

STATE-BY-STATE DATA ON FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS:
REPORT TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

May 8, 1991

The Congress of the United States
Congressional Budget Office

PREFACE

This report by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) was prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The requirement for the report appeared in Section 24 of Senate Resolution 62, the Senate Committee Funding Resolution. This section expressed the sense of the Senate that better historical information should be available on state-by-state distributions of funds under programs for which funds are provided in accordance with a formula for distribution.

Philip Joyce of CBO's Budget Process Unit wrote the report, under the supervision of Marvin Phaup and James L. Blum. The author is indebted to knowledgeable people in the various organizations discussed in the report, including Larry Hush of the Office of Management and Budget, David Kellerman of the Census Bureau, Vic Miller of Federal Funds Information for States, and Stuart Rabinowitz of Fiscal Planning Services Incorporated. Within CBO, valuable comments were provided by Thomas Cuny, Gail Del Balzo, Robert Hartman, C. G. Nuckols, Charles Seagrave, and Paul Van de Water. The report was edited by Frank Pierce.

Questions concerning this report should be directed to Philip Joyce at 226-2837.

Robert D. Reischauer
Director

May 1991

INTRODUCTION

This report focuses on the availability of data on the state-by-state distribution of formula grant funds. The objective, as stated in Senate Resolution 62, is the receipt of such data by the United States Senate for the most recent available fiscal year (for ongoing programs) or the receipt of data on prospective impacts (in the case of new programs). This report focuses primarily on retrospective, rather than prospective, data.

The report defines formula grant programs, surveys the sources of current data on the funding of those programs, reviews the extent to which the Congress currently receives and uses such information, and evaluates the feasibility of using these sources to provide the Senate with better historical information on the distribution of formula funds, by state.

DEFINING FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

Numerous forms of federal assistance are available to governments, nonprofit organizations, private concerns and individuals. The authoritative source of information regarding these programs is the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA), published by the General

Services Administration. The CFDA classifies available assistance by type, including formula grants, project grants, direct loans, guaranteed loans, direct payments to individuals, and other types.

This report uses the CFDA definition of formula grant because it is the one applied by federal agencies in determining whether a program is, from their perspective, a formula grant program. This definition is by no means universally accepted or applied. For example, the CFDA definition encompasses a wide range of programs that are generally thought of as entitlements, such as Medical Assistance, in which the "grant" is provided on a cost reimbursement basis. In addition, however, the definition includes programs in which direct grants are made solely in response to a formula. For example, funds might be distributed solely on the basis of population. Generally speaking, the state-by-state distributions for the latter type of grant are more stable over time than cost reimbursement grants, absent a change in the formula.

The CFDA defines a formula grant program as follows:

Allocation of money to states or their subdivisions in accordance with a distribution formula prescribed by law or administrative

regulation for activities of a continuing nature not confined to a specific project.¹

This definition is consistent with the language of S. Res. 62, which specifies formula programs as those in which funds are provided "in accordance with a formula for distribution." The CFDA definition provides some clarification of this definition, both by identifying the formula as prescribed in law or regulation and by emphasizing the continuing nature of the activities funded.

Currently, 146 grant programs meet the CFDA definition of a formula grant. In addition, the Catalog lists 616 project grant programs. Project grants differ from formula grants in that they are for specific projects for fixed periods. This report focuses on the 146 formula programs, primarily on the availability of data for previous years. Where data sources provide information for current, budget, or future years, these will be discussed as well.

Table 1 provides information on the fiscal year 1990 obligations for the 15 largest programs meeting the CFDA

1. General Services Administration, 1990 Update, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (1990), p. xvi.

definition of a formula grant program. The top three programs--Medical Assistance, Highway Planning and Construction, and Family Support Payments--accounted for over \$65 billion in obligations. Altogether, these 15 programs obligated more than 80 percent of total formula grant allocations in 1990, or \$92.2 billion out of \$112.5 billion.

CURRENT SOURCES OF FORMULA GRANT DATA

There are four principal sources of governmentwide data on state-by-state distributions under CFDA formula grant programs: the Bureau of the Census; the Office of Management and Budget; Federal Funds Information for States, affiliated with the National Governors Association Center for Policy Research² and the National Conference of State Legislatures; and FEDFACTS, an information service provided by Fiscal Planning Services, Inc., a private consulting firm.

2. The Center is a nonprofit organization that exists independently of the National Governors Association.

Table 1

Rank Order of Top 15 Formula Grant Programs
(Fiscal year 1990 obligations, in thousands of dollars)

CFDA Number	Agency	Program	Obligation
93.778	HHS	Medical Assistance	40,690,085
20.205	DOT	Highway Planning/Const.	14,123,642
93.020	HHS	Family Support Payments	11,128,099
84.010	Educ.	Chapter 1 - Local Educ.	4,769,059
10.555	DOA	National School Lunch	3,229,951
93.667	HHS	Social Services Block	2,762,200
17.250	DOL	Job Training Partnership	2,449,930
10.557	DOA	Supplemental Food - WIC	2,123,088
14.218	HUD	CDBG - Entitlement	2,069,670
17.225	DOL	Unemployment Insurance	1,801,074
20.507	DOT	Urban Mass Transportation	1,637,391
84.126	Educ.	Rehabilitation Services	1,524,677
93.028	HHS	Low Income Energy Assist.	1,442,999
84.027	Educ.	Handicapped State Grants	1,259,160
93.658	HHS	Foster Care (Title IV-E)	<u>1,200,061</u>
Total: Obligations for 15 Largest Programs			92,211,086
All 1990 Formula Grant Obligations			112,538,929

SOURCES: Data on individual programs from Office of Management and Budget, Fiscal Year 1992 Budget, Budget Information for the States. Obligations for all programs calculated by CBO (see the Appendix to this report). Sources in addition to OMB include the Bureau of the Census and the General Services Administration.

The Bureau of the Census

The Census Bureau prepares three reports annually on the historical distribution of federal funds, by state. These are each part of the Consolidated Federal Funds Report series. The first, Federal Expenditures by State, shows federal spending for grant and other selected programs for the most recent fiscal year. The second and third volumes of the series show the distribution of federal spending for selected programs by county areas and by local government jurisdictions.

The Consolidated Federal Funds Report series is mandated by Public Law 99-547 (31 USC 6201), which requires the Office of Management and Budget to prepare the report not later than 180 days after the end of each fiscal year. The Census Bureau serves as the agency representative of the OMB for the purposes of preparing the report, which is to contain information on both obligations and actual expenditures in each "state, county or parish, congressional district, and municipality of the United States...in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the report is made." The reports are made available to the general public in printed form and to the states and the Congress in both

printed and machine-readable form. The machine-readable reports are provided, by law, to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House Committee on Administration. The printed reports are typically issued in March of each year, while the machine-readable reports are usually made available within 90 days of the end of each calendar year. The Congress authorized the collection and dissemination of such data for the years 1986 through 1990, and has not yet reauthorized it for 1991 and beyond.

The reports are compiled by collecting information from agencies that manage various federal programs. The information is entered into an automated data base, from which the reports are generated.

The data provided by the Federal Expenditures by State volume and the two other volumes are substantially different. The underlying data for the latter two volumes (including formula grant data) are collected using the Federal Assistance Awards Data System (FAADS). The Census Bureau assembles FAADS by collecting obligation data quarterly from all agencies with CFDA programs. The data focus exclusively on previous years, and have been collected by Census since 1982. The published report summarizes the data by county and

municipality. It is not possible, however, to distinguish between individual grant programs in the printed report. It is possible to get retrospective information on individual formula grant obligations, by state, from the underlying database (FAADS). The FAADS database includes the following data (among others) that are most relevant to determining the geographic distribution of federal funds:

- CFDA program number;
- Recipient city code, county code, state code, zip code and Congressional district code;³
- Recipient city name, county name and state name;
- Amount of assistance;
- Type of assistance (formula grant, project grant, etc.); and
- Principal place of performance (city, county, etc. in which the project was funded).⁴

3. The codes are two- to nine-digit standard Census identifiers (commonly called FIPS codes) for the various jurisdictions.

4. The place of performance may differ from the location of the award in some cases. One example would be if funds "passed through" a state on their way to a local government. In this case, the state would be the recipient, while the local government would be the place of performance.

The grant data collected for the Federal Expenditures by State report differ from those in the other volumes in that they report outlay rather than obligation data and are collected by budget account number rather than by CFDA number. This makes it impossible in most cases to trace the data in the report to the individual CFDA formula grant level. Only in cases where a budget account and CFDA number represent precisely the same program, and the data for that program are collected, will the Federal Expenditures by State report provide the needed information on individual formula grants. The underlying database for the report is currently made available to the Congressional Research Service (CRS) and to the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition; these are the only two Congressional organizations that receive the data in an automated form. CRS and the Northeast-Midwest Coalition each use the data to respond to special requests from individual Congressional committees and offices.

OMB's Budget Information for States

Subsequent to the release of the President's budget each year, the OMB releases a document called Budget Information for the States (BIS). This document contains state-by-state data for all formula grant programs with

budget authority in excess of \$50 million. The report also covers various other programs that are not recognized as formula grants by the CFDA. The document contains data on actual distributions for the previous year, estimates for the current year, and projections for the budget year.

Unlike FAADS, the BIS reports current-year and budget-year data, permitting some prospective analysis. As with FAADS, data for the previous year are on an obligation basis. Further, while the previous-year data represent actual experience, the current-year and budget-year data reflect Presidential policy. This means that if (for example) the President is recommending the abolition of a program in the budget, the report shows each state as receiving no money for that program in the budget year. No attempt is made to show a current services allocation in addition to policy allocations. Finally, the BIS does not attempt to include all formula grants, as does FAADS, because reporting for programs of less than \$50 million is optional.

The printed BIS report is widely distributed. There is no underlying automated data base; the agencies that manage the various programs provide the information to

OMB, which reviews and compiles it for inclusion in the report.

Federal Funds Information for States

A third general source of centralized budgetary information on formula distributions by state is Federal Funds Information for States (FFIS), affiliated with the National Governors Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures. FFIS is a subscription service that is offered to states (FFIS reports 40 current state subscribers) and is heavily prospective. FFIS data are on a budget authority and outlay basis. The database currently covers an 11-year period, from fiscal year 1982 to fiscal year 1992. The focus of the service is the impact of federal actions on state and local government. Like BIS, FFIS does not report on many smaller programs. It makes current services estimates by program, including programs identified by the President for reduction or elimination. The data are coded by CFDA number, Treasury Account number, level of government, appropriations subcommittee, mandatory/discretionary status, and sequester status. This permits reporting on a wide variety of budgetary shifts. FFIS reports at least three times a year to its subscribers, as opposed to the annual reports made by Census and OMB.

The FFIS reports provide the subscribing states with data on 240 federal programs, including a subset of the 146 CFDA formula grant programs. They cover primarily the larger formula grant programs. The service also tracks approximately \$1.2 billion in shared revenues for programs that have no CFDA number. All data are provided in hard copy, but can also be received by subscribers on diskette, in a dBase III, Lotus, ASCII, or Supercalc format.

Currently, there are no Congressional subscribers to FFIS. Any Congressional committee or office that desired to receive data on all states would have to pay considerably more than each state subscriber, which primarily receives information only on its own state. The charge per state is currently \$6,750 to \$7,750 annually.

FEDFACTS

A fourth source of information on state-by-state distributions for formula grant programs is the private consulting firm Fiscal Planning Services, Inc. (FPSI), which provides information to state agencies and other recipients. Through its FEDFACTS information service, Fiscal Planning Services keeps subscribers updated both

on previous-year actual budget data and on the impact of proposed budgetary actions on state and local governments. Generally, four reports are prepared each year: at the time the President's budget is proposed; when the budget resolutions are reported by the Budget Committees; when the Congress has completed action on the budget resolution; and when the final budget is enacted.

FEDFACTS covers 426 federal programs, including 134 formula grant programs. The underlying database includes data from fiscal year 1981 to the present. Data are routinely presented for four years: actual data for the last full fiscal year; an estimate for the current year; and projections for the budget year and for one future year. FEDFACTS reports 15 states among its subscribers, as well as a number of territories, federal agencies, interest groups, and other public or nonprofit organizations. While individual Members of Congress may receive reports, data are not routinely provided to the Congress through any central distribution point. Reports are available both in hard copy and on computer diskette in dBase III, Lotus, and ASCII formats. The underlying database is not made available to subscribers. FEDFACTS tailors the material reported to the needs of the individual user, to the extent practicable. It

segregates funds going to a state government from funds going to the state as a whole, which include payments made to local governments and nonprofit agencies.

Data From Agencies

In addition to these four centralized sources, formula grant information should also be available from the agencies that administer these programs. In many cases, as noted above, the agencies already provide the information to the centralized data sources. They often provide data directly to Congressional committees and to Members as well. In the case of programs being considered for reauthorization, prospective information may or may not be available, depending on the agency.

Coverage of Formula Grant Programs

Table 2 summarizes the extent to which each of the four centralized data systems covers formula grant programs. It reports not only the number of formula grant programs that are covered by each source, but the total dollar value of covered programs. As the table indicates, the extent of Census and FEDFACTS coverage of the CFDA formula programs is greater than that of either the BIS

or the FFIS, primarily because the latter do not systematically collect data for smaller programs.⁵

Table 2
Extent of Coverage of Formula Grant Programs
by Four Sources (FY90, dollars in billions)

Source	Number of Grants Included	Dollars Included
Total CFDA Formula Grants	146	112.5
Census (FAADS)	131	110.3
BIS (OMB)	98	111.5
FFIS (NGA/NCSL)	104	111.2
FPSI (FEDFACTS)	134	112.3
Programs in All Four Systems	78	108.6

SOURCE: Tabulated from data listed in the Appendix.

The 1992 BIS report includes 1990 data on 98 of the 146 CFDA formula grant programs. Of the remaining 48, 42 were excluded because they obligated less than \$50 million in 1990; the remainder were excluded primarily because they did not meet the OMB definition of a grant

5. As noted above, the hard-copy Census publication does not report data by CFDA program; that information can be obtained only by using the automated FAADS system.

to a state or local government.⁶ FFIS reports data on 104 formula grant programs, and there is a great deal of overlap in coverage between this report and the BIS. The vast majority of programs with annual obligations in excess of \$50 million are covered by FFIS. The FEDFACTS service covers 134 formula grant programs; these programs account for over 99 percent of all formula grant obligations. Finally, the Census Bureau's FAADS system also currently reports data on 131 of the 146 formula grant programs. It is the goal of Census to report all of these programs; the missing programs represent a data collection problem, rather than a policy concern. The Census Bureau is attempting to rectify this situation, for the purpose of future reporting. All four of these systems, however, report on the largest formula programs. In fact, each of them covers programs accounting for more than 98 percent of total obligations. An advantage of

6. Some programs with less than \$50 million in obligations are nonetheless included in the BIS, at the option of the agency that manages the program. Agencies are only required to report to OMB on those programs with obligations in excess of \$50 million. The programs excluded from the 1992 report with 1990 obligations in excess of \$50 million were Crime Victims Assistance (\$65.8 million), Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (\$56.3 million), Native American Employment and Training (\$71.4 million), Veterans State Nursing Home Care (\$73.9 million), Cooperative Forestry Assistance (\$67.4 million), and the Clean Coal Technology Program (\$57.9 million). In each of these cases, OMB deliberately excluded the program from the BIS, primarily because of a variance between CFDA definition of a formula grant program, and that applied by OMB.

FAADS and FEDFACTS lies in their more extensive coverage of smaller programs. An advantage of FFIS is that reports are provided at a much lower level of aggregation for particular programs. For example, FFIS disaggregates federal aid to highways into 11 components, while only one of the other sources (FEDFACTS) includes data for even two subprograms of the highway program.

The Appendix to this report lists every CFDA formula grant program and identifies which are included in each of the four data systems.

CURRENT AVAILABILITY IN CONGRESS OF FORMULA GRANT DATA

As noted above, both the House and the Senate currently, by law, receive the machine-readable FAADS data from the Bureau of the Census. Both houses make these data available to Members and staff.

The House Information System makes these data available as part of the Member Information Network. The FAADS quarterly obligation data are available to Members and staff on-line. This includes information on any federal grant awarded during the previous four reported fiscal quarters, by program, state, county, city, and

Congressional district. This means that a limited amount of state-by-state data is available without need for a special request. Other data, including data on prior year awards (to the limits of the data collected in the FAADS system) are available through special request. The House Information System has recently released a new service to its users that will make significantly more of these data available on-line.

The Senate Computer Center makes the FAADS data available by request to Members, committees, subcommittees and offices. Reports are prepared according to the individual needs of the office making the request. Data are available at the national, state, county, city, and program levels. They may include, for example, information on all awards made in a particular state during a particular time period. They may also include data on awards made in each state for a particular assistance program. The system would, if requested, allow data to be provided to a Senator on the state-by-state distribution of awards for a given formula grant program. These data are available for each fiscal year beginning with 1981.

The outlay data used by Census to prepare the Federal Expenditures by State report are made available

annually on computer diskette to two entities within the Congress. The Congressional Research Service uses the data exclusively to respond to requests from the Congress for information on the distribution of federal funds by state or region. The Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition has, in the past, used the data in the preparation of special reports concerning the regional distribution of taxes and spending, as well as in responding to requests for information from members representing Northeast and Midwest states.⁷ The data do not allow reports to be prepared on state-by-state distributions of all formula grants, since they are not broken down by individual CFDA program.

FEASIBILITY OF PROVIDING FORMULA GRANT DATA

Historical Data

Any of the four sources described in this report would provide historical data on state-by-state formula grant allocations, to the extent of the source's coverage. As noted above, FEDFACTS and the Census Bureau's FAADS

⁷The most recent two reports using these data are: Keith Laughlin, The Flow of Federal Funds, 1981-1988 (Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1990); and Diane DeVaul and Heather Twomey, Federal Grant Programs: A Shrinking Resource (Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1990).

system offer the most extensive coverage; all sources, however, cover the vast majority of formula grant funds.

The most convenient and least costly source of these data would be the FAADS system. State-by-state historical data on formula grants are currently available to Senators from the Senate Computing Center on a request basis. The data could be provided routinely, either by the Computing Center or by the Census Bureau. In either case, providing an annual report to all Senators on the state-by-state historical distribution of expenditures for 146 programs would not be costly. It would be more costly for Committees or Senators to collect these data on a case-by-case basis from the administering agencies, and doing so would duplicate information the agencies already provide to the Census Bureau. It would also be more costly for the Senate to contract with either of the nonfederal services for historical data.

One possible advantage to having the Census Bureau prepare a routine report (as opposed to the Senate Computing Center, for example) is that Census already has systems in place to verify the accuracy of the data. Part of the service provided by Census, in other words, would include a check of the data for accuracy. Census is better positioned than the Senate Computing Center to

perform this function, since the Bureau has an ongoing relationship with the agencies that manage the programs and produce the data. The Senate Computer Center, on the other hand, may be more directly accountable to Senate data users.

There are some drawbacks to using the FAADS data. First, Census does not currently collect data for all CFDA programs: data are currently missing on 16 formula grant programs, among others. The bureau is attempting to rectify this situation; it expects to be able to report on the majority of these programs by the end of fiscal year 1991.

Second, because the FAADS system is an obligation system, some care needs to be taken in interpreting the data. For example, the timing of obligations may skew the apparent award of funds to a particular state in a particular year. Obligations for a given year may be the result of budget authority granted in previous years, making comparisons between obligations awarded by fiscal year particularly difficult.⁸ This problem might be

8. For example, if an agency awards a substantial amount of money for a program in the fourth quarter of a particular fiscal year, and then delays next year's awards until the first quarter of the ensuing fiscal year, it will seem as if there have been large fluctuations in funding although the actual differences may be insignificant.

rectified through the use of outlay data, but outlays are currently not identifiable in FAADS by individual formula grant program. The contractual services--FFIS and FEDFACTS--make more of an effort to account for these funding shifts in interpreting data for users. FFIS appears to tackle the problem most directly, by reporting data on a budget authority and outlay basis.

A third problem is that reconciling data in the FAADS system with data from other sources, such as the BIS, is often quite difficult. Even "actual" obligation data may differ from one source to another. In the case of large programs, the discrepancies are typically minor; for other programs, the degree of variation may be greater. In part, this is a function of the lack of a uniform federal accounting system, which results in data collected from one unit in an agency differing from data collected from another unit in the same agency. Other disparities between programs may simply be the result of comparing obligation data (such as that reported by FAADS, BIS, and FEDFACTS) with allocation or outlay data (such as that reported by FFIS or other sources).⁹ Users need to understand the assumptions underlying the

9. For example, both the President's budget and the Census Bureau's Federal Expenditures by State report outlays. These are not easily reconciled with obligation data from FAADS, BIS, or FEDFACTS.

data. In particular, problems arise in comparing data from one source for one fiscal year with data from another source for another fiscal year. While CBO has not attempted to judge the accuracy of these data, users should bear in mind that the data are not collected and reported uniformly.

Finally, while the state-level data are fairly reliable, information as to suballocation of formula grant funds within a state is less complete than our information about the initial award to the state. While the states are often the primary recipients, the ultimate beneficiaries may be local governments or other organizations.

Prospective Data

The availability of data for future outlays is more limited than that of historical data. The FAADS system is strictly historical; it does not include any current or budget year data. BIS, FFIS, and FEDFACTS report such data, but only for a subset of formula grant programs. Further, the current and budget year data included in the BIS are consistent with Presidential budget policy--meaning that the BIS does not report prospective current services data (estimates of the cost of continuing

current programs) for programs recommended for reduction or abolition. FFIS and FEDFACTS are more likely to report current services data. FEDFACTS has the most extensive coverage of formula grant programs of the three systems that report prospective data. FFIS, on the other hand, provides data for certain programs in more detail, and reports data on a budget authority and outlay basis. Further, while the BIS reports data only once a year (with the submission of the President's budget), both FFIS and FEDFACTS provide updates at various stages of the budget process. While agencies could unilaterally produce such data, it would probably be less costly to expand the BIS to include current services data on all formula grant programs. Doing so might also potentially resolve the problem of data comparability, as at least one source would have thorough, consistent data on formula grant programs. A probable disadvantage in expanding the BIS would be that collection of more data would delay its release each year.

Care needs to be taken in using historical data to derive estimates of future formula allocations. The relationship between distributions in previous years and distributions in coming years is much clearer for some grant programs than for others. For a grant that is provided to states on a cost reimbursement basis, an

estimate of prospective state-by-state distributions would require knowledge of how many people would meet the eligibility requirements, by state, for that year. In the case of most other formula grant programs, on the other hand, a prior-year distribution approximates fairly well the distribution for future years, assuming no change in the formula. In this latter case, the decennial census will, however, cause some shifts in formula allocations.

CONCLUSION

The FAADS system would be the easiest system for the Senate to use in accessing detailed information on past allocations by state of formula grant dollars, since FAADS data are already provided to the Senate Computer Center. Preparation of a special report that covered only formula grant programs would not be difficult for either the Census or the Senate Computer Center. In either case, the costs involved would be for computer usage and printing of the report. Neither the Census Bureau nor the Computer Center estimates that there would be additional personnel costs. The FAADS data could be improved by collecting data on more programs and ensuring that the data are consistent with other sources. In

addition, the Senate might consider implementing an on-line system similar to that available to House Members through the Member Information Network.

Other sources of data exist as well, including the OMB, Federal Funds Information for States (FFIS), and FEDFACTS. The relative strength of these services lies in their coverage of prospective data. Further, both FFIS and FEDFACTS provide periodic updates of state-by-state budget impacts. These two services, however, would charge a fee to the Congress for the provision of state-by-state data. This cost represents one disadvantage of their use relative to Census or OMB. (Information is being provided on these services primarily for the sake of comprehensiveness, and should not be construed as an endorsement of these services.)

Two final caveats. There appear to be no other centralized sources of program-level data on formula grants by state, but it is possible that such other sources exist. Second, CBO has not verified the accuracy of the data from any of the four sources discussed. An important limitation on the use of these data is their lack of consistency.

For prospective information, fairly thorough coverage is provided by the OMB's Budget Information for States publication, the Federal Funds Information for States system, and the FEDFACTS system. The disadvantage of all of these sources is that they do not cover the full range of programs, and may reflect only Presidential policy in the budget year--notably in the case of BIS. If the BIS report was changed to incorporate the missing formula programs and to include current services projections for all programs this gap could be filled. Both FFIS and FEDFACTS are also capable of collecting data on these missing programs.

It is clear that data from any of these centralized sources would serve to meet the needs for historical data identified in the Senate resolution. It seems unnecessary to take a more decentralized approach to collecting these data by requiring agencies to report formula distributions directly to the Congress. Resources would probably be better spent on improving the accuracy and coverage of existing sources. In addition, committees and Senators could require that historical data already being provided to the Congress be transmitted for the Senate by either the Census Bureau or the Senate Computer Center in printed form, if greater routine provision of state-by-state data is a priority.

Appendix

Sources of Data on Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Formula Programs

CFDA Number	Program Description	FY90 Obligations (\$000) ¹	BIS ²	FFIS ³	Census ⁴	FPSI ⁵
10.202	Cooperative Forestry Research	<u>16,551</u>		X	X	X
10.203	Payments - Agricultural Experiment Stations	148,099	X	X	X	X
10.205	Payments - Land Grant Colleges	<u>23,922</u>		X	X	X
10.207	Animal Health and Disease Research	<u>5,226</u>			X	X
10.500	Cooperative Extension Service	369,180	X	X	X	X
10.553	School Breakfast Program	591,536	X	X	X	X
10.555	National School Lunch Program	3,229,951	X	X	X	X
10.556	Special Milk Program for Children	22,043	X	X	X	X
10.557	Supplemental Food - Women, Infants and Children	2,123,088	X	X	X	X
10.558	Child and Adult Care Food Program	814,440	X	X	X	X
10.559	Summer Food Service Program for Children	163,450	X	X	X	X
10.560	State Administrative Exp.- Child Nutrition	60,969	X	X	X	X
10.561	State Admin. Matching Grants - Food Stamps	1,139,227	X	X	X	X
10.564	Nutrition Education and Training Program	<u>4,990</u>		X	X	X
10.565	Commodity Supplemental Food Program	71,515	X	X	X	X
10.568	Temporary Emergency Food (Administration)	49,822	X	X	X	X
10.569	Temporary Emergency Food (Food Commodities)	119,573	X	X		
10.570	Nutrition Program for the Elderly	143,379	X	X		X
10.571	Food Commodities for Soup Kitchens	39,440	X			X
10.664	Cooperative Forestry Assistance	<u>67,374</u>		X	X	X
10.665	Schools and Roads - States	362,331	X	X	X	X

10.666	Schools and Roads - Counties	34,057		X	X	X
10.668	Additional Lands - Grants to Minnesota	(1,117)		X		X
11.407	Interjurisdictional Fisheries Act of 1986	<u>2,551</u>			X	X
11.419	Coastal Zone Management - Administrative Costs	<u>27,353</u>		X	X	X
12.112	Payments to States in Lieu of Real Estate Taxes	<u>5,890</u>		X	X	X
14.218	Community Development Block Grant - Entitlement	2,069,670	X	X	X	X
14.228	Community Development Block Grant - States	845,252	X	X	X	X
14.230	Rental Housing Rehabilitation	127,985	X	X	X	X
14.231	Emergency Shelter Grants Program	73,164	X	X	X	X
15.252	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	194,537	X	X	X	X
15.308	Grants for Mining and Mineral Resources and Research	<u>11,849</u>			X	
15.605	Sport Fish Restoration	202,680	X	X	X	X
15.611	Wildlife Restoration	126,041	X	X	X	X
15.805	Assistance to State Water Resources Research Institutes	<u>5,502</u>	X		X	X
16.540	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention - to States	<u>56,253</u>		X	X	X
16.575	Crime Victim Assistance	<u>65,781</u>		X	X	X
16.576	Crime Victim Compensation	<u>46,781</u>		X	X	X
16.579	Drug Control and System Improvement Formula Grant	395,101	X	X	X	X
17.207	Employment Service	779,039	X	X	X	X
17.225	Unemployment Insurance	1,801,074	X	X	X	X
17.235	Senior Community Service Employment Program	367,013	X		X	X
17.246	Employment and Training - Dislocated Workers	463,603	X	X		X
17.247	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	69,047	X		X	X
17.250	Job Training Partnership Act	2,449,930	X	X	X	X
17.251	Native American Employment and Training Programs	<u>71,362</u>			X	X
17.801	Disabled Veterans Outreach	73,788	X		X	X
17.804	Local Veterans Employment Representative Program	68,144	X			X
20.005	Boating Safety Financial Assistance	<u>27,256</u>		X	X	X

20.205	Highway Planning and Construction	14,123,642	X	X	X	X
20.218	Motor Carrier Safety Assistance	<u>47,632</u>			X	X
20.507	Urban Mass Transportation Capital and Operating Assistance	1,637,391	X	X	X	X
20.509	Public Transportation for Nonurbanized Areas	89,254	X	X	X	X
20.600	State and Community Highway Safety	125,022	X	X	X	X
20.700	Pipeline Safety	<u>4,299</u>			X	X
45.007	Promotion of the Arts - State Programs	<u>25,515</u>		X	X	X
64.014	Veterans State Domiciliary Care	<u>12,647</u>			X	X
64.015	Veterans State Nursing Home Care	<u>73,875</u>			X	X
64.016	Veterans State Hospital Care	<u>3,306</u>			X	X
66.001	Air Pollution Control Program Support	98,925	X	X	X	X
66.419	Water Pollution Control - State and Interstate Support	73,847	X	X	X	X
66.432	State Public Water System Supervision	40,022	X	X	X	X
66.433	State Underground Water Source Protection	10,552	X	X	X	X
66.438	Construction Management Assistance	67,425	X	X	X	X
66.454	Water Quality Management Planning	11,343	X	X	X	X
66.458	Capitalization Grants - State Revolving Funds	<u>1,159,004</u>	X	X		X
66.459	Nonpoint Source Reservation	13,262	X		X	X
66.460	Nonpoint Source Implementation	(5,000)				
66.600	Environmental Protection Consolidated Grants	<u>28,496</u>			X	
66.801	Hazardous Waste Management State Program Support	68,645	X	X	X	X
81.041	State Energy Conservation	<u>10,270</u>		X	X	X
81.042	Weatherization Assistance - Low Income Persons	161,964	X	X	X	X
81.050	Energy Extension Service	<u>3,998</u>		X	X	X
81.052	Energy Conservation for Institutional Buildings	<u>44,588</u>		X	X	X

81.096	Clean Coal Technology Program	<u>57,887</u>			X	
83.503	State and Local Emergency Management Assistance	60,182	X	X		X
83.523	Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program	130,092	X	X		X
84.002	Adult Education - State Basic Grant Program	157,811	X	X	X	X
84.009	Education of Handicapped Children in State Schools	147,124	X	X	X	X
84.010	Chapter 1 Programs - Local Educational Agencies	4,769,059	X	X	X	X
84.011	Migrant Education - State Formula Grants	283,544	X	X	X	X
84.012	Educationally Deprived Children (State Administration)	50,176	X	X	X	X
84.013	Chapter 1 Program - Neglected and Delinquent Children	33,194	X	X	X	X
84.027	Handicapped State Grants	1,259,160	X	X	X	X
84.034	Public Library Services	82,505	X	X	X	X
84.035	Interlibrary Cooperation	19,287	X	X	X	X
84.048	Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States	805,624	X	X	X	X
84.049	Vocational Education - Consumer and homemaking Education	34,517	X	X	X	X
84.053	Vocational Education - State Councils	7,923	X	X	X	X
84.069	Grants to States for State Student Incentives	59,242	X	X	X	X
84.126	Rehabilitation Services - Basic Support	1,524,677	X	X	X	X
84.146	Transition Program for Refugee Children	(15,808)			X	
84.151	Federal, State and Local Partnerships - Improvement	519,252	X	X	X	X
84.154	Public Library Construction	14,837	X	X	X	X
84.161	Client Assistance - Individuals With Handicaps	7,901	X		X	X
84.162	Emergency Immigrant Education	<u>30,144</u>		X	X	
84.164	Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education	150,538	X	X	X	X
84.169	Comprehensive Services for Independent Living	12,938	X		X	X
84.173	Handicapped Preschool Grants	221,511	X	X	X	X
84.174	Vocational Education - Community Based Organizations	10,939	X	X	X	X

84.176	Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarships	14,916	X		X	X
84.185	Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarships	8,686	X		X	X
84.186	Drug Free Schools and Communities Grants	460,474	X	X	X	X
84.187	Supported Employment Services - Handicapped	27,630	X		X	X
84.196	Education for Homeless Children and Youth	4,692	X	X	X	X
84.216	Capital Expenses (Education)	25,746	X	X	X	X
84.218	State Program Improvement Grants	12,544	X	X	X	X
84.223	English Literacy Program	9,745	X	X	X	X
93.020	Family Support Payments to States	11,128,099	X	X	X	X
93.021	Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training	459,221	X	X	X	X
93.023	Child Support Enforcement	1,063,572	X	X	X	X
93.025	State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants	300,942	X	X	X	X
93.028	Low-Income Home Energy Assistance	1,442,999	X	X	X	X
93.029	Work Incentive/WIN Demonstration Program	<u>710</u>		X	X	X
93.031	Community Services Block Grant	322,090	X	X	X	X
93.033	Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Awards	<u>963</u>			X	X
93.034	Emergency Community Services for the Homeless	21,855	X	X	X	X
93.138	Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals	(12,587)			X	X
93.146	Temporary AIDS Drug Reimbursements	34,311		X	X	X
93.150	Mental Health Services for the Homeless Block Grant	<u>27,813</u>		X	X	X
93.171	Community Youth Activity Program Block Grants	<u>4,772</u>			X	X
93.199	HIV Home and Community Based Health Services	(0)				
93.614	Child Development Associate Scholarships	<u>1,431</u>			X	X
93.630	Administration on Developmental Disabilities - Support/Advocacy	82,423	X	X	X	X
93.633	Special Programs for the Aging (Title III, Part B)	272,961	X	X	X	X

93.635	Special Programs for the Aging (Title III, Part C)	430,841	X	X	X	X
93.641	Special Programs for the Aging (Title III, Part D)	<u>5,769</u>			X	X
93.643	Children's Justice Grants to States	(3,579)				
93.645	Child Welfare Services	252,648	X	X	X	X
93.658	Foster Care (Title IV-E)	1,200,061	X	X	X	X
93.659	Adoption Assistance	124,855	X	X	X	X
93.667	Social Services Block Grant	2,762,200	X	X	X	X
93.669	Child Abuse and Neglect State Grants	(11,648)				X
93.671	Family Violence Prevention and Services	(8,219)				X
93.672	Child Abuse Challenge Grants	<u>7,703</u>			X	X
93.673	Grants to States - Planning & Development for Dependent Care	(11,856)				X
93.674	Independent Living	50,000	X		X	X
93.775	State Medicaid Fraud Control Units	<u>49,946</u>			X	X
93.777	Certification of Health Care Providers and Suppliers	91,214	X		X	X
93.778	Medical Assistance Program	40,690,085	X	X	X	X
93.962	Health Administration Graduate Traineeships	<u>487</u>			X	
93.963	Graduate Programs in Health Administration	<u>1,465</u>			X	
93.964	Traineeships for Students in Schools of Public Health	<u>2,957</u>			X	
93.991	Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant	83,176	X	X	X	X
93.992	Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Health Services BG	1,192,851	X	X	X	X
93.994	Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant	553,623	X	X	X	X

1. Most obligation data were obtained from the Office of Management and Budget's Budget Information for the States. Underlined numbers were obtained from the Bureau of the Census Financial Assistance Awards Data System (FAADS). Numbers in parentheses are estimates of FY90 obligations for these programs provided by the General Services Administration.

2. Office of Management and Budget, Budget Information for States.

3. The Federal Funds Information for States system, affiliated with the National Governors Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

4. The Bureau of the Census Federal Automated Awards Data System (FAADS).

5. Fiscal Planning Services Incorporated, publisher of the FEDFACTS reports.

