

Federal Assistance Programs Reliant in Whole or Part on Decennial Census Statistics to Distribute Funds, U.S. and States, Fiscal Year 2008

Preliminary - 2/16/10

State	Total Program Expenditures	Rank	Per Capita Expenditures	Rank
United States	\$ 446,662,221,261		\$ 1,469.00	
Alabama	\$ 5,808,342,004	24	\$ 1,245.92	36
Alaska	\$ 1,766,982,469	44	\$ 2,574.68	3
Arizona	\$ 8,581,894,728	15	\$ 1,320.25	28
Arkansas	\$ 4,541,020,980	29	\$ 1,590.33	22
California	\$ 63,587,774,371	1	\$ 1,729.97	15
Colorado	\$ 4,397,439,027	31	\$ 890.27	49
Connecticut	\$ 5,627,356,077	25	\$ 1,607.24	19
Delaware	\$ 1,145,792,280	49	\$ 1,312.34	30
District of Columbia	\$ 2,755,612,462	37	\$ 4,656.06	1
Florida	\$ 16,529,699,587	5	\$ 901.87	48
Georgia	\$ 12,635,503,634	11	\$ 1,304.55	31
Hawaii	\$ 1,521,040,766	46	\$ 1,180.75	39
Idaho	\$ 1,867,943,596	42	\$ 1,225.83	38
Illinois	\$ 19,109,784,923	4	\$ 1,481.20	24
Indiana	\$ 7,419,533,958	19	\$ 1,163.52	41
Iowa	\$ 3,805,998,939	32	\$ 1,267.59	35
Kansas	\$ 3,041,917,559	36	\$ 1,085.57	46
Kentucky	\$ 7,926,279,088	17	\$ 1,856.60	11
Louisiana	\$ 8,948,181,613	14	\$ 2,028.70	6
Maine	\$ 2,532,354,408	39	\$ 1,923.61	8
Maryland	\$ 6,399,545,853	22	\$ 1,135.96	43
Massachusetts	\$ 13,790,803,911	10	\$ 2,122.33	5
Michigan	\$ 16,062,766,249	7	\$ 1,605.73	20
Minnesota	\$ 7,297,443,406	20	\$ 1,397.87	26
Mississippi	\$ 5,584,088,732	26	\$ 1,900.24	10
Missouri	\$ 8,398,373,134	16	\$ 1,420.66	25
Montana	\$ 1,631,410,507	45	\$ 1,686.32	17

Nebraska	\$ 3,094,005,774	35	\$ 1,734.86	14
Nevada	\$ 1,930,408,150	40	\$ 742.42	51
New Hampshire	\$ 1,467,196,178	47	\$ 1,115.05	45
New Jersey	\$ 14,441,031,917	9	\$ 1,663.20	18
New Mexico	\$ 3,804,225,608	33	\$ 1,917.11	9
New York	\$ 44,849,837,749	2	\$ 2,301.14	4
North Carolina	\$ 11,797,053,220	13	\$ 1,279.17	33
North Dakota	\$ 1,089,828,108	50	\$ 1,698.93	16
Ohio	\$ 14,745,639,652	8	\$ 1,283.80	32
Oklahoma	\$ 5,021,755,389	28	\$ 1,378.71	27
Oregon	\$ 4,459,930,809	30	\$ 1,176.74	40
Pennsylvania	\$ 16,416,111,034	6	\$ 1,318.75	29
Rhode Island	\$ 1,884,981,898	41	\$ 1,793.87	12
South Carolina	\$ 5,553,308,647	27	\$ 1,239.63	37
South Dakota	\$ 1,286,525,006	48	\$ 1,599.77	21
Tennessee	\$ 12,280,167,981	12	\$ 1,975.93	7
Texas	\$ 30,920,446,625	3	\$ 1,271.04	34
Utah	\$ 2,537,274,498	38	\$ 927.22	47
Vermont	\$ 1,785,325,775	43	\$ 2,873.67	2
Virginia	\$ 6,693,216,298	21	\$ 861.52	50
Washington	\$ 7,534,162,390	18	\$ 1,150.39	42
West Virginia	\$ 3,233,989,882	34	\$ 1,782.34	13
Wisconsin	\$ 6,305,853,248	23	\$ 1,120.45	44
Wyoming	\$ 815,001,164	51	\$ 1,530.04	23

Notes:

This table was generated by an Access database of federal domestic assistance programs that used Census 2000 and related datasets in Fiscal Year 2008 to determine:

- the eligibility of the applicant, the recipient, or the beneficiary to receive the assistance
- the formula by which **all or some** program funds were allocated geographically and/or
- recipient selection preferences

Datasets related to Census 2000 include:

- the Census Bureau's annual Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Current Population Survey, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, and list of Urbanized Areas
- per capita income (Bureau of Economic Analysis), Area Median Income and Fair Market Rents (HUD), Local Area Unemployment Statistics (Bureau of Labor Statistics), and statistical area delineations (OMB)

Caution: For each state listed in the table, the dollar amount in the second column is the sum of **total** program expenditures as provided by the Consolidated Federal Funds Report (CFFR). Data are not available that indicate the portion of each program's state total allocated on the basis of decennial census data. Hence, figures from the table should be cited with care and clarity. (Preliminary analysis does indicate that, nationally, 90 percent or more of funds from programs that make use of census-related data were distributed on the basis of those data.)

Programs that rely on census-related data were identified through a review of the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (<http://www.cfda.gov>), federal law and regulation, and, as necessary, communication with program personnel. The allocation of funds by geography was drawn from the CFFR database (<http://www.census.gov/govs/www/cffr.html>), maintained by the Census Bureau. FY2008 is the latest year for which CFFR data are available.

At times, program funds are deobligated from a given geography if, for example, actual program costs were less than were anticipated. If a program had a net deobligation in FY2008, expenditures for that program appear as negative.

A per capita expenditure estimate is provided to allow comparisons among states. The table's per capita figure is determined by dividing the sum of total program allocations by the Census Bureau's 2008 population estimate for the geographic area. The per capita estimate is not intended to suggest that each additional person identified in the census will add the per capita figure to federal flows to the state.

The findings in the table are preliminary and subject to revision.

For more information, contact:

Andrew Reamer, Fellow
The Brookings Institution
areamer@brookings.edu
202-797-4398

Rachel Blanchard Carpenter, Policy/Research Assistant
The Brookings Institution
rblanchard@brookings.edu
202-797-4370