

# Brief 7: Comprehensive Accounting of Census-Guided Federal Spending (FY2017)

## Part B: State Estimates

**Andrew Reamer**, Research Professor

George Washington Institute of Public Policy, George Washington University

February 2020

### Overview

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, 316 federal spending programs relied on 2010 Census-derived data to distribute \$1.5 trillion to state and local governments, nonprofits, businesses, and households across the nation. That year census-guided federal spending equaled 9.0 percent of the nation's personal income.

**This brief provides estimates of the distribution of the \$1.5 trillion in census-guided spending by state—in dollars and as a percentage of state personal income.**

As [Brief 7A](#) indicates, census-guided federal spending programs vary substantially in terms of size, geographic focus, and extent of reliance on and uses of census-derived data. Across these diverse programs, the common element is: Every state, county, town, and neighborhood will receive its fair share of federal funds only if it has an accurate census population count.

#### Coverage:

Federal programs that geographically allocated FY2017 funds based, in whole or in part, on data derived from state and local 2010 Census results.

#### Census-guided Programs:

The list of 316 census-guided programs is available on the [Counting for Dollars 2020 website](#). [Brief 7A](#) describes the characteristics of census-guided programs and the criteria and methods by which programs were identified and selected.

### Estimates by State:

**Table 1 provides an estimate of total census-guided federal funding for each state**, with a breakout for Medicare, Medicaid, and all other programs combined. (Due to the absence of reliable, publicly available, easily accessible spending data by state for each program, it is not feasible to provide more detail).

**Table 2 indicates each state's census-guided federal funding as a percentage of its personal income.**

**Table 3 identifies determinants of census-guided federal funding as a percentage of state personal income.**

- Two determinants (*poverty rate, percentage of the population living in a rural area*) are primary and explain *two-thirds* of the differences among the states. This finding is logical as many assistance programs are targeted to poor households and rural residents.
- Three determinants are secondary (*median household income, percentage of the population that is 65 and older, and percentage of persons 25 and older with a bachelor's degree*).
- Together, the five determinants explain *over three-quarters* of the differences among the states.
- Poverty rate, percentage of population that is rural, and percentage of population 65 and older are positively correlated with state economic dependence on census-guided funding. Median household income and educational attainment are negatively correlated.

# Counting for Dollars 2020

## The Role of the Decennial Census in the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds

REPORT

Table 1: Census-Guided Federal Spending, Distribution by State, FY2017

	Total	Medicare	Medicaid	Other Programs
<b>United States</b>	<b>\$1,504,191,364,000</b>	<b>\$710,200,000,000</b>	<b>\$368,403,791,000</b>	<b>\$425,587,573,000</b>
Alabama	\$22,092,343,000	\$11,403,472,000	\$4,068,128,000	\$6,620,743,000
Alaska	\$4,889,633,000	\$1,309,136,000	\$1,437,360,000	\$2,143,137,000
Arizona	\$29,263,522,000	\$12,818,195,000	\$9,168,872,000	\$7,276,455,000
Arkansas	\$16,743,930,000	\$7,519,024,000	\$5,233,552,000	\$3,991,354,000
California	\$171,935,273,000	\$70,224,300,000	\$52,251,053,000	\$49,459,920,000
Colorado	\$19,205,771,000	\$8,469,833,000	\$4,738,243,000	\$5,997,695,000
Connecticut	\$18,738,707,000	\$9,573,113,000	\$4,581,203,000	\$4,584,391,000
Delaware	\$5,824,271,000	\$3,086,554,000	\$1,400,746,000	\$1,336,971,000
District of Columbia	\$6,048,594,000	\$1,496,988,000	\$2,175,606,000	\$2,376,000,000
Florida	\$86,786,253,000	\$50,316,897,000	\$14,627,654,000	\$21,841,702,000
Georgia	\$40,053,909,000	\$18,896,507,000	\$7,251,905,000	\$13,905,497,000
Hawaii	\$5,787,800,000	\$1,973,222,000	\$1,609,715,000	\$2,204,863,000
Idaho	\$6,769,310,000	\$3,083,396,000	\$1,372,954,000	\$2,312,960,000
Illinois	\$55,855,815,000	\$29,473,293,000	\$9,949,814,000	\$16,432,708,000
Indiana	\$31,498,915,000	\$15,786,163,000	\$8,370,623,000	\$7,342,129,000
Iowa	\$13,709,761,000	\$7,432,112,000	\$2,673,861,000	\$3,603,788,000
Kansas	\$11,718,617,000	\$6,889,284,000	\$1,954,836,000	\$2,874,497,000
Kentucky	\$24,990,634,000	\$11,307,893,000	\$7,583,709,000	\$6,099,032,000
Louisiana	\$26,533,833,000	\$10,961,058,000	\$7,939,911,000	\$7,632,864,000
Maine	\$7,490,016,000	\$3,677,806,000	\$1,777,811,000	\$2,034,399,000
Maryland	\$31,077,507,000	\$16,589,482,000	\$7,065,053,000	\$7,422,972,000
Massachusetts	\$38,168,308,000	\$18,644,742,000	\$9,978,555,000	\$9,545,011,000
Michigan	\$48,698,141,000	\$24,378,648,000	\$12,568,266,000	\$11,751,227,000
Minnesota	\$24,717,245,000	\$10,972,242,000	\$6,930,019,000	\$6,814,984,000
Mississippi	\$17,666,838,000	\$8,675,676,000	\$4,227,454,000	\$4,763,708,000
Missouri	\$28,521,858,000	\$14,079,028,000	\$6,678,010,000	\$7,764,820,000
Montana	\$5,742,716,000	\$2,362,159,000	\$1,482,366,000	\$1,898,191,000
Nebraska	\$7,797,929,000	\$4,568,962,000	\$1,145,760,000	\$2,083,207,000
Nevada	\$11,550,222,000	\$5,594,515,000	\$2,775,335,000	\$3,180,372,000
New Hampshire	\$6,551,011,000	\$3,754,903,000	\$1,297,338,000	\$1,498,770,000
New Jersey	\$45,851,273,000	\$24,725,920,000	\$9,399,266,000	\$11,726,087,000
New Mexico	\$10,761,062,000	\$3,809,972,000	\$3,858,465,000	\$3,092,625,000
New York	\$121,680,878,000	\$46,124,363,000	\$38,531,701,000	\$37,024,814,000
North Carolina	\$43,778,491,000	\$22,298,142,000	\$9,411,458,000	\$12,068,891,000
North Dakota	\$3,877,526,000	\$1,730,010,000	\$817,678,000	\$1,329,838,000
Ohio	\$56,052,559,000	\$25,753,117,000	\$16,478,815,000	\$13,820,627,000
Oklahoma	\$18,879,374,000	\$10,090,932,000	\$2,983,507,000	\$5,804,935,000

Table 1: Census-Guided Federal Spending,  
 Distribution by State, FY2017 *(continued)*

	Total	Medicare	Medicaid	Other Programs
Oregon	\$19,044,301,000	\$6,853,548,000	\$6,513,327,000	\$5,677,426,000
Pennsylvania	\$62,986,239,000	\$29,656,325,000	\$17,742,316,000	\$15,587,598,000
Rhode Island	\$5,526,585,000	\$2,108,042,000	\$1,664,801,000	\$1,753,742,000
South Carolina	\$23,156,751,000	\$12,489,181,000	\$4,466,748,000	\$6,200,822,000
South Dakota	\$4,283,790,000	\$2,207,298,000	\$531,828,000	\$1,544,664,000
Tennessee	\$29,629,997,000	\$14,541,615,000	\$6,298,350,000	\$8,790,032,000
Texas	\$101,606,495,000	\$50,065,391,000	\$21,078,511,000	\$30,462,593,000
Utah	\$9,016,519,000	\$3,678,147,000	\$1,807,476,000	\$3,530,896,000
Vermont	\$4,160,616,000	\$1,871,316,000	\$1,040,439,000	\$1,248,861,000
Virginia	\$31,751,080,000	\$17,629,955,000	\$4,811,942,000	\$9,309,183,000
Washington	\$29,372,583,000	\$13,045,323,000	\$7,997,273,000	\$8,329,987,000
West Virginia	\$11,492,058,000	\$5,336,523,000	\$3,277,360,000	\$2,878,175,000
Wisconsin	\$22,938,614,000	\$11,363,404,000	\$5,033,472,000	\$6,541,738,000
Wyoming	\$2,908,019,000	\$1,402,873,000	\$343,345,000	\$1,161,801,000
Non-State	\$19,007,872,000	\$8,100,000,000	\$0	\$10,907,872,000

Table 2: Census-Guided Federal Spending as a Percentage of Personal Income, U.S. and States, FY2017

	Personal Income	Census-Guided Spending as % of Personal Income							
		Total	Rank	Medicare	Rank	Medicaid	Rank	Other Programs	Rank
<b>United States</b>	<b>\$16,647,967,650,000</b>	<b>9.04%</b>		<b>4.27%</b>		<b>2.21%</b>		<b>2.56%</b>	
Alabama	\$195,216,600,000	11.32%	12	5.84%	9	2.08%	29	3.39%	12
Alaska	\$41,804,650,000	11.70%	11	3.13%	45	3.44%	8	5.13%	1
Arizona	\$294,893,000,000	9.92%	23	4.35%	30	3.11%	12	2.47%	31
Arkansas	\$123,482,175,000	13.56%	4	6.09%	5	4.24%	3	3.23%	17
California	\$2,338,581,250,000	7.35%	46	3.00%	47	2.23%	23	2.11%	42
Colorado	\$304,809,125,000	6.30%	51	2.78%	48	1.55%	43	1.97%	48
Connecticut	\$255,023,600,000	7.35%	47	3.75%	41	1.80%	36	1.80%	51
Delaware	\$47,602,225,000	12.24%	8	6.48%	3	2.94%	16	2.81%	25
District of Columbia	\$54,460,000,000	11.11%	14	2.75%	49	3.99%	5	4.36%	3
Florida	\$986,779,900,000	8.79%	32	5.10%	15	1.48%	44	2.21%	40
Georgia	\$456,901,325,000	8.77%	33	4.14%	34	1.59%	41	3.04%	19
Hawaii	\$74,925,300,000	7.72%	44	2.63%	51	2.15%	25	2.94%	22
Idaho	\$71,141,450,000	9.52%	28	4.33%	31	1.93%	33	3.25%	16
Illinois	\$683,648,575,000	8.17%	39	4.31%	33	1.46%	45	2.40%	34
Indiana	\$298,222,425,000	10.56%	17	5.29%	13	2.81%	18	2.46%	32
Iowa	\$148,009,750,000	9.26%	30	5.02%	17	1.81%	35	2.43%	33
Kansas	\$141,089,625,000	8.31%	37	4.88%	20	1.39%	46	2.04%	46
Kentucky	\$180,708,150,000	13.83%	3	6.26%	4	4.20%	4	3.38%	13
Louisiana	\$203,822,450,000	13.02%	6	5.38%	11	3.90%	7	3.74%	8
Maine	\$61,441,825,000	12.19%	9	5.99%	7	2.89%	17	3.31%	15
Maryland	\$361,649,275,000	8.59%	34	4.59%	26	1.95%	32	2.05%	45
Massachusetts	\$461,964,800,000	8.26%	38	4.04%	36	2.16%	24	2.07%	43
Michigan	\$457,343,500,000	10.65%	16	5.33%	12	2.75%	19	2.57%	29
Minnesota	\$302,649,325,000	8.17%	40	3.63%	43	2.29%	22	2.25%	39
Mississippi	\$108,051,725,000	16.35%	2	8.03%	1	3.91%	6	4.41%	2
Missouri	\$276,830,500,000	10.30%	19	5.09%	16	2.41%	21	2.80%	26
Montana	\$47,186,425,000	12.17%	10	5.01%	18	3.14%	11	4.02%	5
Nebraska	\$96,330,650,000	8.09%	42	4.74%	24	1.19%	49	2.16%	41
Nevada	\$137,139,050,000	8.42%	35	4.08%	35	2.02%	31	2.32%	35
New Hampshire	\$77,896,150,000	8.41%	36	4.82%	22	1.67%	39	1.92%	50
New Jersey	\$570,662,225,000	8.03%	43	4.33%	32	1.65%	40	2.05%	44
New Mexico	\$82,201,775,000	13.09%	5	4.63%	25	4.69%	2	3.76%	7
New York	\$1,259,734,850,000	9.66%	26	3.66%	42	3.06%	14	2.94%	23
North Carolina	\$448,143,575,000	9.77%	24	4.98%	19	2.10%	28	2.69%	27
North Dakota	\$39,727,450,000	9.76%	25	4.35%	28	2.06%	30	3.35%	14
Ohio	\$538,489,650,000	10.41%	18	4.78%	23	3.06%	13	2.57%	30

Table 2: Census-Guided Federal Spending as a Percentage of Personal Income, U.S. and States, FY2017 *(continued)*

	Personal Income	Census-Guided Spending as % of Personal Income							
		Total	Rank	Medicare	Rank	Medicaid	Rank	Other Programs	Rank
Oklahoma	\$169,083,775,000	11.17%	13	5.97%	8	1.76%	38	3.43%	11
Oregon	\$197,542,475,000	9.64%	27	3.47%	44	3.30%	9	2.87%	24
Pennsylvania	\$673,402,875,000	9.35%	29	4.40%	27	2.63%	20	2.31%	37
Rhode Island	\$54,683,525,000	10.11%	20	3.85%	38	3.04%	15	3.21%	18
South Carolina	\$208,591,850,000	11.10%	15	5.99%	6	2.14%	26	2.97%	20
South Dakota	\$42,935,400,000	9.98%	21	5.14%	14	1.24%	48	3.60%	10
Tennessee	\$298,548,975,000	9.92%	22	4.87%	21	2.11%	27	2.94%	21
Texas	\$1,333,090,775,000	7.62%	45	3.76%	40	1.58%	42	2.29%	38
Utah	\$134,488,475,000	6.70%	50	2.73%	50	1.34%	47	2.63%	28
Vermont	\$32,182,275,000	12.93%	7	5.81%	10	3.23%	10	3.88%	6
Virginia	\$463,323,350,000	6.85%	49	3.81%	39	1.04%	51	2.01%	47
Washington	\$427,634,825,000	6.87%	48	3.05%	46	1.87%	34	1.95%	49
West Virginia	\$69,391,650,000	16.56%	1	7.69%	2	4.72%	1	4.15%	4
Wisconsin	\$282,230,225,000	8.13%	41	4.03%	37	1.78%	37	2.32%	36
Wyoming	\$32,272,925,000	9.01%	31	4.35%	29	1.06%	50	3.60%	9

Table 3: Determinants of Census-Guided Federal Spending as a Percentage of State Personal Income, FY2017

	Determinants											
	Primary Determinants						Secondary Determinants					
	Census-Guided \$ as % of Personal Income		Poverty Rate		% Rural Population		Median Household Income		% Population 65+		% Population 25+ w/ Bach. Degree	
	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
<b>United States</b>	<b>9.04%</b>		<b>14.7%</b>		<b>19.3%</b>		<b>\$55,775</b>		<b>14.9%</b>		<b>32.5%</b>	
Alabama	11.32%	12	18.5%	5	41.0%	9	\$44,765	48	15.7%	20	24.2%	45
Alaska	11.70%	11	10.3%	47	34.0%	14	\$73,355	4	9.6%	51	29.7%	25
Arizona	9.92%	23	17.4%	8	10.2%	42	\$51,492	32	16.4%	10	27.7%	34
Arkansas	13.56%	4	19.1%	4	43.8%	6	\$41,995	50	16.1%	14	21.8%	49
California	7.35%	46	15.3%	20	5.1%	50	\$64,500	10	13.3%	45	32.3%	15
Colorado	6.30%	51	11.5%	38	13.9%	37	\$63,909	12	13.0%	46	39.2%	3
Connecticut	7.35%	47	10.5%	46	12.0%	40	\$71,346	6	15.7%	19	38.3%	5
Delaware	12.24%	8	12.4%	34	16.7%	34	\$61,255	15	17.0%	7	30.9%	20
District of Columbia	11.11%	14	17.3%	9	0.0%	51	\$75,628	2	11.4%	49	56.7%	1
Florida	8.79%	32	15.7%	17	8.8%	45	\$49,426	39	19.5%	1	28.4%	29
Georgia	8.77%	33	17.0%	10	24.9%	28	\$51,244	33	12.8%	47	29.9%	24
Hawaii	7.72%	44	10.6%	45	8.1%	46	\$73,486	3	16.6%	8	31.4%	19
Idaho	9.52%	28	15.1%	21	29.4%	21	\$48,275	41	14.7%	32	26.0%	41
Illinois	8.17%	39	13.6%	29	11.5%	41	\$59,588	19	14.2%	39	32.9%	13
Indiana	10.56%	17	14.5%	26	27.6%	22	\$50,532	36	14.6%	37	24.9%	43
Iowa	9.26%	30	12.2%	35	36.0%	12	\$54,736	26	16.0%	15	26.8%	36
Kansas	8.31%	37	13.0%	32	25.8%	26	\$53,906	28	14.6%	35	31.7%	18
Kentucky	13.83%	3	18.5%	6	41.6%	8	\$45,215	47	15.2%	26	23.3%	47
Louisiana	13.02%	6	19.6%	3	26.8%	24	\$45,727	45	14.0%	44	23.2%	48
Maine	12.19%	9	13.4%	30	61.3%	1	\$51,494	31	18.8%	2	30.1%	23
Maryland	8.59%	34	9.7%	50	12.8%	38	\$75,847	1	14.1%	42	38.8%	4
Massachusetts	8.26%	38	11.5%	39	8.0%	47	\$70,628	7	15.4%	25	41.5%	2
Michigan	10.65%	16	15.8%	16	25.4%	27	\$51,084	34	15.8%	18	27.8%	33
Minnesota	8.17%	40	10.2%	48	26.7%	25	\$63,488	13	14.7%	34	34.7%	11
Mississippi	16.35%	2	22.0%	1	50.7%	4	\$40,593	51	14.7%	30	20.8%	50
Missouri	10.30%	19	14.8%	22	29.6%	20	\$50,238	37	15.6%	22	27.8%	32
Montana	12.17%	10	14.6%	25	44.1%	5	\$49,509	38	17.3%	5	30.6%	21
Nebraska	8.09%	42	12.6%	33	26.9%	23	\$54,996	25	14.7%	33	30.2%	22
Nevada	8.42%	35	14.7%	24	5.8%	48	\$52,431	30	14.6%	36	23.6%	46
New Hampshire	8.41%	36	8.2%	51	39.7%	11	\$70,303	8	16.4%	9	35.7%	9
New Jersey	8.03%	43	10.8%	44	5.3%	49	\$72,222	5	15.0%	28	37.6%	6
New Mexico	13.09%	5	20.4%	2	22.6%	30	\$45,382	46	15.9%	16	26.5%	39
New York	9.66%	26	15.4%	18	12.1%	39	\$60,850	16	15.0%	29	35.0%	10
North Carolina	9.77%	24	16.4%	13	33.9%	15	\$47,830	42	15.1%	27	29.4%	27
North Dakota	9.76%	25	11.0%	43	40.1%	10	\$60,557	17	14.2%	40	29.1%	28

Table 3: Determinants of Census-Guided Federal Spending as a Percentage of State Personal Income, FY2017 *(continued)*

	Determinants											
	Primary Determinants						Secondary Determinants					
	Census-Guided \$ as % of Personal Income		Poverty Rate		% Rural Population		Median Household Income		% Population 65+		% Population 25+ w/ Bach. Degree	
	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
Ohio	10.41%	18	14.8%	23	22.1%	31	\$51,075	35	15.8%	17	26.8%	38
Oklahoma	11.17%	13	16.1%	14	33.8%	16	\$48,568	40	14.7%	31	24.6%	44
Oregon	9.64%	27	15.4%	19	19.0%	33	\$54,148	27	16.4%	11	32.2%	16
Pennsylvania	9.35%	29	13.2%	31	21.3%	32	\$55,702	22	17.0%	6	29.7%	26
Rhode Island	10.11%	20	13.9%	27	9.3%	44	\$58,073	20	16.1%	13	32.7%	14
South Carolina	11.10%	15	16.6%	12	33.7%	17	\$47,238	44	16.2%	12	26.8%	37
South Dakota	9.98%	21	13.7%	28	43.4%	7	\$53,017	29	15.7%	21	27.5%	35
Tennessee	9.92%	22	16.7%	11	33.6%	18	\$47,275	43	15.4%	24	25.7%	42
Texas	7.62%	45	15.9%	15	15.3%	36	\$55,653	23	11.7%	48	28.4%	31
Utah	6.70%	50	11.3%	40	9.4%	43	\$62,912	14	10.3%	50	31.8%	17
Vermont	12.93%	7	10.2%	49	61.1%	2	\$56,990	21	17.6%	4	36.9%	8
Virginia	6.85%	49	11.2%	41	24.6%	29	\$66,262	9	14.2%	41	37.0%	7
Washington	6.87%	48	12.2%	36	16.0%	35	\$64,129	11	14.5%	38	34.2%	12
West Virginia	16.56%	1	17.9%	7	51.3%	3	\$42,019	49	18.2%	3	19.6%	51
Wisconsin	8.13%	41	12.1%	37	29.9%	19	\$55,638	24	15.6%	23	28.4%	30
Wyoming	9.01%	31	11.1%	42	35.2%	13	\$60,214	18	14.1%	43	26.2%	40

Notes:

The determinants in the table were identified through multivariate regression analysis. R squared results:

0.68 for primary determinants

0.77 for primary + secondary determinants

The data sources for each of the five determinants are identified in Appendix A.

## Appendix A: Sources and Methods

### Medicare

- Total figures for Medicare were obtained from Table II.BI of Medicare Board of Trustees, ["2018 Annual Report of The Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds,"](#) June 5, 2018.
- Original Medicare Parts A and B spending by state was obtained from Table 5 of the [Medicare Part A and Part B Summary of CMS Program Statistics for 2017](#).
- Medicare Part D spending by state was obtained from Table 7 of [Medicare Part D Utilization of CMS Program Statistics for 2017](#).
- Medicare Advantage (Part C) spending by state on facility and physician services are not available. It was assumed that each state's share of nationwide spending for Part C equaled its share of spending for Parts A and B (Original Medicare). As total Part C spending in 2017 equaled 45.9 percent of Original Medicare Parts A and B spending, each state's Part C figure was estimated to be 45.9 percent of its Original Medicare Parts A and B figure.
- For 14 programs accounting for \$87.8 billion, program-specific FY2017 tables were found in U.S. Department of Agriculture budget requests, the Small Business Administration's Capital Access Financial System, the chapter in the President's Budget on aid to state and local governments, and USASpending.gov.
- For four programs accounting for \$30.0 billion, program-specific FY2016 tables were available. For each program, spending by state was adjusted to the FY2017 total on the assumption that each state's share held constant. Across the four programs, FY2017 spending was 2.8 percent greater than that for FY2016.
- For the 142 programs with data on spending by state, total spending and share by state were calculated. Each state's share was then applied to nationwide spending (\$39.6 billion) for the remaining 170 programs for which spending by state was not available. The result was added to each state's All Other Programs total.

### Medicaid

- Figures were obtained from Exhibit 16 of Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, ["Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP,"](#) June 2018.
- For some programs, a small portion of funds were identified as spent in U.S. territories or used for administrative purposes.

### All Other Programs

- This category includes 312 programs that spent \$425.6 billion in FY2017, 28.3 percent of the total. (Medicare is three distinct programs.)
- While the USASpending.gov website eventually should provide spending by state for every federal assistance program, it does not do so at present.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, for this research, spending by state for each program was calculated using one of four alternative methods.
  - [Federal Funds Information for States \(FFIS\)](#) provides program spending by state for several hundred federal assistance programs. Of these, 124 are census-guided and account for \$286.1 billion in FY2017 spending. FFIS graciously provided the Counting for Dollars Project with its database on the condition that its program-specific numbers by state are not published.

### Personal Income

- Personal income figures for each state were obtained from interactive tables in the [Regional Data: GDP and Personal Income](#) section of the Bureau of Economic Analysis website.

### Determinants of Census-guided Funding as a Percentage of State Personal Income

- Poverty rate, median household income, percentage population 65+, percentage persons 25+ with a bachelor's degree or greater – 2015 American Community Survey (the most recent data available for FY2017 distributions)
- Percentage rural population – Census Bureau, ["2010 Census Urban and Rural Classification and Urban Area Criteria"](#) (prepared after each decennial census)

1. Unfortunately, USASpending.gov cannot be depended on to consistently provide accurate program spending numbers by state. Experience indicates that while the website offers reliable data for some programs, it provides no or incomplete data for many others. The 2010 Counting for Dollars effort was able to rely on the Census Bureau's Consolidated Federal Funds Report (CFFR), which published expenditures for every federal financial assistance program by state and county. As a result, Counting for Dollars 2010 could provide census-guided spending numbers by individual program for every state and for large metropolitan areas and counties. After USASpending.gov became operational, the Census Bureau ended the CFFR program. Compared to a decade ago, far less data on federal program spending by geography is now available.



## Appendix B: Comparison to Previous Reports

**The state estimates in this brief are more comprehensive and current than those provided in *Counting for Dollars* briefs #2 and #5.**

- This accounting includes every identified census-guided program, 316 in all.
  - Brief #2 covers five programs tied to the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP). Brief #5 covers 55 large programs.
  - Further, new research determined that all Medicare programs are census-guided, which adds \$644 billion to the national total. State totals in brief #5 do not include Medicare Parts A and D and the non-physician payments components of Part B.
- This accounting is based on FY2017 spending.
  - Brief #2 is based on FY2105 spending and Brief #5 is based on FY 2016 spending.
- This accounting only includes programs that distribute state/local funding based on the state/local count.
  - Brief #5 includes several large programs that distribute spending using only national census numbers.
  - This accounting excludes those programs (which spent \$149.5 billion in FY2016).

**The scope of this brief's accounting is more comprehensive and current than the Census Bureau's "*Uses of Census Bureau Data in Federal Funds Distribution*" (2017).**

- This accounting includes every identified census-guided program, 316 in all.
  - The Census Bureau report includes 132 programs, 184 fewer than this accounting.
  - This accounting includes census-guided tax credit programs, matching payment programs, and procurement programs. The Census Bureau report does not include these types of federal programs.
- New research determined that all Medicare programs are census-guided, which adds \$644 billion to the total.
  - The Census Bureau report does not include Medicare Parts A and D and the non-physician payments components of Part B.
- This accounting is based on FY2017 spending.
  - The Census Bureau report is based on FY2105 spending.
  - Since FY2015, several programs in the Census Bureau report have been terminated and several new census-guided programs have commenced.
- This accounting includes only programs that distribute state/local funding based on the state/local count.
  - The Census Bureau report includes several large programs that distribute spending using only national census numbers.
  - This accounting excludes those programs (which spent \$66.1 billion in FY2015).

**Counting for Dollars 2020** aims to understand 1) the extent to which the federal government will rely on data from the 2020 Census to guide the distribution of federal funding to states, localities, and households across the nation and 2) the impact of the accuracy of the 2020 Census on the fair, equitable distribution of these funds.

**Brief #7—Comprehensive Accounting of Census-Guided Federal Spending (FY 2017)** is comprised of a series of short releases on specific topics. The planned series includes:

- |                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A - Nationwide Analysis          | H - Programs for Children          |
| B - State Estimates              | I - Transportation Programs        |
| C - Medicare                     | J - Housing Programs               |
| D - FMAP-based Programs          | K - Environmental Programs         |
| E - State Share Programs         | L - Community Health Programs      |
| F - Local Share Programs         | M - Community Development Programs |
| G - Programs for Older Residents | N - Rural Programs                 |