
**Executive
Summary**

The 2000 census population data have produced shifts in federal fiscal year (FY) 2002 allocations for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs. The use of 2000 census poverty and housing data is expected to produce even more substantial shifts for FY 2003.

Background

The CDBG program was first authorized under Title I of the Community Development Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-383), replacing seven categorical grant and loan programs of the 1960s such as Model Cities and Urban Renewal. It provides states and localities with funds to help them develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income. Seventy percent of the funds goes to “entitlement” cities and urban counties and 30 percent goes to states to allocate among “non-entitlement” communities.

Program Structure

The CDBG program was last reauthorized by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (PL 102-550), and the program’s authorization officially expired at the end of FY 1994. That authorization has been extended each year in appropriations legislation, retaining its current form.

Eligibility

Entitlement areas receive CDBG funds directly from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Entitlement areas are defined as metropolitan cities (i.e., central cities of metropolitan statistical areas [MSAs], other cities in an MSA with a population of at least 50,000 and cities that retain their metropolitan city status as a result of previously meeting the criteria as metropolitan cities) or urban counties (i.e., counties in an MSA that have a population of at least 200,000 not counting population attributable to metropolitan cities, or counties that continue to qualify as urban counties as a result of previously meeting the criteria as urban counties). At present, there are 860 cities and 153 urban counties that receive entitlement funds.

Non-entitlement areas, defined as areas in a state other than metropolitan cities or urban counties, receive funds through allocations to their state governments that are then passed through to local governments.

Use of Funds

CDBG funds may be used for a wide variety of projects designed to revitalize neighborhoods, promote economic development or provide improved community facilities or services. Using the CDBG program’s national goals (i.e., that CDBG-supported projects benefit low- and moderate-income persons, aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or meet other “urgent” community development needs) as guidelines, recipients determine project funding priorities.

Restrictions and Matching Requirements

The CDBG authorization contains a series of internal constraints that guide recipients' use of CDBG funds.

- The use of grant funds for directly providing public services is capped (with several exceptions) at 15 percent of the recipient's total grant.
- Seventy percent of a CDBG grant must be used to principally benefit low- or moderate-income individuals.
- Planning and administrative costs are capped at 20 percent of the total grant plus income associated with the grant; for nonentitlement grants, state plus subgrantee costs may not exceed this share.
- Within the 20 percent administrative share, states may use \$100,000 plus 2 percent of nonentitlement allocations for their own state-level administrative or planning costs, but must match amounts in excess of \$100,000 with an equal amount of state funds.
- States may use up to 1 percent of their grants to provide technical assistance to local governments and non-profit organizations.
- CDBG funds may be used to match other federal grant-in-aid programs provided those programs meet CDBG's national goals.

Allocation Methodologies

The CDBG allocation methodology is one of the more complex federal structures, with a variety of factors used as proxies to measure community need. Once it is determined that a community qualifies for entitlement status, two formulas are calculated for each jurisdiction. These formulas and the data used for the FY 2002 entitlement allocations are described below:

First Formula

- resident population as measured in the 2000 census (25 percent)
- number of persons with income below the poverty level as measured in the 1990 census (50 percent)
- number of housing units with 1.01 or more persons per room (25 percent) as measured in the 1990 census

Second Formula

- population growth lag as measured by the number of additional persons that would have been living in an entitlement area had its population growth from 1960 to the date of the most recent population count (2000 census) been equal to the average population growth for all metropolitan cities during the same period (20 percent)
- number of persons with income below the poverty level as measured in the 1990 census (30 percent)
- number of existing year-round housing units constructed in 1939 or earlier as measured in the 1990 census (50 percent)

The first formula tends to benefit faster-growing areas; the second benefits areas of slow growth or decline. Each community is assigned first the higher of its two amounts. The totals are then prorated down to fit the available appropriation.

This dual formula structure benefits jurisdictions with the fastest or slowest growth and therefore the greatest differences between the two formula calculations.

States receive their nonentitlement shares of funds on the basis of the same two formulas after subtracting the data for entitlement jurisdictions, with the exception that the nonentitlement second formula uses population in lieu of the growth lag variable. Indian tribes are eligible for direct CDBG funding, and their data is subtracted from both the entitlement and nonentitlement calculations.

While most of the data are available only from the decennial census, population data are updated annually by HUD from the Current Population Survey (CPS).

Initial Impact of the 2000 Census

CDBG first used data from the 2000 decennial census for population and growth-lag calculations for FY 2002 allocations. Table 1 displays the FY 2002 allocations for both the entitlement and nonentitlement programs. The new population data qualified a number of new urban counties, with the result that more jurisdictions competed for the same 70 percent share.

While entitlement jurisdictions in most states lost funds, states such as Alabama (+11 percent), South Carolina (+10 percent) and Wyoming (+4 percent) saw their entitlement shares grow substantially. These increases were primarily a result of new urban county designation. Jurisdictions with the biggest entitlement losses include Rhode Island and the District of Columbia (-5 percent each) and Colorado and Minnesota (-4 percent each).

New entitlement status for urban counties reduced their states' nonentitlement grants below what they otherwise would have received. The most substantial nonentitlement losses were experienced by Florida (-10 percent), Alabama (-8 percent), South Carolina (-6 percent), California and New Jersey (-5 percent each), and Pennsylvania (-4 percent).

Expected 2003 Impact

Two separate sets of circumstances will directly affect CDBG allocations for FY 2003. First, appropriations may increase slightly. The president's budget recommended a 2 percent increase to \$4.4 billion. While the House has not acted on this request to date, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved an increase of 6 percent to \$4.6 billion. The program has been funded at between \$4.2 and \$4.4 billion since FY 1996.

Second, new decennial census poverty and housing data will be used for the 2003 allocations. Table 2 provides the data that are expected to be used for the nonentitlement calculations. Poverty population shifts range from +49 percent in Hawaii to -26 percent in North Dakota; overcrowded housing from +82 percent in Colorado to -19 percent in Maine; pre-1940 housing from -1 percent in Connecticut and Wyoming to -26 percent in Alaska. Some of these shifts reflect the new entitlement status of urban counties, others reflect overall demographic and housing changes measured in the census.

Table 3 provides illustrative FY 2003 CDBG allocations published by HUD on August 20, 2002. These allocations would result from level funding using all currently available input data. HUD stresses that these are estimates only and that actual allocations will not be available until after appropriations action is finalized.

The new data can be expected to shift funds substantially, with the biggest changes resulting from the 50 percent weight for poverty populations for states that use the first formula. The new data would produce substantially higher grants for primarily western states. As calculated for this purpose, shifts in state nonentitlement funds range from Nevada (+20 percent), Arizona and Washington (+16 percent each), Hawaii (+14 percent), California (+13 percent) and Colorado and Florida (+12 percent each) to losses experienced by Louisiana (-15 percent), Mississippi (-13 percent), North Dakota (-12 percent) and Kentucky and Arkansas (-10 percent each).

Counting both entitlement and nonentitlement funds, Nevada would receive a 38 percent increase, followed by Arizona (15 percent) and Idaho (12 percent). States losing the most overall include Mississippi (-13 percent), Louisiana (-11 percent) and North Dakota (-10 percent).

In some states (e.g., Nevada), these FY 2003 increases would add to increases in FY 2002. In others, (e.g., Florida), increases in FY 2003 follow overall declines the previous year.

Further Changes in FY 2004

Jurisdictions in MSAs become eligible for direct entitlements only after their MSAs have received official designation of such by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB). To date, OMB has made no new MSA designations incorporating the new 2000 decennial census data. It is expected to do so after new definitions and standards are implemented next year. These changes will come too late for FY 2003 purposes, and therefore should first affect allocations in FY 2004. This will further increase the number of jurisdictions competing for the 70 percent share.

Administration Budget Proposals

The administration's FY 2003 budget addresses what it sees as deficiencies in the CDBG formula. For FY 2003, it criticizes the allocation of funds aimed at helping poorer communities that actually favor some higher-income cities and counties. The budget proposes a change that would reduce the formula funds available to 1 percent of the wealthiest communities by 50 percent, defined as communities with per capita incomes equal to or greater than two times the national average.

The FY 2003 budget further notes the expected changes to be brought about by the use of the 2000 census data, and states:

“As 2000 Census data become available, HUD will develop proposals for a new CDBG allocation formula and process, to allocate more to those who need the funds and will use them effectively.”

It therefore can be expected that further legislative changes in allocating CDBG funds will be proposed by the administration.

***For additional information,
contact:***

Vic Miller

Federal Funds Information for States

444 N. Capitol St., NW, Suite 642

Washington, DC 20001-1511

Phone: 202-624-8577

Fax: 202-624-7745

Website: www.ffis.org

E-mail: vmiller@ffis.org

Copyright © 2002 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.

Table 1

Shifts in CDBG Allocations for 2002

(federal fiscal years; dollars in thousands)

State	Entitlement Grants		Nonentitlement Grants		Percent Change, 2001-2002		
	2001	2002	2001	2002	Entitlement	Nonentitlement	Total
Alabama	\$27,704	\$30,765	\$34,207	\$31,605	11.0%	-7.6%	0.7%
Alaska	2,344	2,283	3,328	3,277	-2.6%	-1.5%	-2.0%
Arizona	43,480	43,095	11,250	11,359	-0.9%	1.0%	-0.5%
Arkansas	8,970	8,853	24,818	24,898	-1.3%	0.3%	-0.1%
California	492,230	484,817	46,070	43,732	-1.5%	-5.1%	-1.8%
Colorado	31,653	30,548	11,625	11,675	-3.5%	0.4%	-2.4%
Connecticut	35,238	34,920	14,811	14,795	-0.9%	-0.1%	-0.7%
Delaware	6,127	6,042	2,020	2,033	-1.4%	0.6%	-0.9%
District of Columbia	24,333	23,206	0	0	-4.6%	N/A	-4.6%
Florida	149,653	151,464	32,532	29,428	1.2%	-9.5%	-0.7%
Georgia	44,618	44,255	45,667	45,735	-0.8%	0.1%	-0.3%
Hawaii	13,432	13,140	5,152	5,168	-2.2%	0.3%	-1.5%
Idaho	2,529	2,521	9,855	9,829	-0.3%	-0.3%	-0.3%
Illinois	179,203	176,188	39,361	39,040	-1.7%	-0.8%	-1.5%
Indiana	46,466	45,229	38,130	37,830	-2.7%	-0.8%	-1.8%
Iowa	17,589	17,317	31,306	31,081	-1.5%	-0.7%	-1.0%
Kansas	13,666	13,506	21,227	21,055	-1.2%	-0.8%	-1.0%
Kentucky	23,078	22,819	35,566	35,418	-1.1%	-0.4%	-0.7%
Louisiana	46,371	45,375	38,571	38,449	-2.1%	-0.3%	-1.3%
Maine	5,964	5,950	17,062	16,946	-0.2%	-0.7%	-0.6%
Maryland	57,552	56,605	9,309	9,237	-1.6%	-0.8%	-1.5%
Massachusetts	92,965	91,283	38,972	38,713	-1.8%	-0.7%	-1.5%
Michigan	121,768	122,665	44,903	44,629	0.7%	-0.6%	0.4%
Minnesota	47,479	45,768	25,244	25,060	-3.6%	-0.7%	-2.6%
Mississippi	7,356	7,201	39,251	39,214	-2.1%	-0.1%	-0.4%
Missouri	55,628	54,830	30,077	29,922	-1.4%	-0.5%	-1.1%
Montana	2,755	2,715	8,105	8,060	-1.5%	-0.6%	-0.8%
Nebraska	8,503	8,562	15,457	15,378	0.7%	-0.5%	-0.1%
Nevada	13,923	14,043	3,026	3,036	0.9%	0.3%	0.8%
New Hampshire	4,679	4,713	10,399	10,355	0.7%	-0.4%	-0.1%
New Jersey	114,649	112,123	10,086	9,562	-2.2%	-5.2%	-2.4%
New Mexico	7,784	7,640	16,000	16,020	-1.8%	0.1%	-0.5%
New York	370,164	359,400	57,218	56,494	-2.9%	-1.3%	-2.7%
North Carolina	28,280	27,981	47,402	47,596	-1.1%	0.4%	-0.1%
North Dakota	1,914	1,878	6,463	6,402	-1.9%	-0.9%	-1.2%
Ohio	141,132	140,883	57,266	56,751	-0.2%	-0.9%	-0.4%
Oklahoma	16,470	16,225	21,738	21,368	-1.5%	-1.7%	-1.6%
Oregon	24,121	23,618	15,837	15,778	-2.1%	-0.4%	-1.4%
Pennsylvania	214,622	212,972	60,357	58,170	-0.8%	-3.6%	-1.4%
Rhode Island	15,069	14,376	5,880	5,860	-4.6%	-0.3%	-3.4%
South Carolina	16,952	18,653	29,887	28,187	10.0%	-5.7%	0.0%
South Dakota	1,692	1,660	8,462	8,394	-1.9%	-0.8%	-1.0%
Tennessee	29,891	29,345	31,505	31,529	-1.8%	0.1%	-0.9%
Texas	216,911	213,931	88,604	88,286	-1.4%	-0.4%	-1.1%
Utah	16,323	15,815	8,020	8,074	-3.1%	0.7%	-1.9%
Vermont	1,099	1,098	8,910	8,858	-0.1%	-0.6%	-0.5%
Virginia	46,693	45,807	24,550	24,562	-1.9%	0.0%	-1.2%
Washington	51,943	50,520	16,248	16,162	-2.7%	-0.5%	-2.2%
West Virginia	9,203	9,256	21,692	21,512	0.6%	-0.8%	-0.4%
Wisconsin	47,892	47,164	34,288	33,977	-1.5%	-0.9%	-1.3%
Wyoming	1,194	1,240	3,534	3,523	3.9%	-0.3%	0.7%
Puerto Rico	78,256	76,437	58,542	58,278	N/A	-0.5%	-0.5%
Territories	0	0	6,984	7,000	N/A	0.2%	0.2%
Total	\$3,079,510	\$3,038,700	\$1,326,774	\$1,309,300	-1.3%	-1.3%	-1.3%

Note: Excludes special amounts provided to New York City for reconstruction from the events of September 11, 2001.

Copyright © 2002 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.

Table 2

Shifts in Input Data for CDBG FY 2003 Nonentitlement Allocations

State	Poverty Population			Overcrowded Housing			Pre-1940 Housing		
	1990	2000	Change	1990	2000	Change	1990	2000	Change
Alabama	420,554	403,888	-4.0%	31,514	28,340	-10.1%	86,403	79,747	-7.7%
Alaska	19,702	26,330	33.6%	7,121	8,354	17.3%	6,002	4,470	-25.5%
Arizona	110,904	137,900	24.3%	18,051	25,182	39.5%	20,461	17,557	-14.2%
Arkansas	337,579	297,015	-12.0%	25,078	25,627	2.2%	71,195	62,162	-12.7%
California	361,524	452,620	25.2%	87,246	113,338	29.9%	108,110	96,500	-10.7%
Colorado	120,687	125,770	4.2%	11,628	21,127	81.7%	80,767	74,906	-7.3%
Connecticut	58,479	72,246	23.5%	6,249	7,761	24.2%	135,188	133,403	-1.3%
Delaware	20,918	25,696	22.8%	2,044	2,711	32.6%	14,161	12,096	-14.6%
Florida	316,319	370,681	17.2%	36,832	49,237	33.7%	47,368	41,065	-13.3%
Georgia	532,985	577,922	8.4%	52,597	65,079	23.7%	124,964	113,367	-9.3%
Hawaii	28,315	42,217	49.1%	13,182	16,463	24.9%	9,823	7,834	-20.2%
Idaho	104,381	117,014	12.1%	12,579	17,892	42.2%	54,990	49,880	-9.3%
Illinois	320,147	270,330	-15.6%	17,796	20,281	14.0%	352,969	337,914	-4.3%
Indiana	280,665	262,353	-6.5%	23,517	25,281	7.5%	325,571	316,193	-2.9%
Iowa	206,810	166,629	-19.4%	9,451	12,572	33.0%	303,845	298,193	-1.9%
Kansas	166,608	148,128	-11.1%	12,568	16,206	28.9%	195,009	174,593	-10.5%
Kentucky	529,662	476,166	-10.1%	25,879	22,352	-13.6%	154,851	143,121	-7.6%
Louisiana	517,938	443,300	-14.4%	46,009	41,678	-9.4%	68,686	60,132	-12.5%
Maine	106,758	113,422	6.2%	7,079	5,709	-19.4%	169,103	156,212	-7.6%
Maryland	71,165	81,642	14.7%	6,321	6,835	8.1%	72,055	66,712	-7.4%
Massachusetts	161,763	181,046	11.9%	14,655	17,759	21.2%	388,091	374,694	-3.5%
Michigan	399,719	341,016	-14.7%	29,457	33,472	13.6%	370,313	348,528	-5.9%
Minnesota	203,158	161,677	-20.4%	12,004	16,545	37.8%	224,407	211,155	-5.9%
Mississippi	541,700	466,470	-13.9%	44,644	42,358	-5.1%	74,056	63,296	-14.5%
Missouri	376,354	354,343	-5.8%	23,962	27,061	12.9%	199,252	186,844	-6.2%
Montana	84,633	85,302	0.8%	5,806	7,510	29.3%	65,028	58,270	-10.4%
Nebraska	106,540	94,694	-11.1%	6,116	9,405	53.8%	147,944	131,249	-11.3%
Nevada	21,891	30,158	37.8%	5,032	7,337	45.8%	8,143	6,718	-17.5%
New Hampshire	49,666	55,251	11.2%	4,976	4,979	0.1%	100,781	95,666	-5.1%
New Jersey	47,552	54,637	14.9%	5,943	7,141	20.2%	89,893	81,150	-9.7%
New Mexico	185,587	197,072	6.2%	23,595	28,332	20.1%	37,221	32,717	-12.1%
New York	339,738	369,776	8.8%	22,841	22,502	-1.5%	569,198	534,106	-6.2%
North Carolina	558,531	617,430	10.5%	48,050	59,430	23.7%	195,553	177,211	-9.4%
North Dakota	59,399	43,911	-26.1%	2,750	2,620	-4.7%	57,108	48,458	-15.1%
Ohio	501,300	429,275	-14.4%	28,184	27,658	-1.9%	477,729	470,296	-1.6%
Oklahoma	290,753	256,159	-11.9%	19,965	22,663	13.5%	113,743	99,074	-12.9%
Oregon	172,287	182,042	5.7%	20,299	27,774	36.8%	83,720	79,416	-5.1%
Pennsylvania	401,643	389,799	-2.9%	18,609	18,052	-3.0%	561,998	548,699	-2.4%
Rhode Island	32,774	38,924	18.8%	2,869	3,393	18.3%	55,463	52,576	-5.2%
South Carolina	339,588	357,158	5.2%	33,586	31,775	-5.4%	73,326	64,392	-12.2%
South Dakota	70,184	57,939	-17.4%	3,840	4,299	12.0%	78,464	68,276	-13.0%
Tennessee	417,002	411,043	-1.4%	24,914	27,151	9.0%	114,204	110,346	-3.4%
Texas	1,005,571	939,942	-6.5%	126,155	155,207	23.0%	231,339	202,027	-12.7%
Utah	70,710	78,616	11.2%	11,305	14,485	28.1%	37,497	34,939	-6.8%
Vermont	46,801	48,483	3.6%	3,321	3,173	-4.5%	91,932	81,929	-10.9%
Virginia	288,715	298,819	3.5%	21,282	20,624	-3.1%	147,606	144,180	-2.3%
Washington	171,966	199,019	15.7%	21,762	33,483	53.9%	92,470	83,602	-9.6%
West Virginia	308,389	281,226	-8.8%	12,220	9,032	-26.1%	148,951	133,409	-10.4%
Wisconsin	219,092	183,428	-16.3%	15,521	18,524	19.3%	318,025	301,927	-5.1%
Wyoming	39,285	41,862	6.6%	3,764	4,219	12.1%	24,928	24,584	-1.4%
Puerto Rico	962,858	879,900	-8.6%	60,539	113,006	86.7%	17,641	14,312	-18.9%
Total	13,107,249	12,737,686	-2.8%	1,130,707	1,352,994	19.7%	7,597,545	7,110,103	-6.4%

Copyright © 2002 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.

Table 3

Illustrative Impact of Data Shifts on CDBG 2003 Allocations (federal fiscal years; dollars in thousands)

State	Illustrative 2003 Grant Levels			Percent Change, 2002-2003			Formula in 2002 1/
	Entitlement	Nonentitlement	Total	Entitlement	Nonentitlement	Total	
Alabama	\$28,310	\$29,218	\$57,528	-8.0%	-7.6%	-7.8%	1
Alaska	2,333	3,512	5,845	2.2%	7.2%	5.1%	1
Arizona	49,529	13,216	62,745	14.9%	16.3%	15.2%	1
Arkansas	9,222	22,464	31,686	4.2%	-9.8%	-6.1%	1
California	512,090	49,305	561,395	5.6%	12.7%	6.2%	1
Colorado	31,718	13,095	44,813	3.8%	12.2%	6.1%	2
Connecticut	33,858	15,548	49,406	-3.0%	5.1%	-0.6%	2
Delaware	6,317	2,242	8,559	4.6%	10.3%	6.0%	2
District of Columbia	22,900	0	22,900	-1.3%	N/A	-1.3%	N/A
Florida	158,137	32,804	190,941	4.4%	11.5%	5.6%	1
Georgia	48,220	48,202	96,422	9.0%	5.4%	7.1%	1
Hawaii	12,147	5,870	18,017	-7.6%	13.6%	-1.6%	1
Idaho	2,836	10,944	13,780	12.5%	11.3%	11.6%	1
Illinois	170,170	38,174	208,344	-3.4%	-2.2%	-3.2%	2
Indiana	43,482	38,040	81,522	-3.9%	0.6%	-1.9%	2
Iowa	16,751	30,932	47,683	-3.3%	-0.5%	-1.5%	2
Kansas	12,698	19,891	32,589	-6.0%	-5.5%	-5.7%	2
Kentucky	21,325	31,720	53,045	-6.5%	-10.4%	-8.9%	1
Louisiana	92,958	32,873	125,831	-10.3%	-14.5%	-11.4%	1
Maine	5,918	16,858	22,776	-0.5%	-0.5%	-0.5%	2
Maryland	57,476	9,401	66,877	1.5%	1.8%	1.6%	2
Massachusetts	90,600	39,776	130,376	-0.7%	2.7%	0.3%	2
Michigan	112,699	43,114	155,813	-8.1%	-3.4%	-6.9%	2
Minnesota	44,545	23,982	68,527	-2.7%	-4.3%	-3.2%	2
Mississippi	6,094	34,092	40,186	-15.4%	-13.1%	-13.4%	1
Missouri	50,971	29,350	80,321	-7.0%	-1.9%	-5.2%	2
Montana	2,787	7,858	10,645	2.7%	-2.5%	-1.2%	2
Nebraska	8,453	14,451	22,904	-1.3%	-6.0%	-4.3%	2
Nevada	19,921	3,638	23,559	41.9%	19.8%	37.9%	1
New Hampshire	4,785	10,525	15,310	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	2
New Jersey	111,233	9,450	120,683	-0.8%	-1.2%	-0.8%	2
New Mexico	7,643	16,575	24,218	0.0%	3.5%	2.4%	1
New York	362,892	57,010	419,902	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%	2
North Carolina	31,448	50,620	82,068	12.4%	6.4%	8.6%	1
North Dakota	1,815	5,610	7,425	-3.4%	-12.4%	-10.3%	2
Ohio	134,359	56,446	190,805	-4.6%	-0.5%	-3.5%	2
Oklahoma	16,039	19,792	35,831	-1.1%	-7.4%	-4.7%	1
Oregon	26,042	16,917	42,959	10.3%	7.2%	9.0%	1
Pennsylvania	204,896	59,262	264,158	-3.8%	1.9%	-2.6%	2
Rhode Island	14,432	6,028	20,460	0.4%	2.9%	1.1%	2
South Carolina	17,642	27,368	45,010	-5.4%	-2.9%	-3.9%	1
South Dakota	1,617	7,659	9,276	-2.6%	-8.8%	-7.7%	2
Tennessee	27,564	30,915	58,479	-6.1%	-1.9%	-3.9%	1
Texas	214,813	86,646	301,459	0.4%	-1.9%	-0.3%	1
Utah	15,554	8,596	24,150	-1.7%	6.5%	1.1%	1
Vermont	1,064	8,531	9,595	-3.1%	-3.7%	-3.6%	2
Virginia	47,154	24,374	71,528	2.9%	-0.8%	1.6%	1
Washington	54,169	18,808	72,977	7.2%	16.4%	9.4%	1
West Virginia	8,583	20,370	28,953	-7.3%	-5.3%	-5.9%	2
Wisconsin	44,746	33,202	77,948	-5.1%	-2.3%	-3.9%	2
Wyoming	1,217	3,674	4,891	-1.9%	4.3%	2.7%	2
Puerto Rico 2/	67,573	63,352	130,925	-11.6%	8.7%	-2.8%	1
Total	\$3,091,745	\$1,302,300	\$4,394,045	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2

1/ Formula that favors state, and therefore was used for FY 2002 nonentitlement grant.

2/ Puerto Rico municipalities receive direct grants from discretionary funds, and are listed under "entitlement" for comparison purposes.

Copyright © 2002 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.