

²⁶Wisconsin Policy Research Institute, *The Financial Impact of Out-of-State-Based Welfare In-Migration on Wisconsin Taxpayers*, by Richard Cebula (Milwaukee, Wis.: WPRI, 1989). Hereafter cited as *Financial Impact*.

²⁷*Financial Impact* states that the in-migration cases “are shown to result in an overall additional aggregate cost (burden) per year to Wisconsin taxpayers of approximately \$129 million” (p. 37).

²⁸This conclusion is based on conversations with Neil Gleason and Ed Mason, analysts in the Wisconsin DHSS, who had provided the data for the *Financial Impact*.

²⁹See Mary Jo Bane and David Ellwood, “Slipping into and Out of Poverty: The Dynamics of Spells,” *Journal of Human Resources*, 21, no. 1 (Winter 1986), 1–23.

³⁰An unpublished work in progress. Preliminary results suggest that those welfare applicants who said they came to Wisconsin in 1986 to seek better economic opportunities did, in fact, demonstrate a greater attachment to the labor force in subsequent years than those who did admit that the welfare differential motivated their move. Thomas Barton, while writing his Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, found that about 80 percent of AFDC entrants in Kenosha County, Wis., exited from the welfare rolls of that county at least once over the subsequent 30 months. The exit rate for nonnatives was higher than for those who always were Wisconsin residents. This finding, if confirmed, might explain a curious anomaly. Except for Milwaukee, the AFDC rolls in what were considered “magnet” counties—because of their size and proximity to Illinois—fell by 20 to 25 percent between 1986 and 1989. In Milwaukee, the caseload also fell, but only by 6 percent.

³¹Calculated from data included in the *1990 Green Book*.

³²Actual caseload figures and expenditures are derived from Wisconsin DHSS management reports.

³³Data from *WEC Report*.

³⁴Officials in Dane County (the site of the state capital) have noted a dramatic influx of low-income minority families in the past several years. For example, public school officials note that the number of elementary school children who experience episodes of homelessness—80 percent of whom are minorities and in-migrants—has been doubling each year since 1987, when 70 children in the county became homeless. There is considerable speculation that the “new” migration flow is from those urban areas already infested with crack cocaine (e.g., Chicago, Milwaukee) to middle-size cities that look safer to economically disadvantaged parents. Some have labeled this the secondary-city migration pattern.

³⁵Only one state, California, maintained the real value of its AFDC guarantee over the 1970–1990 period (*1991 Green Book*, p. 601).

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 1051.

**Institute for Research on Poverty
National Advisory Committee
1991–1992**

Alfred Blumstein
School of Urban and Public Affairs
Carnegie Mellon University

Reginald Clark
Afro-Ethnic Studies
California State University, Fullerton

Christopher Jencks
Department of Sociology
Northwestern University

Alfred J. Kahn
School of Social Work
Columbia University

Marvin Kosters
Center for the Study of Government Regulation
American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research

Walter Oi
Department of Economics
University of Rochester

June O’Neill
Center for the Study of Business and Government
Baruch College

Patricia Ruggles
Urban Institute

James Smith
Rand Corporation

Eugene Smolensky
Graduate School of Public Policy
University of California, Berkeley

Aage B. Sorensen
Department of Sociology
Harvard University

Robert Willis
Economic Research Center, NORC
University of Chicago
