

Community Services Block Grants (CSBG): Background and Funding

Updated September 12, 2025

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

RL32872

Summary

Community Services Block Grants (CSBG) provide federal funds to states, territories, and tribes for distribution to local agencies to support a wide range of community-based activities to reduce poverty. These include activities to help families and individuals achieve self-sufficiency, find and retain meaningful employment, attain an adequate education, make better use of available income, obtain adequate housing, and achieve greater participation in community affairs. In addition, many local agencies receive federal funds from other sources and may administer other federal programs.

Smaller related programs—Community Economic Development (CED), and Rural Community Development (RCD)—also support anti-poverty efforts. CSBG and these related activities trace their roots to the War on Poverty, launched more than 60 years ago in 1964. Today, they are administered at the federal level by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

In FY2025, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025 (P.L. 119-4) generally provided funding at the same levels as specified in the applicable FY2024 appropriations act. CSBG and related activities were funded at a total level of \$804 million through the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118-47). Of this total, \$22 million was reserved for CED and \$12 million was reserved for RCD. The FY2026 President's budget proposed to eliminate funding for the CSBG and related programs. CSBG has flexibility with regard to its implementation by local entities to address the causes and consequences of poverty. This aspect of CSBG enabled Congress to provide relief in recent years at the local level for services for persons whose low-income status leaves them especially vulnerable to disasters. For example, supplemental appropriations were made through the CSBG in response to hurricanes, typhoons, earthquakes, tornadoes, and wildfires in FY2019, the economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in FY2020, and hurricanes in FY2023.

The Community Services Block Grant Act was last reauthorized in 1998 by P.L. 105-285. The authorization of appropriations for CSBG and most related programs expired in FY2003, but Congress has continued to make annual appropriations each year. Most recently, legislation was introduced in the 117th and 119th Congresses—with bipartisan co-sponsorship in each case—to amend and reauthorize the CSBG Act. During the 119th Congress, a bill was introduced (H.R. 3131) that would amend the CSBG act and reauthorize CSBG at funding levels of \$1 billion annually through FY2032.

According to the most recent Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress (for FY2022), published by HHS, the nationwide network of approximately one thousand CSBG grantees served over 10 million people in 5.2 million low-income households in FY2022. States reported that the network spent \$20.2 billion of federal, state, local, and private resources, including \$1.1 billion in federal CSBG funds.

The CSBG Act definition of the term *poverty line* has been implemented via the calculation of a set of dollar amounts called the *Federal Poverty Guidelines* (FPG). This definition has also been referenced by the statutory language for other federal programs for purposes of program administration, either by referring directly to the definition in the CSBG statute or by using similar language. HHS is the agency responsible for updating the FPG annually for inflation, as specified in the CSBG statute.

Contents

Introduction	1
Background	1
The Block Grant	3
Allocation of Funds.....	3
Use of Funds	3
State Role.....	4
Local Delivery System.....	4
Related Activities	5
Community Economic Development.....	5
Rural Community Development.....	6
CSBG Program Data	6
Use of Federal CSBG Funds	7
Sources of Federal Non-CSBG Funds	7
Recipients of CSBG Services.....	8
Funding for CSBG and Related Activities	9
FY2024 and FY2025 Funding Levels.....	9
FY2026 President’s Budget Request.....	9
Recent Supplemental Appropriations.....	9
Reauthorization Proposals	10
119 th Congress	10
117 th Congress	11

Tables

Table 1. FY2023-FY2025 Enacted and FY2026 Proposed Funding for CSBG and Related Activities	9
Table A-1. Community Services Block Grant Funding Distributed to States, Tribes, and Territories FY2013-FY2024.....	13
Table A-2. Community Services Block Grant Appropriations History FY1982-FY2025.....	16
Table A-3. Community Services Block Grant Act Authorization History: FY1982-FY2025.....	19
Table A-4. Appropriations for CSBG Related Activities FY1982–FY2025.....	20

Appendixes

Appendix A. Additional Funding Information	12
Appendix B. Federal Poverty Guidelines	24

Contacts

Author Information.....	25
Acknowledgments	25

Introduction

The Community Services Block Grant traces its roots to the War on Poverty, launched by President Lyndon Johnson more than 60 years ago when he proposed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In his March 1964 message to Congress, President Johnson said the act would “give every American community the opportunity to develop a comprehensive plan to fight its own poverty—and help them to carry out their plans.”¹ This was to be achieved through a new Community Action Program that would “strike poverty at its source—in the streets of our cities and on the farms of our countryside among the very young and the impoverished old.”

A central feature of the new Community Action Program was that local residents would identify the unique barriers and unmet needs contributing to poverty in their individual communities and develop plans to address those needs, drawing on resources from all levels of government and the private sector. The program would be overseen by a newly created Office of Economic Opportunity, which would pay part of the costs of implementing these local plans. President Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act into law on August 20, 1964 (P.L. 88-452), and within a few years, a nationwide network of about one thousand local Community Action Agencies was established.²

This report provides information on the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), which is the modern-day program that continues to fund this network of local antipoverty agencies. The report also describes two smaller related programs that are administered by the same federal office that currently oversees the CSBG. The report begins with background information and legislative history of the CSBG and related activities. It then summarizes the ways in which CSBG eligible entities use funds and who is served, followed by a discussion of recent funding for CSBG, and concludes with a discussion of reauthorization proposals in recent Congresses. **Appendix A** provides tables showing historical funding for CSBG and related activities dating back to the beginning of the program (in 1982), as well as a table with CSBG funding distributed to states, tribes, and territories in recent years. A discussion of the poverty definition used in the CSBG Act (the Federal Poverty Guidelines or FPG) and referred to in the authorizing statutes for a variety of federal programs by referencing its definition in the CSBG Act, is provided in **Appendix B**.

Background

Administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) provides federal funds to states, territories, and Indian tribes for distribution to local agencies in support of a variety of antipoverty activities. As noted above, the origins of the CSBG date back to 1964, when the Economic Opportunity Act (P.L. 88-452; 42 U.S.C. §2701) established the War on Poverty and authorized the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) as the lead agency in the federal antipoverty campaign. A centerpiece of OEO was the Community Action Program, which would directly involve low-income people in the design and

¹ This was one of five “basic opportunities” that President Johnson said the act would provide. The others were to “give almost half a million young Americans the opportunity to develop skills, continue education, and find useful work;” “give dedicated Americans the opportunity to enlist as volunteers in the war against poverty;” “give many workers and farmers the opportunity to break through particular barriers which bar their escape from poverty;” and “give the entire Nation the opportunity for a concerted attack on poverty through the establishment, under [President Johnson’s] direction, of the Office of Economic Opportunity, a national headquarters for the war against poverty.” U.S. Congress, House, *Poverty: Message from the President of the United States*, 88th Cong., 2nd sess., March 16, 1964, Doc. No. 243 (Washington: GPO, 1964).

² For a brief history of federal antipoverty policy broadly and a discussion of recurring themes, see CRS Report R43731, *Poverty: Major Themes in Past Debates and Current Proposals*, by Gene Falk and Karen Spar.

administration of antipoverty activities in their communities through mandatory representation on local agency governing boards. Currently, these local agencies, generally known as Community Action Agencies (CAAs), are the primary sub-state grantees of the CSBG.

In 1975, OEO was renamed the Community Services Administration (CSA), but remained an independent executive branch agency. In 1981, CSA was abolished and replaced by the CSBG, to be administered by a newly created office in HHS. At the time CSA was abolished, it was administering nearly 900 CAAs, about 40 local community development corporations, and several small categorical programs that were typically operated by local CAAs. The CSBG Act was enacted as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35, Title VI, §671; 42 U.S.C. §9901) as partial response to President Reagan's proposal to consolidate CSA with 11 other social service programs into a block grant to states. Congress rejected this proposal and instead created two new block grants, the Social Services Block Grant under Title XX of the Social Security Act, and the CSBG, which consisted of activities previously administered by CSA.

The CSBG Act was reauthorized in 1984 under P.L. 98-558, in 1986 under P.L. 99-425, in 1990 under P.L. 101-501, in 1994 under P.L. 103-252, and in 1998 under P.L. 105-285. The authorization of appropriations for CSBG and related programs expired in FY2003, although Congress has continued to appropriate funds for the programs each year since then.

Separate from the block grant, related national activities—Community Economic Development (CED), and Rural Community Development (RCD)—offer grants to assist local low-income communities with economic development, and rural housing and water management. These activities are administered at the federal level by the Office of Community Services at the HHS Administration for Children and Families (see the text box below), the same office that administers the CSBG. CED and RCD are also authorized by the CSBG Act.³ Congress has also funded other related activities over the years, but none except CED and RCD have received funding since FY2017.

The Office of Community Services

Federal law requires the CSBG program to be administered by an Office of Community Services established within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).⁴ As of early March 2025, this office operated as a subcomponent of the HHS Administration for Children and Families (ACF).⁵ On March 27, 2025, HHS Secretary Kennedy announced there would be a “dramatic restructuring” at HHS, including a reduction in workforce of about 10,000 full-time employees.⁶ Authoritative data on the reduction in force among ACF staff generally have not been made publicly available, though some reports suggest there were significant reductions in staff within the ACF Office of Community Services.⁷ FY2026 President's budget request materials released in June 2025 proposed merging ACF with another HHS operating division, the Administration for Community Living (ACL), to create a new, consolidated Administration for Children, Families, and Communities (ACFC).⁸ Neither the March 2025

³ 42 U.S.C. §9921.

⁴ 42 U.S.C. §9912.

⁵ See an ACF organization chart, last updated on November 15, 2024, at <https://acf.gov/about/offices>.

⁶ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, “HHS Announces Transformation to Make America Healthy Again,” press release, March 27, 2025, <https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/hhs-restructuring-doge.html>.

⁷ Letter from U.S. Senator Ron Wyden (Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance) and U.S. Senator Bernard Sanders (Ranking Member of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions), to the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., April 15, 2025, https://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/acf_reduction_in_force_letter.pdf.

⁸ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *FY2026 Administration for Children, Families, and Communities Budget Justification*, <https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/olab/ACF-FY-2026-CJ-for-web.pdf>. See also, U.S. (continued...)

announcement, nor the FY2026 budget materials, provide an organizational chart for the proposed ACFC. The FY2026 budget proposal would eliminate the CSBG and related programs discussed in this report, but does not specify whether the Office of Community Services would likewise be eliminated.⁹ This office administers several additional programs beyond the CSBG and related activities, not all of which are proposed for elimination in the FY2026 President's request.¹⁰

The Block Grant

Allocation of Funds

Of funds appropriated annually under the CSBG Act, HHS is required to reserve 1.5% for training and technical assistance and other administrative activities, and not less than half of this set-aside must be provided to state or local entities. In addition, 0.5% of the appropriation is reserved for outlying territories (Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). The law further requires that 9% of the total appropriation be reserved for certain related activities, which are described below, and that the remainder be allocated among the states. In practice, however, Congress typically specifies in annual appropriations laws exactly how much is to be made available for the block grant and each of the related activities. Block grant funds are allotted to states, including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, based on the relative amount received in each state in FY1981, under a section of the former Economic Opportunity Act. HHS may allow Indian tribes and tribal organizations to receive their allotments directly, rather than through the state. See **Table A-1** for a history of CSBG allotments to states, tribes, and territories since FY2013.

Use of Funds

CSBG funds are used for activities designed to have a “measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty.”¹¹ The law envisions a wide variety of activities undertaken on behalf of low-income families and individuals, including those who are welfare recipients, homeless, migrant or seasonal farm workers, or elderly. States must submit an application and plan to HHS, stating their intention that funds will be used for activities to help families and individuals achieve self-sufficiency, find and retain meaningful employment, attain an adequate education, make better use of available income, obtain adequate housing, and achieve greater participation in community affairs. In addition, states must ensure that funds will be used to address the needs of youth in low-income communities; coordinate with related programs, including state welfare reform efforts; and ensure that local grantees provide emergency food-related services.

Department of Health and Human Services, *FY2026 Budget in Brief*, <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/fy-2026-budget-in-brief.pdf>.

⁹ Letter from Russell T. Vought, Director, Office of Management and Budget, to The Honorable Susan Collins, May 2, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Fiscal-Year-2026-Discretionary-Budget-Request.pdf>. See also U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *FY2026 Administration for Children, Families, and Communities Budget Justification*, <https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/olab/ACF-FY-2026-CJ-for-web.pdf>.

¹⁰ For more information about the ACF Office of Community Services and the programs it administers, visit <https://acf.gov/ocs>.

¹¹ The CSBG Act includes a definition of poverty for the purposes of administering the CSBG program (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)), which is also referenced by other federal programs for administrative purposes. This definition is discussed further in **Appendix B**.

State Role

At the state level, a lead agency must be designated to develop the state application and plan. States must pass through at least 90% of their federal CSBG allotment to local eligible entities.¹² States also may use up to \$55,000 or 5% of their allotment, whichever is higher, for administrative costs.¹³ Remaining funds may be used by the state to provide training and technical assistance, coordination and communication activities, payments to assure that funds are targeted to areas with the greatest need, supporting asset-building programs for low-income individuals, supporting innovative programs and activities conducted by local organizations, or other activities consistent with the purposes of the CSBG Act. In addition, as authorized by the 1998 amendments, states may use some CSBG funds to offset revenue losses associated with any qualified state charity tax credit.

Local Delivery System

As noted above, states are required to pass through at least 90% of their federal block grant allotments to *eligible entities*—primarily (but not exclusively) Community Action Agencies (CAAs) that had been designated prior to 1981 under the former Economic Opportunity Act. The distribution of these funds among local agencies is left to the discretion of the state, although states may not terminate funding to an eligible entity or reduce its share disproportionately without determining cause, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing.¹⁴ There are roughly one thousand eligible entities around the country, the majority of which are private nonprofit organizations. Many of these organizations contract with others in delivering various services. Once designated as an eligible entity for a particular community, an agency retains its designation unless it voluntarily withdraws from the program or its grant is terminated for cause. Eligible entities are monitored within a systematic schedule; return visits are made when goals are not met. In designating new or replacement entities, states may select a public agency only when no qualified private nonprofit organization is available, in accordance with the 1998 CSBG amendments.

Local activities vary depending on the needs and circumstances of the local community. Each eligible entity, or CAA, is governed by a board of directors, of which at least one-third of members are representatives of the low-income community. Under the 1998 amendments to the CSBG Act, low-income board members must live in the community that they represent. Another third of the board members must be local elected officials or their representatives, and the remaining board members represent other community interests, such as business, labor, religious organizations, and education. A public entity must either have a governing board with low-income representation as described above, or another mechanism specified by the state to assure participation by low-income individuals in the development, planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs.

¹² Under a one-time appropriation of \$1 billion for the CSBG under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA, P.L. 111-5), states were required to pass through 99% of their allotments to local eligible entities and use the remaining 1% for benefits eligibility coordination activities.

¹³ The Urban Institute conducted an evaluation of the use of CSBG administrative funds by state and local agencies, published in February 2012, which is available at <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412601-Community-Services-Block-Grant-Administrative-Expenses.pdf>.

¹⁴ 42 U.S.C. §9908(b)(8). The law contains four exceptions to the prohibition against states reducing funding to an eligible entity below its proportional share of funding in the previous year: changes in recent Census data, designation of a new eligible entity, severe economic dislocation, or failure of an eligible entity to comply with state requirements. See 42 U.S.C. §9908(c).

There is no typical CAA, since each agency designs its programs based on a local community needs assessment. Examples, however, of CSBG-funded services include emergency assistance, home weatherization, activities for youth and senior citizens, transportation, income management and credit counseling, domestic violence crisis assistance, parenting education, food pantries, and emergency shelters. In addition, local agencies provide information and referral to other community services, such as job training and vocational education, depending on the needs of individual clients. CAAs may also receive federal funds from other sources and may administer federal programs such as Head Start and energy assistance programs. For more information, see the “Use of Federal CSBG Funds” section of this report.

Related Activities

In addition to the block grant itself, over the years the CSBG Act has authorized various related activities that have been funded along with CSBG and administered through the Office of Community Services (OCS) within HHS. There have also been programs authorized by other laws but administered by OCS. These programs have provided various types of assistance, including help obtaining jobs and food and nutrition assistance, and programs have targeted services to specific populations including migrant farmworkers and people experiencing homelessness.

Most of the related activities administered through OCS no longer receive funding, and some have not been funded for many years. See **Table A-4** in **Appendix A** for programs that have been funded from FY1982 to the present. Two of these programs—Community Economic Development (CED) and Rural Community Development (RCD), both authorized by the CSBG Act—continue to be funded, and have received funding in every year since FY1982. This section describes these two recently-funded related activities.

Community Economic Development¹⁵

The Community Economic Development (CED) program helps support local community development corporations (CDCs), including faith-based organizations, to generate employment and business development opportunities for low-income residents. Grant recipients are required to create a certain number of jobs from their project, as specified in the CED grant’s Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO). The grant recipient computes the number of total jobs required to be created by dividing the total grant amount by a set figure (for example, in the FY2024 NOFO, this was \$32,000 per job for construction jobs, and \$27,000 per job for non-construction jobs).¹⁶ The jobs must have substantive fringe benefits and present opportunities for advancement, which CED grant applicants provide evidence for in their applications, per instructions in the NOFO. At least 75% of the jobs created by CED projects have to be for persons with low income (defined using the federal poverty guidelines). CED grants have minimum and maximum amounts (in FY2024, these were \$100,000 and \$800,000 respectively). Projects may be funded by other sources in addition to CED, though there are reporting requirements for tracking how the CED grant funds in particular were spent, and on the jobs created by them.¹⁷

¹⁵ For more information on this program, see <https://acf.gov/ocs/programs/ced>.

¹⁶ <https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocs/hhs-2024-acf-ocs-ee-1965rev3.pdf#page=10>.

¹⁷ Further details for prospective applicants are available in explanatory videos at <https://acf.gov/ocs/programs/ced/ced-information-prospective-applicants>, and in each year’s NOFO.

Rural Community Development¹⁸

The Rural Community Development (RCD) program, also referred to in appropriations language as Rural Community Facilities, “assists small, low-income rural communities, that are not served by other similar Federal programs, to help manage, develop, and improve safe drinking water and waste water facilities.”¹⁹ Many of these rural communities have fewer than 2,500 persons, have residents that lack access to safe drinking or wastewater treatment services, or in some instances indoor plumbing, and are often located in areas of persistent poverty.²⁰ RCD funds must be used

to provide training and technical assistance to: increase access for low-income families to water supply and waste disposal services, preserve affordable water and waste disposal services in low-income rural communities, increase local capacity and expertise to establish and maintain needed community facilities, increase economic opportunities for low-income rural communities by ensuring they have basic water and sanitation, utilize technical assistance to leverage additional public and private resources, and promote improved coordination of Federal, state, and local agencies and financing programs to benefit low-income communities.²¹

As with other grants organized through HHS’s Administration for Children and Families, recipients must comply with reporting requirements.²²

CSBG Program Data

Data on the programs administered and people served by CSBG local eligible entities are captured in CSBG Annual Reports. Since 1987 HHS has contracted with the National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCS) to collect, analyze, and publish data related to CSBG through a survey of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.²³ In recent years HHS has published online the CSBG Reports to Congress on an annual basis.²⁴

The most recent CSBG Annual Report to Congress summarizes data from FY2022. According to the report, the nationwide CSBG network consisted of 1,011 local eligible entities in FY2022, including 894 Community Action Agencies, 83 local government agencies, 13 tribes or tribal

¹⁸ For more information about this program, see <https://acf.gov/ocs/programs/rcd>.

¹⁹ Senate Committee on Appropriations, Explanatory Statement for Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2023, <https://www.appropriations.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/LHHSFY23REPT.pdf#page=205>

²⁰ HHS Office of Community Services, *Rural Community Development Program Overview, FY2021 and 2022*, <https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocs/RCD-Overview-2023.pdf>.

²¹ HHS Office of Community Services, *RCD Fact Sheet*, <https://acf.gov/ocs/fact-sheet/rcd-fact-sheet>.

²² Further information for grantees is available at <https://acf.gov/ocs/policy-guidance/rcd-policy-and-guidance>.

²³ See NASCS’s National Report and State Fact Sheets at <https://nascsp.org/csbg/csbg-data-collection-and-reporting/csbg-national-report-and-state-fact-sheets/>. NASCS also has published CSBG Annual Reports at the national level, though as of the cover date of this report the latest one published by NASCS was for FY2020: see https://nascsp.org/wp-content/uploads/NASCSP_2020_National_Report_Final-Version.pdf.

²⁴ See, for example, *Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 2022*, p. 7, https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocs/RPT_CSBG_Congressional_FY2022.pdf, hereinafter *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*. CSBG Reports to Congress are available on the HHS website, <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ocs/resource/csbg-report-to-congress-0>.

organizations,²⁵ 11 migrant or seasonal farmworker organizations,²⁶ and 10 limited purpose agencies that specialized in one or two types of programs.²⁷

This network of local eligible entities reported spending nearly \$20.2 billion in FY2022, with funding coming from federal, state, local, and private sources. Of the total amount spent, \$1.1 billion came from the federal CSBG allotment (including both regular and supplemental CSBG funds), and another \$14.6 billion came from federal programs other than CSBG.²⁸ Approximately \$2.1 billion came from state governments, nearly \$1.8 billion came from local governments, and \$1.7 billion came from private agencies. In addition to these financial resources, the estimated value of volunteer hours was \$143 million.

Use of Federal CSBG Funds

Based on reports from all jurisdictions, local entities spent their CSBG funds in FY2022 for a wide variety of activities, including activities related to income, infrastructure, and asset building (4%); activities to promote linkages among community groups and other government or private organizations (5%); education-related activities (12%); employment-related activities (9%); housing-related services (22%); health services (15%); and other activities.²⁹

Sources of Federal Non-CSBG Funds

The bulk of funds spent by local eligible entities come from federal programs other than CSBG. Over 45% of the funding in FY2022 was dedicated to Head Start or energy assistance.³⁰ Of nearly \$14.6 billion in non-CSBG federal funds spent by local agencies in FY2022, 25% came from Head Start or Early Head Start. Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) fuel assistance made up nearly 16% of federal funds spent by local agencies, and LIHEAP weatherization funding, together with funding from the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program, made up another 4% of funding.

States reported that nearly 7% of federal non-CSBG funds received by local agencies came from Agriculture Department nutrition programs, including almost 2% from the Special Supplemental

²⁵ Tribes and tribal organizations may participate in the CSBG program as local eligible entities (i.e., sub-state grantees). In addition, tribes may request to receive funds directly from HHS, rather than through the state in which they are located. For example, in FY2017, 69 individual tribes or tribal organizations received direct allotments from HHS. These amounts were subtracted from the allotments of states in which the tribe or tribal organization was located. See https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ocs/list_csb_g_4th_quarter_allocations_fy2017.pdf.

²⁶ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p.15.

²⁷ The term *limited purpose agency*, according to an instructional note issued by HHS, "refers to a CSBG eligible entity that was designated as a limited purpose agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year 1981, that served the general purposes of a community action agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act; did not lose its designation as a limited purpose agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act as a result of failure to comply with that Act; and has not lost its designation as a CSBG eligible entity under the CSBG Act" (see https://acf.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ocs/COMM_CSBG_Annual%20Report%20V2.pdf#page=7). While the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 did not include the phrase *limited purpose agency*, under Section 205 in Title II of that act, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity was authorized to make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies that carried out "programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part" (see <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-78/pdf/STATUTE-78-Pg508.pdf#page=11>).

²⁸ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 19.

²⁹ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 21.

³⁰ CRS computations using dollar amounts from *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, Appendix Tables B-23-1 through B-23-5.

Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) alone.³¹ Another 4% of federal non-CSBG funds came from the TANF block grant, more than 3% came from employment and training programs administered by the Labor Department, and over 2% came from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 8 program.³² The Child Care and Development Block Grant accounted for 2% of federal non-CSBG funding, and funding for Medicare/Medicaid accounted for 1.5%.³³

Recipients of CSBG Services

According to states responding to the annual data collection, the CSBG network provided services to 10 million individuals in 5.2 million households in FY2022.³⁴ The survey captured demographic information for 4.2 million of those households, and of those captured, more than 70% had incomes at or below federal poverty guidelines and almost 43% were “severely poor” with incomes at or below 50% of the poverty guidelines.³⁵ Some 33% of households reported income that indicated participation in employment.³⁶ Of those that reported their household structure in CSBG-eligible entity programs, about 45% of the households included children; of those, 59% were headed by a single mother, 33% by two parents, and 6% by a single father.³⁷ Looking at participants by age, the survey found that 35.5% of individuals served were children age 17 or younger, and 25.8% were age 55 or older.³⁸ About 54% of individuals reported they were White and 28% were Black. Also, 21.5% of individuals reported their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino, regardless of race.³⁹

As part of the data collection about CSBG-eligible entity program participants, health insurance coverage and disability status information was collected, though it was not obtained for all participants. The FY2022 report offered the following about information that was obtained:

Health insurance data offered by over 6.6 million participants indicated that 12.6 percent were without medical insurance... Disability data collected from over 7.5 million participants indicated that 23.7 percent of the CSBG-eligible entity program participants who reported disability status had a disability.⁴⁰

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 26.

³⁵ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 26.

³⁶ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 27.

³⁷ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 28. Of those reporting, 55% reported having no children (single or two adults); by subtraction, the remaining 45% of households had children.

³⁸ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 30.

³⁹ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, p. 29.

⁴⁰ *CSBG FY2022 Report to Congress*, pp. 30-31.

Funding for CSBG and Related Activities

FY2024 and FY2025 Funding Levels

FY2025 funding for CSBG has been provided via a full-year continuing resolution (CR).⁴¹ The FY2025 CR generally provided funding at the same levels as specified in the applicable FY2024 appropriations act. The CSBG and related activities were funded at \$804 million in the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118-47). Out of this total, \$22 million was reserved for CED and \$12 million was reserved for RCD.⁴²

FY2026 President's Budget Request

The FY2026 President's budget requested no funding for CSBG. The recommendation to zero out the CSBG program echoes previous budget requests for FY2018 through FY2021. In each of those years, Congress funded the CSBG program.⁴³ Funding levels for fiscal years 1982 onward, as reflected in the President's budget request and as enacted by Congress, are available in **Table A-2** in **Appendix A**.

Table I. FY2023-FY2025 Enacted and FY2026 Proposed Funding for CSBG and Related Activities

(\$ in millions)

Program	FY2023 Final (P.L. 117-328)	FY2024 Final (P.L. 118-47)	FY2025 Final (P.L. 119-4)	FY2026 President's Budget Recommendation
Community Services Block Grant	770.000	770.000	770.000	0
Community Economic Development	22.383	22.383	22.383	0
Rural Community Facilities	12.000	12.000	12.000	0
Total for CSBG and Related Activities	804.383	804.383	804.383	0

Source: Prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). Sources of data are agency budget justifications and congressional appropriations documents.

Recent Supplemental Appropriations

Congress also viewed CSBG as a tool for providing supplemental funding for emergencies, including disaster relief from hurricanes and wildfires, and during the COVID-19 pandemic. In

⁴¹ P.L. 118-83, Division A, Section 101.

⁴² P.L. 118-47, Division D, Title II, and House Committee Print 55-008, *H.R. 2882 / P.L. 118-47 Legislative Text and Explanatory Statement*. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CPRT-118HPRT55008/pdf/CPRT-118HPRT55008.pdf#page=718>.

⁴³ The FY2018 to FY2021 budget bills were introduced during the 115th and 116th Congresses. In the 115th Congress, the Senate and House majorities were the same party as the president; in the 116th, the president's party retained majority in the Senate and was in the minority in the House.

P.L. 116-20, which addressed the effects of hurricanes, typhoons, wildfires, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, \$1 billion was appropriated to CSBG, as the sponsor indicated in her remarks, “with language ensuring it is spent quickly to help communities rebuild housing, businesses, and public infrastructure in the most impacted and distressed areas affected by major natural disasters.”⁴⁴ Another \$1 billion for CSBG was appropriated in P.L. 116-136, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act). As stated in a Dear Colleague letter from the Office of Community Services in HHS, “The flexibility of CSBG extends to CARES funding, meaning eligible entities can support a broad array of services for the prevention, preparation, and response to COVID-19. This includes gap-filling services to address unmet needs such as mobile food delivery for the home-bound, innovative strategies such as the creation of community gardens or provision of mental health services on-site, and rapid responses to help families and individuals achieve self-sufficiency, find and maintain adequate housing, and other necessary activities to reduce the impact of the causes of poverty.”⁴⁵

Reauthorization Proposals

The authorization of appropriations for CSBG and related activities expired at the end of FY2003, although Congress has continued to fund these programs through the annual appropriations process. Several attempts had been made at reauthorizing the program since then, though as of the cover date of this report none have been enacted. The two most recent reauthorization attempts are discussed below.

119th Congress

On May 1, 2025, Representative Glenn Thompson introduced H.R. 3131, and it was referred to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. As of the cover date of this report, no further action on the bill has been taken. The bill seeks to reauthorize CSBG from FY2026 through FY2032, with appropriations authorized for \$1 billion for each fiscal year. The bill would also separately authorize appropriations of \$40 million each year for the discretionary programs (CED and RCD). This would be a change from current law which authorizes these programs to be funded via a percentage set-aside out of total amounts appropriated for the CSBG Act. Other provisions in the bill would amend the percentages set aside for training and technical assistance, the percentages used to determine the minimum state allotment at different appropriations levels, and the requirements related to the date by which funds need to be obligated by the states, in addition to other fiscal controls and reporting requirements. The bill also would set the criterion of eligibility for services, assistance, or resources provided directly to individuals or families through the CSBG grant program to 200% of the poverty line (as opposed to the poverty line itself).⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Rep. Nita Lowey, “Supplemental Appropriations Act 2019,” remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 165 no. 78 (May 10, 2019), p. H3688, <https://www.congress.gov/116/crec/2019/05/10/CREC-2019-05-10-pt1-PgH3687-4.pdf>.

⁴⁵ Dear Colleague Letter #CSBG-DCL-2022-43, “Expending CSBG CARES Funds,” August 4, 2022, <https://acf.gov/ocs/policy-guidance/csbg-dcl-2022-43-expending-csbg-cares-funds-fy-2022>.

⁴⁶ Under current law, as stated in 42 U.S.C. §9902(2), “Whenever a State determines that it serves the objectives of the block grant program established under this chapter, the State may revise the poverty line to not to exceed 125 percent of the official poverty line otherwise applicable under this paragraph.”

117th Congress

In the 117th Congress, H.R. 5129 passed the House; it was not taken up in the Senate. Had it been enacted, it would have authorized appropriations of \$1 billion annually for each of FY2023 through FY2027, and such sums as may be necessary annually for FY2028 through FY2032. Other provisions in the bill included revisions to the percentages used to determine state minimum allotments, and the appropriations levels at which the minimum allotment would be increased; H.R. 3131 in the 119th Congress uses language similar to this bill.

Appendix A. Additional Funding Information

This appendix provides additional funding information for Community Services Block Grants and related activities.

- **Table A-1** shows funding amounts for the CSBG (not including related activities) distributed to the states, tribes, and territories from FY2013 through FY2024.
- **Table A-2** shows funding for the CSBG (not including related activities unless noted specifically) from the block grant's first year in FY1982 through FY2025, including amounts in budget requests that may not necessarily have been enacted.
- **Table A-3** shows the amounts authorized for the years in which the CSBG Act was authorized, and dashes otherwise. Amounts include related activities.
- **Table A-4** displays the amounts for the various related activities that have been funded at different times from FY1982 to FY2025, and includes the budget request for FY2026.

**Table A-1. Community Services Block Grant Funding Distributed to States, Tribes, and Territories
FY2013-FY2024**

(\$ in millions)

	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024
Alabama	11.596	12.190	12.300	13.052	12.926	13.056	13.105	13.510	13.602	13.782	14.054	14.054
Alaska	2.467	2.498	2.522	2.668	2.610	2.638	2.650	2.617	2.634	2.675	2.733	2.733
Arizona	5.163	5.428	5.476	5.811	5.760	5.817	5.839	6.020	6.061	6.141	6.262	6.340
Arkansas	8.598	9.039	9.120	9.678	9.592	9.688	9.725	10.025	10.093	10.227	10.428	10.428
California	56.380	59.271	59.802	63.459	62.895	63.526	63.766	65.736	66.181	67.057	68.379	68.379
Colorado	5.492	5.774	5.826	6.182	6.127	6.188	6.219	6.412	6.455	6.540	6.669	6.669
Connecticut	7.627	8.006	8.077	8.571	8.495	8.580	8.613	8.879	8.939	9.057	9.236	9.236
Delaware	3.340	3.517	3.552	3.757	3.675	3.714	3.732	3.852	3.877	3.937	4.022	4.022
District of Columbia	10.389	10.922	11.020	11.693	11.590	11.706	11.750	12.113	12.195	12.357	12.600	12.600
Florida	18.378	19.321	19.494	20.686	20.502	20.708	20.786	21.428	21.573	21.859	22.290	22.290
Georgia	17.010	17.882	18.042	19.145	18.975	19.166	19.238	19.832	19.967	20.231	20.630	20.630
Hawaii	3.340	3.517	3.552	3.757	3.675	3.714	3.732	3.852	3.877	3.937	4.022	4.022
Idaho	3.304	3.479	3.513	3.716	3.635	3.674	3.691	3.810	3.835	3.894	3.978	3.978
Illinois	29.871	31.402	31.684	33.621	33.322	33.657	33.784	34.827	35.064	35.528	36.228	32.197
Indiana	9.207	9.679	9.766	10.363	10.271	10.374	10.413	10.735	10.808	10.951	11.167	11.167
Iowa	6.844	7.195	7.259	7.703	7.634	7.711	7.740	7.979	8.033	8.140	8.300	8.300
Kansas	5.161	5.426	5.475	5.809	5.758	5.816	5.838	6.018	6.059	6.139	6.260	6.260
Kentucky	10.660	11.207	11.308	11.999	11.892	12.012	12.057	12.429	12.514	12.679	12.929	12.929
Louisiana	14.845	15.606	15.746	16.475	16.329	16.493	16.555	17.066	17.182	17.409	17.753	17.753
Maine	3.334	3.510	3.545	3.750	3.699	3.736	3.750	3.866	3.892	3.944	4.021	4.021
Maryland	8.677	9.122	9.203	9.766	9.679	9.776	9.813	10.116	10.185	10.320	10.523	10.523

	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024
Massachusetts	15.755	16.472	16.620	17.636	17.479	17.655	17.722	18.270	18.394	18.637	19.004	19.004
Michigan	23.236	24.404	24.623	26.128	25.896	26.156	26.255	27.066	27.249	27.610	28.154	28.154
Minnesota	7.609	8.000	8.071	8.565	8.489	8.574	8.606	8.872	8.932	9.050	9.229	9.229
Mississippi	10.057	10.573	10.668	11.320	11.220	11.332	11.375	11.726	11.806	11.962	12.198	12.198
Missouri	17.498	18.395	18.560	19.695	19.520	19.716	19.790	20.402	20.540	20.812	21.222	21.222
Montana	3.070	3.232	3.264	3.453	3.377	3.413	3.423	3.533	3.556	3.611	3.689	3.689
Nebraska	4.408	4.634	4.675	4.961	4.917	4.966	4.974	5.127	5.162	5.230	5.334	5.334
Nevada	3.340	3.517	3.552	3.757	3.675	3.714	3.732	3.852	3.877	3.937	4.022	4.022
New Hampshire	3.340	3.517	3.552	3.757	3.675	3.714	3.732	3.852	3.877	3.937	4.022	4.022
New Jersey	17.323	18.211	18.375	19.498	19.325	19.519	19.592	20.198	20.335	20.604	21.010	21.010
New Mexico	3.467	3.645	3.678	3.902	3.868	3.927	3.942	4.064	4.091	4.145	4.227	4.227
New York	54.882	57.696	58.213	61.772	61.223	61.838	62.071	63.989	64.423	65.275	66.562	66.562
North Carolina	16.580	17.448	17.604	18.680	18.514	18.700	18.771	19.351	19.482	19.740	20.129	20.129
North Dakota	3.055	3.217	3.208	3.393	3.319	3.355	3.371	3.603	3.582	3.638	3.762	3.762
Ohio	24.649	25.913	26.145	27.744	27.497	27.773	27.878	28.739	28.934	29.317	29.895	29.895
Oklahoma	7.557	7.955	7.872	8.320	8.246	8.327	8.358	8.616	8.655	8.769	8.942	8.942
Oregon	5.042	5.300	5.348	5.675	5.625	5.681	5.702	5.879	5.918	5.997	6.115	6.115
Pennsylvania	26.772	28.144	28.397	30.133	29.865	30.165	30.279	31.214	31.426	31.842	32.469	32.469
Puerto Rico	26.639	28.005	28.256	29.983	29.717	30.015	30.129	31.059	31.270	31.684	32.308	32.308
Rhode Island	3.496	3.675	3.708	3.934	3.899	3.939	3.953	4.076	4.103	4.158	4.239	4.239
South Carolina	9.716	10.214	10.306	10.936	10.839	10.948	10.989	11.328	11.405	11.556	11.784	11.784
South Dakota	2.746	2.892	2.878	3.044	2.977	3.009	3.023	3.167	3.188	3.237	3.307	3.307
Tennessee	12.457	13.096	13.213	14.021	13.897	14.036	14.089	14.524	14.623	14.816	15.108	15.108
Texas	30.421	31.980	32.267	34.240	33.936	34.277	34.406	35.469	35.709	36.182	36.895	36.895

	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024
Utah	3.264	3.437	3.471	3.671	3.591	3.630	3.647	3.764	3.789	3.847	3.930	3.930
Vermont	3.340	3.517	3.552	3.754	3.672	3.712	3.729	3.852	3.877	3.937	4.022	4.022
Virginia	10.124	10.643	10.738	11.395	11.294	11.407	11.450	11.804	11.884	12.041	12.278	12.278
Washington	7.493	7.878	7.948	8.434	8.359	8.443	8.475	8.779	8.838	8.912	9.088	9.126
West Virginia	7.079	7.442	7.508	7.968	7.897	7.976	8.006	8.253	8.309	8.419	8.585	8.585
Wisconsin	7.694	8.088	8.161	8.660	8.583	8.669	8.702	8.970	9.031	9.151	9.331	9.331
Wyoming	3.340	3.517	3.327	3.519	3.442	3.479	3.495	3.608	3.631	3.688	3.767	3.767
Subtotal to States	617.133	648.649	654.042	693.610	686.873	693.818	696.463	718.128	722.920	732.544	747.112	743.197
American Samoa	0.868	0.914	0.923	0.977	0.955	0.966	0.970	1.001	1.008	1.023	1.046	1.046
Guam	0.822	0.865	0.874	0.924	0.904	0.914	0.918	0.948	0.954	0.969	0.990	0.990
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	0.515	0.542	0.547	0.579	0.566	0.573	0.575	0.594	0.598	0.607	0.620	0.620
U.S. Virgin Islands	1.135	1.195	1.207	1.277	1.249	1.262	1.268	1.309	1.318	1.338	1.367	1.367
Subtotal to Territories	3.340	3.517	3.552	3.757	3.675	3.714	3.732	3.852	3.877	3.937	4.022	4.022
Subtotal to Tribes	4.790	5.239	5.750	6.363	6.278	6.325	6.360	6.465	6.572	6.708	6.800	6.684
Total to States, Territories, and Tribes	625.263	657.405	663.344	703.729	696.826	703.857	706.555	728.444	733.369	743.189	757.934	753.903

Source: Data are from Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Community Services funding announcements available at <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ocs/resource/csbg-dear-colleague-letters>.

Notes: According to 42 U.S.C. §9902(5), *states* are defined as “each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.” In 42 U.S.C. §9906, which describes allotments and payments to states, subsection (d) indicates “In this section, the term “State” does not include Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.” To reflect these definitions, the table above omits Puerto Rico from the territories, and includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in the subtotal to the remaining states.

**Table A-2. Community Services Block Grant Appropriations History
FY1982-FY2025**

(dollars in millions; includes only the CSBG block grant and no related activities unless noted)

Fiscal Year	President's Request	Appropriation
FY1982	—	314.50
FY1983	100.00 ^a	341.68 ^b
FY1984	2.85 ^c	316.68
FY1985	2.92 ^d	335.00
FY1986	3.86 ^e	320.60
FY1987	3.61 ^e	335.10
FY1988	310.00 ^f	325.52
FY1989	310.00 ^f	318.63
FY1990	0 ^g	322.09
FY1991	0 ^h	349.37
FY1992	0 ⁱ	360.00
FY1993	0 ⁱ	372.00
FY1994	372.00	397.00
FY1995	399.62	389.60
FY1996	391.50	389.60
FY1997	387.59	489.60
FY1998	414.72	489.69
FY1999	490.60	499.83
FY2000	500.00	527.62
FY2001	510.00	599.99
FY2002	599.99	649.97
FY2003	570.00	645.76
FY2004	494.96	641.94
FY2005	494.95	636.79
FY2006	0 ^k	629.99
FY2007	0 ^l	630.44
FY2008 ^m	0 ⁿ	653.80
FY2009 ^o	0 ^p	699.98
FY2010	700.00	700.00
FY2011 ^q	700.00	678.64
FY2012 ^r	350.00	677.35
FY2013 ^s	346.30	635.28
FY2014	350.00	667.96
FY2015	344.75	673.99

Fiscal Year	President's Request	Appropriation
FY2016	674.00	714.99
FY2017	674.00	714.65
FY2018	0 ^c	715.00
FY2019 ^u	0 ^c	717.75
FY2020 ^v	0 ^c	740.00
FY2021	0 ^c	744.99
FY2022	753.90	755.00
FY2023 ^w	754.22	770.00
FY2024	770.00	770.00
FY2025	770.00	770.00
FY2026	0 ^x	^y

Source: Prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on information in Department of Health and Human Services congressional budget justifications, the budget appendix, enacted appropriations laws and accompanying committee reports and tables, and archived CRS reports. It is possible that there may be years in which rescissions occurred that are not accounted for in the table.

- a. Of the amount requested by the President in FY1983, \$9 million would have come from a transfer from the Rural Development Loan Fund. In addition, the President's budget proposed to close out the CSBG program.
- b. In addition to annual appropriations for CSBG in FY1983 (P.L. 97-377), Congress appropriated \$25 million as part of a supplemental appropriations act (P.L. 98-8).
- c. The FY1984 budget recommended funding sufficient to terminate and close out the CSBG program.
- d. The FY1985 budget recommended no funding for CSBG, stating that it duplicated other programs. The appropriation would have funded staff salaries for an "orderly closeout" of the program.
- e. The FY1986 and FY1987 budgets proposed sufficient funds to close out the CSBG program.
- f. The FY1988 and FY1989 President's budgets proposed to phase out the CSBG program over a four-year period starting in the subsequent fiscal year.
- g. The FY1990 budget proposed no new funding for CSBG, stating that "[t]his action is necessary given current budget constraints and the need for more effective control of the Federal budget deficit. State and local governments must assume a greater share of responsibility for providing the assistance previously made available by the CSBG program."
- h. The FY1991 President's budget proposed no new funding for CSBG. The budget justifications stated that it "proposes to fund CAA [Community Action Agency] administrative and other costs through allocations included in the appropriations for the various Federal programs which are partially administered by CAA's [sic]."
- i. In FY1992, the President's budget recommended no new funding for CSBG. The budget justifications stated "[t]he Community Action Agencies and other local organizations that historically have received Community Services and discretionary funds have been successful in obtaining funding from other sources. In general, Community Services funds now represent a small fraction of the operating budgets of most of these organizations. Thus the more successful of these organizations no longer are dependent on Community Services funding."
- j. The FY1993 President's budget proposed no funding for CSBG. Budget justifications observed that since the creation of CSBG, funding had increased for other activities to support low-income people, and that "services will continue to be provided through funds from other federal resources, as well as State and local resources."
- k. According to the FY2006 budget justifications for CSBG, the President's budget proposed "to focus economic and community development activities through a more targeted and unified program to be administered by the Department of Commerce."

- l. According to the FY2007 budget justifications for CSBG, the President's budget proposed no new funding for CSBG "because it lacks performance measures, does not award grants on a competitive basis nor hold grantees accountable for program results."
- m. Funding reflects a 1.747% across-the-board reduction, as mandated by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110-161).
- n. The FY2008 President's budget would have provided no funding for CSBG because "it does not award grants on a competitive basis and states cannot hold their grantees accountable for program results as reflected in their low PART [Program Assessment Rating Tool] assessment."
- o. Funding levels shown for FY2009 were included in the FY2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act (P.L. 111-8) and do not include the additional \$1 billion provided to the CSBG under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA, P.L. 111-5).
- p. The FY2009 President's budget proposed no new funding for CSBG because "the program does not award grants on a competitive basis and states cannot hold their grantees accountable for program results as reflected in the program's PART assessment of Results Not Demonstrated."
- q. Funding reflects a 0.2% across-the-board rescission as mandated by the FY2011 Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-10).
- r. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (P.L. 112-74) mandated that appropriated amounts were subject to an across-the-board rescission of 0.189%. Amounts shown in this table reflect that rescission, as implemented by HHS and displayed in the FY2013 justifications for the Administration for Children and Families.
- s. The source for numbers shown for FY2013 is the "all-purpose table" published by the Administration for Children and Families at HHS on May 20, 2013. Numbers shown reflect funding provided by the FY2013 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 113-6) and the effects of budget sequestration and an across-the-board rescission of 0.2%.
- t. The President's FY2018 budget requested no funding for CSBG. The budget justifications stated that "[i]n a constrained budget environment, difficult funding decisions were made to ensure that federal funds are being spent as effectively as possible. The CSBG accounts for approximately five percent of total funding received by local agencies that benefit from these funds. Although states have discretion to reduce or terminate funding to local agencies that do not meet state-established performance standards, CSBG continues to be distributed by a formula not tied directly to the local agency performance." This language was used in the budget justifications for the following three years as well.
- u. The Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019 (P.L. 116-20) provided an additional \$25 million for relief from disasters caused by hurricanes, typhoons, wildfires, earthquakes, tornadoes, and floods; see <https://acf.gov/ocs/toolkit/csbg-disaster-supplemental-resources> (accessed June 12, 2025).
- v. An additional \$1 billion in supplemental funds was provided through the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act), P.L. 116-136.
- w. An additional \$25 million in supplemental funds was provided through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-328), in response to hurricanes Fiona and Ian; see <https://acf.gov/ocs/toolkit/csbg-disaster-supplemental-resources> (accessed June 12, 2025).
- x. The President's recommendations on FY2026 discretionary funding levels included no funding for CSBG (memorandum from OMB Director Russell Vought to Sen. Susan Collins, Chair of Senate Appropriations Committee, May 2, 2025). See also the *Technical Supplement to the 2026 Budget: Appendix*, pp. 378-379, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/BUDGET-2026-APP/pdf/BUDGET-2026-APP.pdf#page=385>.
- y. Appropriations levels have not been finalized as of the cover date of this report.

**Table A-3. Community Services Block Grant Act Authorization History:
FY1982-FY2025**

(dollars in millions; includes related activities as well as the block grant)

Fiscal Year	Authorization Level
FY1982	389.38 ^a
FY1983	389.38 ^a
FY1984	389.38 ^a
FY1985	400.00 ^b
FY1986	415.00 ^b
FY1987	390.00 ^c
FY1988	409.50 ^c
FY1989	430.00 ^c
FY1990	451.50 ^c
FY1991	451.50 ^d
FY1992	460.00 ^d
FY1993	480.00 ^d
FY1994	500.00 ^d
FY1995	525.00 ^e
FY1996	such sums as necessary (ssn) ^e
FY1997	ssn ^e
FY1998	ssn ^e
FY1999	ssn ^f
FY2000	ssn ^f
FY2001	ssn ^f
FY2002	ssn ^f
FY2003	ssn ^f
FY2004-FY2025	— ^g

Source: Prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), based on information in Department of Health and Human Services congressional budget justifications, the budget appendix, enacted appropriations laws and accompanying committee reports and tables, and archived CRS reports.

- a. From FY1982 through FY1984 CSBG was authorized as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35).
- b. In FY1985 and FY1986, CSBG was authorized as part of the Human Services Reauthorization Act (P.L. 98-558).
- c. From FY1987 through FY1990, CSBG was authorized as part of the Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-425).
- d. From FY1991 through FY1994 CSBG was authorized as part of the Augustus F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-501).
- e. From FY1995 through FY1998, CSBG was authorized as part of the Human Services Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103-252).
- f. From FY1999 through FY2003, CSBG was authorized as part of the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-285).
- g. From FY2004 through the present fiscal year, CSBG has not been authorized.

**Table A-4. Appropriations for CSBG Related Activities
FY1982–FY2025**

(\$ in millions)

Fiscal Year	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Assistance^a	Demonstration Partnership Program^b	Emergency Community Services for the Homeless^c	National Youth Sports^a	Community Food and Nutrition^d	Job Opportunities for Low- Income Individuals^e	Individual Development Accounts^f	Rural Community Facilities^a	Community Economic Development^a
FY1982	3.00	—	—	6.00	—	—	—	4.00	19.63
FY1983	2.88	—	—	5.76	—	—	—	3.84	18.84
FY1984	2.88	—	—	5.76	—	—	—	3.84	18.84
FY1985	3.04	—	—	6.13	—	—	—	4.05	19.92
FY1986 ^g	2.7	—	—	5.9	—	—	—	3.6	17.6
FY1987	2.69	1.00	—	5.87	2.50	—	—	3.57	17.61
FY1988	2.97	2.87	19.1	6.32	2.39	—	—	3.93	18.91
FY1989	2.95	3.51	18.92	9.67	2.42	—	—	4.01	20.25
FY1990	2.95	3.50	21.86	10.62	2.41	3.50 ^h	—	4.01	20.25
FY1991	3.03	4.05	25.00	10.83	2.44	4.50 ⁱ	—	4.10	20.49
FY1992	3.03 ⁱ	4.05	25.00	12.00 ^j	7.00	^k	—	4.10 ^j	22.00 ⁱ
FY1993	2.95	3.80	19.84	9.42	6.94	5.00 ^l	—	4.96	20.73
FY1994	2.95	7.995	19.84	12.00	7.94	5.50 ^l	—	5.46	22.23
FY1995	—	—	19.75	12.00	8.68	5.50 ^l	—	3.27	23.69
FY1996	—	—	—	11.52	4.00	5.50 ^m	—	3.01	27.33 ^m
FY1997	—	—	—	12.00	4.00	5.50 ^m	—	3.50	27.33 ^m
FY1998	—	—	—	14.00	3.99	5.50 ^m	—	3.49	30.01 ^m
FY1999	—	—	—	15.00	5.00	5.50 ^m	9.99	3.50	30.04 ^m
FY2000	—	—	—	15.00	6.31	8.33	10.00	5.31	21.71

Fiscal Year	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Assistance^a	Demonstration Partnership Program^b	Emergency Community Services for the Homeless^c	National Youth Sports^a	Community Food and Nutrition^d	Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals^e	Individual Development Accounts^f	Rural Community Facilities^a	Community Economic Development^a
FY2001	—	—	—	16.00	6.31	5.50	24.89	5.32	24.53
FY2002	—	—	—	17.00	7.31	5.50	24.94	7.00	26.98
FY2003	—	—	—	16.89	7.28	5.46	24.83	7.20	27.08
FY2004	—	—	—	17.89	7.24	5.43	24.70	7.18	26.91
FY2005	—	—	—	17.86	7.18	5.44	24.70	7.24	27.30
FY2006	—	—	—	—	—	5.38	24.44	7.29	27.00
FY2007	—	—	—	—	—	5.38	24.45	7.29	27.02
FY2008 ⁿ	—	—	—	—	—	5.29	24.02	7.89	31.47
FY2009	—	—	—	—	—	5.29	24.02	10.00	36.00
FY2010	—	—	—	—	—	2.64	23.91	10.00	36.00
FY2011 ^o	—	—	—	—	—	1.64	23.98	4.99	17.96
FY2012 ^p	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.87	4.98	29.94
FY2013 ^q	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.59	4.67	28.08
FY2014	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.00	5.97	29.88
FY2015	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.95	6.50	29.88
FY2016	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.95	6.50	29.88
FY2017	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.50	19.88
FY2018	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.00	19.88
FY2019	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.91	19.68
FY2020	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.00	20.38
FY2021	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.00	20.38
FY2022	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.00	21.38

Fiscal Year	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Assistance ^a	Demonstration Partnership Program ^b	Emergency Community Services for the Homeless ^c	National Youth Sports ^a	Community Food and Nutrition ^d	Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals ^e	Individual Development Accounts ^f	Rural Community Facilities ^a	Community Economic Development ^a
FY2023	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.00	22.38
FY2024	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.00	22.38
FY2025	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.00	22.38

Source: The table was compiled by CRS using various sources. The sources used are Congressional Budget Justifications; budget appendices; appropriations materials including appropriations bills and committee reports and tables; and archived CRS reports. It is possible that there may be years in which rescissions occurred that are not accounted for in the table.

- a. Authorization of assistance for Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers, National Youth Sports, Rural Community Facilities, and Community Economic Development was provided as part of the original CSBG Act (included in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, Section 681).
- b. The Demonstration Partnership Program was authorized by Section 408 of P.L. 99-425, the Human Resources Reauthorization Act of 1986.
- c. Emergency Community Services for the Homeless was authorized by the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (P.L. 100-77), Title VII, Subtitle D.
- d. Community Food and Nutrition was originally authorized as part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-452). It was repealed at the end of FY1981, but then reauthorized in FY1985 as an activity of the Office of Community Services in HHS as part of the Human Services Reauthorization Act (P.L. 98-558). Between FY1981 and FY1987, the program did not receive funding.
- e. Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals was initially authorized as a demonstration program as part of the Family Support Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-485), Section 505. It was amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-193), Section 112.
- f. Individual Development Accounts were authorized as a demonstration program as part of the Assets for Independence Act, which was included in the Coats Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-285), Title IV.
- g. Funding for FY1986 is from the archived CRS Report, *Community Services Block Grants: History, Funding, Program Data*, by Karen Spar and Kimberly T. Henderson, September 1, 1987. Appropriated funding was reduced to levels presented in the table pursuant to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction law. CRS could not identify a source that showed final funding levels to the same decimal place as other funding levels in the table.
- h. According to the Senate Report accompanying the FY1991 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education (H.R. 5257, S.Rept. 101-516), \$3.5 million “is being awarded in fiscal year 1990 for 3-year grants to nonprofit organizations such as community development corporations” for programs authorized under Section 505 of the Family Support Act.
- i. The FY1991 funding level for Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals (JOLI) was in Conference Report. H.Rept. 101-908 to accompany the FY1991 Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act (H.R. 5257, P.L. 101-517).
- j. Funding for FY1992 is in the Conference Report (H.Rept. 102-282) accompanying FY1992 appropriations act (P.L. 102-170).
- k. CRS could not locate a funding level for JOLI in FY1992.
- l. From FY1993-FY1995, funds for JOLI were set aside within the Social Services Research Account.
- m. From FY1996-FY1999, JOLI funds were provided as a set-aside within Community Economic Development (CED).

- n. Funding reflects a 1.747% across-the-board reduction, as mandated by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110-161).
- o. Funding reflects a 0.2% across-the-board rescission as mandated by P.L. 112-10, the FY2011 Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act.
- p. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (P.L. 112-74) mandated that appropriated amounts were subject to an across-the-board rescission of 0.189%. Amounts shown in this table reflect that rescission, as implemented by HHS and displayed in the FY2013 justifications for the Administration for Children and Families.
- q. The source for numbers shown in FY2013 is the “all-purpose table” published by the Administration for Children and Families at HHS on May 20, 2013. Numbers shown reflect funding provided by the FY2013 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 113-6) and the effects of budget sequestration and an across-the-board rescission of 0.2%.

Appendix B. Federal Poverty Guidelines

Section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. §9902(2)) provides a definition of the term *poverty line* to mean:

the official poverty line defined by the Office of Management and Budget based on Bureau of the Census data. The Secretary shall revise the poverty line annually (or at any shorter interval the Secretary deems feasible and desirable) which shall be used as a criterion of eligibility in community service block grant programs. The required revision shall be accomplished by multiplying the official poverty line by the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index For All Urban Consumers during the annual or other interval immediately preceding the time at which the revision is made. Whenever the State determines that it serves the objectives of the block grant established by this chapter the State may revise the poverty line to not to exceed 125 percent of the official poverty line otherwise applicable under this paragraph.⁴⁷

This definition refers to the set of FPG published by HHS for programmatic usage, as distinguished from the official poverty measure published by the Census Bureau for statistical purposes.⁴⁸ The FPG represents a simplified set of dollar amounts (compared with the poverty measure as computed by the Census Bureau), below which a person, family, or household (depending on the context) is considered to be in poverty. Staff at HHS have traditionally performed the computations to update the dollar amounts for inflation, and performed the simplifications through averaging and rounding, in accordance with administrative practices established by the Office of Economic Opportunity (the agency that had originally administered the CSBG program).

In addition to its usage for the CSBG program, the language above establishing the FPG is referred to as a definition of poverty in many federal programs, such as the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), the Low-Income Household Water Assistance Program (LIHWAP), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the National School Lunch Program, the National School Breakfast Program, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), to name a few examples.

For a number of years, staff within the HHS Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) have been responsible for computing and updating the FPG. Updates to the FPG are typically released annually in January or February. The 2025 update was published in the *Federal Register* on January 17, 2025.⁴⁹ On March 27, 2025, HHS Secretary Kennedy announced there would be a “dramatic restructuring” at HHS, including a reduction in workforce of about 10,000 full-time employees. It is not clear if this office will retain the responsibility for computing the FPG updates moving forward.

⁴⁷ 42 U.S.C. §9902(2) at <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title42-section9902&num=0&edition=prelim>.

⁴⁸ For a summary of the distinction between the FPG and the official Census poverty thresholds, and a brief history of the FPG, see CRS Report R44780, *An Introduction to Poverty Measurement*, by Joseph Dalaker at https://www.crs.gov/Reports/R44780#_Toc177565649. Further explanation, including answers to frequently asked questions, computational details, and previously published versions of the FPG are available at <https://aspe.hhs.gov/topics/poverty-economic-mobility/poverty-guidelines>.

⁴⁹ Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary, “Annual Update of the HHS Poverty,” 90 *Federal Register* 5917-5918, January 17, 2025.

Author Information

Joseph Dalaker
Analyst in Social Policy

Acknowledgments

Karen Spar, former CRS Specialist in Domestic Social Policy and Division Research Coordinator, was the original author of this report.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.