

Counting for Dollars: States and District of Columbia

Federal Assistance Distributed on the Basis of Census-Related Statistics, 50 States and the District of Columbia, Fiscal Year 2008

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	\$ 6,693,276,298	21	\$ 861.53	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 prepared for the Counting for Dollars Project at the Brookings Institution's Metropolitan Policy Program (www.brookings.edu/metro/CountingforDollars). It was generated by a database of federal domestic assistance programs that used census-related datasets in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 to:

- determine the eligibility of applicants, recipients, or beneficiaries
- geographically allocate **all or some** program funds by formula and/or
- score applications for project funding

Census-related datasets include:

- the Census Bureau's Census 2000, 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 (Department of Housing and Urban Development), Local Area Unemployment Statistics (Bureau of Labor Statistics), and statistical area delineations (Office of Management and Budget)

Programs that rely on census-related data were identified through a review of the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (www.cfda.gov), federal law and regulation, administrative materials, and, as necessary, communication with program personnel. The distribution of funds by geography was drawn from the Census Bureau's Consolidated Federal Funds Report (CFFR) (www.census.gov/govs/cffr/). Programs were assigned to OMB budget function codes on the basis of information found in Appendix III of the CFDA print edition. FY2008 is the latest year for which CFFR data are available.

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

Cautions:

- For each program listed in the table, the dollar amount is the **total** expenditure as provided by the CFFR. Spending figures on only that portion distributed on the basis of census-related data are not fully available. Hence, figures from the table should be cited with care and clarity. (Note: Nationally, at least 90 percent of funds spent by census-guided programs were in fact distributed on the basis of census-related data.)
- A per capita expenditure estimate is provided only to allow comparisons among geographic areas. It is not intended to suggest that the funding total will increase by the per capita estimate for each additional person counted in the census.