

The Value of Census 2000 to Utah

Prepared by:  
Governor's Office of Planning and Budget  
Demographic and Economic Analysis  
116 State Capitol  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
(801) 538-1036

## **Introduction**

On April 1, 2000, the 22<sup>nd</sup> decennial census will be conducted. The census is the only national survey providing consistent, uniform measures and data for every geographic area in the nation. The results will capture a picture in time of the population in Utah; who we are, how we have changed, and the direction we are heading—demographically, socially, and economically.

The U.S. Constitution stipulates in Article 1, Section 2, that a census of the population be conducted every ten years for the purposes of apportionment in the U.S. House of Representatives. No other source provides as much comprehensive information about who we are or has such important consequences for the way we govern ourselves. The decennial census is the only data-gathering effort that collects the same information from enough people to get comparable data from the national level to the neighborhood level.

Census 2000 will be conducted to determine how many people reside in the United States, precisely where they reside, and their demographic characteristics. It will be the largest and most complex mobilization in the nation, and will include critical phases, such as preparing address lists, mailing questionnaires, performing quality checks and tabulating census results.

The primary means of census-taking in 2000 will be the long and short form questionnaires. These questionnaires will be used to collect the data the nation needs to meet statutory data requirements of the federal agencies and to administer state, local, and tribal government programs. All of the questions included on the 2000 questionnaire are either “mandated” or “required” by federal law or imposed by court decisions requiring the use of census data..

The answers that Utahns provide on the questionnaire will provide the baseline demographic statistics for planning, implementing and evaluating government services and private business decisions and will be used for such things as planning new school construction and public transportation systems, and managing healthcare services. The data will also form the basis for our political representation in the U.S. House of Representatives and an entire decade of distributions of federal and state funds.

## **Congressional Reapportionment**

The results of Census 2000 will be used to determine the number seats each state will have in the U.S. House of Representatives. The Constitution provides that each state will have at least one member in the House. The apportionment process will allocate the remaining seats to the states based on the population counts from the census.

Calculation of a congressional apportionment requires three factors: the apportionment population of each state, the number of Representatives to be allocated among the states, and a method to use for the calculation.

Several entities have analyzed which states may gain and which may lose seats after Census 2000. These analyses apply the method of equal proportions, a mathematical formula that has been used in the previous five censuses to calculate House seat assignment. Based on these analyses, Utah

may or may not gain a fourth seat after the 2000 census. Utah is one of the states “On the Bubble”—in some of the analyses Utah gains a fourth seat, but in others Utah holds steady with three seats. It is not possible to know for sure if Utah will gain an additional House seat, since these analyses are based on projections of the population, instead of the actual census results.

## **Redistricting**

The Utah Constitution requires the Utah Legislature to redraw all congressional, state legislative, and state school board districts based on the new population totals from the Census Bureau. County clerks work closely with the Census Bureau and provide data on geography and boundaries for voting precincts that form a building block for new districts that will last until the 2010 Census. When the legislature completes the redistricting, county clerks receive a copy of the new boundaries to ensure that ballots and voting precincts match the new boundaries. The new districts will be enacted in the fall of 2001.

## **Federal Government Expenditures in Utah**

While the benefits of accurate political representation and informed decision making are obvious, census data are also crucial for the distribution of federal and state funds. Every year the federal government distributes billions of dollars to states through federal programs. The economy of Utah and all other states depend significantly on these federal monies. In fiscal year 1998, Utah received \$8.7 billion from the federal government (Table 2), which amounted to 20% of Utah’s total personal income in 1998.

Federal money is distributed to states through five major categories (Table 1):

- Grants to state and local governments—Major grants in Utah include: Medicaid; Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; and Highway Planning and Construction.
- Salaries and wages for federal employees—This category includes wages paid to a federal employee by a federal employer.
- Retirement and disability programs—Major programs include: Social Security; Medicare; Food Stamps; and federal employee retirement.
- Procurement contracts—The major contracts are defense, aerospace, and the Post Office.
- Other direct payments—This category includes all other grants not included in the other four categories.

While all of these categories of federal expenditures are important, the majority of money that Utah receives based on population statistics is part of the grants to state and local government category of federal spending.

### **Grants to State and Local Governments**

Grants are allocations of revenue paid by the federal government to state and local governments and can be divided into two categories: discretionary grants and formula grants. Discretionary grants are not dependent on formulas to determine where the money is allocated, but can be distributed by program administrators based on the merit of the competing applications. Formula grants, on the other hand, are allocated using formulas mandated by statutes or administrative

regulations. Federal funds that come into Utah based on population statistics are based on the population component of grant formulas.

Federal revenues and the formulas by which they are disbursed through grant programs are constantly changing due to changes in legislation. For example, federal programs are periodically merged with others or are phased in and out of the federal budget depending upon the need as determined by Congress. The purpose of this research is to provide a “snapshot” of the magnitude of revenue allocation to state and local governments by formula grants that base revenue disbursement on population criteria as specified in their formulas.

### **Federal Grant Programs that Allocate Funds Based on Population**

In fiscal year 1998, 94 federal grant programs were identified that relied all or in part on population or population characteristics for the distribution of federal money to Utah (Table 3). Of the \$1.5 billion that came into Utah, \$113 million came from programs that were 100% population driven. The remaining monies came from programs that were based in part on population. Thus, population statistics from the Census Bureau, based on the population component of the grant formula, brought in \$697 for every person in Utah or \$2,163 per household in 1998. The five largest programs that distribute money to Utah based on population are: Medicaid, Flood Insurance, Highway Planning and Construction, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), and Very Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans.

Medicaid, which provides medical assistance to poor children, pregnant women and elderly, is the largest federal program that distributes money to states based on population data. Of the total federal money distributed to Utah, 35% came from the Medicaid program. This amounted to \$509.2 million in fiscal year 1998.

Flood Insurance, distributed through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), is the second largest program with population-dependent funding. The Flood Insurance program is designed to enable persons to purchase insurance against physical damage to their homes or buildings caused by floods, mudslides, etc. In fiscal year 1998, \$276.9 million, or 19% of the total federal money distributed to Utah came in through this program.

The third largest population driven program in Utah is the Highway Planning and Construction program. Utah received \$144.8 million in fiscal year 1998 to help in the improvement and development of the interstate highway system and primary, secondary and urban streets. This amounted to 10% of the total federal funding distributed to Utah based on population data.

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), formerly Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), is the fourth largest program. TANF provides assistance to poor single-parent families with children under 18, promotes job preparation, and provides incentives to get participants jobs. This program brought in \$78.9 million in fiscal year 1998. This amounted to 5% of the total federal money that came into Utah from population-based programs.

The fifth largest program is Very Low to Moderate Income Housing Loans, which provides assistance to low income families through direct loans to buy, build, or improve homes in rural areas. In fiscal year 1998, Utah received \$42.1 million dollars which accounted for 3% of the total

amount of population driven programs.

The distribution of federal funds to Utah's counties is equally important. Table 4 shows the distribution of \$8.7 billion in federal funds to Utah's 29 counties in fiscal year 1998. These monies range from 7 percent of the total personal income in Summit County in 1998 to 71 percent of Daggett County's total personal income. Because state money is often distributed based on population, it is clear that Utah's cities and counties will benefit from a complete and accurate census count in 2000.

### **Summary of Federal Government Expenditures**

During fiscal year 1998, 11 federal agencies distributed \$1.5 billion to Utah through federal programs that are based all or in part on population statistics (Table 3). In addition to the large programs listed above, other well-known programs such as Head Start, WIC, Community Development Block Grants, and Crime Victim Assistance provided significant funding to Utah. Compounded over the decade, the decennial census and population estimates based on the census count helped to distribute an estimated \$15 billion to Utah during the 1990s.

### **State Government Expenditures**

Federal funding formulas are only one aspect of the impact of population on the distribution of federal money to states. In Utah, population statistics are used to distribute state funds to local communities from state revenues, in addition to being used for the purposes of apportionment and redistricting, state planning, funding, and cost apportionment.

### **State Funds Distributed in Utah Based on Population**

In fiscal year 1998, the State of Utah managed a \$5.7 billion budget. This amount includes revenues from the state's general, school and transportation funds, as well as federal funds, dedicated credits, mineral lease, property taxes, and other revenues. While the allocation of these monies can be a complex process that considers competing needs, federal requirements, and changing state priorities, population is an important factor in the allocation of specific funds. The largest funds distributed in Utah based on population statistics are Local Option Sales Taxes, Class B and C Road Monies, Community Development Block Grants, Liquor Control Fund, and Criminal Fines and Forfeitures (Table 5).

The Local Option Sales Tax is the largest state fund distributed by the state based on population data. This sales tax is collected by retailers and paid to the State Tax Commission. The Tax Commission then distributes the money to municipalities throughout the state. In fiscal year 1998, the State Tax Commission distributed \$263.5 million of local option sales taxes among Utah's cities and counties. The distribution was determined based on the following formula: 1) 50% based on the local government's share of the state's population, 2) 50% based on the point of sale or use of transaction. Therefore, \$131.8 million of sales taxes were divided among Utah's cities and counties during fiscal year 1998 based on population statistics.

The second largest state program that distributes money based on population statistics is money for the improvement and maintenance of class B and C roads in the state. Class B roads are county roads and class C roads are city streets. According to the allocation formula, 50% of the B

and C road monies are allocated based on a municipality or county population. During fiscal year 1998, the state distributed \$82.9 million to cities and counties for B and C road development and improvement. Thus, \$41.4 million in road monies was tied directly to population.

Other monies in Utah distributed based on population include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the Liquor Control Fund, and Criminal Fines and Forfeitures. These programs distributed an additional \$7.6 million to the state in fiscal year 1998.

The Community Development Block Grant program is unique in that the monies are distributed to Utah by the federal government based on population and then distributed within Utah based on population. The money is used to build public work facilities, rehabilitate housing, assist with economic development and other activities that make communities more viable and expand economic opportunities. In fiscal year 1998 the state distributed \$7.4 million in CDBG monies to local governments. Of that fund, \$5.7 million, or 77% of the fund, was distributed based on population.

The Liquor Control Fund is also distributed to municipalities based on population. The appropriation is used for programs or projects related to prevention, detection and prosecution of alcohol-related offenses. During fiscal year 1998, \$1.3 million was allocated to cities and counties based on their population.

The Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) received \$1.5 million from Criminal Fines and Forfeitures in fiscal year 1998. EMS then distributed \$629,000, or 41% of the total fund, to counties in 1998 based on their population. These grant monies are used by agencies within counties for any emergency medical services activities or needs, such as certified personnel.

In total, the major state funds in Utah distributed \$180.8 million during fiscal year 1998 to municipalities and counties based on population statistics.

### **Conclusion**

On April 1, 2000, Utahns will be asked to fill out and return a census form. The answers provided on this form will not only determine the number of seats Utah will have in the U.S. House of Representatives, but will be used for such things as planning new school construction and public transportation systems and managing health care services. Equally important, is the use of decennial census data in the distribution of federal and state funds. The answers provided on this form set the stage for an entire decade of fund distribution. This means millions of dollars to Utah and it's municipalities and counties every year.

This research has identified 94 federal programs and 5 major state programs that distribute funds based on population statistics. This amounted to \$1.5 billion in federal funds that came into Utah in fiscal year 1998. Compounded over the decade, decennial census data helped distribute \$15 billion in federal funds to Utah, or \$697 per person and \$2,163 per household. In addition to the distribution of federal funds, the state distributed \$180.8 million in 1998 to local governments through 5 major funds that based part of the fund allocation on population statistics.

A complete and accurate count in 2000 will ensure that Utah receives it's share of federal

funds—which will amount to hundreds of millions of dollars over the next ten years. It is clear that the decennial census means money for Utah and all Utahns need to be counted.

**Table 1**  
**Distribution of Federal Funds by State (Millions of Dollars): Fiscal Year 1998**

State and Outlying Area	Expenditure by Category (percent of total funds)					
	Total Funds	Retirement and Disability	Other Direct Payments	Grants	Procurement	Salaries and Wages
United States	\$1,484,477	34.2%	22.1%	18.1%	14.1%	11.5%
Alabama	25,297	37.5%	22.2%	16.4%	12.3%	11.6%
Alaska	4,767	15.9%	9.2%	29.9%	18.1%	26.9%
Arizona	24,067	37.8%	18.7%	17.2%	15.8%	10.5%
Arkansas	13,016	43.1%	26.4%	18.7%	3.6%	8.1%
California	161,571	30.5%	23.2%	19.9%	15.7%	10.7%
Colorado	21,009	31.6%	16.7%	14.5%	20.5%	16.6%
Connecticut	19,424	32.2%	22.4%	18.8%	19.6%	7.0%
Delaware	3,553	41.6%	22.9%	19.1%	6.1%	10.3%
Florida	83,558	43.4%	26.5%	12.4%	8.5%	9.2%
Georgia	37,144	34.4%	20.4%	16.8%	12.4%	16.1%
Hawaii	8,442	27.8%	15.3%	14.1%	12.5%	30.3%
Idaho	5,961	35.8%	18.5%	17.7%	17.1%	10.9%
Illinois	55,467	37.1%	26.4%	18.3%	8.2%	9.9%
Indiana	26,098	41.2%	27.0%	15.9%	8.6%	7.3%
Iowa	14,535	38.3%	32.1%	16.7%	6.4%	6.5%
Kansas	13,426	37.9%	25.4%	14.4%	9.8%	12.5%
Kentucky	23,161	34.5%	19.9%	18.3%	16.6%	10.7%
Louisiana	22,900	33.3%	27.1%	20.6%	10.3%	8.7%
Maine	7,463	35.6%	19.1%	21.5%	13.7%	10.0%
Maryland	41,565	25.3%	18.2%	12.1%	25.1%	19.3%
Massachusetts	37,173	30.9%	25.2%	21.6%	14.7%	7.6%
Michigan	41,917	41.9%	26.4%	20.6%	4.5%	6.7%
Minnesota	20,399	37.1%	25.1%	20.6%	8.8%	8.4%
Mississippi	15,314	35.5%	24.4%	19.8%	10.5%	9.8%
Missouri	32,682	33.2%	22.6%	15.5%	19.4%	9.3%
Montana	5,465	33.1%	28.0%	20.8%	6.9%	11.2%
Nebraska	8,253	38.6%	25.5%	18.3%	5.9%	11.7%
Nevada	7,566	43.4%	20.6%	14.3%	10.6%	11.0%
New Hampshire	5,272	42.3%	19.5%	19.8%	9.9%	8.5%
New Jersey	40,373	37.6%	26.1%	17.6%	10.1%	8.6%
New Mexico	12,933	26.1%	12.8%	19.7%	29.1%	12.2%
New York	99,766	33.4%	25.2%	28.1%	6.0%	7.3%
North Carolina	35,677	40.2%	20.5%	20.0%	5.8%	13.5%
North Dakota	4,131	28.3%	26.2%	25.8%	6.2%	13.4%
Ohio	52,006	40.5%	24.2%	18.7%	8.4%	8.2%
Oklahoma	18,205	38.7%	22.5%	16.8%	7.6%	14.5%
Oregon	15,119	41.7%	22.1%	21.7%	4.8%	9.7%
Pennsylvania	67,350	39.4%	26.7%	18.4%	7.7%	7.9%
Rhode Island	6,039	35.3%	25.1%	22.7%	5.2%	11.8%
South Carolina	19,870	39.2%	19.3%	17.7%	12.5%	11.3%
South Dakota	4,319	32.7%	24.8%	23.3%	7.3%	11.8%
Tennessee	30,497	34.9%	21.6%	18.1%	16.8%	8.6%
Texas	92,019	33.0%	22.6%	17.2%	15.1%	12.1%
Utah	8,728	35.2%	15.6%	19.8%	13.5%	15.9%
Vermont	2,895	36.8%	20.5%	27.7%	5.3%	9.6%
Virginia	55,830	26.5%	12.1%	7.9%	33.2%	20.3%
Washington	31,186	34.4%	17.7%	17.4%	15.8%	14.8%
West Virginia	10,697	42.0%	22.2%	23.2%	4.6%	8.0%
Wisconsin	21,883	42.6%	23.3%	21.5%	5.9%	6.7%
Wyoming	2,743	33.1%	15.8%	31.0%	6.4%	13.7%
District of Columbia	24,034	7.0%	6.7%	17.1%	21.6%	47.6%
Undistributed	28,615	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	87.8%	11.7%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Consolidated Federal Funds Report: 1998

**Table 2**  
**Summary of Total Personal Income and Federal Funds Distribution (Millions of Dollars): Fiscal Year 1998**

State and Outlying Area	1998 Population	Total Personal Income	Total Funds	Funds Per Capita	Rank	Funds Per \$1,000 Personal Income	Rank
United States	270,299,000	\$7,158,176	\$1,484,477	\$5,491	na	\$207	na
Alabama	4,352,000	93,567	25,297	5,813	16	270	9
Alaska	614,000	15,823	4,767	7,763	3	301	4
Arizona	4,669,000	108,087	24,067	5,155	28	223	23
Arkansas	2,538,000	51,763	13,016	5,128	29	251	15
California	32,667,000	900,900	161,571	4,946	34	179	40
Colorado	3,971,000	114,449	21,009	5,291	25	184	38
Connecticut	3,274,000	123,431	19,424	5,933	12	157	47
Delaware	744,000	22,258	3,553	4,776	38	160	44
Florida	14,916,000	386,654	83,558	5,602	20	216	24
Georgia	7,642,000	191,865	37,144	4,861	36	194	33
Hawaii	1,193,000	31,268	8,442	7,076	5	270	10
Idaho	1,229,000	25,901	5,961	4,850	37	230	21
Illinois	12,045,000	349,029	55,467	4,605	43	159	45
Indiana	5,899,000	143,362	26,098	4,424	45	182	39
Iowa	2,862,000	68,720	14,535	5,079	31	212	25
Kansas	2,629,000	65,854	13,426	5,107	30	204	27
Kentucky	3,936,000	84,834	23,161	5,884	14	273	8
Louisiana	4,369,000	93,430	22,900	5,242	26	245	18
Maine	1,244,000	28,620	7,463	5,999	11	261	13
Maryland	5,135,000	154,164	41,565	8,094	2	270	11
Massachusetts	6,147,000	202,252	37,173	6,047	9	184	37
Michigan	9,817,000	255,039	41,917	4,270	48	164	43
Minnesota	4,725,000	130,737	20,399	4,317	47	156	48
Mississippi	2,752,000	52,283	15,314	5,565	21	293	7
Missouri	5,439,000	132,955	32,682	6,009	10	246	16
Montana	880,000	17,827	5,465	6,210	7	307	2
Nebraska	1,663,000	41,212	8,253	4,963	33	200	29
Nevada	1,747,000	47,795	7,566	4,331	46	158	46
New Hampshire	1,185,000	34,626	5,272	4,449	44	152	49
New Jersey	8,115,000	275,531	40,373	4,975	32	147	50
New Mexico	1,737,000	34,753	12,933	7,446	4	372	1
New York	18,175,000	575,768	99,766	5,489	22	173	41
North Carolina	7,546,000	182,036	35,677	4,728	39	196	31
North Dakota	638,000	13,855	4,131	6,475	6	298	6
Ohio	11,209,000	282,920	52,006	4,640	41	184	36
Oklahoma	3,347,000	70,469	18,205	5,439	24	258	14
Oregon	3,282,000	81,310	15,119	4,607	42	186	35
Pennsylvania	12,001,000	322,706	67,350	5,612	19	209	26
Rhode Island	988,000	26,614	6,039	6,112	8	227	22
South Carolina	3,836,000	82,039	19,870	5,180	27	242	19
South Dakota	738,000	16,388	4,319	5,852	15	264	12
Tennessee	5,431,000	128,244	30,497	5,615	18	238	20
Texas	19,760,000	494,544	92,019	4,657	40	186	34
Utah	2,100,000	44,297	8,728	4,156	50	197	30
Vermont	591,000	14,309	2,895	4,898	35	202	28
Virginia	6,791,000	186,686	55,830	8,221	1	299	5
Washington	5,689,000	159,674	31,186	5,482	23	195	32
West Virginia	1,811,000	35,087	10,697	5,906	13	305	3
Wisconsin	5,224,000	131,547	21,883	4,189	49	166	42
Wyoming	481,000	11,169	2,743	5,702	17	246	17
District of Columbia	523,000	19,526	24,034	45,955	na	1,231	na
Undistributed	na	na	28,615	na	na	na	na

note: The source of the 1998 population estimates is the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Consolidated Federal Funds Report: 1998; Bureau of Economic Analysis

**Table 3**  
**Federal Expenditures in Utah Based on Population Statistics, Ranked by Largest Programs: Fiscal Year 1998**

Rank	CFDA #	Agency	Program Name	FY 1998 Expenditures	100% Pop. Driven	Percent of Total Expenditures
1	93.778	HHS	Medical assistance program	509,180,355		34.77%
2	83.100	FEMA	Flood insurance	276,947,897		18.91%
3	20.205	DOT	Highway planning and construction	144,805,348		9.89%
4	93.558	HHS	Temporary assistance for needy families	78,925,393		5.39%
5	10.410	USDA	Very low to moderate income housing loans	42,087,988	yes	2.87%
6	84.010	ED	Title I grants to local educational agencies	33,036,334		2.26%
7	84.126	ED	Rehabilitation services-vocational rehabilitation grants	30,880,511		2.11%
8	10.557	USDA	WIC program	29,608,069		2.02%
9	93.600	HHS	Head start	27,557,327		1.88%
10	93.658	HHS	Foster care-Title IV-E	22,104,513		1.51%
11	17.225	DOL	Unemployment insurance	21,253,512		1.45%
12	93.596	HHS	Child care mandatory and matching funds of the	20,761,612		1.42%
13	10.768	USDA	Business and industry loans	19,325,216		1.32%
14	93.667	HHS	Social services block grant	16,975,052	yes	1.16%
15	20.507	DOT	Federal transit capital and operating assistance	16,734,216		1.14%
16	17.207	DOL	Employment service	15,174,609		1.04%
17	14.218	HUD	Community development block grants/entitlement grants	12,570,094	yes	0.86%
18	17.250	DOL	Job training partnership act	12,555,453		0.86%
19	93.959	HHS	Block grants for prevention and treatment of substance abuse	12,390,591		0.85%
20	84.048	ED	Vocational education-basic grants to states	11,495,239		0.78%
21	14.228	HUD	Community development block grants/state's program	8,652,235	yes	0.59%
22	93.994	HHS	Maternal and child health services block grant	6,144,891		0.42%
23	10.760	USDA	Water and waste disposal systems for rural communities	5,963,000		0.41%
24	15.605	DOI	Sport fish restoration	5,933,000		0.41%
25	10.427	USDA	Rural rental assistance payments	5,237,512	yes	0.36%
26	16.579	DOJ	Byrne formula grant program	4,525,865	yes	0.31%
27	93.659	HHS	Adoption assistance	3,735,748		0.26%
28	14.239	HUD	Home investment partnerships program	3,718,324		0.25%
29	84.186	ED	Safe and drug-free schools and communities	3,544,922		0.24%
30	93.645	HHS	Child welfare services-state grants	3,438,141		0.23%
31	84.298	ED	Innovative education program strategies	3,283,555		0.22%
32	84.181	ED	Special education-grants for infants and families	3,280,289	yes	0.22%
33	84.276	ED	Goals 2000- state and local education	3,213,060		0.22%
34	10.500	USDA	Cooperative extension service	3,081,938	yes	0.21%
35	15.611	DOI	Wildlife restoration	3,025,000		0.21%
36	16.523	DOJ	Juvenile accountability incentive block grants	2,997,900	yes	0.20%
37	11.307	DOC	Special economic development & adjustment assistance program	2,961,466		0.20%
38	14.157	HUD	Supportive housing for the elderly	2,944,810		0.20%
39	93.045	HHS	Special programs for the aging-Title III, part C	2,545,191	yes	0.17%
40	16.575	DOJ	Crime victim assistance	2,345,298	yes	0.16%
41	84.281	ED	Eisenhower professional development grants	2,260,799		0.15%
42	14.850	HUD	Public and Indian housing	2,012,696		0.14%
43	93.991	HHS	Preventive health and health services block grant	1,764,587		0.12%
44	84.002	ED	Adult education-state grant program	1,670,139	yes	0.11%
45	10.203	USDA	Payments to agricultural experiment stations under the Hatch Act	1,666,361		0.11%
46	93.044	HHS	Special programs for the aging-Title III, part B	1,605,368	yes	0.11%
47	20.600	DOT	State and community highway safety	1,363,635		0.09%
48	94.006	CNCS	Americorps	1,318,374		0.09%
49	16.588	DOJ	Violence against women formula grants	1,305,000		0.09%
50	84.243	ED	Tech-prep education	1,196,451		0.08%
51	10.766	USDA	Community facilities loans and grants	1,150,000	yes	0.08%
52	16.540	DOJ	Juvenile justice and delinquency prevention	856,000	yes	0.06%
53	93.630	HHS	Development disabilities basic support and advocacy	755,606		0.05%
54	20.509	DOT	Public transportation for nonurbanized areas	649,333		0.04%
55	84.187	ED	Supported employment services for individuals with disabilities	600,000	yes	0.04%
56	17.251	DOL	Native American employment and training programs	596,155		0.04%
57	84.169	ED	Independent living - state grants	583,492	yes	0.04%
58	17.235	DOL	Senior community service employment program	576,652		0.04%
59	84.213	ED	Even start-state educational agencies	565,400		0.04%
60	10.569	USDA	Emergency food assistance program	540,916		0.04%
61	45.025	NFAH	Promotion of the arts-partnership agreements	517,800		0.04%
62	83.523	FEMA	Emergency food and shelter national board program	453,954		0.03%
63	45.129	NFAH	Promotion of the humanities-federal/state partnership	440,446		0.03%
64	84.185	ED	Byrd honors scholarships	391,500	yes	0.03%
65	93.623	HHS	Runaway and homeless youth	351,572	yes	0.02%
66	20.505	DOT	Federal transit technical studies grants	312,824		0.02%

Rank	CFDA #	Agency	Program Name	FY 1998 Expenditures	100% Pop. Driven	Percent of Total Expenditures
67	16.589	DOJ	Rural domestic violence and child victimization	300,488		0.02%
68	93.150	HHS	Projects for assistance in transition from homelessness	300,000	yes	0.02%
69	11.302	DOC	Economic development-support for planning organizations	274,000		0.02%
70	93.138	HHS	Protection and advocacy for individuals with mental	259,782		0.02%
71	10.568	USDA	Emergency food assistance program	250,667		0.02%
72	17.247	DOL	Migrant and seasonal farmworkers	250,354		0.02%
73	81.041	DOE	State energy program	247,641		0.02%
74	93.669	HHS	Child abuse and neglect state grants	237,706	yes	0.02%
75	10.417	USDA	Very low-income housing repair loans and grants	222,980	yes	0.02%
76	84.161	ED	Rehabilitation services-client assistance program	214,526	yes	0.01%
77	16.548	DOJ	Title V-delinquency prevention program	180,000	yes	0.01%
78	93.671	HHS	Family violence prevention and services	163,476	yes	0.01%
79	93.584	HHS	Refugee and entrant assistance-targeted assistance	135,000		0.01%
80	10.415	USDA	Rural rental housing loans	127,706	yes	0.01%
81	84.196	ED	Education for homeless children and youth	127,539		0.01%
82	10.433	USDA	Rural housing preservation grants	118,000	yes	0.01%
83	93.643	HHS	Children's justice grants to states	114,321	yes	0.01%
84	84.240	ED	Program of protection and advocacy of individual rights	105,884	yes	0.01%
85	93.958	HHS	Block grants for community mental health services	100,000		0.01%
86	10.769	USDA	Rural development grants	89,000		0.01%
87	93.043	HHS	Special programs for the aging-Title III, part F	81,857	yes	0.01%
88	93.575	HHS	Child care and development block grant	70,659		0.00%
89	93.571	HHS	Community services block grant discretionary awards	49,652		0.00%
90	93.046	HHS	Special programs for the aging-Title III, part D	49,568	yes	0.00%
91	66.433	EPA	State underground water source protection	46,485		0.00%
92	66.001	EPA	Air pollution control program support	45,039		0.00%
93	45.310	NFAH	State library program	9,490	yes	0.00%
94	93.560	HHS	Family support payments to states	493		0.00%
			Total	\$1,464,618,847	\$113,432,947	7.7%

Agency Codes:

DOE	Department of Energy
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOL	Department of Labor
DOT	Department of Transportation
ED	Department of Education
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
NFAH	National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities
USDA	Department of Agriculture

Source: Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA); U.S. Census Bureau, Consolidated Federal Funds Report, 1998; Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

**Table 4**  
**Summary of Total Personal Income and Federal Funds Distribution by County (Millions of Dollars):**  
**Fiscal Year 1998**

State and County	1998 Population	1998 Total Personal Income	Total Funds	Funds Per Capita	Rank	Funds Per \$1,000 Personal Income	Rank	% of State Total Funds
Utah	2,099,758	44,297,000*	\$8,728,165	\$4,157	na	197	na	na
Beaver	5,896	88,500	20,803	3,528	19	235	14	0.2%
Box Elder	41,949	833,400	503,580	12,005	1	604	2	5.8%
Cache	86,949	1,464,300	236,533	2,720	26	162	25	2.7%
Carbon	20,966	394,900	203,775	9,719	3	516	3	2.3%
Daggett	737	10,700	7,621	10,341	2	712	1	0.1%
Davis	233,013	4,809,400	1,107,272	4,752	9	230	16	12.7%
Duchesne	14,481	234,400	47,860	3,305	21	204	21	0.5%
Emery	10,989	166,700	47,582	4,330	10	285	10	0.5%
Garfield	4,272	70,700	21,226	4,969	8	300	8	0.2%
Grand	8,068	144,900	33,960	4,209	11	234	15	0.4%
Iron	28,659	444,400	106,240	3,707	16	239	12	1.2%
Juab	7,572	109,400	23,580	3,114	22	216	18	0.3%
Kane	6,200	119,500	38,907	6,275	6	326	6	0.4%
Millard	12,249	190,500	38,020	3,104	23	200	22	0.4%
Morgan	7,022	126,300	26,823	3,820	14	212	20	0.3%
Piute	1,402	18,500	5,351	3,817	15	289	9	0.1%
Rich	1,834	28,600	5,489	2,993	24	192	24	0.1%
Salt Lake	850,667	20,674,300	3,255,314	3,827	13	157	26	37.3%
San Juan	13,711	168,900	54,428	3,970	12	322	7	0.6%
Sanpete	21,452	274,100	58,411	2,723	25	213	19	0.7%
Sevier	18,452	294,200	65,957	3,575	17	224	17	0.8%
Summit	26,746	990,400	66,154	2,473	27	67	29	0.8%
Tooele	33,351	573,200	231,488	6,941	4	404	4	2.7%
Uintah	25,660	365,600	88,882	3,464	20	243	11	1.0%
Utah	335,635	5,885,400	721,098	2,148	29	123	27	8.3%
Wasatch	13,267	269,400	29,166	2,198	28	108	28	0.3%
Washington	82,115	1,491,400	290,600	3,539	18	195	23	3.3%
Wayne	2,379	38,900	15,204	6,391	5	391	5	0.2%
Weber	184,065	3,853,300	920,702	5,002	7	239	13	10.5%
State Undistributed	na	na	456,137	na	na	na	na	5.2%

na = not applicable

\* The state total is the official BEA estimate and does not match the sum of the counties. BEA has not yet released 1998 county level data. County figures were estimated by the Utah Department of Workforce Services.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Consolidated Federal Funds Report: 1998;  
Utah Department of Workforce Services; Bureau of Economic Analysis; Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

Table 5

**Major State and Local Funds Distributed in Utah Based on Population Statistics: Fiscal Year 1998  
(Thousands of Dollars)**

	Total	Percent Population Driven	Population Driven Expenditures	Percent of Total
Local Option Sales Taxes	\$263,504	50	\$131,752	72.9%
Class B and C Road Monies	\$82,887	50	\$41,444	22.9%
Community Development Block Grants	\$7,401	77	\$5,699	3.2%
Liquor Control Fund	\$2,609	50	\$1,305	0.7%
Criminal Fines and Forfeitures*	\$1,527	41	\$629	0.3%
Total	\$357,928		\$180,828	

\* The Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) received \$1.5 million from Criminal Fines and Forfeitures in fiscal year 1998. This money was then distributed by EMS to counties based on their population.

note: totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Utah Code Annotated; Governor's Office of Planning and Budget