$363,438,137</td>
<td>$430,028,455</td>
<td>$679,971,117</td>
<td>$1,000,496,070</td>
<td>$1,117,802,969</td>
<td>208%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyo.</td>
<td>$25,284,892</td>
<td>$26,389,959</td>
<td>$37,074,837</td>
<td>$51,674,879</td>
<td>$53,162,213</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C: Women, Infants, and Children (“WIC”) Annual Food Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala.</td>
<td>$74,210,159</td>
<td>$82,129,896</td>
<td>$76,022,244</td>
<td>$79,838,341</td>
<td>$87,239,755</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$14,830,199</td>
<td>$15,892,266</td>
<td>$16,569,253</td>
<td>$15,506,693</td>
<td>$16,269,305</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>$78,684,234</td>
<td>$96,973,323</td>
<td>$105,224,266</td>
<td>$93,665,889</td>
<td>$100,870,256</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark.</td>
<td>$40,670,480</td>
<td>$49,082,980</td>
<td>$47,942,672</td>
<td>$48,932,442</td>
<td>$53,810,866</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td>$698,765,814</td>
<td>$738,758,026</td>
<td>$757,390,634</td>
<td>$827,345,241</td>
<td>$920,629,963</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo.</td>
<td>$35,441,943</td>
<td>$44,628,898</td>
<td>$46,113,503</td>
<td>$46,781,507</td>
<td>$49,822,303</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conn.</td>
<td>$30,878,226</td>
<td>$34,092,965</td>
<td>$35,500,802</td>
<td>$30,778,425</td>
<td>$32,950,302</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del.</td>
<td>$8,039,196</td>
<td>$10,514,237</td>
<td>$10,815,265</td>
<td>$10,891,414</td>
<td>$12,235,263</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>$7,171,835</td>
<td>$8,889,738</td>
<td>$9,247,588</td>
<td>$8,273,117</td>
<td>$9,391,572</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fla.</td>
<td>$214,966,918</td>
<td>$258,862,751</td>
<td>$272,171,534</td>
<td>$247,390,909</td>
<td>$262,985,183</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>$147,858,511</td>
<td>$176,503,058</td>
<td>$186,877,035</td>
<td>$193,582,313</td>
<td>$225,969,436</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haw.</td>
<td>$21,977,213</td>
<td>$24,428,156</td>
<td>$23,613,339</td>
<td>$22,246,444</td>
<td>$23,799,696</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$14,661,269</td>
<td>$19,024,435</td>
<td>$20,355,036</td>
<td>$19,527,932</td>
<td>$20,108,849</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>$139,961,473</td>
<td>$154,166,784</td>
<td>$169,791,276</td>
<td>$166,396,777</td>
<td>$177,201,732</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>$61,333,474</td>
<td>$73,815,080</td>
<td>$76,407,408</td>
<td>$75,139,432</td>
<td>$83,674,360</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$29,382,669</td>
<td>$35,799,568</td>
<td>$34,498,197</td>
<td>$31,513,040</td>
<td>$34,914,528</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan.</td>
<td>$21,977,213</td>
<td>$24,428,156</td>
<td>$23,613,339</td>
<td>$22,246,444</td>
<td>$23,799,696</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky.</td>
<td>$66,238,789</td>
<td>$79,202,090</td>
<td>$82,060,000</td>
<td>$80,810,000</td>
<td>$89,450,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.</td>
<td>$87,801,639</td>
<td>$97,810,485</td>
<td>$93,502,131</td>
<td>$90,400,500</td>
<td>$95,833,122</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me.</td>
<td>$11,333,474</td>
<td>$12,574,349</td>
<td>$12,803,014</td>
<td>$12,871,811</td>
<td>$13,465,539</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md.</td>
<td>$53,273,131</td>
<td>$66,819,066</td>
<td>$72,637,183</td>
<td>$70,092,498</td>
<td>$81,015,210</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>$57,740,848</td>
<td>$61,766,095</td>
<td>$62,562,086</td>
<td>$58,946,209</td>
<td>$61,858,249</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>$107,402,331</td>
<td>$121,704,763</td>
<td>$115,202,157</td>
<td>$120,286,804</td>
<td>$136,272,286</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn.</td>
<td>$59,239,544</td>
<td>$70,849,413</td>
<td>$68,682,739</td>
<td>$67,552,620</td>
<td>$73,482,264</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss.</td>
<td>$52,124,767</td>
<td>$62,783,464</td>
<td>$73,704,744</td>
<td>$63,882,500</td>
<td>$63,947,436</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo.</td>
<td>$52,465,647</td>
<td>$60,880,339</td>
<td>$54,913,301</td>
<td>$60,760,382</td>
<td>$70,914,720</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont.</td>
<td>$8,660,534</td>
<td>$9,460,491</td>
<td>$9,186,975</td>
<td>$9,033,187</td>
<td>$10,492,002</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neb.</td>
<td>$18,177,984</td>
<td>$21,480,373</td>
<td>$20,971,660</td>
<td>$21,038,923</td>
<td>$23,511,032</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nev.</td>
<td>$19,414,882</td>
<td>$25,759,369</td>
<td>$27,028,439</td>
<td>$29,725,974</td>
<td>$35,908,738</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.H.</td>
<td>$7,926,142</td>
<td>$8,977,934</td>
<td>$8,690,440</td>
<td>$7,157,133</td>
<td>$7,569,965</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.J.</td>
<td>$71,623,257</td>
<td>$87,624,385</td>
<td>$93,879,419</td>
<td>$98,155,852</td>
<td>$107,497,168</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M.</td>
<td>$30,509,851</td>
<td>$32,802,772</td>
<td>$32,158,207</td>
<td>$26,278,926</td>
<td>$29,827,126</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>$272,094,470</td>
<td>$292,296,689</td>
<td>$311,543,551</td>
<td>$316,295,403</td>
<td>$352,074,635</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>$113,667,969</td>
<td>$136,418,654</td>
<td>$141,758,728</td>
<td>$130,769,295</td>
<td>$143,038,362</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>$7,443,565</td>
<td>$8,361,673</td>
<td>$7,590,274</td>
<td>$7,513,762</td>
<td>$8,103,064</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$122,014,284</td>
<td>$139,031,682</td>
<td>$141,758,728</td>
<td>$130,769,295</td>
<td>$143,038,362</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla.</td>
<td>$52,463,978</td>
<td>$60,615,316</td>
<td>$61,778,383</td>
<td>$59,347,355</td>
<td>$62,463,349</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or.</td>
<td>$43,506,016</td>
<td>$50,139,963</td>
<td>$50,267,983</td>
<td>$49,217,076</td>
<td>$53,873,401</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>$106,122,891</td>
<td>$121,732,749</td>
<td>$133,525,020</td>
<td>$134,635,245</td>
<td>$161,926,585</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.</td>
<td>$12,649,188</td>
<td>$13,469,665</td>
<td>$13,321,840</td>
<td>$13,731,698</td>
<td>$14,682,419</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td>$56,749,082</td>
<td>$71,500,649</td>
<td>$70,735,574</td>
<td>$68,642,624</td>
<td>$75,361,907</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>$8,859,022</td>
<td>$10,249,696</td>
<td>$9,796,081</td>
<td>$11,638,276</td>
<td>$12,829,503</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenn.</td>
<td>$86,918,047</td>
<td>$87,957,478</td>
<td>$78,277,721</td>
<td>$78,424,170</td>
<td>$82,200,080</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tex.</td>
<td>$334,539,441</td>
<td>$397,961,910</td>
<td>$374,594,749</td>
<td>$332,237,106</td>
<td>$367,891,514</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$21,143,562</td>
<td>$25,980,888</td>
<td>$26,628,372</td>
<td>$30,425,445</td>
<td>$32,784,183</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vt.</td>
<td>$9,031,133</td>
<td>$9,645,819</td>
<td>$9,554,486</td>
<td>$8,979,847</td>
<td>$9,080,542</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>$56,448,273</td>
<td>$62,538,023</td>
<td>$62,652,202</td>
<td>$62,244,345</td>
<td>$68,618,393</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash.</td>
<td>$80,056,758</td>
<td>$95,504,212</td>
<td>$100,061,356</td>
<td>$91,184,263</td>
<td>$98,690,238</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Va.</td>
<td>$21,646,472</td>
<td>$26,598,409</td>
<td>$27,768,532</td>
<td>$25,244,808</td>
<td>$27,046,481</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis.</td>
<td>$50,630,798</td>
<td>$58,103,155</td>
<td>$60,434,561</td>
<td>$58,924,500</td>
<td>$63,184,345</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyo.</td>
<td>$4,101,430</td>
<td>$5,068,725</td>
<td>$4,815,244</td>
<td>$4,697,051</td>
<td>$5,382,350</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These numbers were obtained by adding—by individual state—the annual numbers for 2007–2011 for TANF, SNAP, and WIC and then multiplying that sum by the co-efficient of 31.7%. We used this co-efficient because it is the one referenced in the 2008 Report as a very conservative estimate of the cost of family fragmentation. SCAFIDI, supra note 4, at 14.