

ISSUE BRIEF 03-10

New Census Data Cause Shifts in Emergency Shelter Grants

March 5, 2003

Executive Summary

The Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) program in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is level funded in fiscal year (FY) 2003 at the FY 2002 level. However, changes in formula data from the 2000 census will cause shifts in allocations to states and local governments.

Background

The HUD ESG program is authorized under Title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987. It provides grants to state and local governments to help them increase the number and quality of emergency shelters and transitional housing facilities for homeless individuals and families, to operate facilities and provide essential social services, and to help prevent homelessness. Eligible activities including moderate or major building site rehabilitation, essential services, operations, homeless prevention and administrative costs. There are a number of limitations on uses; for states, administrative funds must be shared with local subgrantees.

Allocations are made among local governments on the basis of the same data as used for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program (see *Issue Brief 02-48*), with a one-year lag. These include data on poverty, population, housing overcrowding, age of housing and growth lag. If an allocation to a metropolitan city or urban county is less than 0.05% of total funds, the award is made to the state government for use at the local level.

Local governments must match grant funds with an equal amount of local resources, cash or in-kind; states are exempt from matching the first \$100,000 of their awards, but must pass the benefit of the exemption on to their recipient local governments and non-profit institutions.

Shifts in Allocations

CDBG felt the impact of new decennial census population data in FY 2002, and poverty and housing data in FY 2003. The latter data are causing major CDBG reallocations; ESG should see similar fluctuations in FY 2004. Governments losing direct ESG funding from populations shifts in FY 2003 include Covington, Kentucky; Ocean City, New Jersey; St. Clair County, Illinois and Newport News, Virginia; funds for them will flow through their states. Local governments that will newly receive direct funding include Mobile, Alabama; Lee County, Florida; Davenport, Iowa; Medford, Massachusetts; Pontiac, Michigan and Tonawanda Town, New York. Overall comparisons between FY 2002-2003 funding levels are displayed in Table 1.

*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 © 2003 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.

Table 1**Emergency Shelter Grant Allocations, 2002-2003**

(federal fiscal years; dollars in thousands)

State	2002		2003		Percent Change 1/	
	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State
Alabama	\$607	\$1,499	\$725	\$1,427	19.4%	-4.8%
Alaska	80	113	79	113	-1.3%	0.0%
Arizona	1,156	705	1,164	714	0.7%	1.3%
Arkansas	78	1,071	78	1,084	0.0%	1.2%
California	12,538	5,783	12,443	5,785	-0.8%	0.0%
Colorado	519	953	490	967	-5.6%	1.5%
Connecticut	673	1,031	684	1,029	1.6%	-0.2%
Delaware	197	79	198	80	0.5%	1.3%
District of Columbia	828	0	800	0	-3.4%	N/A
Florida	3,767	2,430	3,840	2,397	1.9%	-1.4%
Georgia	1,222	1,851	1,227	1,876	0.4%	1.4%
Hawaii	457	175	453	178	-0.9%	1.7%
Idaho	0	421	0	426	N/A	1.2%
Illinois	5,067	2,370	4,988	2,435	-1.6%	2.7%
Indiana	1,132	1,747	1,116	1,747	-1.4%	0.0%
Iowa	265	1,399	341	1,330	28.7%	-4.9%
Kansas	332	855	335	858	0.9%	0.4%
Kentucky	700	1,296	627	1,382	-10.4%	6.6%
Louisiana	1,296	1,594	1,286	1,604	-0.8%	0.6%
Maine	88	695	88	702	0.0%	1.0%
Maryland	1,758	518	1,752	518	-0.3%	0.0%
Massachusetts	2,245	2,245	2,297	2,184	2.3%	-2.7%
Michigan	2,995	2,677	3,140	2,629	4.8%	-1.8%
Minnesota	1,302	1,173	1,270	1,172	-2.5%	-0.1%
Mississippi	126	1,460	125	1,476	-0.8%	1.1%
Missouri	1,676	1,241	1,674	1,249	-0.1%	0.6%
Montana	0	370	0	372	N/A	0.5%
Nebraska	289	526	295	530	2.1%	0.8%
Nevada	309	268	318	271	2.9%	1.1%
New Hampshire	77	436	76	444	-1.3%	1.8%
New Jersey	2,772	1,473	2,666	1,529	-3.8%	3.8%
New Mexico	187	623	187	628	0.0%	0.8%
New York	11,503	3,039	11,372	2,970	-1.1%	-2.3%
North Carolina	250	2,325	250	2,355	0.0%	1.3%
North Dakota	0	285	0	286	N/A	0.4%
Ohio	3,785	2,965	3,817	2,997	0.8%	1.1%
Oklahoma	386	913	387	911	0.3%	-0.2%
Oregon	503	857	495	864	-1.6%	0.8%
Pennsylvania	6,469	2,888	6,442	2,912	-0.4%	0.8%
Rhode Island	403	311	385	313	-4.5%	0.6%
South Carolina	193	1,401	191	1,423	-1.0%	1.6%
South Dakota	0	346	0	346	N/A	0.0%
Tennessee	774	1,315	773	1,328	-0.1%	1.0%
Texas	5,709	4,687	5,688	4,736	-0.4%	1.0%
Utah	281	547	280	542	-0.4%	-0.9%
Vermont	0	341	0	343	N/A	0.6%
Virginia	1,084	1,340	998	1,431	-7.9%	6.8%
Washington	1,259	1,062	1,238	1,061	-1.7%	-0.1%
West Virginia	179	872	183	878	2.2%	0.7%
Wisconsin	965	1,832	959	1,840	-0.6%	0.4%
Wyoming	0	161	0	163	N/A	1.2%
Puerto Rico	2,174	2,481	2,152	2,493	-1.0%	0.5%
American Samoa	0	43	0	43	N/A	0.0%
Guam	0	123	0	123	N/A	0.0%
Northern Marianas	0	40	0	40	N/A	0.0%
Virgin Islands	0	94	0	94	N/A	0.0%
United States	\$80,655	\$69,345	\$80,372	\$69,628	-0.4%	0.4%

1/ Most substantial changes reflect shifts within a state between direct local funding and allocations to states.

Copyright © 2003 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.