

PERSPECTIVES ON OPPORTUNITY

Blue-State Benefits: How Federal Grants Fail to Consider Population Shift

Howard Husock

October 2023

The federal government annually awards hundreds of billions of dollars in grants to states. In this report, I examine funding for the largest federal grant programs for 2020–22, focusing on grants-in-aid that do not fully adjust for population change. For states losing population, I calculate “avoided reductions,” the difference between the grants a state received in 2022 and what it would have received had grant funding been reduced proportionate to population loss. I find that the sums of avoided reductions differ greatly among states, with California, Illinois, and New York spared the most.

Every year, the federal government distributes grants to states for some 1,274 programs, including programs that serve some of government’s most important purposes: public education, income support for the poor, highway maintenance, nutritional assistance for new mothers, and health insurance for low-income households (Lawhorn 2019, 10–11, Table 4). Such grants-in-aid reflect the belief that communities of differing fiscal capacities—that is, poor and not—should be able to provide vital services for their citizens.

Such grants, not surprisingly, vary by state. States with larger populations receive larger grants; the opposite is also true, although some programs guarantee a minimum for any state, no matter its size. What’s more—as common sense would dictate—when a state’s population declines, that may influence the magnitude of the federal aid it receives.

This approach mirrors representation in Congress; because the total number of seats in Congress is capped (at 435), when a state loses population, it can lose congressional seats. Indeed, in light of the 2020 federal

census’s findings, California, Illinois, and New York each lost population and one seat in Congress. Because of population gains, Colorado, Florida, Montana, North Carolina, and Oregon each gained one seat; Texas gained two seats.

In contrast, some major federal grant programs do not consider population change—or do so only slowly. That can mean less aid for states with growing populations and a larger share for states with falling populations whose public policies may encourage out-migration. What’s more, this is not just a theoretical possibility. Over the past few years—and especially in the aftermath of the COVID pandemic—the US has seen major population shifts, to an extent not fully clear until after the most recent federal decennial census. Lag in adjustments based on population and grants fixed at historic dollar levels can shield states that have shed population from out-migration’s effects, at least those related to federal assistance.

This report reviews the 12 largest federal grant programs and the extent to which they adjust, expeditiously or at all, for population change. In addition, it

calculates how much states with declining populations—including California, Illinois, and New York—would have seen federal assistance reduced if budget levels had reflected their population decline. The report concludes that some states with large but declining populations are disproportionately buffered from the effects of that decline and, as a result, receive increasing per capita assistance, notably cash public assistance. The annual “avoided reductions” are not large, to date, but will over time mount up, absent a stronger tie between assistance and population.

Here follows discussion of (1) program-by-program aid formulas and how they do or do not reflect population change; (2) population trends by states; (3) per capita changes in federal aid for the largest income aid program for the indigent, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF); (4) an overall sum of what I call avoided reductions in aid, defined as reductions that would have occurred if population declines were considered for select programs; and (5) further details on small-state minimums, which inflate the grants that low-population states receive.

Federal Grants-in-Aid

Federal budget allocations to states to support and complement state services are major elements of state and federal budget appropriations. As the Congressional Research Service summarized in its most recent report on the topic,

The federal government is expected to provide state and local governments about \$750 billion in federal grants in FY [fiscal year] 2019, funding a wide range of public policies, such as health care, transportation, income security, education, job training, social services, community development, and environmental protection. Federal grants account for

about one-third of total state government funding, and more than half of state government funding for health care and public assistance. (Lawhorn 2019, ii)

The Congressional Research Service notes that this total has steadily increased, standing at \$696 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2018. As Table 1 makes clear, these grants-in-aid are a feature of modern US government, having been negligible in the pre-New Deal era. In FY1930, for example, total grant-in-aid outlays were 0.109 percent of gross domestic product (GDP), whereas in FY2018, grant-in-aid outlays were 3.392 percent of GDP.¹

In addition to such large dollar figures, the number of individual grant programs for which state and local governments qualify or from which they can seek support is so large that it has proved difficult to estimate. In 2018, the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance put the number of funded federal grants to state and local governments at more than 1,274 (Lawhorn 2019).

That said, a relative handful of major programs account for a large percentage of federal grant-in-aid spending (Table 2).²

These grants’ magnitudes are set in different ways. As the Congressional Research Service notes, contemporary grants-in-aid fall into two categories: categorical grants and block grants.³ The latter allow state and local governments to deploy grants at their discretion; categorical grants must be used for a narrow purpose.

However, population changes in recipient states may or may not influence both grant types’ magnitude. For instance, TANF takes the form of a block grant to state governments—but was set at a static \$16.5 billion, with fixed allotments for each state, when the program was established in 1996. Similarly, Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) grant funding is divided among states according to percentages that have not changed since Congress first set them in 1987 (Ramseur 2023, 9).

1 Author’s calculations based on Table 1 and the Federal Reserve Economic Data series for annual, non-seasonally adjusted gross domestic product (FRED 2023).

2 The 12 programs in Table 2 were budgeted in total at \$757.4 billion for fiscal year 2022, while all federal grant-in-aid programs totaled \$1.2 trillion, a figure that includes temporary programs such as the \$106 billion Coronavirus Relief Fund (PGPF 2023).

3 According to Lawhorn (2019), 2,

Categorical grants can be used only for a specifically aided program and usually are limited to narrowly defined activities. Block grants can be used only for a specifically aided set of programs and usually are not limited to narrowly defined activities. General revenue sharing can be used for any purpose not expressly prohibited by federal or state law and is not limited to narrowly defined activities.

Table 1. Outlays for Federal Grants to State and Local Governments, by Function, Selected Fiscal Years, FY1902–FY2019 (Nominal Dollars, Millions)

Fiscal Year	Total	Health	Income Security	Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services	Transportation	Community and Regional Development	Other
2019 (estimated)	749,554	453,862	114,169	67,500	67,211	21,917	24,895
2018	696,507	421,117	110,649	60,591	64,836	19,089	20,225
2017	674,700	406,946	107,400	61,553	64,783	14,797	19,221
2016	660,818	393,666	104,769	60,876	63,861	15,298	19,357
2015	624,354	368,026	101,082	60,527	60,831	14,357	19,531
2014	576,965	320,022	100,869	60,485	62,152	13,232	20,205
2013	546,171	283,036	102,190	62,690	60,518	16,781	20,956
2012	544,569	268,277	102,574	68,126	60,749	20,258	24,585
2011	606,766	292,847	113,625	89,147	60,986	20,002	30,159
2010	608,390	290,168	115,156	97,586	60,981	18,908	25,591
2000	285,874	124,843	68,653	36,672	32,222	8,665	14,819
1990	135,325	43,890	36,768	21,780	19,174	4,965	8,748
1980	91,385	15,758	18,495	21,862	13,022	6,486	15,762
1970	24,065	3,849	5,795	6,417	4,599	1,780	1,625
1960	7,019	214	2,635	525	2,999	109	537
1950	2,253	122	1,335	150	465	1	180
1940	872	22	341	28	165	0	316
1930	100	0	1	22	76	0	1
1922	118	0	1	7	92	0	18
1913	12	0	2	3	0	0	7
1902	7	0	1	1	0	0	5

Source: Adapted from Lawhorn (2019), 5, Table 2.

In contrast, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which is directed to lower-income communities to support infrastructure renewal and social services, is distributed to states based on two formulas, with the state receiving a grant based on whichever formula produces a higher amount. Both formulas include population; a decline in population, all else equal, leads to a decline in the grant. The CDBG Entitlement program, which makes up 70 percent of CDBG funding and is given to cities, has a similar greater-of-two-formulas approach. However, while Formula A for the entitlement

program includes population, Formula B does not and instead involves factors such as housing built before 1940, which has been criticized for its inconsistent relationship to need. Thus, a city with a shrinking population could avoid losing funding if Formula B determined its grant (Jaroscak 2021).

Many grants are subject to policies that prevent state funding from decreasing. “Hold harmless” provisions prevent a recipient from receiving less than a certain portion of the prior year’s funding. For Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I, Part A education

grants, each local education agency may not receive less than a certain percentage of its prior-year funding (85 percent, 90 percent, or 95 percent), set by a formula. For Substance Use Prevention, Treatment, and Recovery Services Block Grants (SUBGs), no state can receive less than its prior-year funding except in the unlikely case that appropriations for the program are less than the prior year's (Skinner and Rosenstiel 2018, 3; Duff 2020, 17, n. 77). Similarly, for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B, § 611 grants:

No state may receive more than its allocation for the previous year increased by the percentage increase in the total amount appropriated plus 1.5 percent, and no state may receive less than its allocation for the previous year increased by the greater of the percentage increase in the total amount appropriated minus 1.5 percent or 90 percent of the percentage increase in the amount appropriated. (Louis, Janie, and Gerstein 2003, 111)

For the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), the federal government extensively models the program's expected need to determine a "fair share" for each state, but those fair share values are employed only if funding for the program increases. In that case, 80 percent of the increase goes to adjusting each state's share for inflation, and just 20 percent goes to adjusting toward fair shares (Aussenberg and Kortrey 2017, 3).

Finally, grants for the Medicaid program providing health insurance for low-income households—the largest grant program—are calculated distinctively:

The FMAP [federal medical assistance percentage] is based on a formula in the federal Medicaid statute that is based on state per capita income. The lower a state's per capita income, the higher the state's FMAP, or federal Medicaid matching rate. FMAPs vary from a floor of 50 percent to a high of 74 percent. (KFF 2012, 1)

Thus, although population change could affect a state's Medicaid allocation, such as if a state gains or loses many Medicaid recipients or if population change affects per capita income and influences the federal matching

Table 2. Largest Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs

Program	Total Obligations in FY2022 (Dollars, Billions)
Medicaid	593
FAHP	58
National School Lunch Program	23
ESEA Title I, Part A State Grants	17.3
State CHIP	17.1
TANF	16.5
IDEA Part B, §611 State Grants	13.3
WIC	6.9
Social Security Act Title IV, Part E Foster Care Grants	5.8
CDBGs	3.2
SUBGs	1.7
Environmental Protection Agency CWSRF Grants	1.6
Total	757.4

Source: CMS (2022), 46–47, n. 10; DOT (n.d.), Exhibit II-1; FAPRI (2023); Skinner and Sorenson (2023), 8–10, Table I; HHS (n.d.), 90; Falk and Landers (2023), 2, Table 1; NCLD (2022); FNS (2023); Children's Bureau (2023); HUD (n.d.); TAGGS (n.d.); and Deane (2022), 1.

rate, it is hard to distinguish individual trends, and many such trends work in opposite directions. Because population will not necessarily affect Medicaid grants to a state, I exclude it from my analysis.

Similarly, in programs including the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Social Security Act Title IV, Part E foster care grants, the federal government either provides funding at a rate matching what states spend or reimburses state expenditures afterward, as in the National School Lunch Program. Because these programs are more tightly based on state needs and effort, I do not expect them to contribute to the mismatch between state population change and state grant receipt.

In total, of the 12 programs, two (CWSRF grants and TANF) have allocations to each state set in statute, and five (CDBGs; ESEA Title I, Part A grants; IDEA Part B, § 611

Table 3. Population Change in the US and US States, 2020–22

Geographic Area	Population Estimate for April 1, 2020	Population Estimate for July 1, 2022	Raw Population Change	Percentage Population Change
Idaho	1,839,092	1,939,033	99,941	5.43%
Montana	1,084,197	1,122,867	38,670	3.57%
Utah	3,271,614	3,380,800	109,186	3.34%
Florida	21,538,226	22,244,823	706,597	3.28%
South Carolina	5,118,429	5,282,634	164,205	3.21%
Texas	29,145,428	30,029,572	884,144	3.03%
Arizona	7,151,507	7,359,197	207,690	2.90%
Delaware	989,957	1,018,396	28,439	2.87%
South Dakota	886,677	909,824	23,147	2.61%
North Carolina	10,439,414	10,698,973	259,559	2.49%
Nevada	3,104,624	3,177,772	73,148	2.36%
Tennessee	6,910,786	7,051,339	140,553	2.03%
Georgia	10,711,937	10,912,876	200,939	1.88%
Maine	1,362,341	1,385,340	22,999	1.69%
Oklahoma	3,959,346	4,019,800	60,454	1.53%
New Hampshire	1,377,518	1,395,231	17,713	1.29%
Colorado	5,773,733	5,839,926	66,193	1.15%
Arkansas	3,011,555	3,045,637	34,082	1.13%
Washington	7,705,247	7,785,786	80,539	1.05%
Alabama	5,024,356	5,074,296	49,940	0.99%
Wyoming	576,837	581,381	4,544	0.79%
Indiana	6,785,668	6,833,037	47,369	0.70%
Vermont	643,085	647,064	3,979	0.62%
Virginia	8,631,384	8,683,619	52,235	0.61%
Connecticut	3,605,942	3,626,205	20,263	0.56%
United States	331,449,520	333,287,557	1,838,037	0.55%
Missouri	6,154,920	6,177,957	23,037	0.37%
Nebraska	1,961,489	1,967,923	6,434	0.33%
Iowa	3,190,372	3,200,517	10,145	0.32%
Minnesota	5,706,504	5,717,184	10,680	0.19%
Kentucky	4,505,893	4,512,310	6,417	0.14%
Oregon	4,237,291	4,240,137	2,846	0.07%
Alaska	733,378	733,583	205	0.03%

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

North Dakota	779,091	779,261	170	0.02%
Kansas	2,937,847	2,937,150	-697	-0.02%
Wisconsin	5,893,725	5,892,539	-1,186	-0.02%
New Mexico	2,117,527	2,113,344	-4,183	-0.20%
Maryland	6,177,213	6,164,660	-12,553	-0.20%
Pennsylvania	13,002,689	12,972,008	-30,681	-0.24%
New Jersey	9,289,031	9,261,699	-27,332	-0.29%
Rhode Island	1,097,371	1,093,734	-3,637	-0.33%
Ohio	11,799,374	11,756,058	-43,316	-0.37%
Michigan	10,077,325	10,034,113	-43,212	-0.43%
Massachusetts	7,029,949	6,981,974	-47,975	-0.68%
Mississippi	2,961,288	2,940,057	-21,231	-0.72%
Hawaii	1,455,273	1,440,196	-15,077	-1.04%
West Virginia	1,793,755	1,775,156	-18,599	-1.04%
California	39,538,245	39,029,342	-508,903	-1.29%
Louisiana	4,657,749	4,590,241	-67,508	-1.45%
Illinois	12,812,545	12,582,032	-230,513	-1.80%
New York	20,201,230	19,677,151	-524,079	-2.59%

Source: US Census Bureau (2023).

grants; SUBGs; and WIC) have limited ability to adjust state allocations year to year. Four programs (CHIP, Medicaid, the National School Lunch Program, and Social Security Act Title IV, Part E foster care grants) match state spending rather than providing states a predetermined sum. The Federal-Aid Highway Program (FAHP) contains several formula grant programs and can transfer some funds among programs; FAHP's complexity puts it outside the scope of this report.

Population Trends

Since 2019, and especially in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, the United States has seen notable state-to-state population shifts. The US Census Bureau provides estimates for states' population change between April 1, 2020, and July 1, 2022, a little over two years that included most of the coronavirus pandemic in the US and the subsequent economic recovery. Table 3 includes a population change figure for the US overall

and each state in order from the most growth to the greatest shrinkage.

Three of the states with the largest populations—California, Illinois, and New York, which have historically received the largest federal grants—have seen the largest net population outflows. A political overlay can be inferred: Three of the four states losing the largest shares of population (California, Illinois, and New York) are known historically as “blue states” for progressive policies favoring relatively high tax rates and state spending. Meanwhile, the four fastest-growing states—Florida, Idaho, Montana, and Utah—typically lean to the political right. Notably, the combined population outflow of California, Illinois, and New York (1.4 million) exceeds the outflow of all other states combined.

Grant-Level Insulation

As noted above, population change is not a direct factor in the allocation of all federal grants-in-aid. Moreover, even

Table 4. Change in TANF Funding per Person by State, 2020–22

State	Grant Money Received, Millions	Population on April 1, 2020	Population on July 1, 2022	Grant Money Received per Capita, 2020	Grant Money Received per Capita, 2022	Change in the Ratio of Grant Money Received to Population, 2020–22
Montana	\$45.38	1,084,197	1,122,867	\$41.86	\$40.42	-\$1.44
Maine	\$77.86	1,362,341	1,385,340	\$57.15	\$56.20	-\$0.95
Delaware	\$32.18	989,957	1,018,396	\$32.51	\$31.60	-\$0.91
Idaho	\$31.83	1,839,092	1,939,033	\$17.31	\$16.42	-\$0.89
Arizona	\$221.69	7,151,507	7,359,197	\$31.00	\$30.12	-\$0.87
Florida	\$560.48	21,538,226	22,244,823	\$26.02	\$25.20	-\$0.83
Utah	\$76.58	3,271,614	3,380,800	\$23.41	\$22.65	-\$0.76
North Carolina	\$301.24	10,439,414	10,698,973	\$28.86	\$28.16	-\$0.70
South Dakota	\$21.82	886,677	909,824	\$24.61	\$23.98	-\$0.63
South Carolina	\$99.64	5,118,429	5,282,634	\$19.47	\$18.86	-\$0.61
Georgia	\$329.65	10,711,937	10,912,876	\$30.77	\$30.21	-\$0.57
Oklahoma	\$147.53	3,959,346	4,019,800	\$37.26	\$36.70	-\$0.56
Tennessee	\$190.89	6,910,786	7,051,339	\$27.62	\$27.07	-\$0.55
Washington	\$403.00	7,705,247	7,785,786	\$52.30	\$51.76	-\$0.54
Texas	\$484.65	29,145,428	30,029,572	\$16.63	\$16.14	-\$0.49
Vermont	\$47.20	643,085	647,064	\$73.39	\$72.94	-\$0.45
Connecticut	\$265.91	3,605,942	3,626,205	\$73.74	\$73.33	-\$0.41
New Hampshire	\$38.39	1,377,518	1,395,231	\$27.87	\$27.52	-\$0.35
Nevada	\$43.83	3,104,624	3,177,772	\$14.12	\$13.79	-\$0.32
Wyoming	\$21.71	576,837	581,381	\$37.64	\$37.34	-\$0.29
United States	\$16,511.87	331,449,520	333,287,557	\$49.82	\$49.54	-\$0.27
Colorado	\$135.61	5,773,733	5,839,926	\$23.49	\$23.22	-\$0.27
Indiana	\$206.12	6,785,668	6,833,037	\$30.38	\$30.16	-\$0.21
Arkansas	\$56.55	3,011,555	3,045,637	\$18.78	\$18.57	-\$0.21
Alabama	\$93.01	5,024,356	5,074,296	\$18.51	\$18.33	-\$0.18
Missouri	\$216.34	6,154,920	6,177,957	\$35.15	\$35.02	-\$0.13
Iowa	\$131.09	3,190,372	3,200,517	\$41.09	\$40.96	-\$0.13
Virginia	\$157.76	8,631,384	8,683,619	\$18.28	\$18.17	-\$0.11
Nebraska	\$57.84	1,961,489	1,967,923	\$29.49	\$29.39	-\$0.10
Minnesota	\$267.10	5,706,504	5,717,184	\$46.81	\$46.72	-\$0.09
Kentucky	\$180.69	4,505,893	4,512,310	\$40.10	\$40.04	-\$0.06
Oregon	\$167.37	4,237,291	4,240,137	\$39.50	\$39.47	-\$0.03

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Alaska	\$63.40	733,378	733,583	\$86.45	\$86.42	-\$0.02
North Dakota	\$26.31	779,091	779,261	\$33.77	\$33.77	-\$0.01
Kansas	\$101.60	2,937,847	2,937,150	\$34.58	\$34.59	\$0.01
Wisconsin	\$317.14	5,893,725	5,892,539	\$53.81	\$53.82	\$0.01
Maryland	\$228.34	6,177,213	6,164,660	\$36.97	\$37.04	\$0.08
New Mexico	\$125.69	2,117,527	2,113,344	\$59.36	\$59.47	\$0.12
New Jersey	\$402.70	9,289,031	9,261,699	\$43.35	\$43.48	\$0.13
Pennsylvania	\$717.13	13,002,689	12,972,008	\$55.15	\$55.28	\$0.13
Mississippi	\$86.48	2,961,288	2,940,057	\$29.20	\$29.41	\$0.21
Ohio	\$725.57	11,799,374	11,756,058	\$61.49	\$61.72	\$0.23
Rhode Island	\$94.71	1,097,371	1,093,734	\$86.30	\$86.59	\$0.29
Michigan	\$772.79	10,077,325	10,034,113	\$76.69	\$77.02	\$0.33
Massachusetts	\$457.86	7,029,949	6,981,974	\$65.13	\$65.58	\$0.45
Louisiana	\$163.43	4,657,749	4,590,241	\$35.09	\$35.60	\$0.52
West Virginia	\$109.81	1,793,755	1,775,156	\$61.22	\$61.86	\$0.64
Hawaii	\$98.58	1,455,273	1,440,196	\$67.74	\$68.45	\$0.71
Illinois	\$583.13	12,812,545	12,582,032	\$45.51	\$46.35	\$0.83
California	\$3,721.50	39,538,245	39,029,342	\$94.12	\$95.35	\$1.23
New York	\$2,434.87	20,201,230	19,677,151	\$120.53	\$123.74	\$3.21

Note: These data include the State Family Assistance Grant that each state earned before deductions for Tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs or penalties for not meeting a statutory condition for full funding. They do not include funding from the TANF Contingency Fund or temporary TANF assistance funds.

Source: Falk (2023), 3–4, Table I.

those whose distribution formulas consider population change do so only gradually.

Because of these dynamics, the states that have lost the most residents have not yet seen their grant funding decline. Arguably, they are thus buffered from the effects of various factors that motivate out-migration, including high personal tax rates, historically high housing costs, and worsening quality of life.

In Table 4, I calculate the extent to which California, Illinois, and New York saw an increase in federal aid in one major program, notwithstanding their population decline. TANF block grant amounts have been fixed since 1996. Thus, population decrease arithmetically leads to more federal assistance per capita. Table 4 notes this increase

or decrease, factoring in population change. As noted above, these figures' absolute values are not large, but they reflect data for only 27 months, a little over two years.

Seen through another lens, however, the static TANF formula fiscally penalizes some states seeing population loss. This is the case when comparing the TANF grant's magnitude with the number of persons in poverty.

For instance, for New York state, which receives the second-largest TANF grant, the size of that grant remained flat even as the number and percentage of persons in poverty in the state increased between 2020 and 2021. As per Tables 3 and 5, some 11.9 percent of New Yorkers (2.4 million) were classified as in poverty in 2020, compared to 13.6 percent (2.7 million) in 2021.⁴

4 The latter calculation uses a total of 19,835,913 for the July 1, 2021, estimate of New York state's population; for more information, see US Census Bureau (2021a), Table 1.

Table 5. Change in TANF Funding per Person in Poverty by State, 2020–21

State	Grant Money Received, Millions	Population in Poverty, 2020	Population in Poverty, 2021	Grant Money Received per Person in Poverty, 2020	Grant Money Received per Person in Poverty, 2021	Change in Grant Money Received per Person in Poverty, 2020–21
Hawaii	\$98.58	121,182	152,656	\$813.47	\$645.75	-\$167.72
Rhode Island	\$94.71	108,306	126,971	\$874.45	\$745.90	-\$128.55
New York	\$2,434.87	2,401,141	2,703,053	\$1,014.05	\$900.78	-\$113.27
Alaska	\$63.40	68,714	77,736	\$922.65	\$815.57	-\$107.08
Vermont	\$47.20	56,281	63,208	\$838.60	\$746.69	-\$91.90
Massachusetts	\$457.86	628,899	701,700	\$728.03	\$652.49	-\$75.53
Minnesota	\$267.10	458,302	519,437	\$582.81	\$514.21	-\$68.59
Maryland	\$228.34	533,561	620,829	\$427.96	\$367.80	-\$60.16
Utah	\$76.58	234,666	286,086	\$326.32	\$267.67	-\$58.65
California	\$3,721.50	4,419,167	4,742,405	\$842.13	\$784.73	-\$57.40
New Jersey	\$402.70	818,389	925,852	\$492.07	\$434.95	-\$57.11
Pennsylvania	\$717.13	1,345,976	1,503,929	\$532.79	\$476.83	-\$55.96
Wyoming	\$21.71	52,418	60,226	\$414.17	\$360.48	-\$53.70
Connecticut	\$265.91	333,435	355,861	\$797.48	\$747.22	-\$50.26
Nebraska	\$57.84	172,623	201,627	\$335.05	\$286.85	-\$48.20
Wisconsin	\$317.14	571,049	622,948	\$555.36	\$509.09	-\$46.27
Illinois	\$583.13	1,351,159	1,493,042	\$431.57	\$390.56	-\$41.01
Maine	\$77.86	139,614	149,571	\$557.70	\$520.58	-\$37.13
Oregon	\$167.37	457,940	507,504	\$365.48	\$329.79	-\$35.69
Iowa	\$131.09	313,752	340,626	\$417.82	\$384.85	-\$32.96
Kansas	\$101.60	300,931	332,457	\$337.60	\$305.59	-\$32.01
Ohio	\$725.57	1,428,219	1,523,366	\$508.02	\$476.29	-\$31.73
United States	\$16,511.87	38,371,394	41,393,176	\$430.32	\$398.90	-\$31.41
Washington	\$403.00	714,653	755,589	\$563.91	\$533.35	-\$30.55
New Hampshire	\$38.39	92,404	99,562	\$415.50	\$385.63	-\$29.87
North Dakota	\$26.31	75,781	82,270	\$347.22	\$319.84	-\$27.39
Kentucky	\$180.69	647,158	712,023	\$279.20	\$253.77	-\$25.44
Michigan	\$772.79	1,232,948	1,283,086	\$626.79	\$602.29	-\$24.49
Delaware	\$32.18	104,400	113,026	\$308.28	\$284.75	-\$23.53
West Virginia	\$109.81	274,176	291,051	\$400.52	\$377.30	-\$23.22
Virginia	\$157.76	769,479	862,792	\$205.03	\$182.85	-\$22.17
Oklahoma	\$147.53	552,168	599,003	\$267.17	\$246.28	-\$20.89

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Colorado	\$135.61	511,346	554,126	\$265.20	\$244.72	-\$20.47
New Mexico	\$125.69	346,455	367,050	\$362.78	\$342.42	-\$20.36
Idaho	\$31.83	181,197	202,091	\$175.68	\$157.52	-\$18.16
Louisiana	\$163.43	802,040	878,477	\$203.77	\$186.04	-\$17.73
Missouri	\$216.34	725,117	765,097	\$298.34	\$282.75	-\$15.59
Florida	\$560.48	2,642,642	2,830,813	\$212.09	\$197.99	-\$14.10
Alabama	\$93.01	714,568	800,848	\$130.16	\$116.14	-\$14.02
Indiana	\$206.12	760,167	799,733	\$271.15	\$257.73	-\$13.41
Nevada	\$43.83	386,817	433,095	\$113.31	\$101.21	-\$12.11
North Carolina	\$301.24	1,329,685	1,383,626	\$226.55	\$217.72	-\$8.83
Texas	\$484.65	3,862,713	4,122,799	\$125.47	\$117.55	-\$7.92
South Dakota	\$21.82	99,903	103,337	\$218.42	\$211.16	-\$7.26
South Carolina	\$99.64	703,004	736,098	\$141.73	\$135.36	-\$6.37
Arkansas	\$56.55	448,665	471,195	\$126.03	\$120.01	-\$6.03
Tennessee	\$190.89	911,097	934,856	\$209.52	\$204.19	-\$5.32
Georgia	\$329.65	1,465,328	1,493,837	\$224.97	\$220.67	-\$4.29
Mississippi	\$86.48	536,535	549,710	\$161.18	\$157.32	-\$3.86
Montana	\$45.38	130,711	129,910	\$347.21	\$349.35	\$2.14
Arizona	\$221.69	932,555	919,680	\$237.72	\$241.05	\$3.33

Note: There is a robust debate about how best to measure poverty (Corinth, Meyer, and Wu 2022). However, since government programs, including programs discussed in this report, commonly use Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates data to determine the relevant total for the number of people in poverty in a given state, these estimates are used to measure the population in poverty in this table.

Source: US Census Bureau (2021b); and Falk (2023), 3–4, Table I.

As Table 5 shows, New York received \$1,014.05 per person in poverty in 2020 but only \$900.78 per person in poverty in 2021, a loss of \$113.27 per person in poverty, which is larger than the loss that all but two other states faced. In one sense, New York was penalized by a grant that did not adjust based on the number of those in poverty while being protected by a formula that maintained the grant size.

This can be seen through another lens as well. The increase in the population percentage and absolute number of persons in poverty in New York state, in the context of overall population decline, suggests that the state is losing affluent households while retaining those in poverty—reflecting other factors that should concern officials but are beyond the scope of this report. The same is true for California and Illinois.

Although not all federal grant-in-aid formulas consider population change, note how much grant disbursements would change if they did, which would arguably be commonsensical. Table 6 arrays calculations of avoided reductions—the difference between actual funding and hypothetical funding in a counterfactual scenario with funding adjusted based on the state’s population change—in the sum of funding for seven non-adjusting programs in 17 states. This sum includes funding for programs I identified as not adjusting to shifts in population: CDBGs; CWSRF grants; ESEA Title I, Part A grants; IDEA Part B, § 611 grants; SUBGs; TANF; and WIC. For example, New York lost 2.59 percent of its population from 2020 to 2022, so in the counterfactual scenario, its 2022 grant total is reduced by 2.59 percent. A full list, including

Table 6. States with Avoided Reductions, 2020–22

State	All Program Funding, FY2022	Counterfactual Funding, FY2022	Avoided Reductions	Actual Change, 2020–22	Counterfactual Change, 2020–22
New York	\$4,402,621,421	\$4,288,404,543	–\$114,216,878	\$141,651,882	\$27,435,004
California	\$6,915,302,559	\$6,826,294,607	–\$89,007,952	\$219,762,774	\$130,754,822
Illinois	\$1,680,018,743	\$1,649,793,198	–\$30,225,545	\$74,037,938	\$43,812,393
Louisiana	\$592,082,894	\$583,501,424	–\$8,581,470	\$33,012,714	\$24,431,244
Massachusetts	\$1,067,844,463	\$1,060,557,093	–\$7,287,370	\$40,844,450	\$33,557,080
Michigan	\$1,673,470,472	\$1,666,294,559	–\$7,175,913	\$62,032,439	\$54,856,526
Ohio	\$1,687,763,427	\$1,681,567,576	–\$6,195,851	\$61,423,533	\$55,227,682
Pennsylvania	\$1,725,544,574	\$1,721,472,998	–\$4,071,576	\$67,233,696	\$63,162,120
New Jersey	\$1,184,520,818	\$1,181,035,490	–\$3,485,328	\$64,685,671	\$61,200,342
West Virginia	\$291,118,772	\$288,100,234	–\$3,018,538	\$20,686,451	\$17,667,913
Mississippi	\$371,304,371	\$368,642,298	–\$2,662,072	\$27,790,289	\$25,128,216
Hawaii	\$212,244,296	\$210,045,391	–\$2,198,905	\$12,206,054	\$10,007,149
Maryland	\$706,219,324	\$704,784,183	–\$1,435,141	\$44,222,229	\$42,787,089
Rhode Island	\$199,043,927	\$198,384,239	–\$659,688	\$9,590,855	\$8,931,167
New Mexico	\$308,358,379	\$307,749,242	–\$609,137	\$13,217,675	\$12,608,539
Wisconsin	\$776,710,990	\$776,554,692	–\$156,298	\$31,916,281	\$31,759,983
Kansas	\$325,296,906	\$325,219,730	–\$77,176	\$18,396,482	\$18,319,306

Source: Falk (2023), 3–4, Table I; Deane (2022), 1; TAGGS (n.d.); EPA (n.d.a and n.d.b); HUD (n.d.); NEA (2020, 12 and 2022, 9); Skinner and Sorenson (2022a, 8–10, Table I; 2022b, 8–10, Table I; and 2023, 8–10, Table I); and FNS (2023).

states that gained funding in the counterfactual scenario, is in Appendix A, Table A1.

Here again, California, Illinois, and New York are shown to benefit from federal grant formulas that insulated them and other population-losing states from out-migration’s budgetary effects.

Think of it this way. If federal grants were adjusted for population change, the large blue states—those with high populations experiencing out-migration—would have seen their 2022 assistance from Washington adjusted downward proportionately. The fact that this did not happen, by and large, leads to the calculation of avoided reductions—cuts in aid that population loss logically would have justified but that did not occur. The calculation is straightforward. If one multiplies the total of major grants in 2022 by the population percentage decline from 2020 to 2022, the product is the avoided cut.

For example, New York state actually received \$4.4 billion in grants in FY2022 from the programs I analyze, whereas in the counterfactual scenario with grant money adjusted downward based on population changes, it would have received closer to \$4.2 billion. The difference between these sums is New York’s avoided reductions, which total \$114,216,878.

Another way to think of this is in terms of change over time: New York state actually received \$141,651,882 more in 2022 than in 2020, but in the counterfactual scenario, in which grant money changes with population, it would’ve gained only \$27,435,004 between 2022 and 2020. Note that all the states with avoided reductions still receive more in the 2022 counterfactual scenario than they actually did in 2020.

Small-State Minimums

Of lesser budgetary impact but still notable in considering the advantages of larger states suffering out-migration are small-state minimums incorporated into federal grant-in-aid formulas. Five of the top 12 grant programs (namely, CHIP; CWSRF grants; ESEA Title I, Part A education grants; FAHP; and SUBGs) require small states to be awarded grants larger than they would have received absent a grant-level floor. To the extent that larger blue states benefit from the non-consideration or limited consideration of population change, smaller states, many red or politically conservative, have historically benefited from small-state minimum provisions. Such states include Alaska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming, which are the five least populous states.

A notable example of a grant formula that ensures minimum funding for smaller states is the formula governing the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which distributes funds to help workers find employment or gain access to job training. Each of the act's major sections—for youth and adult activities, dislocated workers, and employment services—is guided by a grant formula that protects funding totals against, for example, reductions in the civilian labor force. A number of factors, including retirements or disability, can cause such a reduction. But population decline can also reduce labor force numbers. Three of the four types of grants for smaller jurisdictions must not, by regulation, fall below 90 percent of the previous year's total. A fourth section guarantees that a portion of previous funding cannot be reduced at all in smaller states.

As the regulation puts it:

States with civilian labor force below 1 million and under the national median civilian labor force density receive an amount which when added to their share of the 97% portion, will result in an amount equal to 100% of their relative share of the prior year funding. (DOL n.d.)

By definition, such totals are smaller than the grant funding distributed to larger jurisdictions but reflect similar insulation against population and labor force reductions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

When Congress designs grant programs that transfer money from the federal to the state level, it often restricts how much any state's overall allocation can vary year to year. In principle, this stability can help state policymakers who are planning long-term provision of services. Constructing a new substance abuse treatment center, hiring new staff to care for foster youth, and signing a contract with a nonprofit affordable housing provider are less risky if state policymakers know they can rely on stable federal funding over the long term rather than worrying about potential cuts.

Funding stability brings predictability but also opportunity costs—especially for growing states faced with a growing demand for services. Such states, for instance, might struggle to provide adequate special education resources to a growing statewide student body. These states would likely not realize that a federal grant, absent the stability provisions described above, would provide enough additional funding to cover special education needs. Broadly, insulating funding distribution from population helps incumbents at the risk of creating a non-level playing field.

As a result, states that have lost significant numbers of residents to out-migration over the past few years have seen their federal assistance buffered from the impact of population loss.

These states' significant protection from funding changes, in turn, means that states to which population has shifted are not receiving grants-in-aid to which they are, arguably, entitled and that they may well need, as newcomers strain their capacity to provide public services.

The most straightforward approach to fixing this problem is to tie a greater share of grant programs to population (or population in poverty or another measure of need). TANF could be based on state characteristics instead of a set figure. CWSRF grants could be based on measures of need, for which Environmental Protection Agency surveys and research have laid the groundwork (Ramseur 2023, 10–11). Hold harmless provisions and other rules preventing grant programs from adjusting to income share could be scrapped or have their role greatly reduced.

Certain census products may need additional

funding. For example, IDEA Part B, § 611 has historically had to use data that are older and lower in quality than the census datasets that programs such as ESEA Title I, Part A education grants use. This is because each state sets its own age range for students to qualify for special education benefits, and the census does not usually produce estimates of children in poverty by age for each state (Louis, Janie, and Gerstein 2003, 111).

It may be time to rethink the measures of need some programs use to determine which states should receive aid. A 2019 RAND Corporation study, for example, suggested that the SUBG program update the data sources used to measure population need and cost of service and that it incorporate information on adults with mental illness (Ashwood et al. 2019).

In fairness to larger states that are losing population, small-state minimums in federal grants should end.

These recommendations would, in addition to promoting fairness in allocations among the states, provide greater accountability for states that have adopted policies contributing to population out-migration—or at least prompt elected officials in those states to reflect on steps to discourage such out-migration.

Finally, although numbers throughout this report are given in nominal terms—that is, without adjusting for inflation—inflation will affect the funding many states receive over time. If a state avoids grant-funding reductions because that funding cannot fall below a prior-year level, its funding will still lose value over time.⁵ The reductions that California, Illinois, and New York avoid may buoy their budgets—but these avoided reductions also shield the states from the effects of policies that spur out-migration. Elected officials should take note.

⁵ As previously noted, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children has a mechanism to automatically adjust for inflation when funding for the program increases, although Congress may not increase the program's funding by enough to cover a full inflation adjustment.

About the Author

Howard Husock is a senior fellow in Domestic Policy Studies at the American Enterprise Institute, where he focuses on municipal government, urban housing policy, civil society, and philanthropy.

About AEI's Center on Opportunity and Social Mobility

The Center on Opportunity and Social Mobility, directed by Scott Winship, conducts rigorous research and develops evidence-based policies aimed at expanding opportunity in America by reducing entrenched poverty, increasing upward mobility, and rebuilding social capital.

About AEI's Perspectives on Opportunity

AEI's Perspectives on Opportunity is a policy report series published by the Center on Opportunity and Social Mobility. Contributions to this series include empirical and theoretical analysis of issues related to opportunity in the United States and evidence-based policy proposals to expand opportunity, promote upward mobility, and strengthen social capital. Center on Opportunity and Social Mobility Deputy Director Kevin Corinth is the editor of Perspectives on Opportunity.

Appendix A

Table A1. Complete Avoided Reductions and Increases for US States, 2020–22

State	Funding for All Programs, FY2022	Counterfactual Funding, FY2022	Avoided Reductions and Increases	Actual Change, 2020–22	Counterfactual Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$502,001,357	\$506,991,041	\$4,989,684	\$31,034,317	\$36,024,001
Alaska	\$148,471,444	\$148,512,946	\$41,502	\$9,128,831	\$9,170,333
Arizona	\$695,878,554	\$716,087,863	\$20,209,309	\$30,557,400	\$50,766,709
Arkansas	\$310,094,975	\$313,604,344	\$3,509,369	\$32,891,590	\$36,400,959
California	\$6,915,302,559	\$6,826,294,607	-\$89,007,952	\$219,762,774	\$130,754,822
Colorado	\$478,861,124	\$484,351,031	\$5,489,907	\$21,100,096	\$26,590,003
Connecticut	\$543,708,338	\$546,763,618	\$3,055,280	\$17,106,722	\$20,162,002
Delaware	\$112,964,478	\$116,209,666	\$3,245,188	\$10,080,503	\$13,325,692
Florida	\$2,058,010,537	\$2,125,526,964	\$67,516,427	\$121,410,305	\$188,926,733
Georgia	\$1,118,000,756	\$1,138,972,682	\$20,971,926	\$64,124,482	\$85,096,408
Hawaii	\$212,244,296	\$210,045,391	-\$2,198,905	\$12,206,054	\$10,007,149
Idaho	\$154,950,670	\$163,371,089	\$8,420,419	\$10,136,858	\$18,557,277
Illinois	\$1,680,018,743	\$1,649,793,198	-\$30,225,545	\$74,037,938	\$43,812,393
Indiana	\$783,696,414	\$789,167,197	\$5,470,783	\$64,920,939	\$70,391,721
Iowa	\$390,884,094	\$392,127,058	\$1,242,964	\$18,020,767	\$19,263,731
Kansas	\$325,296,906	\$325,219,730	-\$77,176	\$18,396,482	\$18,319,306
Kentucky	\$543,415,038	\$544,188,934	\$773,896	\$28,195,462	\$28,969,358
Louisiana	\$592,082,894	\$583,501,424	-\$8,581,470	\$33,012,714	\$24,431,244
Maine	\$196,149,092	\$199,460,475	\$3,311,383	\$8,844,411	\$12,155,795
Maryland	\$706,219,324	\$704,784,183	-\$1,435,141	\$44,222,229	\$42,787,089
Massachusetts	\$1,067,844,463	\$1,060,557,093	-\$7,287,370	\$40,844,450	\$33,557,080
Michigan	\$1,673,470,472	\$1,666,294,559	-\$7,175,913	\$62,032,439	\$54,856,526
Minnesota	\$699,889,281	\$701,199,158	\$1,309,877	\$39,873,840	\$41,183,717
Mississippi	\$371,304,371	\$368,642,298	-\$2,662,072	\$27,790,289	\$25,128,216
Missouri	\$699,862,256	\$702,481,742	\$2,619,486	\$33,210,002	\$35,829,488
Montana	\$129,070,628	\$133,674,184	\$4,603,556	\$6,990,558	\$11,594,113

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$211,565,324	\$212,259,292	\$693,968	\$11,919,404	\$12,613,372
Nevada	\$234,956,418	\$240,492,223	\$5,535,805	\$16,394,759	\$21,930,564
New Hampshire	\$139,082,910	\$140,871,326	\$1,788,416	\$8,035,165	\$9,823,581
New Jersey	\$1,184,520,818	\$1,181,035,490	-\$3,485,328	\$64,685,671	\$61,200,342
New Mexico	\$308,358,379	\$307,749,242	-\$609,137	\$13,217,675	\$12,608,539
New York	\$4,402,621,421	\$4,288,404,543	-\$114,216,878	\$141,651,882	\$27,435,004
North Carolina	\$1,061,730,103	\$1,088,128,290	\$26,398,187	\$66,879,300	\$93,277,487
North Dakota	\$96,931,204	\$96,952,355	\$21,151	\$7,075,690	\$7,096,841
Ohio	\$1,687,763,427	\$1,681,567,576	-\$6,195,851	\$61,423,533	\$55,227,682
Oklahoma	\$440,519,281	\$447,245,430	\$6,726,149	\$22,715,545	\$29,441,694
Oregon	\$468,041,410	\$468,355,773	\$314,363	\$26,533,887	\$26,848,249
Pennsylvania	\$1,725,544,574	\$1,721,472,998	-\$4,071,576	\$67,233,696	\$63,162,120
Rhode Island	\$199,043,927	\$198,384,239	-\$659,688	\$9,590,855	\$8,931,167
South Carolina	\$477,433,371	\$492,749,974	\$15,316,603	\$31,862,316	\$47,178,919
South Dakota	\$104,489,392	\$107,217,123	\$2,727,731	\$7,014,869	\$9,742,599
Tennessee	\$705,553,956	\$719,903,659	\$14,349,703	\$47,216,272	\$61,565,975
Texas	\$2,642,875,800	\$2,723,049,019	\$80,173,219	\$104,941,087	\$185,114,306
Utah	\$299,897,321	\$309,906,017	\$10,008,696	\$7,588,008	\$17,596,704
Vermont	\$118,806,950	\$119,542,052	\$735,102	\$5,745,148	\$6,480,250
Virginia	\$718,269,073	\$722,615,860	\$4,346,787	\$40,639,562	\$44,986,348
Washington	\$929,357,553	\$939,071,651	\$9,714,098	\$50,700,211	\$60,414,309
West Virginia	\$291,118,772	\$288,100,234	-\$3,018,538	\$20,686,451	\$17,667,913
Wisconsin	\$776,710,990	\$776,554,692	-\$156,298	\$31,916,281	\$31,759,983
Wyoming	\$81,635,320	\$82,278,397	\$643,077	\$4,284,505	\$4,927,583
Total	\$42,416,520,758	\$42,471,729,930	\$55,209,172	\$1,949,884,224	\$2,005,093,395

Note: As the “Total” row shows, the counterfactual fiscal year 2022 scenario includes about \$55.2 million more than the actual fiscal year 2022 funding. Because each state’s grants were adjusted in proportion to population change (which would not sum to equal the total US population growth), and grants for each state were already disproportionate to factors such as population, there is no reason to expect these counterfactual changes to sum to zero. This additional \$55.2 million is about 0.13 percent of the total \$58 billion accounted for across all programs and states. Source: Falk (2023), 3–4, Table I; Skinner and Sorenson (2022a, 8–10, Table I; 2022b, 8–10, Table I; and 2023, 8–10, Table I); HUD (n.d.); FNS (2023); TAGGS (n.d.); EPA (n.d.a and n.d.b); Deane (2022), 1; and NEA (2020, 12 and 2022, 9).

Table A2. Per Capita Grant Funding by State

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2022	Funding per Capita, 2020	Funding per Capita, 2022
Alabama	\$470,967,040	\$502,001,357	\$93.74	\$98.93
Alaska	\$139,342,613	\$148,471,444	\$190.00	\$202.39
Arizona	\$665,321,154	\$695,878,554	\$93.03	\$94.56
Arkansas	\$277,203,385	\$310,094,975	\$92.05	\$101.82
California	\$6,695,539,785	\$6,915,302,559	\$169.34	\$177.18
Colorado	\$457,761,028	\$478,861,124	\$79.28	\$82.00
Connecticut	\$526,601,616	\$543,708,338	\$146.04	\$149.94
Delaware	\$102,883,975	\$112,964,478	\$103.93	\$110.92
Florida	\$1,936,600,232	\$2,058,010,537	\$89.91	\$92.52
Georgia	\$1,053,876,274	\$1,118,000,756	\$98.38	\$102.45
Hawaii	\$200,038,242	\$212,244,296	\$137.46	\$147.37
Idaho	\$144,813,812	\$154,950,670	\$78.74	\$79.91
Illinois	\$1,605,980,805	\$1,680,018,743	\$125.34	\$133.53
Indiana	\$718,775,475	\$783,696,414	\$105.93	\$114.69
Iowa	\$372,863,327	\$390,884,094	\$116.87	\$122.13
Kansas	\$306,900,424	\$325,296,906	\$104.46	\$110.75
Kentucky	\$515,219,576	\$543,415,038	\$114.34	\$120.43
Louisiana	\$559,070,180	\$592,082,894	\$120.03	\$128.99
Maine	\$187,304,681	\$196,149,092	\$137.49	\$141.59
Maryland	\$661,997,095	\$706,219,324	\$107.17	\$114.56
Massachusetts	\$1,027,000,013	\$1,067,844,463	\$146.09	\$152.94
Michigan	\$1,611,438,033	\$1,673,470,472	\$159.91	\$166.78
Minnesota	\$660,015,441	\$699,889,281	\$115.66	\$122.42
Mississippi	\$343,514,082	\$371,304,371	\$116.00	\$126.29
Missouri	\$666,652,254	\$699,862,256	\$108.31	\$113.28
Montana	\$122,080,070	\$129,070,628	\$112.60	\$114.95

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$199,645,920	\$211,565,324	\$101.78	\$107.51
Nevada	\$218,561,659	\$234,956,418	\$70.40	\$73.94
New Hampshire	\$131,047,745	\$139,082,910	\$95.13	\$99.68
New Jersey	\$1,119,835,147	\$1,184,520,818	\$120.55	\$127.89
New Mexico	\$295,140,704	\$308,358,379	\$139.38	\$145.91
New York	\$4,260,969,539	\$4,402,621,421	\$210.93	\$223.74
North Carolina	\$994,850,803	\$1,061,730,103	\$95.30	\$99.24
North Dakota	\$89,855,514	\$96,931,204	\$115.33	\$124.39
Ohio	\$1,626,339,894	\$1,687,763,427	\$137.83	\$143.57
Oklahoma	\$417,803,736	\$440,519,281	\$105.52	\$109.59
Oregon	\$441,507,523	\$468,041,410	\$104.20	\$110.38
Pennsylvania	\$1,658,310,878	\$1,725,544,574	\$127.54	\$133.02
Rhode Island	\$189,453,072	\$199,043,927	\$172.64	\$181.99
South Carolina	\$445,571,055	\$477,433,371	\$87.05	\$90.38
South Dakota	\$97,474,523	\$104,489,392	\$109.93	\$114.85
Tennessee	\$658,337,684	\$705,553,956	\$95.26	\$100.06
Texas	\$2,537,934,713	\$2,642,875,800	\$87.08	\$88.01
Utah	\$292,309,313	\$299,897,321	\$89.35	\$88.71
Vermont	\$113,061,802	\$118,806,950	\$175.81	\$183.61
Virginia	\$677,629,511	\$718,269,073	\$78.51	\$82.72
Washington	\$878,657,342	\$929,357,553	\$114.03	\$119.37
West Virginia	\$270,432,321	\$291,118,772	\$150.76	\$164.00
Wisconsin	\$744,794,709	\$776,710,990	\$126.37	\$131.81
Wyoming	\$77,350,815	\$81,635,320	\$134.09	\$140.42
Total	\$40,466,636,534	\$42,416,520,758	\$122.09	\$127.27

Source: Falk (2023), 3–4, Table I; Skinner and Sorenson (2022a, 8–10, Table I; 2022b, 8–10, Table I; and 2023, 8–10, Table I); HUD (n.d.); FNS (2023); TAGGS (n.d.); EPA (n.d.a and n.d.b); Deane (2022), 1; and NEA (2020, 12 and 2022, 9).

Table A3. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I, Part A Grants by State, 2020–22

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2021	Funding, 2022	Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$266,628	\$266,382	\$279,142	\$12,514
Alaska	\$47,422	\$47,510	\$50,604	\$3,182
Arizona	\$345,804	\$355,430	\$370,385	\$24,581
Arkansas	\$166,871	\$163,805	\$174,307	\$7,436
California	\$1,997,325	\$2,040,023	\$2,076,706	\$79,381
Colorado	\$153,690	\$161,189	\$174,023	\$20,333
Connecticut	\$144,530	\$153,915	\$153,701	\$9,171
Delaware	\$54,530	\$54,033	\$57,224	\$2,694
Florida	\$920,950	\$907,251	\$1,006,554	\$85,604
Georgia	\$557,817	\$568,658	\$655,086	\$97,269
Hawaii	\$54,184	\$56,701	\$58,193	\$4,009
Idaho	\$58,907	\$57,359	\$60,274	\$1,367
Illinois	\$668,211	\$685,476	\$701,661	\$33,450
Indiana	\$263,699	\$251,572	\$273,340	\$9,641
Iowa	\$102,445	\$102,837	\$110,758	\$8,313
Kansas	\$109,281	\$110,335	\$117,527	\$8,246
Kentucky	\$272,208	\$250,129	\$272,020	–\$188
Louisiana	\$344,704	\$363,771	\$364,176	\$19,472
Maine	\$55,318	\$55,961	\$59,492	\$4,174
Maryland	\$253,988	\$282,884	\$292,787	\$38,799
Massachusetts	\$242,991	\$259,046	\$262,718	\$19,727
Michigan	\$492,431	\$482,905	\$514,603	\$22,172
Minnesota	\$174,601	\$179,175	\$174,738	\$137
Mississippi	\$215,748	\$223,970	\$234,558	\$18,810
Missouri	\$259,609	\$261,459	\$265,588	\$5,979
Montana	\$50,504	\$51,290	\$54,751	\$4,247

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$74,443	\$68,070	\$70,063	-\$4,380
Nevada	\$139,245	\$147,369	\$157,263	\$18,018
New Hampshire	\$46,337	\$43,996	\$49,194	\$2,857
New Jersey	\$368,432	\$360,294	\$417,927	\$49,495
New Mexico	\$130,745	\$129,392	\$135,700	\$4,955
New York	\$1,196,039	\$1,221,069	\$1,319,754	\$123,715
North Carolina	\$476,487	\$493,733	\$532,882	\$56,395
North Dakota	\$40,357	\$43,267	\$45,823	\$5,466
Ohio	\$593,749	\$597,709	\$618,532	\$24,783
Oklahoma	\$199,914	\$201,507	\$211,951	\$12,037
Oregon	\$150,328	\$146,243	\$145,025	-\$5,303
Pennsylvania	\$662,525	\$706,423	\$697,679	\$35,154
Rhode Island	\$55,157	\$55,605	\$57,212	\$2,055
South Carolina	\$276,490	\$269,753	\$285,457	\$8,967
South Dakota	\$50,504	\$51,071	\$54,600	\$4,096
Tennessee	\$328,541	\$323,379	\$349,664	\$21,123
Texas	\$1,625,608	\$1,594,652	\$1,785,415	\$159,807
Utah	\$82,296	\$87,155	\$74,465	-\$7,831
Vermont	\$37,700	\$37,507	\$40,146	\$2,446
Virginia	\$277,073	\$291,449	\$300,720	\$23,647
Washington	\$250,340	\$273,416	\$282,409	\$32,069
West Virginia	\$101,239	\$98,787	\$107,169	\$5,930
Wisconsin	\$205,539	\$212,706	\$215,867	\$10,328
Wyoming	\$40,151	\$39,496	\$41,800	\$1,649
Total	\$16,125,449	\$16,349,952	\$17,338,952	\$1,213,503

Source: Skinner and Sorenson (2022a, 8–10, Table I; 2022b, 8–10, Table I; and 2023, 8–10, Table I).

Table A4. Community Development Block Grants by State, 2020–22

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2021	Funding, 2022	Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$44,626,179	\$45,533,283	\$44,158,556	–\$467,623
Alaska	\$4,976,744	\$5,296,920	\$4,590,870	–\$385,874
Arizona	\$56,906,184	\$57,963,616	\$55,356,374	–\$1,549,810
Arkansas	\$26,523,574	\$27,134,850	\$26,563,807	\$40,233
California	\$399,993,156	\$398,769,758	\$381,293,287	–\$18,699,869
Colorado	\$37,896,751	\$38,092,821	\$37,645,723	–\$251,028
Connecticut	\$41,096,539	\$36,176,508	\$40,199,886	–\$896,653
Delaware	\$7,427,027	\$7,646,656	\$7,638,103	\$211,076
Florida	\$153,939,763	\$158,688,850	\$152,459,305	–\$1,480,458
Georgia	\$85,869,451	\$86,378,794	\$82,804,969	–\$3,064,482
Hawaii	\$13,492,330	\$13,685,479	\$13,205,737	–\$286,593
Idaho	\$12,789,630	\$13,124,372	\$12,611,606	–\$178,024
Illinois	\$167,234,413	\$168,912,727	\$161,278,814	–\$5,955,599
Indiana	\$68,571,900	\$69,464,914	\$67,181,115	–\$1,390,785
Iowa	\$38,299,716	\$39,005,513	\$37,962,982	–\$336,734
Kansas	\$26,536,756	\$27,055,039	\$26,013,702	–\$523,054
Kentucky	\$44,337,478	\$45,541,883	\$44,204,926	–\$132,552
Louisiana	\$49,635,579	\$50,848,116	\$50,469,353	\$833,774
Maine	\$18,251,190	\$18,458,178	\$17,853,902	–\$397,288
Maryland	\$52,485,834	\$53,241,233	\$51,657,671	–\$828,163
Massachusetts	\$103,249,553	\$104,853,327	\$99,927,709	–\$3,321,844
Michigan	\$124,996,694	\$126,352,569	\$121,757,076	–\$3,239,618
Minnesota	\$53,299,325	\$54,047,489	\$52,304,597	–\$994,728
Mississippi	\$29,497,586	\$29,836,251	\$28,391,180	–\$1,106,406
Missouri	\$64,597,895	\$66,408,827	\$64,247,056	–\$350,839
Montana	\$8,723,821	\$8,827,545	\$8,512,494	–\$211,327

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$18,493,511	\$18,521,834	\$17,721,758	-\$771,753
Nevada	\$22,982,618	\$23,420,150	\$22,742,632	-\$239,986
New Hampshire	\$12,736,381	\$13,013,793	\$12,679,450	-\$56,931
New Jersey	\$91,015,501	\$92,081,943	\$87,616,945	-\$3,398,556
New Mexico	\$18,678,780	\$19,166,198	\$18,236,316	-\$442,464
New York	\$327,929,334	\$333,107,801	\$316,245,280	-\$11,684,054
North Carolina	\$80,177,387	\$81,419,755	\$78,352,913	-\$1,824,474
North Dakota	\$5,643,072	\$5,713,905	\$5,582,868	-\$60,204
Ohio	\$154,608,199	\$156,488,864	\$150,995,099	-\$3,613,100
Oklahoma	\$28,419,847	\$29,156,960	\$27,713,906	-\$705,941
Oregon	\$35,977,295	\$36,453,434	\$34,879,947	-\$1,097,348
Pennsylvania	\$191,629,415	\$194,159,099	\$187,014,399	-\$4,615,016
Rhode Island	\$16,798,854	\$17,154,628	\$16,238,214	-\$560,640
South Carolina	\$38,660,341	\$39,505,256	\$38,103,423	-\$556,918
South Dakota	\$7,494,841	\$7,649,569	\$7,350,794	-\$144,047
Tennessee	\$51,607,996	\$52,643,820	\$50,269,398	-\$1,338,598
Texas	\$244,838,557	\$249,943,342	\$241,073,582	-\$3,764,975
Utah	\$21,704,636	\$22,132,013	\$21,578,530	-\$126,106
Vermont	\$8,010,349	\$8,207,806	\$8,027,729	\$17,380
Virginia	\$58,585,305	\$59,868,457	\$57,955,560	-\$629,745
Washington	\$58,689,830	\$59,085,252	\$57,156,789	-\$1,533,041
West Virginia	\$21,311,806	\$21,628,689	\$21,049,356	-\$262,450
Wisconsin	\$63,416,585	\$60,759,005	\$58,438,232	-\$4,978,353
Wyoming	\$3,687,395	\$4,142,988	\$2,993,688	-\$693,707
Total	\$3,318,352,903	\$3,356,770,079	\$3,230,307,608	-\$88,045,295

Note: This table includes state and entitlement grants but not increases in Community Development Block Grant funding from the 2020 Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act.

Source: HUD (n.d.).

Table A5. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Grants by State, 2020–22

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2021	Funding, 2022	Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$19,855,847	\$19,615,763	\$22,534,578	\$2,678,731
Alaska	\$109,349,819	\$110,522,483	\$129,998,595	\$20,648,776
Arizona	\$61,152,340	\$63,945,095	\$73,589,268	\$12,436,928
Arkansas	\$909,451,203	\$919,430,956	\$1,064,010,699	\$154,559,496
California	\$65,420,821	\$67,060,009	\$77,580,688	\$12,159,867
Colorado	\$42,158,524	\$42,023,125	\$48,673,177	\$6,514,653
Connecticut	\$14,212,694	\$14,581,140	\$16,440,613	\$2,227,919
Delaware	\$367,447,832	\$369,769,893	\$433,692,363	\$66,244,531
Florida	\$179,402,733	\$181,353,412	\$220,199,032	\$40,796,299
Georgia	\$9,551,038	\$9,506,899	\$11,197,375	\$1,646,337
Hawaii	\$28,030,122	\$28,105,034	\$33,291,319	\$5,261,197
Idaho	\$24,036,587	\$24,120,879	\$27,733,126	\$3,696,539
Illinois	\$189,997,954	\$190,102,697	\$223,369,471	\$33,371,517
Indiana	\$103,748,146	\$106,319,735	\$139,595,766	\$35,847,620
Iowa	\$41,548,152	\$42,126,277	\$48,203,934	\$6,655,782
Kansas	\$40,104,440	\$41,542,295	\$47,685,007	\$7,580,567
Kentucky	\$82,795,276	\$81,965,297	\$94,544,252	\$11,748,976
Louisiana	\$103,378,717	\$104,101,298	\$121,248,217	\$17,869,500
Maine	\$15,827,563	\$16,225,224	\$18,682,160	\$2,854,597
Maryland	\$105,187,258	\$106,321,444	\$122,025,675	\$16,838,417
Massachusetts	\$77,040,618	\$78,924,800	\$93,556,434	\$16,515,816
Michigan	\$172,584,590	\$174,641,257	\$204,233,546	\$31,648,956
Minnesota	\$90,604,035	\$90,880,188	\$106,115,817	\$15,511,782
Mississippi	\$78,105,862	\$78,175,319	\$92,934,960	\$14,829,098
Missouri	\$79,605,558	\$80,083,199	\$90,370,338	\$10,764,780
Montana	\$14,835,795	\$14,571,230	\$16,674,845	\$1,839,050

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$29,813,684	\$30,079,463	\$35,088,485	\$5,274,801
Nevada	\$45,608,882	\$45,746,083	\$52,843,847	\$7,234,965
New Hampshire	\$9,435,731	\$9,602,440	\$10,854,728	\$1,418,997
New Jersey	\$140,945,583	\$144,309,833	\$170,426,791	\$29,481,208
New Mexico	\$37,679,996	\$40,424,137	\$43,357,368	\$5,677,372
New York	\$430,351,499	\$429,891,734	\$502,881,919	\$72,530,420
North Carolina	\$179,978,478	\$182,602,409	\$214,541,604	\$34,563,126
North Dakota	\$12,041,389	\$12,365,968	\$14,579,247	\$2,537,858
Ohio	\$140,594,951	\$140,981,951	\$161,784,208	\$21,189,257
Oklahoma	\$52,913,116	\$54,478,614	\$62,753,792	\$9,840,676
Oregon	\$65,514,654	\$67,242,014	\$78,037,615	\$12,522,961
Pennsylvania	\$180,098,215	\$185,488,795	\$215,524,737	\$35,426,522
Rhode Island	\$16,894,954	\$17,092,823	\$19,767,250	\$2,872,296
South Carolina	\$81,199,053	\$81,133,902	\$94,347,071	\$13,148,018
South Dakota	\$17,216,479	\$17,143,308	\$20,044,596	\$2,828,117
Tennessee	\$108,040,017	\$113,704,125	\$134,248,554	\$26,208,537
Texas	\$479,049,428	\$481,621,830	\$548,285,947	\$69,236,519
Utah	\$37,233,712	\$37,449,030	\$42,224,484	\$4,990,772
Vermont	\$12,296,719	\$12,240,446	\$14,505,487	\$2,208,768
Virginia	\$85,985,612	\$86,839,217	\$99,321,256	\$13,335,644
Washington	\$124,326,014	\$128,733,426	\$147,524,285	\$23,198,271
West Virginia	\$33,753,317	\$33,893,704	\$40,296,747	\$6,543,430
Wisconsin	\$78,909,721	\$80,390,323	\$95,028,073	\$16,118,352
Wyoming	\$7,871,858	\$7,798,759	\$8,415,682	\$543,824
Total	\$5,532,600,499	\$5,596,774,903	\$6,522,585,589	\$989,985,090

Source: FNS (2023).

Table A6. Substance Use Prevention, Treatment, and Recovery Services Block Grants by State, 2020–22

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2021	Funding, 2022	Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$23,284,320	\$63,592,296	\$23,487,098	\$202,778
Alaska	\$3,668,600	\$15,418,669	\$5,889,392	\$2,220,792
Arizona	\$43,139,347	\$112,764,746	\$40,825,200	–\$2,314,147
Arkansas	\$3,668,600	\$37,690,895	\$13,921,593	\$10,252,993
California	\$251,213,101	\$702,421,754	\$254,824,867	\$3,611,766
Colorado	\$32,732,766	\$80,559,241	\$29,312,690	–\$3,420,076
Connecticut	\$18,476,023	\$50,716,133	\$18,609,574	\$133,551
Delaware	\$3,867,724	\$19,427,428	\$7,364,538	\$3,496,814
Florida	\$112,055,687	\$309,005,551	\$111,385,315	–\$670,372
Georgia	\$57,635,273	\$158,724,904	\$57,551,669	–\$83,604
Hawaii	\$7,631,606	\$23,863,069	\$8,979,047	\$1,347,441
Idaho	\$7,857,688	\$23,872,697	\$8,932,664	\$1,074,976
Illinois	\$62,295,227	\$187,405,556	\$68,045,797	\$5,750,570
Indiana	\$30,807,730	\$89,622,261	\$32,644,193	\$1,836,463
Iowa	\$13,204,014	\$36,496,716	\$13,490,420	\$286,406
Kansas	\$12,104,947	\$33,196,410	\$12,296,670	\$191,723
Kentucky	\$20,550,614	\$56,703,127	\$20,775,840	\$225,226
Louisiana	\$24,632,180	\$69,582,109	\$25,424,148	\$791,968
Maine	\$6,760,610	\$19,393,095	\$7,364,538	\$603,928
Maryland	\$30,060,015	\$94,744,448	\$34,478,191	\$4,418,176
Massachusetts	\$40,229,851	\$110,733,935	\$40,243,602	\$13,751
Michigan	\$56,516,318	\$155,573,896	\$56,452,247	–\$64,071
Minnesota	\$21,254,480	\$68,922,347	\$25,490,129	\$4,235,649
Mississippi	\$8,583,886	\$38,190,058	\$14,200,673	\$5,616,787
Missouri	\$26,454,192	\$73,853,186	\$26,946,274	\$492,082
Montana	\$6,147,950	\$18,135,347	\$7,364,538	\$1,216,588

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$6,249,282	\$21,211,676	\$8,038,018	\$1,788,736
Nevada	\$14,260,914	\$46,797,186	\$17,400,676	\$3,139,762
New Hampshire	\$7,155,296	\$19,454,035	\$7,364,538	\$209,242
New Jersey	\$43,943,631	\$133,573,090	\$48,463,155	\$4,519,524
New Mexico	\$8,226,183	\$26,559,366	\$9,961,995	\$1,735,812
New York	\$112,723,667	\$310,131,745	\$112,232,468	-\$491,199
North Carolina	\$39,383,451	\$121,315,140	\$45,390,704	\$6,007,253
North Dakota	\$6,079,696	\$18,234,989	\$6,930,266	\$850,570
Ohio	\$64,880,995	\$178,804,628	\$64,935,588	\$54,593
Oklahoma	\$17,402,859	\$47,763,319	\$17,546,632	\$143,773
Oregon	\$22,792,246	\$57,394,140	\$20,975,823	-\$1,816,423
Pennsylvania	\$59,599,723	\$163,889,078	\$59,499,759	-\$99,964
Rhode Island	\$5,548,107	\$21,244,237	\$7,995,251	\$2,447,144
South Carolina	\$21,524,171	\$65,997,378	\$24,115,420	\$2,591,249
South Dakota	\$6,153,699	\$16,883,962	\$6,438,402	\$284,703
Tennessee	\$32,191,130	\$88,867,342	\$32,376,340	\$185,210
Texas	\$147,950,120	\$402,378,668	\$145,112,856	-\$2,837,264
Utah	\$23,254,669	\$46,273,753	\$16,985,842	-\$6,268,827
Vermont	\$6,982,034	\$18,032,613	\$6,856,588	-\$125,446
Virginia	\$42,299,521	\$116,712,977	\$42,378,537	\$79,016
Washington	\$30,769,158	\$104,952,157	\$38,183,070	\$7,413,912
West Virginia	\$4,633,959	\$21,047,627	\$8,829,500	\$4,195,541
Wisconsin	\$27,427,864	\$75,686,646	\$27,595,818	\$167,954
Wyoming	\$3,903,411	\$11,789,716	\$4,594,150	\$690,739
Total	\$1,680,168,536	\$4,785,605,343	\$1,746,502,303	\$66,333,767

Source: TAGGS (n.d.).

Table A7. Clean Water State Revolving Fund Grants by State, 2020–22

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2021	Funding, 2022	Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$17,949,000	\$17,946,000	\$13,069,000	–\$4,880,000
Alaska	\$9,607,000	\$9,606,000	\$6,995,000	–\$2,612,000
Arizona	\$10,842,000	\$10,840,000	\$7,894,000	–\$2,948,000
Arkansas	\$10,500,000	\$10,499,000	\$7,646,000	–\$2,854,000
California	\$114,801,000	\$114,785,000	\$83,589,000	–\$31,212,000
Colorado	\$12,840,000	\$12,838,000	\$9,349,000	–\$3,491,000
Connecticut	\$19,664,000	\$19,662,000	\$14,318,000	–\$5,346,000
Delaware	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	–\$2,142,000
Florida	\$54,183,000	\$54,175,000	\$39,452,000	–\$14,731,000
Georgia	\$27,140,000	\$27,136,000	\$19,761,000	–\$7,379,000
Hawaii	\$12,432,000	\$12,430,000	\$9,052,000	–\$3,380,000
Idaho	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	–\$2,142,000
Illinois	\$72,597,000	\$72,587,000	\$52,859,000	–\$19,738,000
Indiana	\$38,685,000	\$38,679,000	\$28,167,000	–\$10,518,000
Iowa	\$21,725,000	\$21,722,000	\$15,818,000	–\$5,907,000
Kansas	\$14,489,000	\$14,487,000	\$10,550,000	–\$3,939,000
Kentucky	\$20,429,000	\$20,427,000	\$14,875,000	–\$5,554,000
Louisiana	\$17,646,000	\$17,643,000	\$12,848,000	–\$4,798,000
Maine	\$12,426,000	\$12,424,000	\$9,047,000	–\$3,379,000
Maryland	\$38,823,000	\$38,817,000	\$28,268,000	–\$10,555,000
Massachusetts	\$54,499,000	\$54,491,000	\$39,682,000	–\$14,817,000
Michigan	\$69,019,000	\$69,010,000	\$50,254,000	–\$18,765,000
Minnesota	\$29,503,000	\$29,499,000	\$21,482,000	–\$8,021,000
Mississippi	\$14,462,000	\$14,460,000	\$10,530,000	–\$3,932,000
Missouri	\$44,498,000	\$44,492,000	\$32,400,000	–\$12,098,000
Montana	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	–\$2,142,000

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$8,210,000	\$8,209,000	\$5,978,000	-\$2,232,000
Nevada	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	-\$2,142,000
New Hampshire	\$16,041,000	\$16,039,000	\$11,680,000	-\$4,361,000
New Jersey	\$65,594,000	\$65,585,000	\$47,760,000	-\$17,834,000
New Mexico	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	-\$2,142,000
New York	\$177,173,000	\$177,146,000	\$129,000,000	-\$48,173,000
North Carolina	\$28,970,000	\$28,966,000	\$21,093,000	-\$7,877,000
North Dakota	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	-\$2,142,000
Ohio	\$90,364,000	\$90,352,000	\$65,796,000	-\$24,568,000
Oklahoma	\$12,968,000	\$12,967,000	\$9,443,000	-\$3,525,000
Oregon	\$18,133,000	\$18,130,000	\$13,203,000	-\$4,930,000
Pennsylvania	\$63,583,000	\$63,575,000	\$46,296,000	-\$17,287,000
Rhode Island	\$10,778,000	\$10,777,000	\$7,848,000	-\$2,930,000
South Carolina	\$16,444,000	\$16,442,000	\$11,973,000	-\$4,471,000
South Dakota	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	-\$2,142,000
Tennessee	\$23,318,000	\$23,315,000	\$16,978,000	-\$6,340,000
Texas	\$73,366,000	\$73,356,000	\$53,419,000	-\$19,947,000
Utah	\$8,458,000	\$8,457,000	\$6,158,000	-\$2,300,000
Vermont	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	-\$2,142,000
Virginia	\$32,850,000	\$32,846,000	\$23,919,000	-\$8,931,000
Washington	\$27,914,000	\$27,910,000	\$20,325,000	-\$7,589,000
West Virginia	\$25,023,000	\$25,019,000	\$18,219,000	-\$6,804,000
Wisconsin	\$43,395,000	\$43,389,000	\$31,597,000	-\$11,798,000
Wyoming	\$7,880,000	\$7,879,000	\$5,738,000	-\$2,142,000
Total	\$1,552,261,000	\$1,552,046,000	\$1,130,232,000	-\$422,029,000

Source: EPA (n.d.a and n.d.b); and Deane (2022), 1.

Table A8. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B, § 611 Grants, 2020–22

State	Funding, 2020	Funding, 2021	Funding, 2022	Change, 2020–22
Alabama	\$197,300,000	\$199,800,000	\$205,400,000	\$8,100,000
Alaska	\$40,400,000	\$41,000,000	\$42,400,000	\$2,000,000
Arizona	\$226,000,000	\$230,600,000	\$236,800,000	\$10,800,000
Arkansas	\$121,500,000	\$123,100,000	\$128,800,000	\$7,300,000
California	\$1,327,800,000	\$1,344,400,000	\$1,376,800,000	\$49,000,000
Colorado	\$176,600,000	\$178,800,000	\$185,700,000	\$9,100,000
Connecticut	\$144,500,000	\$146,400,000	\$150,500,000	\$6,000,000
Delaware	\$39,400,000	\$40,000,000	\$41,400,000	\$2,000,000
Florida	\$702,300,000	\$711,000,000	\$744,800,000	\$42,500,000
Georgia	\$381,000,000	\$385,800,000	\$400,000,000	\$19,000,000
Hawaii	\$43,200,000	\$43,800,000	\$45,700,000	\$2,500,000
Idaho	\$62,500,000	\$63,300,000	\$65,900,000	\$3,400,000
Illinois	\$549,800,000	\$556,700,000	\$570,900,000	\$21,100,000
Indiana	\$281,100,000	\$284,600,000	\$299,200,000	\$18,100,000
Iowa	\$132,800,000	\$134,400,000	\$138,300,000	\$5,500,000
Kansas	\$115,900,000	\$117,400,000	\$123,100,000	\$7,200,000
Kentucky	\$171,700,000	\$173,800,000	\$182,500,000	\$10,800,000
Louisiana	\$204,800,000	\$207,400,000	\$213,500,000	\$8,700,000
Maine	\$59,500,000	\$60,300,000	\$61,900,000	\$2,400,000
Maryland	\$217,400,000	\$220,100,000	\$230,600,000	\$13,200,000
Massachusetts	\$308,700,000	\$312,600,000	\$321,500,000	\$12,800,000
Michigan	\$433,800,000	\$439,300,000	\$448,700,000	\$14,900,000
Minnesota	\$206,100,000	\$208,700,000	\$219,200,000	\$13,100,000
Mississippi	\$130,100,000	\$131,800,000	\$134,600,000	\$4,500,000
Missouri	\$247,000,000	\$250,100,000	\$257,200,000	\$10,200,000
Montana	\$41,200,000	\$41,700,000	\$43,200,000	\$2,000,000

(Continued on the next page)

(Continued from the previous page)

Nebraska	\$81,200,000	\$82,200,000	\$84,600,000	\$3,400,000
Nevada	\$86,000,000	\$88,400,000	\$90,100,000	\$4,100,000
New Hampshire	\$51,600,000	\$52,200,000	\$53,700,000	\$2,100,000
New Jersey	\$393,100,000	\$398,000,000	\$409,300,000	\$16,200,000
New Mexico	\$99,000,000	\$100,300,000	\$103,100,000	\$4,100,000
New York	\$824,900,000	\$835,200,000	\$857,900,000	\$33,000,000
North Carolina	\$372,500,000	\$377,200,000	\$392,700,000	\$20,200,000
North Dakota	\$34,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,600,000	\$1,600,000
Ohio	\$474,300,000	\$480,200,000	\$493,500,000	\$19,200,000
Oklahoma	\$161,900,000	\$164,000,000	\$171,800,000	\$9,900,000
Oregon	\$136,500,000	\$141,600,000	\$148,500,000	\$12,000,000
Pennsylvania	\$462,900,000	\$468,700,000	\$482,100,000	\$19,200,000
Rhode Island	\$47,600,000	\$48,200,000	\$49,500,000	\$1,900,000
South Carolina	\$192,300,000	\$194,700,000	\$204,500,000	\$12,200,000
South Dakota	\$39,000,000	\$39,600,000	\$40,900,000	\$1,900,000
Tennessee	\$258,300,000	\$261,500,000	\$274,100,000	\$15,800,000
Texas	\$1,126,400,000	\$1,140,400,000	\$1,148,600,000	\$22,200,000
Utah	\$127,300,000	\$128,900,000	\$134,000,000	\$6,700,000
Vermont	\$32,800,000	\$33,700,000	\$34,300,000	\$1,500,000
Virginia	\$308,800,000	\$312,700,000	\$327,700,000	\$18,900,000
Washington	\$241,300,000	\$244,300,000	\$255,300,000	\$14,000,000
West Virginia	\$82,600,000	\$83,600,000	\$86,000,000	\$3,400,000
Wisconsin	\$226,100,000	\$228,900,000	\$234,900,000	\$8,800,000
Wyoming	\$34,400,000	\$35,400,000	\$36,000,000	\$1,600,000
Total, All States	\$12,457,200,000	\$12,621,800,000	\$13,017,300,000	\$560,100,000

Source: NEA (2020, 12 and 2022, 9).

References

- Ashwood, J. Scott, Karen Chan Osilla, Maria DeYoreo, Joshua Breslau, Jeanne S. Ringel, Cheryl K. Montemayor, Nima Shahidinia, David M. Adamson, Margaret Chamberlin, and M. Audrey Burnam. *Review and Evaluation of the Substance Abuse, Mental Health, and Homelessness Grant Formulas*. 2019. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2454.html.
- Aussenberg, Randy Alison, and Julia E. Kortrey. 2017. *A Primer on WIC: The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children*. Congressional Research Service. April 7. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R44115>.
- Children's Bureau. 2023. "Title IV-E Foster Care." US Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. May 10. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/grant-funding/title-iv-e-foster-care>.
- CMS (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services). 2022. *Financial Report FY 2022*. November. <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/cms-financial-report-fiscal-year-2022.pdf>.
- Corinth, Kevin, Bruce D. Meyer, and Derek Wu. 2022. "The Change in Poverty from 1995 to 2016 Among Single-Parent Families." *AEA Papers and Proceedings* 112 (May): 345–50. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pandp.20221043>.
- Deane, Michael. 2022. "FY 2022 CWSRF Base Allotment Availability." US Environmental Protection Agency. May 12. <https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2022-05/FY%202022%20CWSRF%20Base%20Allotment%20Availability.pdf>.
- DOL (US Department of Labor). n.d. "Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) and Wagner-Peyser Act Statutory Formulas for State Allotments." <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/budget/pdfs/FormDesc23.pdf>.
- DOT (US Department of Transportation). n.d. *Budget Estimates Fiscal Year 2023: Federal Highway Administration*. https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-03/FHWA_Budget_Estimates_FY23.pdf.
- Duff, Johnathan H. 2020. *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA): Overview of the Agency and Major Programs*. Congressional Research Service. June 23. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R46426>.
- EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). n.d.a. "FY 2020 CWSRF Allotments: \$1,638,826,000." https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-02/documents/fy2020_cwsrf_allotments.pdf.
- . n.d.b. "FY 2021 CWSRF Allotments: \$1,638,826,000." https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2021-03/documents/2021_cwsrf_allotments.pdf.
- Falk, Gene. 2023. *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Primer on TANF Financing and Federal Requirements*. August 14. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/RL/RL32748>.
- Falk, Gene, and Patrick A. Landers. 2023. *The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: Responses to Frequently Asked Questions*. Congressional Research Service. February 27. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/RL/RL32760>.
- FAPRI (Food & Agricultural Policy Research Institute). 2023. "Food Policy Bites: The Cost of a Free Lunch—Taking Stock of the National School Lunch Program Post-Pandemic." University of Missouri. February 22. <https://fapri.missouri.edu/publications/food-policy-bites-05>.
- FNS (Food and Nutrition Service). 2023. WIC Program Grant Levels by Fiscal Year, FY 2022. US Department of Agriculture. August 21. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/wic/program-grant-levels>.
- FRED (Federal Reserve Economic Data). 2023. Gross Domestic Product (GDP). March 30. <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/GDPA>.
- HHS (US Department of Health and Human Services). n.d. *Fiscal Year 2022 Budget in Brief: Strengthening Health and Opportunity for All Americans*. <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/fy-2022-budget-in-brief.pdf>.
- HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development). n.d. HUD Awards and Allocations. <https://www.hudexchange.info/grantees/allocations-awards>.
- Jaroscak, Joseph V. 2021. "Flexible Federal Funding: Examining the Community Development Block Grant Program and Its Impact on Addressing Local Challenges." Testimony before the House Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance. June 16. <https://democrats-financialservices.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hhrg-117-ba04-wstate-jaroscakj-20210616.pdf>.

- KFF (Kaiser Family Foundation). 2012. "Medicaid Financing: An Overview of the Federal Medicaid Matching Rate (FMAP)." September. <https://www.kff.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/8352.pdf>.
- Lawhorn, Julie M. 2019. *Federal Grants to State and Local Governments: A Historical Perspective on Contemporary Issues*. Congressional Research Service. May 22. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R40638>.
- Louis, Thomas A., Thomas B. Janie, and Marisa A. Gerstein, eds. 2003. *Statistical Issues in Allocating Funds by Formula*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/10580/chapter/14>.
- Maguire, Steven. 2009. *General Revenue Sharing: Background and Analysis*. Congressional Research Service. January 9. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/RL/RL31936>.
- NCLD (National Center for Learning Disabilities). 2022. "NCLD Applauds Congress for Increases in IDEA Funding for Fiscal Year 2023." Press Release. December 22. <https://www.ncl.org/news/ncl-applauds-congress-for-increases-in-idea-funding-for-fiscal-year-2023>.
- NEA (National Education Association). 2020. "Federal Education-Related Discretionary Programs: Final Appropriations, FY 2021." December 22. <https://www.nea.org/sites/default/files/2021-01/FY21%20Final%20Appropriations%20for%20Education%20Related%20Discretionary%20Programs%20with%20State%20Tables.pdf>.
- . 2022. "Federal Education-Related Discretionary Programs: Final Appropriations, FY 2023." December 23. <https://www.nea.org/sites/default/files/2023-01/final-fy23-appropriations-for-education-related-discretionary-programs-with-state-tables.pdf>.
- PGPF (Peter G. Peterson Foundation). 2023. "How Much Funding Do State and Local Governments Receive from the Federal Government?" July 20. <https://www.pgpf.org/blog/2023/07/how-much-funding-do-state-and-local-governments-receive-from-the-federal-government>.
- Ramseur, Jonathan L. 2023. *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Allotment Formula: Background and Options*. Congressional Research Service. March 15. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47474>.
- Skinner, Rebecca R., and Leah Rosenstiel. 2018. *Allocation of Funds Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Congressional Research Service. September 17. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R44461>.
- Skinner, Rebecca R., and Isobel Sorenson. 2022a. *FY2020 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. Congressional Research Service. April 22. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47078>.
- . 2022b. *FY2021 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. Congressional Research Service. May 16. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47111>.
- . 2023. *FY2022 State Grants Under Title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*. Congressional Research Service. June 14. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47598>.
- TAGGS (Tracking Accountability in Government Grant System). n.d. Block Grants for Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse, Assistance Listing. US Department of Health and Human Services. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. https://tags.hhs.gov/Detail/CFDADetail?arg_CFDA_NUM=93959.
- US Census Bureau. 2021a. "New Vintage 2021 Population Estimates Available for the Nation, States and Puerto Rico." Press Release. December 21. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2021/2021-population-estimates.html>.
- . 2021b. SAIPE Datasets. October 8. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe/data/datasets.All.List_1743592724.html#list-tab-List_1743592724.
- . 2023. State Population Totals and Components of Change: 2020–2022. June 13. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2020s-state-total.html>.

Robert Doar, President; Scott Winship, Director of the AEI Center on Opportunity and Social Mobility; Kevin Corinth, Editor, Perspectives on Opportunity

The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, 501(c)(3) educational organization and does not take institutional positions on any issues. The views expressed here are those of the author(s).

© 2023 by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. All rights reserved.