

Counting for Dollars: States and District of Columbia

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

State	Census-Guided Program Expenditures (All Assistance Types)	% of Total Federal Assistance (All Types)	Rank	Census-Guided Program Expenditures (Grants Only)	% of Total Federal Assistance (Grants Only)	Rank
United States	\$ 446,662,221,261	31.2%	-	\$ 419,811,875,589	74.7%	-
Alabama	\$ 5,808,342,004	28.8%	35	\$ 5,238,521,050	74.1%	24
Alaska	\$ 1,766,982,469	42.2%	2	\$ 1,638,647,072	61.6%	47
Arizona	\$ 8,581,894,728	28.9%	34	\$ 8,194,532,856	79.9%	7
Arkansas	\$ 4,541,020,980	34.1%	14	\$ 4,090,999,863	81.4%	3
California	\$ 63,587,774,371	38.3%	7	\$ 62,050,771,785	75.8%	20
Colorado	\$ 4,397,439,027	20.4%	49	\$ 3,897,738,808	62.1%	46
Connecticut	\$ 5,627,356,077	33.1%	17	\$ 5,359,953,831	72.7%	27
Delaware	\$ 1,145,792,280	30.3%	30	\$ 1,049,102,552	73.4%	26
District of Columbia	\$ 2,755,612,462	33.0%	18	\$ 2,665,084,698	46.6%	51
Florida	\$ 16,529,699,587	22.7%	46	\$ 15,663,209,498	77.9%	17
Georgia	\$ 12,635,503,634	32.2%	21	\$ 11,302,519,686	77.9%	18
Hawaii	\$ 1,521,040,766	35.4%	10	\$ 1,445,740,863	64.3%	44
Idaho	\$ 1,867,943,596	31.9%	25	\$ 1,649,626,020	78.0%	16
Illinois	\$ 19,109,784,923	33.2%	16	\$ 18,052,764,743	79.6%	8
Indiana	\$ 7,419,533,958	27.0%	37	\$ 6,955,305,954	78.7%	13
Iowa	\$ 3,805,998,939	25.4%	41	\$ 3,349,749,951	66.5%	39
Kansas	\$ 3,041,917,559	24.8%	42	\$ 2,747,949,114	64.5%	43
Kentucky	\$ 7,926,279,088	25.7%	40	\$ 6,673,918,577	80.9%	4
Louisiana	\$ 8,948,181,613	35.3%	11	\$ 8,127,481,678	66.2%	41
Maine	\$ 2,532,354,408	41.5%	4	\$ 2,282,304,104	78.1%	15
Maryland	\$ 6,399,545,853	21.1%	48	\$ 5,956,298,288	57.9%	50
Massachusetts	\$ 13,790,803,911	32.6%	20	\$ 13,035,960,833	64.1%	45
Michigan	\$ 16,062,766,249	34.1%	13	\$ 15,190,490,194	79.3%	9
Minnesota	\$ 7,297,443,406	31.3%	28	\$ 6,643,031,368	72.2%	29
Mississippi	\$ 5,584,088,732	37.1%	9	\$ 5,008,708,566	74.3%	23
Missouri	\$ 8,398,373,134	29.5%	33	\$ 7,758,857,607	75.1%	21
Montana	\$ 1,631,410,507	32.0%	24	\$ 1,418,370,647	67.2%	38
Nebraska	\$ 3,094,005,774	27.5%	36	\$ 2,932,370,744	78.9%	11
Nevada	\$ 1,930,408,150	20.4%	50	\$ 1,854,588,544	72.7%	28
New Hampshire	\$ 1,467,196,178	32.0%	22	\$ 1,312,826,080	71.0%	32
New Jersey	\$ 14,441,031,917	34.5%	12	\$ 13,805,347,205	85.4%	1
New Mexico	\$ 3,804,225,608	40.3%	5	\$ 3,653,680,872	74.8%	22

New York	\$ 44,849,837,749	41.9%	3	\$ 42,795,809,532	78.8%	12
North Carolina	\$ 11,797,053,220	31.8%	26	\$ 10,789,132,137	71.3%	31
North Dakota	\$ 1,089,828,108	22.9%	45	\$ 993,327,263	60.9%	48
Ohio	\$ 14,745,639,652	29.9%	32	\$ 13,730,517,992	77.5%	19
Oklahoma	\$ 5,021,755,389	30.8%	29	\$ 4,575,312,723	73.9%	25
Oregon	\$ 4,459,930,809	30.0%	31	\$ 4,100,551,718	67.3%	37
Pennsylvania	\$ 16,416,111,034	26.1%	39	\$ 15,578,861,542	72.1%	30
Rhode Island	\$ 1,884,981,898	32.0%	23	\$ 1,714,212,686	70.5%	33
South Carolina	\$ 5,553,308,647	33.4%	15	\$ 5,072,543,022	79.2%	10
South Dakota	\$ 1,286,525,006	21.5%	47	\$ 1,071,249,477	60.2%	49
Tennessee	\$ 12,280,167,981	39.0%	6	\$ 11,530,936,551	83.0%	2
Texas	\$ 30,920,446,625	31.7%	27	\$ 29,927,255,414	78.4%	14
Utah	\$ 2,537,274,498	23.0%	44	\$ 2,335,269,035	69.8%	36
Vermont	\$ 1,785,325,775	48.8%	1	\$ 1,680,922,411	80.3%	6
Virginia	\$ 6,693,276,298	18.6%	51	\$ 6,114,135,511	70.4%	34
Washington	\$ 7,534,162,390	26.6%	38	\$ 7,147,994,727	65.1%	42
West Virginia	\$ 3,233,989,882	37.9%	8	\$ 2,972,390,780	80.6%	5
Wisconsin	\$ 6,305,853,248	23.4%	43	\$ 5,915,556,901	70.4%	35

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

Types of federal domestic assistance include grants, direct loans, guaranteed/insured loans, and direct payments.

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.