Impact of New Entitlement Communities

As noted above, appropriation level reflects the size of the pie and impacts each grantee (each slice of the pie) equally. However, new entitlement communities affect the number of slices in the pie, and they affect other grantees differently. Some new entitlement communities are created out of existing urban counties, 54 of the 135 new entitlements between FYs 1993 and 2002. The slice of the pie in these cases mostly comes out of the larger urban county's pie. The urban county's grant goes down, but so do the number of individuals/places they need to serve with their grant funds[22]. Other new entitlements come from areas that previously were served by the state government through their nonentitlement grants. The slice of the pie for these remaining 81 new entitlements is created by reducing all of the existing entitlement grantees by a very small amount.

Table 5–4
Number of Entitlement Grantees: FYs 1993 and 2002

Variable	1993[a]	2002	New Entitlement Distribution
Overall	889	1,024	135
Jurisdiction type			
Central cities	494	539	45
Satellite cities	260	326	66
Urban counties	135	159	24
Region			
New England	69	73	4
New York/New Jersey	90	96	6
Mid-Atlantic	81	87	6
Southeast	130	164	34
Midwest	172	187	15
Southwest	90	106	16
Great Plains	28	30	2
Rocky Mountain	31	37	6
Pacific/Hawaii	154	183	29
Northwest/Alaska	30	40	10
Puerto Rico	14	21	7
Formula			
A	504	626	122
B	385	398	13

[a]An entitlement in FY 1993, North Charleston, South Carolina, gave up its entitlement status to make Charleston County eligible as an urban county. To account for this in our analysis, we simply treat Charleston County as if it were an existing entitlement in FY 1993.

[22]If both the urban county and the new entitlement community coming out of the urban county are formula A, the impact on other grantees is zero. If one or the other switches formulas or they are formula B grantees and it effects the growth lag denominator, other grantees may be effected slightly.

Table 5–4 gives a sense of the changing number and character of entitlement communities. In FY 1993 there were 889 entitlement grantees, but by FY 2002 that number had increased to 1,024. The largest increase by jurisdiction type that became entitled was satellite cities, with 66 new entitlement communities. Over this period, 45 new central cities also joined the program, and 24 new urban counties became entitled.

The Great Plains region saw the smallest increase (2) in communities joining the entitlement program between FYs 1993 and 2002 followed by the New England region (4). The Southeast region had the largest increase (34) in communities becoming entitled, followed by the Pacific/Hawaii region (29). Nearly all of the new entitlement communities receive funding under formula A. Only 13 new entitlement communities receive funding under formula B.

Chapter 2 discusses the requirements for a community to qualify for the CDBG program. A central city can be of any population for an MA, or it can be a city with a population greater than 50,000 within an MA. As such, it is not surprising that table 5–5 shows 88 percent of the 111 new entitlement cities as having populations less than 75,000. Similarly, to qualify as an urban county, a county within an MA must have a population in excess of 200,000 (after subtracting entitlement cities). Thus it is not surprising that all but one of the new entitlement counties have populations less than 250,000.[23] The main point here is that new entitlement cities tend to be small. It takes a large number of new entitlement cities to have a significant impact on the allocations for other communities. However, since the population threshold to qualify as an entitlement community is higher for urban counties, introducing many new urban counties can have a noticeable impact on other grantees.

Table 5–5
New Entitlement Communities by 2000 Population

Community Size	Total	Cities	Urban Counties
250,000 or more	1	0	1
200,000–249,999	14	0	14
125,000–199,999	11	2	9
100,000–124,999	3	3	0
75,000–99,999	8	8	0
50,000–74,999	60	60	0
49,999 or fewer	38	38	0
Total	135	111	24

As noted earlier, some new entitlement communities come out of existing urban counties, and others are communities previously served under the nonentitlement program. Table 5–6 shows

[23]Interestingly, 9 of the 24 new entitlement counties created between FYs 1993 and 2002 had populations less than 200,000 by FY 2002. Although to qualify for the formula requires that the nonentitled population be greater than 200,000, the formula only gives credit for those portions of the nonentitled area that sign up to be served by the urban county. That is, if a small city decides not to receive funds from the urban county, the county does not receive funding for its geography but still qualifies for the program.

the proportion of funding in FY 2002 that actually was allocated to existing entitlement communities, new entitlement communities from urban counties, and new entitlement communities from nonentitled areas. It also shows which CDBG formula variables are most important for existing entitlement communities versus new entitlement communities.

Table 5–6
Old and New Entitlement Share: FY 2002

Variable	Population	Growth Lag	Poverty	Overcrowding	Pre-1940 Housing	Total
Grant (000s)						
Pre-1993 entitlements	302,655	556,155	871,397	396,304	790,299	2,916,809
New entitlements						
From urban county	9,703	1,507	15,648	11,655	3,569	42,082
From nonentitled	19,747	425	39,141	14,990	5,506	79,809
Total	332,104	558,086	926,186	422,949	799,374	3,038,700
Per capita						
Pre-1993 entitlements	1.83	3.36	5.26	2.39	4.77	17.61
New entitlements						
From urban county	2.69	0.42	4.33	3.23	0.99	11.65
From nonentitled	2.66	0.06	5.28	2.02	0.74	10.76
Total	1.88	3.16	5.24	2.39	4.52	17.20

Four percent of FY 2002 CDBG funds went to communities entitled since FY 1993, 1.4 percent to communities out of urban counties existing before FY 1993, and 2.6 percent to areas not previously receiving entitlement grants (that is, from nonentitled areas). Because most nonentitlement communities are formula A communities, it is not surprising that the bulk of their grant funds come from formula A variables—population, poverty, and overcrowding.

Table 5–7
Impact of New Entitlements on Pro Rata Reduction

Variable	Pro Rata Reduction (%)
Without new entitlements	10.1
With new entitlements	12.4
Change	2.3

Because CDBG largely uses MA totals as the denominator, new entitlements take away from existing entitlements by increasing the pro rata reduction. That is, with a larger share of the MA total population eligible to receive entitlement funds, the larger the pro rata reduction will need to be to bring the "greater than" component of the formula inline with actual appropriations. Table 5–7 shows that the 2.6 percent of entitlement funds that go to new entitlement communities results in a 2.3-percentage-point increase in pro rata reduction.

The continued addition of new entitlement communities over time is another important element to consider relative to the 70:30 split between entitlement and nonentitlement communities. When the split was begun in FY 1982, there were 666 entitlement communities. In FY 2002 there are 1,024 entitlement communities. In other words, the share of the jurisdictions served by the entitlement side of the formula has increased, although their split of the funding has remained static. We anticipate that this issue will become significantly more pronounced when the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issues its new MA definitions in mid-2003. Because the definitions are not yet issued, this report does not further analyze the equity of the 70:30 split, holding that discussion for the forthcoming CDBG needs analysis report. Note, however, that the proposed new definitions would, at minimum, substantially increase the number of CDBG urban counties in the Northeast. The forthcoming report also discusses the impact of "grandfathering" on retaining jurisdictions as entitlement communities even after their population falls below the qualification requirements for the program.[24]

Impact of All Formula Variables

The analysis in this section essentially replicates the analysis in chapter 4 but includes the effect of changing population and growth lag, as well as the effect of new entitlement communities. For simplicity, we hold the appropriation constant at FY 2002 levels. Because new entitlement communities received zero dollars in FY 1993, they are often listed separately to show change for the jurisdictions that existed in FY 1993.

Table 5–8 shows the overall impact of population, growth lag, poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing between an allocation that uses all 1990 Census data and one that uses all 2000 Census data. The additional impact of new entitlements, growth lag, and population increases the number of jurisdictions losing higher percentage amounts of funds than presented in chapter 4. Specifically, just poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing result in 12 percent of jurisdictions losing funding of 10 percent or more; however, when changes to population, growth lag, and introduction of new entitlement communities are factored in, the figure jumps to more than 21 percent. Significantly, 31 of the 100 jurisdictions receiving the largest grants using all 1990 Census data see declines of 10 percent or more.

[24]As of FY 2002, the number of cities grandfathered into the program is 52, most of which were central cities that are no longer considered central cities. Six urban counties are grandfathered. An additional 13 urban counties have grant allocation populations less than 200,000, of which 8 qualify for CDBG because they have the potential for 200,000 (that is, there are nonparticipating jurisdictions), and 5 qualify because of amendments to the CDBG definitions (see appendix C).

Table 5–8
Overall Impact of Population, Growth Lag, Poverty, Overcrowding, and Pre-1940 Housing: Census 1990 to Census 2000

	Entitlement Communities			100 Largest Census 1990 Grantees	
Loss/Gain	*n*	%	Total Change ($000)	Total	Total Change ($000)
>20% loss	45	4.4	–29,649	5	–12,728
10–20% loss	172	16.8	–106,406	26	–69,041
5–10% loss	141	13.8	–46,475	18	–28,880
0–5% loss	160	15.6	–26,616	26	–20,202
0–5% gain	126	12.3	5,732	8	1,990
5–10% gain	80	7.8	14,715	10	7,460
10–20% gain	77	7.5	17,885	4	4,410
>20% gain	88	8.6	48,923	3	8,080
New entitlements	135	13.2	121,891	NA	NA
Total	1,024	100.0	0	100	–108,911

"NA" = Not Applicable

Why More Jurisdictions Lose Funds

New entitlements account for some of the change. Fifteen of the 217 jurisdictions that lose 10 percent or more of their funding are urban counties from which new entitlement communities were created during the decade.[25] In these cases, the impact on the county as a whole may be negligible, because the overall funding to the county does not change appreciably, simply the mechanism for delivering the funds.[26] In addition, as noted above, new entitlements are responsible for a 2.3-percentage-point increase in pro rata reduction, which reduces grants for all of the jurisdictions.

Table 5–9 shows that population and growth lag also cause shifts in the share of funds each allocates, which accounts for some of the additional losses (and gains) in funding for some jurisdictions. As noted in chapter 4, poverty and overcrowding are the most volatile variables in terms of redistributing funds, and pre-1940 housing is the least volatile. That is introducing Census 2000 data for poverty and overcrowding results in jurisdictions having large gains or losses in funding share while introducing Census 2000 pre-1940 data results in relatively small changes in funding share.

Population and growth lag fall somewhere between pre-1940 housing and poverty in terms of volatility. The shifting shares of growth lag results in more jurisdictions gaining share than losing share, whereas population has relatively more places losing share (not including new entitlements) than gaining share. For jurisdictions that receive growth lag funding (see the Detroit example above), it can be responsible for allocating a high percentage of that

[25]Fifty-four of the 135 new entitlements come out of 34 different urban counties.

[26]This is a little simplistic, since it could dramatically reshape what types of projects are funded in the county, even if the total dollar amount has not changed appreciably. Furthermore, some counties may gain or lose significant funding for reasons beyond the subtraction of new entitlement communities.

jurisdiction's funding. As a result, a change in share on the growth-lag variable can have a big effect on an individual jurisdiction's allocation.

Table 5–9
Change between 1990 and 2000 in Shares by Jurisdiction
For Population, Growth Lag, Poverty, Overcrowding, and Pre-1940 Housing

		Formula A		Formula B	
Loss/Gain	**Poverty[a]**	**Population**	**Overcrowding**	**Growth Lag**	**Pre-1940**
>20% loss	115	19	78	22	6
10–20% loss	144	97	71	19	46
5–10% loss	76	105	23	23	70
0–5% loss	84	69	35	40	78
0–5% gain	64	63	27	56	90
5–10% gain	62	44	25	31	47
10–20% gain	133	49	61	53	26
>20% gain	211	38	163	73	8
Not applicable[b]			1	55	1
New entitlements	135	111	111	24	24
Total	1,024	595	595	396	396

[a]Only the poverty share estimate includes the 33 jurisdictions that switched formulas.
[b]These are cases where the jurisdiction had no share in either 1990 or 2000 on that variable.

Regions That Gained Most and Those That Lost Over the Decade

Table 5–10 tells a somewhat different story than chapter 4. The chapter 4 analysis shows that the introduction of 2000 Census data leads to a big decrease in funding for Puerto Rico entitlement communities. However, Puerto Rico increased its number of entitlement communities over the decade by one-third. As a result, funding to Puerto Rico entitlement communities as a group has remained relatively constant over the decade. That is, the addition of the new entitlement communities in Puerto Rico largely makes up for the older entitlement communities' funding declines. On the other hand, the Great Plains, a pretty big funding loser with the addition of poverty and the housing variables, has even more jurisdictions losing funding when the population, growth lag, and new entitlement cases are factored into the formula.

Another way to look at the regional shift in funds is to look at the share of the total entitlement allocation that shifts from one region to another. Table 5–11 shows that Puerto Rico's overall share of CDBG funding for entitlement communities remained constant, largely because the new entitlement communities counterbalanced funding loss due to declining share in poverty. The Great Plains share of the entitlement allocation fell 9.4 percent, from 3.2 to 2.9 percent, a third of that due to growth lag, population, and new entitlement communities. The Southeast had a large increase in funding share, from 10.3 percent to 11.2 percent of the overall CDBG entitlement allocation. This was largely due to the addition of new entitlement communities. The remaining shifts are fairly consistent with chapter 4 funding shifts. That is, changes to poverty and overcrowding between 1990 and 2000 are the driving forces for changes in the other regions.

Table 5–10
Jurisdictions by Region Gaining and Losing Funds: Census 1990 to Census 2000

Region	Entitlement Communities (*n*)	Impact of Census 2000 Data (%)					
		>10% Loss	5–10% Loss	Loss 5%/ Gain 5%	5–10% Gain	>10% Gain	New Entitlements
New England	73	2.7	8.2	58.9	11.0	13.7	5.5
New York/New Jersey	96	16.7	12.5	49.0	4.2	11.5	6.3
Mid-Atlantic	87	13.8	18.4	41.4	9.2	10.3	6.9
Southeast	164	24.4	12.8	14.0	7.9	20.1	20.7
Midwest	187	25.1	23.5	28.9	8.6	5.9	8.0
Southwest	106	35.8	12.3	16.0	6.6	14.2	15.1
Great Plains	30	43.3	20.0	26.7	0.0	3.3	6.7
Rocky Mountain	37	21.6	5.4	37.8	8.1	10.8	16.2
Pacific/Hawaii	183	12.6	9.8	21.3	8.7	31.7	15.8
Northwest/Alaska	40	12.5	5.0	12.5	12.5	32.5	25.0
Puerto Rico	21	61.9	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
Total	1,024	21.2	13.8	27.9	7.8	16.1	13.2

Table 5–11
Shifting Shares of CDBG Entitlement Allocation by Region

Region	Entitlement Communities		Share of Entitlement Allocation (%)	
	Total (*n*)	%	Census 1990	Census 2000
New England	73	7.1	5.0	5.0
New York/New Jersey	96	9.4	16.1	15.6
Mid-Atlantic	87	8.5	11.6	11.4
Southeast	164	16.0	10.3	11.2
Midwest	187	18.3	19.2	18.1
Southwest	106	10.4	9.5	9.5
Great Plains	30	2.9	3.2	2.9
Rocky Mountain	37	3.6	1.8	1.8
Pacific/Hawaii	183	17.9	18.6	19.5
Northwest/Alaska	40	3.9	2.6	2.8
Puerto Rico	21	2.1	2.2	2.2
Total	1,024	100.0	100.0	100.0

Effect of Community Type

As we expect, the impact of new entitlements, population, and growth lag leads to more communities having losses of 10 percent or more than was the case just due to poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing. Table 5–12 shows that 148 central cities have losses 10 percent or greater when all of the factors are included, compared to 100 central cities when just

poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing are considered. The number of satellite with losses greater than 10 percent increase from 20 to 38. Urban counties jump from 6 to 31.

Table 5–12
Number of Entitlement Jurisdictions Gaining or Losing Funds by Type

Loss/Gain	Total	Central Cities	Satellite Cities	Urban Counties
>20% loss	45	27	6	12
10–20% loss	172	121	32	19
5–10% loss	141	94	32	15
0–5% loss	160	102	40	18
0–5% gain	126	48	54	24
5–10% gain	80	33	24	23
10–20% gain	77	36	30	11
>20% gain	88	33	42	13
New entitlements	135	45	66	24
Total	1,024	539	326	159

The addition of new entitlement communities, population, and growth lag has its largest negative effect on the share of the entitlement allocation to central cities, with the largest positive effect on satellite cities (table 5–13). The total effect of the Census 2000 data and new entitlements compared with the allocation with 1990 Census data is a decline in funding share to central cities of 3.1 percentage points and a gain for satellite cities of 1.9 percentage points. Urban counties gain 1.2 percentage points.

Table 5–13
Changing Share of the Entitlement Allocation by Jurisdiction Type

	Entitlement Communities		Share of Entitlement Allocation (%)	
Jurisdiction Type	***n***	**%**	**Census 1990**	**Census 2000**
Central cities	539	52.6	69.2	66.1
Satellite cities	326	31.8	10.5	12.4
Urban counties	159	15.5	20.3	21.5
Total	1,024	100.0	100.0	100.0

Variable Funding Allocation Change Based on City Type and Region

Both because of the regional and jurisdictional type bias of the dual formulas and the regional bias of changing demographics, there are distinctly different observable patterns in allocation based on region and jurisdiction type. Table 5–14 shows how central cities, satellite cities, and urban counties fare in each jurisdiction. For example, the total funds allocated to the 45[27] central cities in New England using 2000 data are 2.6 percent less than were allocated to the 43[28] central cities that received funding using 1990 data.

[27]FY 2002 CDBG universe.
[28]FY 1993 CDBG universe.

Not surprisingly, jurisdictions with large increases in new entitlement communities, notably the Southeast, Puerto Rico, and the western regions, show big increases in average funding gain for satellite cities. In fact, all of the regions have an average funding gain for satellite cities. The opposite is true for central cities. With only the exceptions of the Pacific/Hawaii and Northwest/Alaska regions, central cities show average declines in funding in every region, most notably in the Great Plains and Midwest.

Table 5–14
Average Gain and Loss of Funds by Type of Entitlement Community and Region (%)

Region	Total	Central Cities	Satellite Cities	Urban Counties
New England	–0.6	–2.6	6.1	—
New York/New Jersey	–3.4	–5.5	3.2	0.7
Mid-Atlantic	–1.4	–6.0	0.7	8.4
Southeast	8.2	–3.9	60.0	18.9
Midwest	–5.5	–8.7	4.8	7.5
Southwest	–0.1	–4.6	35.1	15.4
Great Plains	–8.9	–10.5	25.0	–1.2
Rocky Mountain	2.6	–3.3	24.3	14.3
Pacific/Hawaii	5.0	3.5	21.0	–4.4
Northwest/Alaska	8.2	10.2	208.9	–8.0
Puerto Rico	1.9	–10.4	49.2	—
Total	0.0	–4.4	18.1	5.8

— = No urban counties.

Formula Stability

Factoring in the impact of the new entitlement communities, along with changes to population and growth lag, more clearly demonstrates the findings from chapter 4 that most old entitlement formula B grantees lose funding and old formula A grantees evenly split between gaining and losing funds. As table 5–15 shows, formula B has probably been somewhat more stable over the 1990s as a funding source: 43 percent of the old formula B jurisdictions have a gain or loss of less than 5 percent; only 18 percent of the old formula A jurisdictions can report the same. The formula A funding distribution has large numbers of big gainers and losers; 28 percent of the old entitlement jurisdictions gain more than 10 percent, whereas 28 percent lose more than 10 percent. The fraction of big gainers and losers for old formula B grantees are 7 and 18 percent, respectively. This decline, but relative stability of formula B grantee allocations, can be traced back to the large weight (50 percent) formula B places on pre-1940 housing and the fact that there has been relatively little change in the share of pre-1940 housing.

Table 5–15
Number of Entitlement Jurisdictions Gaining or Losing Funds by Formula

Loss/Gain	Total	Formula A	Formula B	Switch
>20% loss	45	36	6	3
10–20% loss	172	102	64	6
5–10% loss	141	52	87	2
0–5% loss	160	56	98	6
0–5% gain	126	53	67	6
5–10% gain	80	53	23	4
10–20% gain	77	56	18	3
>20% gain	88	76	9	3
New entitlements	135	122	13	0
Total	1,024	606	385	33

As discussed earlier, most new entitlement communities receive funding under formula A, so it is not surprising that table 5–16 shows a shift in the overall share of the CDBG appropriation from formula B to formula A.

Table 5–16
Changing Share of Entitlement Allocation by Formula

	Entitlement Communities		Share of Entitlement Allocation (%)	
Formula	*n*	%	Census 1990	Census 2000
A	606	59.2	43.4	46.3
B	385	37.6	55.1	52.1
Switch	33	3.2	1.5	1.5
Total	1,024	100.0	100.0	100.0

Big Cities

Table 5–17 shows the impact of CDBG changes over time on the 25 biggest cities. As with most of the above analysis, this does not take into account the impact of changing appropriations. As noted, that impact was an inflation-adjusted 11.7-percent decline for all jurisdictions. Note particularly that most of the big cities, with notable exceptions of Phoenix, Austin, and Dallas, have lost funding over time due to the introduction of new Census data between FYs 1990 and 2000 and the addition of new entitlement communities. The addition of new entitlement communities has affected the big cities similarly, decreasing their allocations between 2 and 3 percent. The addition of the changing population data has little effect on the formula A big cities, so the bigger impact on formula A communities comes from the introduction of poverty and overcrowding discussed in chapter 4. Changing allocations under growth lag, however, have had noticeable negative effects on allocations for Denver (nearly 12 percent), New York, Chicago, and Seattle. Baltimore and Milwaukee have notable gains from the addition of growth lag.

Table 5–17
Largest Cities—Change in Allocation: Census 1990 to Census 2000 (%)

City	Total Change (%)	New Entitlements	Formula A			Formula B		
			Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
New York	–4.8	–2.6	—	—	—	–4.0	1.6	0.2
Los Angeles	–6.9	–2.5	–1.4	4.4	–7.4	—	—	—
Chicago	–12.0	–2.5	—	—	—	–3.6	–2.6	–3.3
Houston	0.6	–2.7	0.1	–0.3	3.4	—	—	—
Philadelphia	–9.8	–2.5	—	—	—	0.8	–0.5	–7.5
Phoenix	31.6	–3.5	2.9	16.4	15.8	—	—	—
San Diego	–2.9	–2.6	–1.5	3.6	–2.4	—	—	—
Dallas	7.1	–2.8	–0.1	2.3	7.8	—	—	—
San Antonio	–14.4	–2.3	0.5	–8.9	–3.7	—	—	—
Detroit	–16.2	–2.4	—	—	—	–2.3	–6.6	–4.9
San Jose	–5.9	–2.5	–0.8	–0.7	–1.9	—	—	—
Honolulu	–12.7	–2.3	–2.6	6.1	–13.9	—	—	—
Indianapolis	–4.4	–2.6	—	—	—	2.2	–2.5	–1.5
San Francisco	–4.5	–2.6	—	—	—	–1.6	–1.5	1.2
Columbus	–11.9	–2.3	–1.4	–8.1	–0.1	—	—	—
Austin	9.8	–2.9	3.7	1.5	7.6	—	—	—
Baltimore	–3.6	–2.7	—	—	—	4.5	–3.0	–2.4
Memphis	–15.5	–2.2	–1.9	–9.1	–2.3	—	—	—
Milwaukee	–7.0	–2.6	—	—	—	2.9	–3.6	–3.7
Boston	–5.3	–2.6	—	—	—	–1.7	–0.5	–0.4
District of Columbia	–2.1	–2.8	—	—	—	1.8	0.3	–1.5
Nashville-Davidson	–1.5	–2.6	–1.8	0.2	2.8	—	—	—
El Paso	–18.5	–2.1	–1.1	–7.5	–7.8	—	—	—
Seattle	–5.7	–2.6	—	—	—	–4.3	–0.9	2.1
Denver	–13.1	–2.4	—	—	—	–11.7	–2.2	3.2

— = Not Applicable

Chapter 6: Variable-by-Variable Analysis

The previous chapters largely focus on the combined impact of the five formula variables on how the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are allocated. This chapter discusses the impact of changing from 1990 Census data to 2000 data for each individual variable on that variable's importance and formula distribution.

Table 6–1 shows the total amount of CDBG funds allocated in fiscal year (FY) 2002 by each of the formula variables. The variables, in order of overall importance based on the amount of funds they allocate, are as follows:

- Pre-1940 housing: 27.2 percent of the total CDBG funds are allocated by the pre-1940 housing variable. For formula B grantees, an average of $13.28 is allocated per capita. For each pre-1940 housing unit a formula B grantee had in 1990, the formula allocated $168.76 of CDBG funds in FY 2002.

- Poverty in formula A: 20.7 percent of the total CDBG funds are allocated by the poverty variable in formula A. For formula A grantees, an average of $5.51 is allocated per capita. For each person in poverty that a formula A grantee had in 1990, the formula allocated $53.62 of CDBG funds in FY 2002.

- Growth lag: 18.5 percent of the total CDBG funds are allocated by the growth-lag variable. For formula B grantees, an average of $9.03 is allocated per capita. For each growth-lag "person" in 2000, the formula allocated $20.94 of CDBG funds in FY 2002.

Table 6–1
FY 2002 Allocations to Entitlement Communities by Individual Formula Variables

Variable	Amount ($000s)	%	Per Capita ($)	Dollars per formula variable[a]
Formula A				
Population	335,847	11.1	2.94	2.94
Poverty	630,214	20.7	5.51	53.62
Overcrowding	404,808	13.3	3.54	168.76
Subtotal formula A	1,370,869	45.1	11.98	NA
Formula B				
Growth lag	562,168	18.5	9.03	20.94
Poverty	278,681	9.2	4.47	32.17
Pre-1940	826,983	27.2	13.28	95.88
Subtotal formula B	1,667,831	54.9	26.78	NA
Total	3,038,700	100.0	NA	NA

[a]That is, dollars allocated per person, dollars per person in poverty, dollars per overcrowded housing unit, dollars per growth lag "person", and dollars per pre-1940 housing unit.

- Overcrowding: 13.3 percent of the total CDBG funds are allocated by the overcrowding variable in formula A. For formula A grantees, an average of $3.54 is allocated per capita.

For each overcrowded housing unit a formula A grantee had in 1990, the formula allocated $168.76 of CDBG funds in FY 2002.

- Population: 11.1 percent of the total CDBG funds are allocated by the population variable in formula A. For formula A grantees, an average of $2.94 is allocated per capita.

- Poverty in formula B: 9.2 percent of the total CDBG funds are allocated by the poverty variable in formula B. For formula B grantees, an average of $4.47 is allocated per capita. For each person in poverty that a formula B grantee had in 1990, the formula allocated $32.17 of CDBG funds in FY 2002.

Although Pre-1940 housing allocates the most of the formula variables nationwide, there are dramatic regional differences in variable importance. Generally, because the pre-1940 housing variable of formula B and the poverty variable of formula A have the greatest "explicit" weights (50 percent for each), one would expect these variables to allocate the most funds to each region. Most regions are either strongly formula A or formula B; thus the above hypothesis generally holds true. For example, table 6–2 shows that poverty allocates the most funds in the Southwest region (which includes mostly formula A communities), and pre-1940 housing allocates the most funds in New England (which consists of all formula B communities).

Table 6–2
Importance of Variables by Region and Entitlement Type: FY 2002 Appropriation

	Formula A				Formula B			
	n	Population (%)	Poverty (%)	Overcrowding (%)	*n*	Growth Lag (%)	Poverty (%)	Pre-1940 Housing (%)
Region								
New England	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	73	27.8	13.2	59.1
New York/New Jersey	20	1.9	1.5	0.8	76	27.7	15.9	52.1
Mid-Atlantic	24	5.8	5.2	3.1	63	31.5	12.2	42.2
Southeast	143	22.0	41.4	19.3	21	7.9	4.1	5.3
Midwest	68	6.4	6.5	2.5	119	32.3	15.1	37.1
Southwest	94	18.1	46.4	24.4	12	4.5	2.9	3.8
Great Plains	14	7.7	10.7	3.1	16	29.4	12.6	36.5
Rocky Mountain	29	19.5	28.1	10.1	8	10.8	9.7	21.9
Pacific/Hawaii	175	18.8	34.6	38.2	8	1.9	1.2	5.3
Northwest/Alaska	32	18.9	22.8	10.9	8	9.9	8.7	28.8
Puerto Rico	21	8.5	76.8	14.7	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jurisdiction type								
Central city	279	6.4	17.9	10.2	260	23.1	11.5	30.9
Satellite city	223	16.4	24.4	21.8	103	13.0	4.4	20.0
Urban county	118	23.5	28.1	18.8	41	6.4	4.0	19.2

However, for some regions, the implicit weights are more influential than the explicit weights. For example, in the Pacific/Hawaii region, overcrowding allocates the most, 38.2 percent of the

funds, well above its explicit formula A weight of 25 percent and its implicit overall weight of 13.3 percent. Growth lag is also notable for its real importance as a formula variable relative to its explicit weight. The explicit weight for growth lag in formula B is 20 percent, its implicit weight is 18.5 percent, even though formula B allocates funds to less than 40 percent of CDBG grantees. In regions where formula B is strong, such as in the Midwest, Mid-Atlantic, New England, Great Plains, and New York/New Jersey, growth lag is particularly important and far exceeds its explicit weight of 20 percent, allocating nearly one-third of the funds.

The relative importance of growth lag has declined with the introduction of new Census data and new entitlement communities. With all Census 1990 data and 889 entitlement communities, table 6–3 shows that the implicit weight for growth lag is 18.9 percent. With the introduction of 2000 Census data and the addition of 135 new entitlement communities, that implicit weight falls to 18.3 percent. The implicit weight on the poverty variable for formula B grantees actually decreases more, mostly because poverty has expanded and these communities are not experiencing increases in poverty. On the formula A side, the implicit weight of poverty has risen a full 1.9 percentage points due to both the addition of new formula A communities and the overall growth of the poverty population for formula A relative to formula B communities.

Table 6–3
Changing Allocation Portions by Individual Formula Variables: FY 2002 Appropriations (%)

		Funds Distributed by Each Formula Factor (%)			
Variable	**Factor Weights**	**All Census 1990 Data**	**FY 2002**	**All Census 2000 Data**	**Change 1990 to 2000 data**
Formula A					
Population	20.0	10.5	11.1	10.8	0.3
Poverty	50.0	20.0	20.7	21.9	1.9
Overcrowding	25.0	13.2	13.3	13.8	0.6
Subtotal	100.0	44.0	45.1	46.9	2.8
Formula B					
Growth lag	20.0	18.9	18.5	18.3	–0.6
Poverty	30.0	9.5	9.2	8.6	–0.9
Pre-1940	50.0	27.0	27.2	26.1	–1.0
Subtotal	100.0	56.0	54.9	53.1	–2.8
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	

Table 6–4 takes a different approach to demonstrating the change in variable importance over the past 10 years. It separates the effect of new entitlement communities from the effect of the data elements without the new entitlement communities. For example, the Southeast region has an overall gain of 8.2 percent in funding between Census 1990 data and Census 2000 data. New entitlement communities account for 5.2 percent of that increase. The change in data from Census 1990 to Census 2000 had a positive effect on formula A grantees as a whole in the Southeast region, as well as on formula switchers. The change had a negative effect on the relatively few formula B grantees, accounting for a combined effect of a 3-percentage-point increase to the Southeast region because of the changing share of the formula variables between regions.

Table 6–4
Change Due to Data and New Entitlements (%)

	Total	New Entitlements	Switch Formulas	Formula A			Formula B		
				Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
Region									
New England	–0.6	–1.3	0.0	NA	NA	NA	2.0	0.3	–1.6
New York/New Jersey	–3.4	–1.9	0.2	–0.2	0.4	0.1	–1.9	1.0	–1.1
Mid-Atlantic	–1.4	–1.1	0.0	–0.2	0.9	0.5	1.8	–1.1	–2.2
Southeast	8.2	5.2	0.2	0.5	2.9	0.7	–0.2	–0.7	–0.4
Midwest	–5.5	–1.2	0.4	–0.3	0.0	0.3	–0.5	–2.9	–1.3
Southwest	–0.1	1.0	0.0	0.1	–1.0	0.8	0.0	–0.6	–0.4
Great Plains	–8.9	–1.9	–0.1	–0.4	0.0	–0.3	–1.1	–2.1	–3.0
Rocky Mountain	2.6	3.6	0.0	0.9	–0.8	2.8	–3.9	–1.0	1.0
Pacific/Hawaii	5.0	–1.3	0.1	–0.1	6.6	–0.2	0.0	–0.1	0.0
Northwest/Alaska	8.2	0.0	0.2	0.9	3.6	3.5	–1.6	–0.3	1.9
Puerto Rico	1.9	15.9	0.0	–1.3	–18.4	5.7	NA	NA	NA
Total	0.0	0.0	0.2	–0.1	1.3	0.5	–0.3	–0.7	–0.9
Jurisdiction type									
Central city	–4.5	–1.1	0.0	–0.2	0.0	–0.1	–0.6	–1.1	–1.4
Satellite city	18.1	12.4	–0.1	–0.2	3.1	2.1	0.9	0.3	–0.4
Urban county	5.8	–2.7	0.4	0.3	4.7	1.7	0.5	0.1	0.8
Total	0.0	0.0	0.2	–0.1	1.3	0.5	–0.3	–0.7	–0.9

NA= Not Applicable, not grantees

The impact of changing data over the previous 10 years is discussed below:

Population—Formula A

If no new entitlements had been added between 1993 and 2002, the introduction of new population data would have generally maintained its level of importance in allocating funds. Among the old entitlement communities, the Northwest/Alaska, Rocky Mountain, and Southeast regions were increasing their share of funds under the population variable at the expense of Puerto Rico and the other regions.

However, because population generally determines eligibility for new entitlement status, its true effect is more significant. Table 6–3 demonstrates the overall importance of population. Population has an explicit weight in formula A of 25 percent. Its implicit weight when all 1990 Census data are used with the 889 entitlement grantees of FY 1993 is 10.5 percent. Due primarily to the addition of new entitlements, the implicit weight for population rose to 11.1 percent for the actual FY 2002 allocation with 1,024 grantees. The addition of poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing data diminishes this implicit weight of population to 10.8 percent. In terms of formula A communities only, the implicit weight for population rose from 23.9 to 24.6 percent between all 1990 Census data and the FY 2002 allocation, falling to 23.0 percent with the introduction of new Census 2000 data.

Table 6–5
Entitlement Community Share Concentration (%)

Formula	1990 Census	2000 Census Entitlements		
		Total	New	Old
A				
Population	47.7	49.9	4.4	45.5
Poverty	44.3	50.1	4.0	46.1
Overcrowding	58.4	63.5	4.0	59.5
B				
Growth lag[a]	104.5	104.8	0.4	104.4
Poverty	33.8	32.5	0.3	32.2
Pre-1940 housing	59.7	60.0	0.7	59.4

[a]Calculated as the sum of entitlement city share plus urban county share.

Poverty—Formula A

In formula A, poverty is weighted at 50 percent. Of all of the formula variables, the importance of this variable increases the most with the introduction of Census 2000 data. For old entitlement communities allocated funds under formula A, there is an overall increase in funds of 1.3 percent due to the poverty variable in formula A. Although this seems modest, there are very large regional shifts due to poverty. Old entitlement formula A grantees in Puerto Rico see average decreases in funds from the poverty variable of more than 18 percent, whereas the Pacific/Hawaii and Northwest/Alaska regions see the largest gains.

New entitlement communities matter here as well. Because most of the new entitlement communities are formula A grantees, the implicit weight of poverty increased in importance between an all 1990 Census data allocation to the 889 FY 1993 grantees of 20.0 to 20.7 percent. With the addition of Census 2000 data for poverty and the other variables, its implicit weight rose from 20.7 percent to 21.9 percent. Among formula A grantees alone, its implicit weight continues to move closer to its explicit weight of 50 percent: 45.5 percent with all Census 1990 data, 45.9 percent in FY 2002, and 46.7 percent with all Census 2000 data.

Table 6–5 shows another way to understand why poverty has become more important for formula A grantees with all 2000 Census data than it was with all 1990 Census data. Table 6–5 shows the share of poverty that formula A cities make up of the metropolitan total. Poverty has become more concentrated among the formula A grantees, increasing from 44.3 to 50.1 percent.

Overcrowding—Formula A

In formula A, overcrowding has an explicit weight of 25 percent. The introduction of Census 2000 data, more because of the increase in overcrowding in existing entitlement communities than the addition of new entitlement communities, led to an increase in its implicit weight from 13.2 to 13.8 percent of the total allocation. Although overcrowding has an implicit weight among formula A grantees that is greater than its explicit weight, that implicit weight has been falling: 30.0 percent with all Census 1990 data, 29.5 percent in FY 2002, and 29.4 percent with all Census 2000 data.

Growth Lag—Formula B

In formula B, growth lag has an explicit weight of 20 percent. Unlike any of the other formula variables, its implicit weight across all CDBG grantees almost matches its explicit weight in formula B. Among formula B grantees, its explicit weight is significantly higher than its implicit weight. Table 6–5 shows growth lag allocates more than 100 percent of its share. The only reason growth lag's implicit weight is less than its explicit weight is pro rata reduction.

Formula B's growth-lag share is more than 100 percent, although none of the other variables claims more than 65 percent for two reasons. First, growth lag can allocate more than 100 percent of its share because:

A. The denominator is the sum of growth lag among entitlement communities rather than the metropolitan area (MA) total, which the other CDBG variables use. That is, there are places with poverty, overcrowding, population, and pre-1940 housing that are included in the CDBG denominator but are not included in the numerators.

B. Entitlement cities get special treatment in that they get a share allocation based on the sum of growth lag for all entitlement cities. Because this is less than the sum of all growth-lag, it effectively allows cities to get more than 100 percent share of the growth-lag allocation. Entitlement counties use a denominator of all entitlement communities for their growth-lag calculation.

Second, few formula A communities have any growth lag. If a community is losing population, it will generally receive more funds under formula B than formula A and is thus a formula B grantee. While this is generally true, over time, more and more formula A communities, communities without pre-1940 housing but with slower growing or declining populations, are receiving growth-lag "units."

This leads to a change in the implicit weight of growth lag. Using all 1990 Census data, the overall implicit weight of growth lag is 18.9 percent. With the introduction of all Census 2000 data, the implicit weight falls to 18.3 percent. This decrease in implicit weight is due to both the increasing pro rata reduction and increasing growth lag among formula A communities. On the other hand, the implicit weight of growth lag among formula B grantees alone has been increasing, from 33.8 to 34.5 percent. An increasing formula B implicit weight and a decreasing overall implicit weight is occurring because formula B grantees overall have been losing funding share to formula A grantees. However, for grantees who receive funding under formula B, growth lag is increasingly concentrated among formula B grantees—the share of growth lag among formula B communities has increased from 104.5 to 104.8 percent. Regionally, the old formula B grantees of the New England and Mid-Atlantic regions have been increasing their allocations on the growth-lag variable, although the other regions have been losing.

Growth-lag peculiarities are described below.

Assembling Data

Of all the CDBG variables, growth lag is the most complicated for the U.S. Department of Housing Urban Development (HUD) to maintain. Annexation and new incorporations since 1960 pose a challenge for calculating growth lag, because 1960 population data do not match the new boundaries from which the 2000 population data are based.

To account for the problem posed by annexation and new incorporations since 1960, HUD has implemented the following rules:

1. Entitlement cities with annexation since 1960: Because no 1960 data for the areas outside of the 1960 city boundary exist, we simply use the 1960 population with the 1960 boundary and the 2000 population with the 2000 boundary. The result is that most communities with annexation do not receive growth-lag funding.[29]

2. Entitlement cities unincorporated in 1960 and now qualified as entitlement communities: Growth lag is automatically set at zero. In addition, these communities are not included when HUD calculates the growth rate of metropolitan cities between 1960 and 2000.

3. Urban counties with city annexations or incorporations since 1960: We subtract the 1960 data for the areas in which 1960 data exist to form the urban county 1960 base population and compared it with the current 2000 population minus the current nonparticipating/ entitlement areas. This equation results in a 1960 base that is larger than what it probably really was, thus making the urban county appear to have less population growth or more population loss since 1960 than it really did. The problem occurs largely with counties that are currently formula A, but it affects formula B counties by increasing the formula B denominator for urban counties. For example, Santa Clara County, California, has had tremendous growth in the past 40 years. However, it has growth lag because the entitlement communities subtracted out of the county have each annexed substantial portions of land in the past 40 years that is not accounted for in the 1960 population number for those communities.

---

[29]In the 1980s, Congress amended the growth-lag definition to help formula B cities with annexations during the 1980s to retain the funding they received through growth lag. Without this adjustment, a few cities would have lost funds because their annexation made them appear to have significant population growth since 1960. For the FY 2002 allocation, for communities with annexation in the 1980s only, this adjustment calculates the current population used for calculating growth lag as:

$$pop^{adj} = \text{Census 2000 population for current geography} * \frac{\text{Census 1980 pop with 1980 geog + Cubans \& Haitians*}}{\text{Census 1980 population with 1988 geography}}$$

$$\text{growth lag} = (\text{1960 population} * 1.374) - pop^{adj}$$

*Shortly after the 1980 Census, there was a large migration of Cubans and Haitians into the United States. An Executive order called for an adjustment to the 1980 Census numbers to account for this migration.

No additional formula modifications involving annexation have been added since that time, and nothing addresses the cities with annexations and growth lag since 1990.

Places Losing Population and Share, Places Gaining Population and Share

The assumed behavior of growth lag is that if a place continues to lose population, its share of growth lag should increase at a faster rate than a place that may be gaining population, albeit slower than the national rate for all metropolitan cities. Actually this is not entirely true. Case in point, the Detroit example in chapter 5 shows Detroit's population continuing to decline about 7.5 percent between 1990 and 2000. Nonetheless, its share of growth lag declined by more than 3 percent. In contrast, Cherry Hill, New Jersey, had a population increase between 1990 and 2000 of 1 percent, yet its share of growth lag increased 42 percent. As a result, Cherry Hill's CDBG allocation from growth lag is increasing and Detroit's is declining. The reason is "growth-lag math."

The basic principal of growth-lag math is that if a grantee has a small amount of growth lag currently, it takes very few additional growth-lag units to increase its share of overall growth lag; however if it already has a high number of growth lag units, it requires a very high number of new growth-lag units to increase its share of overall growth lag. The following is an example using growth-lag math for two cities:

Data:

City A - slow growing
1960 Population = 100
1990 population = 105
2000 population = 110

City B - declining
1960 Population = 1,000
1990 Population = 750
2000 Population = 700

Metropolitan city growth rate
1960–1990 = 10 percent
1960–2000 = 20 percent

Growth lag denominator
1990 = 500
2000 = 800

Growth Lag With 1990 Data:

1990 growth lag = (1960 population $*$ 1.10) – 1990 population

City A: (100 $*$ 1.10) – 105 = 5

City B: (1,000 ∗ 1.10) – 750 = 350

1990 growth-lag share (GLS) = growth lag of city/1990 growth-lag denominator

City A: 5/500 = 0.0100

City B: 350/500 = 0.7000

Growth Lag With 2000 Data:

(1960 population ∗ 1.20) – 2000 population

City A: (100 ∗ 1.20) – 110 = 10

City B: (1,000 ∗ 1.20) – 700 = 500

2000 GLS = (growth lag of city/2000 growth-lag denominator)

City A: 10/800 = 0.0125

City B: 500/800 = 0.6250

GLS From 1990 to 2000:

Change in GLS 1990 to 2000 = (2000 GLS – 1990 GLS) / 1990 GLS

City A: (0.0125 – 0.0100) / 0.0100 = +25 percent

City B: (0.6250 – 0.7000) / 0.7000 = –11 percent

In this example, city A's 1990 growth lag is small. As such, it does not take much to double it. City B, on the other hand, has a fairly large growth lag in 1990, and it takes a lot to double it. As a result, a city that already has a substantial amount of growth lag has to have substantial population loss to avoid loss of funding share to communities with relatively small amounts of growth lag, even if the cities gaining funding share have population losses substantially less than communities losing funding share. Although the example compares a city gaining population with one that continues to lose population, most communities that gain funding under the growth lag between 1990 and 2000 are indeed experiencing real population loss. Those gaining, however, mostly had relatively small 1990 growth-lag amounts.

Poverty—Formula B

Although poverty is important and growing in importance for formula A grantees, it is considerably less important for formula B grantees and has become less important over time. The explicit weight for poverty in formula B is 30 percent. Its overall implicit weight has fallen from 9.5 to 8.6 percent between an all 1990 Census data calculation and an all 2000 Census data calculation. Among formula B grantees only, its implicit weight has fallen from 17 to 16.2 percent, well below its explicit weight of 30 percent.

Pre-1940 Housing—Formula B

Pre-1940 housing has the largest formula B explicit weight at 50 percent. Like growth lag, its overall implicit weight has declined, from 27 percent with all 1990 Census data to 26.1 percent with all 2000 Census data, although its formula B implicit weight has increased from 48.2 to 49.1 percent.

As noted earlier, there is much less shifting in share between jurisdictions on pre-1940 housing, largely because jurisdictions generally do not have an increase in pre-1940 housing. Nonetheless, most jurisdictions that have pre-1940 housing have lost funding, largely because their share of the metropolitan total of pre-1940 housing has not increased significantly over the decade (see table 6–5) and pro rata reduction has risen.

One of the odd things about pre-1940 housing is that it is difficult to increase the stock of pre-1940 housing (such as converting an old warehouse into residential units) in practice, yet many jurisdictions appear to have done so, at least according to the Decennial Census. Between 1990 and 2000, 303 of the 1,024 CDBG entitlement communities did have relatively small increases in units built before 1940. We theorize that the increase in pre-1940 units is more likely due to respondent error (in either 1990 or 2000) or better data collection in one or the other of the Censuses.

Furthermore, in past CDBG studies, we found that communities tearing down pre-1940 housing tend to have more community development need than places retaining their pre-1940 housing. In other words, over time, pre-1940 housing has probably worsened as a proxy for community development need. The forthcoming study on community development need will explore this more thoroughly.

Ramifications of American Community Survey

The U.S. Census Bureau is proposing to implement a new method for collecting the long-form data used for most of the CDBG variables (poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing). Under this new system, called the American Community Survey (ACS), the Census Bureau would collect long-form data continuously. Data would be released each year, beginning with data collected in 2004 for areas with populations more than 65,000, with data collected in 2006 for areas with population between 20,000 and 65,000, and after data collection is completed in 2008 for all areas. The data for the smaller areas would be reported as “rolling averages,” that is, the sum of the sample responses across multiple years.

An analysis conducted for HUD concludes that because the smallest CDBG grantee has fewer than 20,000 (Ranoul, population 12,857), HUD would have to wait until the data collected in 2008 are released to begin using data from the ACS in CDBG (Eggers et al. 2002). The data that would be used would need to be 5-year averages to be comparable across all jurisdictions.

Each year after the 2008 data are released the ACS would be updated to the new 5-year average. That is, the 2008 data would reflect an average for data collected between 2004 and 2008, the 2009 data would reflect an average for data collected from 2005 to 2009. Moving to this new data source would have the same effect as population and growth lag currently have on the formula—small allocation changes each year rather than a jolt, as is experienced under the current formula when long-form decennial Census data are only added annually. From an administrative standpoint, it would modestly increase the burden on HUD staff who manage the allocation, because they would need to recompile all of the new data annually.

Full funding for the ACS was still not established as of March 2003, when this report was finalized. As a result, the dates noted above will probably slip 1 or 2 years.

Chapter 7: Impact on States

As noted in the introductory sections, state nonentitlement grantees statutorily receive 30 percent of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. With the exception of Hawaii, these funds are allocated to the states, who then subsequently provide the funds for activities in communities not served by the entitlement program. In Hawaii, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) administers the program for nonentitled areas.

This chapter analyzes how updating the data in the formula from Census 1990 to Census 2000 has impacted state nonentitlement grant amounts. It concludes with a state-by-state analysis of the combined entitlement and nonentitlement formula allocations.

FY 2002 to All Census 2000

Chapter 2 shows that state nonentitlement formula allocations have two fundamental differences from entitlement formula allocations:

1. In formula B, population is used in place of growth lag.

2. For each of the formula variables, the denominator is the sum of that variable for all nonentitlement areas rather than the sum of all metropolitan areas (MAs) used for most of the entitlement formula variables.

Table 7–1
FY 2002 Allocations to States by Individual Formula Variables

Variable	Grant ($000s)	Implicit Weight (%)	Per Capita ($)	Dollars per formula variable[a]
Formula A (*n* = 24 states)				
Population	138,213	10.6	2.51	2.51
Poverty	343,127	26.3	6.24	41.31
Overcrowding	195,649	15.0	3.56	239.41
Subtotal	676,989	52.0	12.31	NA
Formula B (*n* = 27 states)				
Population	105,991	8.1	2.01	2.01
Poverty	118,966	9.1	2.26	24.78
Pre-1940	400,353	30.7	7.60	71.26
Subtotal	625,311	48.0	11.86	NA
Total (*n* = 51 states)	**1,302,300**	**100.0**	NA	NA

[a]That is, dollars allocated per person, dollars per person in poverty, dollars per overcrowded housing unit, dollars per pre-1940 housing unit.

The first difference means that formula B does not have a proxy for community decline, although it does retain pre-1940 housing to target to older communities. The second difference means that unlike the entitlement allocation, both formula A and formula B allocate all of the appropriated

funds in the state formula, thus resulting in the state formula having a higher pro rata reduction than the entitlement formula. In fiscal year (FY) 2002, the pro rata reduction for entitlements is 11.43 percent, and the pro rata reduction for states is 16.85 percent.

Table 7-1 shows each of the formula variables, the amount each allocates to states in FY 2002, the implicit weight of each variable after taking into account the "greater than" and pro rata reduction elements of the formula, per capita grant amounts for each variable, and the per formula variable amounts. That is, for example, each person in poverty is responsible for $41.31 of the funds allocated to formula A grantees.

Table 7–1 shows some similarities between how formula A and formula B allocate funds to states:

- Similar numbers of grantees—24 for formula A and 27 for formula B.
- Similar amounts allocated—52 percent to formula A and 48 percent to formula B.
- Similar per capita grant amounts—$12.31 for formula A grantees and $11.86 for formula B.

There is, however, a big difference in the factors that determine which formula a state receives funding. States with substantial poverty and overcrowding in their nonentitled areas receive funds under formula A, whereas states with significant numbers of pre-1940 housing units in their nonentitled areas receive funding under formula B.

Table 7–2 shows the effect that introducing 2000 Census data will have on the allocation of CDBG funds to nonentitlement states in FY 2003. Overall, the pattern of change to the CDBG allocation due to the introduction of Census 2000 data is similar for nonentitlement states and entitlement communities. The driving forces for funding changes are largely poverty and overcrowding, with formula A states having the largest gains and losses. The largest gainers are primarily western states. The only state with an increase greater than 10 percent that is not in the west is Florida. Nevada and Arizona both see increases of greater than 20 percent, largely due to increases in their share of persons in poverty. Washington also has a substantial increase due to increases in both its share of overcrowded households and persons in poverty.

Only four states lose more than 10 percent funding as a result of the new Census data: Louisiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Kentucky. The decreases for Louisiana, Mississippi, and Kentucky are attributable to both decreases in their share of persons in poverty and overcrowded households. The loss for North Dakota, the only formula B state among the larger winners and losers, is equally attributable to loss in share of persons in poverty and loss in share of pre-1940 housing units. Table 7-2 shows the state-by-state impact of introducing new Census 2000 data into the formula, along with which of the three variables that changed is driving the change for each state.

Table 7–2
Impact of Census 2000 Poverty, Overcrowding, and Pre-1940 Housing on State Nonentitlement Grants

States	FY 2002 Grant ($000)	Census 2000 Grant ($000)	Change (%)	Poverty (%)	Overcrowding (%)	Pre-1940 Housing (%)
Northeast						
Connecticut	14,795	15,575	**5.3**	2.6	—	3.0
Maine	16,946	16,890	**–0.3**	1.3	—	–1.5
Massachusetts	38,713	39,853	**2.9**	1.5	—	1.7
New Hampshire	10,355	10,545	**1.8**	1.6	—	0.4
New Jersey	9,562	9,468	**–1.0**	2.1	—	–2.9
New York	56,494	57,150	**1.2**	1.7	—	–0.4
Pennsylvania	58,170	59,085	**1.6**	–0.2	—	2.0
Rhode Island	5,860	6,039	**3.1**	2.9	—	0.3
Vermont	8,857	8,548	**–3.5**	0.8	—	–4.1
South						
Alabama	31,606	29,286	**–7.3**	–1.2	–6.0	—
Arkansas	24,898	22,543	**–9.5**	–5.7	–3.5	—
Delaware	2,033	2,210	**8.7**	[a]	[a]	[a]
Florida	29,428	32,946	**12.0**	8.8	3.5	—
Georgia	45,735	48,029	**5.0**	4.8	0.5	—
Kentucky	35,418	31,806	**–10.2**	–5.1	–4.9	—
Louisiana	38,449	33,079	**–14.0**	–6.8	–7.0	—
Maryland	9,237	9,417	**2.0**	3.3	—	–1.0
Mississippi	39,214	34,235	**–12.7**	–6.9	–5.6	—
North Carolina	47,596	50,814	**6.8**	6.2	0.8	—
Oklahoma	21,368	19,798	**–7.3**	–6.0	–1.2	—
Puerto Rico	58,279	63,694	**9.3**	–4.6	14.0	—
South Carolina	28,187	27,101	**–3.9**	2.9	–6.5	—
Tennessee	31,529	31,007	**–1.7**	0.3	–1.7	—
Texas	88,287	85,210	**–3.5**	–3.0	–0.2	—
Virginia	24,562	24,417	**–0.6**	[a]	[a]	[a]
West Virginia	21,512	20,410	**–5.1**	–2.5	—	–2.5
North-Central						
Illinois	39,041	37,773	**–3.2**	–3.2	—	0.1
Indiana	37,830	38,110	**0.7**	–0.8	—	1.8
Iowa	31,081	30,992	**–0.3**	–2.9	—	2.8
Kansas	21,055	19,934	**–5.3**	–1.8	—	–3.4
Michigan	44,630	43,148	**–3.3**	–2.9	—	–0.2
Minnesota	25,060	23,766	**–5.2**	–4.1	—	–0.9
Missouri	29,923	29,404	**–1.7**	–1.2	—	–0.3
Nebraska	15,377	14,486	**–5.8**	–1.5	—	–4.1
North Dakota	6,402	5,644	**–11.8**	–5.3	—	–6.4
Ohio	56,751	56,421	**–0.6**	–2.9	—	2.5
South Dakota	8,394	7,661	**–8.7**	–3.4	—	–5.2
Wisconsin	33,977	33,251	**–2.1**	–2.2	—	0.2
West						
Alaska	3,277	3,474	**6.0**	7.3	–1.1	—
Arizona	11,359	13,636	**20.0**	15.3	5.0	—
California	43,732	49,648	**13.5**	9.6	4.1	—
Colorado	11,675	12,811	**9.7**	[a]	[a]	[a]
Hawaii	5,169	5,902	**14.2**	11.8	2.6	—
Idaho	9,830	10,972	**11.6**	6.4	5.5	—
Montana	8,060	7,864	**–2.4**	0.6	—	–2.9
Nevada	3,036	3,670	**20.9**	12.6	8.6	—
New Mexico	16,020	16,763	**4.6**	4.7	0.1	—
Oregon	15,778	16,665	**5.6**	2.6	3.3	—
Utah	8,075	8,544	**5.8**	4.6	1.5	—
Washington	16,162	18,922	**17.1**	8.3	9.1	—
Wyoming	3,523	3,682	**4.5**	2.5	—	2.3

Notes: For all communities, there is a small change due to the increased pro rata reduction effect on population or growth lag that is not shown below but is accounted for in the total percent change.
FY = fiscal year; — = Not Applicable.
[a]Colorado, Delaware, and Virginia switch formulas.

All Census 1990 to All Census 2000

The above analysis does not consider the effect of updating the population data over the decade nor the impact of subtracting new entitlement geography from the state allocations. As described in chapter 5, new entitlement communities affect the share of funds available for entitlement communities and the share of funding for states. New entitlement communities that come out of state nonentitlement geography lead to decreases in funding for existing entitlement grantees, whereas the "nongiving" state nonentitlement areas generally have increases in funding. This is because of the statutorily fixed division of CDBG funds—70 percent for entitlement communities and 30 percent for nonentitlement communities. For nongiving states (all of the states except the state from which the new entitlement community is created), the share of the funded population increases, and the allocation pool does not change. The "giving" state loses funding, however, because it loses the geography/population of that new entitlement community.

Table 7–3 takes into account the effect of both introducing Census 2000 data into the formula and reducing state geography by the creation of new entitlement communities. It shows that the states in the West increased share on poverty, population, and overcrowding while decreasing share on pre-1940 housing. It is not surprising, then, to expect the formula A states to experience funding increases on average. On the other hand, southern states experienced decreases in share on population, poverty, and overcrowding. Thus, on average, we should expect formula A states in the South to have decreases in funding. Similarly, because the Northeast gains share on poverty and pre-1940 housing, on average we expect the formula B states to gain in funding. However, the North-Central states that lose share on poverty and pre-1940 housing would have funding declines on average.

Table 7–3
Regional Share Shifts in Formula Variables From 1990 to 2000

	Change in Share (%)			
Region	**Population**	**Poverty**	**Overcrowding**	**Pre-1940**
Northeast	–0.64	1.15	–0.66	0.62
North-Central	0.28	–0.43	–0.88	–0.39
South	–0.16	–1.64	–0.19	0.75
West	0.51	0.92	1.73	–0.99
Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

We see on table 7–4, that these regional trends hold true. All of the formula A states in the West have funding increases, 11 of the 17 states in the South have funding decreases, 8 out of 9 Northeast states have funding increases, and 8 out of 12 North-Central states have funding decreases.

Table 7–4
Impact of shifting from all Census 1990 to all Census 2000 on State Nonentitlement Grants

States	Total Grant Change	New Entitlements	Formula A			Formula B		
			Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Population	Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
Northeast								
Connecticut	**8.4**	4.5[a]	—	—	—	–1.8	2.4	3.3
Maine	**3.2**	4.0[a]	—	—	—	–1.2	1.2	–0.8
Massachusetts	**1.8**	–0.8	—	—	—	–1.0	1.5	2.1
New Hampshire	**6.6**	4.2[a]	—	—	—	–0.2	1.5	1.0
New Jersey	**–14.0**	–10.5	—	—	—	–1.4	2.7	–4.8
New York	**1.1**	2.0	—	—	—	–1.7	1.4	–0.6
Pennsylvania	**2.0**	0.5	—	—	—	–1.0	–0.2	2.8
Rhode Island	**6.5**	4.3[a]	—	—	—	–1.4	2.8	0.9
Vermont	**0.3**	3.8[a]	—	—	—	–0.6	0.7	–3.5
South								
Alabama	**–11.0**	–4.7	0.4	–1.1	–5.6	—	—	—
Arkansas	**–7.0**	0.2	0.1	–4.5	–2.8	—	—	—
Delaware[b]	**6.4**	–7.2	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]
Florida	**4.5**	–15.7	4.0	10.8	5.4	—	—	—
Georgia	**7.5**	1.8	1.6	3.6	0.5	—	—	—
Kentucky	**–4.4**	6.5[a]	–0.6	–5.3	–5.0	—	—	—
Louisiana	**–10.3**	6.4[a]	–1.2	–7.8	–7.7	—	—	—
Maryland	**–11.4**	–14.3	—	—	—	1.0	3.2	–1.3
Mississippi	**–9.6**	4.6	–0.5	–7.6	–6.1	—	—	—
North Carolina	**5.6**	–0.6	0.4	5.7	0.0	—	—	—
Oklahoma	**–5.1**	6.7[a]	–4.4	–5.9	–1.4	—	—	—
Puerto Rico	**–2.3**	–10.9	–0.1	–4.8	13.5	—	—	—
South Carolina	**–16.7**	–9.4	–0.8	0.8	–7.2	—	—	—
Tennessee	**6.2**	7.4[a]	1.1	–0.1	–2.1	—	—	—
Texas	**–3.3**	–2.2	1.7	–2.7	–0.1	—	—	—
Virginia[b]	**6.5**	4.1	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]
West Virginia	**–1.9**	4.6[a]	—	—	—	–1.8	–2.5	–2.1
North-Central								
Illinois	**–6.6**	–4.1	—	—	—	–0.6	–2.5	0.6
Indiana	**5.2**	4.4[a]	—	—	—	–0.5	–0.9	2.2
Iowa	**3.3**	3.9[a]	—	—	—	–1.1	–2.9	3.4
Kansas	**–2.1**	4.0[a]	—	—	—	–1.3	–1.8	–2.8
Michigan	**–2.0**	4.2[a]	—	—	—	–0.7	–3.9	–1.5
Minnesota	**–12.9**	0.1	—	—	—	–0.4	–3.7	–8.9
Missouri	**1.5**	3.5	—	—	—	0.1	–1.3	–0.7
Nebraska	**–2.7**	3.8[a]	—	—	—	–1.4	–1.6	–3.6
North Dakota	**–10.4**	3.7[a]	—	—	—	–3.1	–5.1	–5.8
Ohio	**1.2**	1.9	—	—	—	–0.9	–2.8	3.1
South Dakota	**–6.3**	3.7[a]	—	—	—	–2.0	–3.4	–4.6
Wisconsin	**–1.7**	0.1	—	—	—	–0.4	–2.1	0.6
West								
Alaska	**8.5**	8.4[a]	–5.0	6.9	–1.8	—	—	—
Arizona	**23.1**	2.4	1.0	15.2	4.5	—	—	—
California	**8.7**	–8.4	0.1	11.1	5.9	—	—	—
Colorado[b]	**8.8**	–6.1	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]	[b]
Hawaii	**24.5**	9.8[a]	1.2	12.0	1.6	—	—	—
Idaho	**10.6**	–3.8	2.2	6.6	5.7	—	—	—
Montana	**–5.6**	–3.9	—	—	—	–0.9	1.2	–2.0
Nevada	**36.3**	10.2[a]	4.8	13.2	8.0	—	—	—
New Mexico	**9.9**	5.9	–0.5	4.7	–0.2	—	—	—
Oregon	**8.5**	2.4	0.4	2.8	2.8	—	—	—
Utah	**9.5**	–0.6	5.0	4.2	0.9	—	—	—
Washington	**21.4**	9.0[a]	0.9	7.3	4.2	—	—	—
Wyoming	**8.7**	5.0[a]	—	—	—	–1.3	2.3	2.7

— = Not Applicable
[a] No new entitlement(s) created between FY 1993 and FY 2002 out of state non-entitlement balance.
[b] Switches formula.

Table 7–4 shows the effect of new entitlement communities (more specifically the subtraction of new entitlements) and how updating the data for each of the formula variables from Census 1990 to Census 2000 changes state grant amounts. For a few state grantees, the loss of geography served due to communities converting to new entitlements resulted in a substantial decrease in funding. Those states, mostly in the South are Florida, Maryland, and Puerto Rico. In the Northeast, New Jersey also lost more than 10 percent of its grant due to the loss of geography to new entitlement communities. Of course, these states no longer have to provide services to areas that are now entitled, so it might be a net gain for the other nonentitled areas in the state. For the 21 states that had no new entitlement areas between FYs 1993 and 2002, all have funding increases from the introduction of new entitlements—ranging from 3.7 percent for North and South Dakota to 10.2 percent for Nevada.

States with no new entitlements do not have the same benefit because of the data change between 1990 and 2000. The reason a state with no new entitlement communities benefits from the formula is because its share of the data is now more valuable. However, if its share of the data is also declining, then the benefit it gains from the new entitlements is less. Not surprisingly then, North and South Dakota, which experience funding declines because of the change in data of 14 and 10 percent, respectively, do not gain as much from the new entitlements as Nevada, which has a funding gain of 26 percent because of the data.

Of course, that means the states likely to have the largest gains are those that do not lose geography from the loss of new entitlements and also have large increases in their relative share on the formula variables. Hawaii and Nevada fall into this category. Many of the states that do lose many new entitlement communities from their geography have overall grant changes that are still positive because their remaining nonentitled areas are growing fast. Thus their share of the data is still growing faster than that of other states. For example, Florida, with 16 new entitlement communities, and California, with 26 new entitlement communities, each loses funds because of new entitlements but gains funds overall because its overall share in the remaining nonentitlement areas has grown fast enough to overwhelm this loss in funding due to new entitlements.

Of the states that tend lose the most, some, such as New Jersey, Alabama, and South Carolina, have lost geography due to new entitlements and lose share on the formula variables for their remaining geographies. Others, such as Maryland, lose almost entirely because of new entitlement communities. Still others, such as Minnesota, North Dakota, and Louisiana, lose funding exclusively because of declining share on formula variables.

In terms of the importance of the various formula variables, table 7–5 shows virtually the opposite trend for states from what we saw for entitlements. For states, the amount of funds allocated by formula B has increased, particularly the amount of funds allocated by the pre-1940 housing variable. With the addition of 2000 Census data and the loss of geography to new entitlement communities, pre-1940 housing allocates 0.5 percentage points (roughly $6.5 million) more than it did without the changes. Poverty in formula A has lost about an equal amount in importance.

Table 7–5
Changing Allocation Portions by Individual Formula Variables (FY 2002 Appropriations)

Variable	Factor Weights	Funds Distributed by Each Formula Factor (%)			
		All Census 1990 Data	FY 2002	All Census 2000 Data	Change 1990 to 2000
Formula A					
Population	20.0	10.4	10.6	10.3	–0.1
Poverty	50.0	26.7	26.3	26.2	–0.5
Overcrowding	25.0	15.1	15.0	15.2	0.1
Subtotal formula A	100.0	52.2	52.0	51.7	–0.5
Formula B					
Population	20.0	8.3	8.1	8.3	–0.1
Poverty	30.0	8.9	9.1	9.0	0.1
Pre-1940	50.0	30.6	30.7	31.1	0.5
Subtotal formula B	100.0	47.8	48.0	48.3	0.5
Total	NA	100.0	100.0	100.0	NA

FY = fiscal year; "NA" = not applicable

Combined Effect on Entitlement and State Grantees

One of the interesting questions about the addition of new data and new entitlements over the decade is the overall effect on allocations to an individual state. That is, when the total amount allocated to entitlement communities and the nonentitlement balance are taken into account, which states gain the most and which lose the most? Table 7–6 shows this state-by-state effect.

Overall, Nevada gains the most as a result of introducing the Census 2000 data compared with the allocation from 1990 Census data. Furthermore, this increase is due entirely to the changing data between 1990 and 2000. Nevada was the fastest growing state in the United States during the 1990s, and its overall grant increase reflects this growth. The other states with large overall increases are Arizona and Idaho. Idaho's increases are both for data reasons and the addition of new entitlement communities.

Generally, adding new entitlement communities seems to be slightly worse for states overall than not adding new entitlement communities. Of the 21 states that had no new entitlement communities created in the past 10 years, only 4 lose overall funding. Of the remaining states that did add new entitlement communities, 12 out of 30 lose overall funding. On balance, however, no state's aggregate CDBG grant amount declines by more than 1.8 percent as a result of new entitlements (New Jersey and California).

Table 7–6
Impact of Census 2000 on Nonentitlement and Entitlement Grantees Combined

States	Total Grantees (*n*)	New Entitlements (*n*)	Total Grant Change (%)	Change Due to Data (%)	Change Due to New Entitlements (%)			
					Total	States	Cities	Counties
Northeast								
Connecticut	23	0	**2.2**	2.8	–0.6	1.3	–1.9	—
Maine	5	0	**2.4**	0.2	2.2	3.0	–0.7	—
Massachusetts	36	4	**0.1**	0.6	–0.5	–0.3	–0.2	—
New Hampshire	6	0	**5.1**	3.1	2.0	2.9	–0.9	—
New Jersey	51	4	**–4.4**	–2.6	–1.8	–0.9	0.4	–1.4
New York	47	2	**–2.8**	–1.2	–1.6	0.3	–1.6	–0.3
Pennsylvania	45	2	**–2.7**	–1.5	–1.2	0.1	–1.3	—
Rhode Island	7	0	**0.5**	1.2	–0.7	1.2	–2.0	—
Vermont	2	0	**0.3**	–2.8	3.1	3.4	–0.3	—
South								
Alabama	17	4	**–3.9**	–6.8	2.9	–2.6	1.6	3.9
Arkansas	13	3	**–1.1**	–5.8	4.7	0.2	4.6	—
Delaware	4	1	**5.6**	5.3	0.3	–1.8	3.1	–1.0
District of Columbia	1	0	**–2.1**	0.6	–2.8	0.0	–2.8	—
Florida	68	16	**6.0**	6.7	–0.7	–2.8	4.3	–2.2
Georgia	16	2	**10.6**	8.1	2.5	0.9	–0.2	1.7
Kentucky	9	0	**–7.0**	–9.8	2.8	3.8	–0.9	–0.1
Louisiana	14	0	**–12.5**	–14.1	1.5	2.8	–1.2	–0.1
Maryland	12	2	**2.8**	3.3	–0.5	–2.3	–1.4	3.3
Mississippi	7	1	**–8.4**	–13.8	5.4	3.9	1.4	—
North Carolina	25	5	**14.7**	10.2	4.5	–0.4	2.6	2.3
Oklahoma	10	0	**–4.9**	–7.5	2.6	3.7	–1.1	—
Puerto Rico	22	7	**–0.2**	–2.8	2.6	–5.4	8.0	—
South Carolina	16	6	**1.9**	–2.8	4.7	–6.9	1.8	9.8
Tennessee	14	0	**–1.1**	–3.5	2.4	3.6	–1.1	–0.1
Texas	69	12	**0.9**	0.7	0.3	–0.6	0.0	0.9
Virginia	24	1	**4.8**	4.9	–0.1	1.4	–0.9	–0.6
West Virginia	6	0	**–4.5**	–6.9	2.3	3.1	–0.8	—
North-Central								
Illinois	47	8	**–6.4**	–5.2	–1.1	–0.7	–0.4	—
Indiana	20	0	**–1.6**	–2.1	0.5	1.9	–1.4	–0.1
Iowa	10	0	**–0.2**	–1.7	1.5	2.5	–1.0	—
Kansas	8	0	**–3.5**	–4.9	1.4	2.4	–0.9	–0.1
Michigan	46	0	**–6.7**	–5.9	–0.8	1.1	–1.6	–0.3
Minnesota	16	3	**–2.8**	–2.6	–0.2	0.0	4.3	–4.5
Missouri	13	2	**–6.3**	–6.5	0.2	1.2	–0.7	–0.2
Nebraska	3	0	**–6.0**	–7.4	1.4	2.3	–0.9	—
North Dakota	4	0	**–9.7**	–11.9	2.2	2.8	–0.6	—
Ohio	42	3	**–3.3**	–2.9	–0.4	0.5	–1.4	0.4
South Dakota	3	0	**–6.3**	–9.0	2.7	3.1	–0.4	—
Wisconsin	22	1	**–2.3**	–2.4	0.1	0.1	–1.4	1.5
West								
Alaska	2	0	**4.2**	0.5	3.7	4.8	–1.1	—
Arizona	14	3	**20.1**	20.6	–0.5	0.5	2.0	–3.0
California	164	26	**3.5**	5.3	–1.8	–0.7	1.7	–2.8
Colorado	17	2	**5.8**	5.2	0.7	–1.7	–0.7	3.1
Hawaii	2	0	**–3.2**	–4.0	0.8	2.5	–1.7	—
Idaho	4	2	**23.2**	15.9	7.2	–3.4	10.6	—
Montana	4	1	**2.5**	–1.3	3.8	–3.1	6.9	—
Nevada	7	0	**51.5**	53.1	–1.6	1.8	–2.1	–1.3
New Mexico	5	1	**6.8**	2.2	4.6	4.0	0.7	—
Oregon	14	4	**10.1**	8.4	1.6	1.0	5.0	–4.3
Utah	12	3	**1.0**	–0.1	1.1	–0.2	3.6	–2.3
Washington	24	4	**8.4**	8.4	0.0	2.1	3.9	–6.0
Wyoming	3	0	**6.5**	3.5	3.0	3.7	–0.7	—
Column Label[a]			**A**	B	C	D	E	F

— = Not Applicable
[a]A = B + C ; C = D + E + F

References

Bunce, Harold L. 1976. *An evaluation of the Community Development Block Grant formula.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Bunce, Harold L., and Robert L. Goldberg. 1979. *City need and community development funding.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Bunce, Harold L., Sue G. Neal, and John L. Gardner. 1983. *Effects of the 1980 Census on community development funding.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Dommel, Paul R., Victor E. Basch, Sarah F. Liebschutz, and Leonard S. Rubnowitz. 1980. *Targeting community development.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Eggers, F.J., R. Iachan, P. Saavedra, and J. Patel. 2002. *The American community survey: Challenges and opportunities for HUD: Final report.* Beltsville, MD: ORC Macro.

Neary, Kevin, and Todd Richardson. 1995. *Effect of the 1990 Census on CDBG program funding*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Census 2000 Operational Plan.* U.S. Department of Commerce. V-14. http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/pdf/Operational2000.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1995. *Federal funds, local choices: An evaluation of the Community Development Block Grant program.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

———. 1995. Overview of Major Federal Urban Policy Initiatives 1949–1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

———. 1975. *Community Development Block Grant program: A provisional report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

———. 1974. *Programs of HUD.* Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Appendix A shows the effect of introducing Census 2000 long form data for poverty, overcrowding, and pre-1940 housing on individual CDBG grants. It holds constant the CDBG universe to the FY 2002 CDBG universe and appropriations at the FY 2002 appropriation level. As such, the "All Census 2000" grant is slightly different than the FY 2003 allocation. This is done to show the effect of introducing the new census data alone.

This appendix shows the total amount allocated by each of the variables in FY 2002 and when all Census 2000 data are used. It then shows the percent change in allocation for the total grant as well as each of the formula variables.

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
Alabama							
Anniston							
FY 2002 ($000)	**848**	—	205	—	462	180	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**808**	—	156	—	458	194	B
Change (%)	**–4.8**	—	–24.1	—	–1.1	+7.7	
Auburn							
FY 2002 ($000)	**834**	126	640	68	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**881**	125	718	38	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+5.5**	–1.1	+12.1	–44.3	—	—	
Bessemer							
FY 2002 ($000)	**992**	—	315	—	430	248	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**862**	—	231	—	425	206	B
Change (%)	**–13.2**	—	–26.7	—	–1.1	–17.0	
Birmingham							
FY 2002 ($000)	**8,781**	—	2,077	—	4,790	1,914	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**8,124**	—	1,691	—	4,739	1,694	B
Change (%)	**–7.5**	—	–18.6	—	–1.1	–11.5	
Decatur							
FY 2002 ($000)	**550**	158	326	65	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**639**	157	385	97	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+16.2**	–1.1	+18.0	+49.1	—	—	
Dothan							
FY 2002 ($000)	**770**	170	481	119	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**658**	168	426	64	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–14.6**	–1.1	–11.5	–46.7	—	—	
Florence							
FY 2002 ($000)	**534**	—	209	—	152	173	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**503**	—	207	—	150	146	B
Change (%)	**–5.7**	—	–1.1	—	–1.1	–15.4	
Gadsden							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,469**	—	277	—	860	332	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,427**	—	250	—	850	326	B
Change (%)	**–2.8**	—	–9.7	—	–1.1	–1.7	
Hoover							
FY 2002 ($000)	**269**	184	65	20	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**347**	182	100	64	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+28.9**	–1.1	+55.5	+218.8	—	—	
Huntsville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,726**	464	970	291	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,598**	460	944	194	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–7.4**	–1.1	–2.7	–33.4	—	—	
Mobile							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,621**	—	1,380	—	1,448	793	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,368**	—	1,184	—	1,433	751	B
Change (%)	**–7.0**	—	–14.2	—	–1.1	–5.3	
Montgomery							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,889**	592	1,757	540	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,628**	585	1,646	396	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–9.0**	–1.1	–6.3	–26.6	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
Alabama (continued)							
Opelika							
FY 2002 ($000)	**380**	69	241	70	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**317**	68	197	51	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–16.7**	–1.1	–18.2	–27.1	—	—	
Tuscaloosa							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,393**	229	990	175	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,146**	226	801	118	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–17.8**	–1.1	–19.0	–32.4	—	—	
Jefferson County							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,773**	1,012	1,449	312	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,595**	1,001	1,331	263	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–6.4**	–1.1	–8.1	–15.8	—	—	
Mobile County							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,934**	562	1,883	488	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,408**	556	1,487	365	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–17.9**	–1.1	–21.0	–25.3	—	—	
Nonentitlement							
FY 2002 ($000)	**31,606**	6,690	17,371	7,545	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**29,286**	6,619	17,004	5,663	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–7.3**	–1.1	–2.1	–24.9	—	—	
Alaska							
Anchorage							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,283**	764	837	682	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,329**	756	902	671	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+2.0**	–1.1	+7.8	–1.7	—	—	
Nonentitlement							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,277**	758	814	1,705	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,474**	750	1,054	1,670	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+6.0**	–1.1	+29.5	–2.0	—	—	
Arizona							
Chandler							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,314**	518	465	331	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,585**	513	562	510	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+20.6**	–1.1	+20.9	+54.1	—	—	
Flagstaff							
FY 2002 ($000)	**726**	155	365	205	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**757**	154	423	181	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+4.3**	–1.1	+15.7	–12.0	—	—	
Gilbert							
FY 2002 ($000)	**497**	322	96	78	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**624**	319	170	135	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+25.7**	–1.1	+76.7	+72.7	—	—	
Glendale							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,098**	642	898	557	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,710**	636	1,241	833	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+29.2**	–1.1	+38.1	+49.7	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
Arizona (continued)							
Mesa							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,570**	1,164	1,455	951	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**4,151**	1,151	1,692	1,308	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+16.3**	–1.1	+16.3	+37.5	—	—	
Peoria City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**662**	318	211	133	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**748**	315	272	162	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.0**	–1.1	+29.1	+21.4	—	—	
Phoenix							
FY 2002 ($000)	**15,792**	3,878	7,375	4,538	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**20,723**	3,837	9,918	6,968	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+31.2**	–1.1	+34.5	+53.5	—	—	
Scottsdale							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,143**	595	407	141	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,399**	589	563	247	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+22.4**	–1.1	+38.4	+75.3	—	—	
Tempe							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,892**	466	999	428	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,988**	461	1,058	469	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+5.0**	–1.1	+5.9	+9.6	—	—	
Tucson							
FY 2002 ($000)	**7,698**	1,429	4,262	2,007	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**7,619**	1,414	4,180	2,025	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.0**	–1.1	–1.9	+0.9	—	—	
Yuma							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,038**	228	470	340	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,138**	225	527	386	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+9.7**	–1.1	+12.0	+13.6	—	—	
Maricopa County							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,588**	984	1,652	953	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,259**	973	1,477	809	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–9.2**	–1.1	–10.6	–15.1	—	—	
Pima County							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,076**	1,014	1,398	665	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,066**	1,003	1,395	668	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.3**	–1.1	–0.2	+0.5	—	—	
Nonentitlement							
FY 2002 ($000)	**11,359**	2,456	4,581	4,322	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**13,636**	2,430	6,320	4,886	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+20.0**	–1.1	+38.0	+13.1	—	—	
Arkansas							
Conway							
FY 2002 ($000)	**367**	127	209	31	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**497**	125	313	59	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+35.6**	–1.1	+49.8	+89.0	—	—	
Fayetteville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**647**	170	404	72	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**777**	169	506	103	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+20.0**	–1.1	+25.0	+41.9	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
Arkansas (continued)							
Fort Smith							
FY 2002 ($000)	**934**	236	529	169	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,034**	233	599	201	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+10.7**	–1.1	+13.3	+19.1	—	—	
Jacksonville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**329**	88	173	68	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**340**	87	196	58	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+3.6**	–1.1	+13.6	–15.6	—	—	
Jonesboro							
FY 2002 ($000)	**622**	163	391	68	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**679**	161	448	70	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+9.2**	–1.1	+14.7	+2.7	—	—	
Little Rock							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,264**	538	1,351	375	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,084**	532	1,238	315	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–7.9**	–1.1	–8.4	–16.1	—	—	
North Little Rock							
FY 2002 ($000)	**943**	—	334	—	426	183	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**883**	—	280	—	421	182	B
Change (%)	**–6.3**	—	–16.3	—	–1.1	–0.3	
Pine Bluff							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,172**	162	819	191	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**924**	160	625	139	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–21.2**	–1.1	–23.7	–27.4	—	—	
Rogers							
FY 2002 ($000)	**274**	114	114	46	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**486**	113	236	137	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+77.7**	–1.1	+107.6	+199.1	—	—	
Springdale							
FY 2002 ($000)	**340**	134	149	56	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**597**	133	275	189	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+75.7**	–1.1	+84.5	+235.5	—	—	
Texarkana							
FY 2002 ($000)	**432**	78	296	58	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**387**	77	271	39	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–10.6**	–1.1	–8.5	–33.5	—	—	
West Memphis							
FY 2002 ($000)	**530**	81	344	105	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**526**	80	371	74	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.8**	–1.1	+8.1	–29.4	—	—	
Nonentitlement							
FY 2002 ($000)	**24,898**	4,950	13,944	6,004	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**22,543**	4,897	12,521	5,124	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–9.5**	–1.1	–10.2	–14.6	—	—	
California							
Alameda							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,529**	—	150	—	326	1,054	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,577**	—	171	—	322	1,084	B
Change (%)	**+3.1**	—	+13.8	—	–1.1	+2.9	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Alhambra							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,908**	252	634	1,022	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,710**	249	582	878	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–10.4**	–1.1	–8.1	–14.1	—	—	
Anaheim							
FY 2002 ($000)	**4,796**	963	1,498	2,336	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**6,163**	953	2,203	3,007	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+28.5**	–1.1	+47.1	+28.7	—	—	
Antioch							
FY 2002 ($000)	**745**	266	301	178	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**887**	263	371	253	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+19.1**	–1.1	+23.3	+42.0	—	—	
Apple Valley							
FY 2002 ($000)	**569**	159	261	149	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**758**	158	449	152	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+33.3**	–1.1	+71.8	+2.2	—	—	
Bakersfield							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,110**	725	1,506	879	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**4,002**	718	2,115	1,169	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+28.7**	–1.1	+40.5	+33.1	—	—	
Baldwin Park							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,849**	223	575	1,051	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,817**	220	654	943	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.7**	–1.1	+13.7	–10.3	—	—	
Bellflower							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,072**	214	314	544	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,470**	212	550	708	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+37.1**	–1.1	+75.0	+30.2	—	—	
Berkeley							
FY 2002 ($000)	**4,065**	—	527	—	1,055	2,483	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,954**	—	565	—	1,044	2,345	B
Change (%)	**–2.7**	—	+7.3	—	–1.1	–5.6	
Buena Park							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,053**	230	293	530	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,257**	227	423	607	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+19.4**	–1.1	+44.2	+14.6	—	—	
Burbank							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,354**	295	414	646	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,444**	291	506	646	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+6.6**	–1.1	+22.3	+0.1	—	—	
Camarillo							
FY 2002 ($000)	**443**	168	120	155	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**437**	166	145	125	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.3**	–1.1	+21.4	–19.1	—	—	
Carlsbad							
FY 2002 ($000)	**633**	230	230	173	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**597**	227	221	149	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–5.6**	–1.1	–3.8	–14.2	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Carson							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,407**	263	310	833	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,355**	261	397	698	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–3.6**	–1.1	+27.8	–16.2	—	—	
Cerritos							
FY 2002 ($000)	**542**	151	112	278	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**480**	150	123	207	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–11.3**	–1.1	+9.8	–25.5	—	—	
Chico							
FY 2002 ($000)	**956**	176	655	125	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,053**	174	730	148	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+10.1**	–1.1	+11.5	+18.6	—	—	
Chino							
FY 2002 ($000)	**710**	197	202	310	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**745**	195	240	309	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+5.0**	–1.1	+18.8	–0.3	—	—	
Chula Vista							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,085**	510	699	876	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,382**	504	887	992	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.3**	–1.1	+26.9	+13.1	—	—	
Citrus Heights							
FY 2002 ($000)	**822**	250	362	210	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**813**	247	335	230	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.1**	–1.1	–7.5	+9.7	—	—	
Compton							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,914**	274	1,312	1,329	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,556**	272	1,245	1,040	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–12.3**	–1.1	–5.1	–21.7	—	—	
Concord							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,121**	358	394	370	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,285**	354	442	489	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.6**	–1.1	+12.2	+32.3	—	—	
Corona							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,179**	367	337	476	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,437**	363	495	580	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+21.9**	–1.1	+47.0	+21.9	—	—	
Costa Mesa							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,405**	319	462	624	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,692**	316	647	730	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+20.4**	–1.1	+40.1	+16.9	—	—	
Daly							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,627**	304	352	971	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,550**	301	351	898	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–4.7**	–1.1	–0.2	–7.4	—	—	
Davis							
FY 2002 ($000)	**945**	177	602	167	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,006**	175	681	150	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+6.4**	–1.1	+13.2	–10.0	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Downey							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,365**	315	385	665	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,845**	312	566	967	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+35.1**	–1.1	+46.8	+45.5	—	—	
El Cajon							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,364**	279	600	486	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,565**	276	747	542	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.7**	–1.1	+24.6	+11.5	—	—	
El Monte							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,478**	340	1,257	1,880	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,329**	337	1,446	1,546	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–4.3**	–1.1	+15.0	–17.8	—	—	
Encinitas							
FY 2002 ($000)	**584**	170	242	171	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**502**	169	204	130	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–14.1**	–1.1	–15.9	–24.5	—	—	
Escondido							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,714**	392	644	677	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,152**	388	858	906	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+25.6**	–1.1	+33.1	+33.8	—	—	
Fairfield							
FY 2002 ($000)	**844**	282	294	267	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,012**	279	410	322	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+19.9**	–1.1	+39.4	+20.5	—	—	
Fontana							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,504**	379	529	597	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,260**	374	902	983	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+50.2**	–1.1	+70.5	+64.7	—	—	
Fountain Valley							
FY 2002 ($000)	**429**	161	101	167	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**443**	160	113	170	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+3.1**	–1.1	+12.3	+1.7	—	—	
Fremont							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,690**	597	392	700	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,084**	591	527	966	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+23.4**	–1.1	+34.4	+38.0	—	—	
Fresno							
FY 2002 ($000)	**8,416**	1,256	4,456	2,704	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**9,379**	1,242	5,299	2,837	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+11.4**	–1.1	+18.9	+4.9	—	—	
Fullerton							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,721**	370	589	762	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,868**	366	682	820	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+8.5**	–1.1	+15.8	+7.6	—	—	
Gardena							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,000**	170	264	567	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,139**	168	432	539	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.8**	–1.1	+63.7	–4.9	—	—	

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Garden Grove							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,667**	485	791	1,391	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,226**	480	1,100	1,645	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+20.9**	–1.1	+39.1	+18.2	—	—	
Gilroy City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**564**	122	215	228	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**593**	120	205	267	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+5.1**	–1.1	–4.4	+17.3	—	—	
Glendale							
FY 2002 ($000)	**4,059**	572	1,366	2,120	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**4,055**	566	1,446	2,043	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.1**	–1.1	+5.8	–3.6	—	—	
Glendora City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**426**	145	125	156	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**423**	144	138	141	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.7**	–1.1	+10.5	–9.2	—	—	
Hawthorne							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,648**	247	526	876	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,117**	244	815	1,058	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+28.5**	–1.1	+55.1	+20.8	—	—	
Hayward							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,801**	411	601	789	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,129**	407	667	1,056	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+18.2**	–1.1	+10.9	+33.8	—	—	
Hemet							
FY 2002 ($000)	**620**	173	290	158	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**848**	171	453	225	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+36.8**	–1.1	+56.2	+42.6	—	—	
Hesperia							
FY 2002 ($000)	**741**	184	335	223	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**862**	182	423	257	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+16.3**	–1.1	+26.4	+15.6	—	—	
Huntington Beach							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,668**	557	502	609	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,721**	551	601	570	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+3.2**	–1.1	+19.7	–6.4	—	—	
Huntington Park							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,188**	180	722	1,285	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,972**	178	742	1,052	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–9.9**	–1.1	+2.8	–18.2	—	—	
Inglewood							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,778**	331	956	1,491	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,767**	327	1,208	1,232	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.4**	–1.1	+26.3	–17.4	—	—	
Irvine							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,120**	420	373	328	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,511**	416	598	497	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+34.8**	–1.1	+60.5	+51.6	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Laguna Niguel							
FY 2002 ($000)	**332**	182	74	76	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**422**	180	121	121	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+26.9**	–1.1	+62.3	+58.8	—	—	
La Habra							
FY 2002 ($000)	**734**	173	219	342	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,005**	171	365	468	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+36.8**	–1.1	+66.8	+36.8	—	—	
Lake Forest							
FY 2002 ($000)	**359**	172	71	115	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**528**	171	149	208	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+47.3**	–1.1	+110.3	+80.7	—	—	
Lakewood							
FY 2002 ($000)	**732**	233	191	308	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**905**	230	281	393	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+23.6**	–1.1	+47.3	+27.5	—	—	
La Mesa							
FY 2002 ($000)	**588**	161	255	172	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**555**	159	245	152	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–5.7**	–1.1	–4.3	–12.0	—	—	
Lancaster							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,205**	349	489	367	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,659**	345	881	433	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+37.7**	–1.1	+80.0	+18.1	—	—	
Livermore							
FY 2002 ($000)	**498**	215	158	125	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**564**	213	188	163	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.3**	–1.1	+19.3	+30.6	—	—	
Lompoc							
FY 2002 ($000)	**634**	121	283	230	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**633**	119	280	233	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.1**	–1.1	–0.9	+1.4	—	—	
Long Beach							
FY 2002 ($000)	**9,516**	1,355	3,737	4,424	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**10,747**	1,340	4,996	4,410	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+12.9**	–1.1	+33.7	–0.3	—	—	
Los Angeles							
FY 2002 ($000)	**91,096**	10,847	34,520	45,728	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**88,512**	10,732	38,695	39,085	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–2.8**	–1.1	+12.1	–14.5	—	—	
Lynwood							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,037**	205	713	1,119	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,945**	203	766	977	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–4.5**	–1.1	+7.4	–12.7	—	—	
Madera							
FY 2002 ($000)	**835**	127	416	292	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,171**	125	672	373	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+40.2**	–1.1	+61.6	+27.7	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Merced							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,449**	188	740	521	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,525**	186	845	495	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+5.3**	–1.1	+14.1	–5.0	—	—	
Milpitas City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**693**	184	124	384	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**726**	182	144	400	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+4.8**	–1.1	+16.0	+4.0	—	—	
Mission Viejo							
FY 2002 ($000)	**508**	273	97	137	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**621**	270	168	183	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+22.5**	–1.1	+73.3	+33.4	—	—	
Modesto							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,515**	554	1,122	838	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,889**	549	1,418	923	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.9**	–1.1	+26.4	+10.1	—	—	
Montebello							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,340**	182	442	716	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,302**	181	504	617	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–2.9**	–1.1	+14.0	–13.8	—	—	
Monterey							
FY 2002 ($000)	**279**	87	101	91	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**270**	86	102	82	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–3.4**	–1.1	+0.8	–10.4	—	—	
Monterey Park							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,478**	176	531	771	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,200**	174	450	576	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–18.8**	–1.1	–15.3	–25.2	—	—	
Moreno Valley							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,487**	418	529	539	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,114**	414	973	727	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+42.2**	–1.1	+83.8	+34.9	—	—	
Mountain View							
FY 2002 ($000)	**866**	208	223	435	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**856**	205	229	421	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.1**	–1.1	+2.9	–3.2	—	—	
Napa City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**695**	213	252	231	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**849**	211	309	329	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+22.1**	–1.1	+22.8	+42.8	—	—	
National City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,425**	159	541	725	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,351**	158	543	651	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–5.2**	–1.1	+0.3	–10.2	—	—	
Newport Beach							
FY 2002 ($000)	**490**	206	200	84	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**426**	203	149	74	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–13.1**	–1.1	–25.7	–12.6	—	—	

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Norwalk							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,766**	303	456	1,007	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,910**	300	582	1,027	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+8.1**	–1.1	+27.7	+2.0	—	—	
Oakland							
FY 2002 ($000)	**10,043**	—	2,213	—	2,221	5,610	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**10,092**	—	2,217	—	2,197	5,679	B
Change (%)	**+0.5**	—	+0.2	—	–1.1	+1.2	
Oceanside							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,920**	473	689	759	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,244**	468	893	883	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+16.8**	–1.1	+29.7	+16.3	—	—	
Ontario							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,539**	464	957	1,118	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,977**	459	1,166	1,352	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+17.3**	–1.1	+21.8	+21.0	—	—	
Orange							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,436**	378	459	599	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,642**	374	599	668	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.3**	–1.1	+30.5	+11.7	—	—	
Oxnard							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,102**	500	944	1,658	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,362**	495	1,232	1,635	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+8.4**	–1.1	+30.5	–1.4	—	—	
Palmdale							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,057**	343	355	359	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,809**	339	883	588	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+71.2**	–1.1	+148.6	+63.6	—	—	
Palm Springs							
FY 2002 ($000)	**625**	126	268	232	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**618**	124	309	184	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.2**	–1.1	+15.6	–20.5	—	—	
Palo Alto							
FY 2002 ($000)	**808**	—	82	—	279	447	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**789**	—	81	—	276	432	B
Change (%)	**–2.4**	—	–1.5	—	–1.1	–3.4	
Paradise							
FY 2002 ($000)	**283**	78	149	56	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**280**	77	155	47	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–1.1**	–1.1	+4.3	–15.7	—	—	
Paramount City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,357**	162	444	751	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,493**	161	580	753	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+10.1**	–1.1	+30.7	+0.3	—	—	
Pasadena							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,665**	—	613	—	547	1,505	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,812**	—	606	—	541	1,664	B
Change (%)	**+5.5**	—	–1.1	—	–1.1	+10.5	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Petaluma							
FY 2002 ($000)	**341**	160	95	86	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**437**	158	157	122	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+28.1**	–1.1	+65.0	+41.7	—	—	
Pico Rivera							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,249**	186	364	699	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,127**	184	379	564	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–9.8**	–1.1	+4.1	–19.3	—	—	
Pittsburg							
FY 2002 ($000)	**731**	167	272	293	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**793**	165	313	315	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+8.4**	–1.1	+15.1	+7.6	—	—	
Pleasanton City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**306**	187	65	54	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**346**	185	78	83	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.3**	–1.1	+20.3	+54.6	—	—	
Pomona							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,275**	439	1,268	1,568	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,505**	434	1,505	1,566	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+7.0**	–1.1	+18.7	–0.1	—	—	
Porterville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**751**	116	407	227	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**869**	115	479	275	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+15.8**	–1.1	+17.7	+20.8	—	—	
Rancho Cucamonga							
FY 2002 ($000)	**983**	375	296	312	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,170**	371	433	366	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+19.0**	–1.1	+46.3	+17.2	—	—	
Redding							
FY 2002 ($000)	**936**	237	501	198	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,022**	235	594	193	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+9.2**	–1.1	+18.7	–2.6	—	—	
Redlands							
FY 2002 ($000)	**671**	187	284	201	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**698**	185	314	200	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+4.1**	–1.1	+10.5	–0.3	—	—	
Redondo Beach							
FY 2002 ($000)	**551**	186	180	185	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**507**	184	180	144	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–7.9**	–1.1	–0.1	–22.4	—	—	
Redwood City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**958**	221	286	451	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**910**	219	213	477	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–5.0**	–1.1	–25.3	+5.9	—	—	
Rialto							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,164**	270	468	427	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,635**	267	762	606	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+40.5**	–1.1	+63.0	+42.1	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Richmond							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,583**	291	746	546	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,689**	288	767	635	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+6.7**	–1.1	+2.8	+16.2	—	—	
Riverside							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,536**	749	1,409	1,378	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**4,092**	741	1,887	1,464	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+15.7**	–1.1	+33.9	+6.3	—	—	
Rosemead							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,532**	157	544	830	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,411**	155	582	674	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–7.9**	–1.1	+6.9	–18.8	—	—	
Roseville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**499**	235	161	104	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**572**	232	189	151	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.6**	–1.1	+17.6	+45.6	—	—	
Sacramento							
FY 2002 ($000)	**6,613**	1,195	3,337	2,082	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**7,084**	1,182	3,852	2,050	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+7.1**	–1.1	+15.4	–1.5	—	—	
Salinas							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,587**	443	893	1,250	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**3,080**	439	1,144	1,498	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+19.1**	–1.1	+28.1	+19.8	—	—	
San Bernardino							
FY 2002 ($000)	**3,913**	544	1,983	1,385	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**4,366**	538	2,400	1,427	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+11.6**	–1.1	+21.0	+3.0	—	—	
San Buenaventura							
FY 2002 ($000)	**985**	296	323	366	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,084**	293	430	361	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+10.1**	–1.1	+33.3	–1.3	—	—	
San Diego							
FY 2002 ($000)	**18,404**	3,592	7,634	7,178	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**18,640**	3,553	8,334	6,752	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+1.3**	–1.1	+9.2	–5.9	—	—	
San Francisco							
FY 2002 ($000)	**25,315**	—	2,896	—	5,061	17,358	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**25,248**	—	2,509	—	5,007	17,732	B
Change (%)	**–0.3**	—	–13.3	—	–1.1	+2.2	
San Jose							
FY 2002 ($000)	**12,757**	2,627	3,843	6,287	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**12,427**	2,599	3,763	6,065	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–2.6**	–1.1	–2.1	–3.5	—	—	
San Leandro							
FY 2002 ($000)	**687**	—	109	—	235	344	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**915**	231	243	440	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+33.0**	—	+124.1	—	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
San Mateo							
FY 2002 ($000)	**976**	272	278	426	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**990**	269	271	450	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+1.4**	–1.1	–2.6	+5.6	—	—	
Santa Ana							
FY 2002 ($000)	**8,380**	992	2,779	4,608	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**8,533**	982	3,153	4,399	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+1.8**	–1.1	+13.4	–4.5	—	—	
Santa Barbara							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,454**	271	568	615	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,362**	268	572	521	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–6.4**	–1.1	+0.8	–15.3	—	—	
Santa Clara							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,177**	301	303	573	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,332**	297	376	659	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.2**	–1.1	+24.0	+14.9	—	—	
Santa Clarita							
FY 2002 ($000)	**995**	444	217	334	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,372**	439	461	472	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+37.9**	–1.1	+112.7	+41.1	—	—	
Santa Cruz							
FY 2002 ($000)	**761**	160	383	218	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**760**	159	403	198	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.1**	–1.1	+5.2	–8.8	—	—	
Santa Maria							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,338**	227	545	565	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,560**	225	716	619	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+16.5**	–1.1	+31.3	+9.4	—	—	
Santa Monica							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,776**	—	257	—	638	882	B
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,696**	—	250	—	631	815	B
Change (%)	**–4.5**	—	–2.5	—	–1.1	–7.6	
Santa Rosa							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,301**	433	520	347	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,559**	429	599	532	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+19.8**	–1.1	+15.1	+53.0	—	—	
Santee							
FY 2002 ($000)	**449**	156	147	146	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**400**	154	136	109	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–10.9**	–1.1	–7.3	–25.0	—	—	
Seaside							
FY 2002 ($000)	**571**	93	215	262	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**502**	92	184	226	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–12.0**	–1.1	–14.6	–13.8	—	—	
Simi Valley							
FY 2002 ($000)	**814**	327	190	298	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**891**	323	312	256	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+9.4**	–1.1	+64.4	–14.2	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
South Gate							
FY 2002 ($000)	**2,682**	283	802	1,597	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**2,600**	280	890	1,431	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–3.0**	–1.1	+10.9	–10.4	—	—	
South San Francisco							
FY 2002 ($000)	**748**	178	170	400	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**747**	176	152	419	—	—	A
Change (%)	**–0.1**	–1.1	–10.5	+4.6	—	—	
Stockton							
FY 2002 ($000)	**5,020**	716	2,359	1,946	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**5,099**	708	2,743	1,648	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+1.6**	–1.1	+16.3	–15.3	—	—	
Sunnyvale							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,364**	387	293	685	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,547**	383	344	820	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.4**	–1.1	+17.6	+19.8	—	—	
Thousand Oaks							
FY 2002 ($000)	**803**	344	233	227	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**841**	340	276	226	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+4.8**	–1.1	+18.6	–0.6	—	—	
Torrance							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,338**	405	364	569	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,463**	401	426	637	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+9.4**	–1.1	+16.9	+12.0	—	—	
Tulare							
FY 2002 ($000)	**735**	129	383	223	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**836**	128	433	275	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.7**	–1.1	+12.9	+23.7	—	—	
Turlock							
FY 2002 ($000)	**712**	164	292	257	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**898**	162	425	310	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+26.0**	–1.1	+45.6	+21.0	—	—	
Tustin							
FY 2002 ($000)	**727**	198	179	350	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**997**	196	275	526	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+37.2**	–1.1	+53.5	+50.6	—	—	
Union City							
FY 2002 ($000)	**779**	196	186	398	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**796**	194	210	392	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+2.1**	–1.1	+13.0	–1.3	—	—	
Upland							
FY 2002 ($000)	**713**	201	262	251	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**871**	199	392	281	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+22.2**	–1.1	+49.7	+12.1	—	—	
Vacaville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**654**	260	208	186	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**694**	257	232	205	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+6.2**	–1.1	+11.7	+10.1	—	—	

Appendix A: Effect of 2000 Census Data

Grantee	Total Grant	Grant Allocation Due To: ($000) Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Pre-1940 Housing	Formula
California (continued)							
Vallejo							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,409**	343	483	584	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,468**	339	560	569	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+4.1**	–1.1	+15.9	–2.6	—	—	
Victorville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**760**	188	344	228	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,042**	186	574	282	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+37.1**	–1.1	+67.0	+23.4	—	—	
Visalia							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,359**	269	701	390	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,436**	266	734	436	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+5.7**	–1.1	+4.7	+12.0	—	—	
Vista							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,177**	264	441	472	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,473**	261	605	607	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+25.1**	–1.1	+37.2	+28.5	—	—	
Walnut Creek							
FY 2002 ($000)	**389**	189	122	78	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**406**	187	114	106	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+4.4**	–1.1	–6.9	+35.1	—	—	
Watsonville							
FY 2002 ($000)	**812**	130	251	430	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,017**	129	404	484	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+25.3**	–1.1	+60.7	+12.5	—	—	
West Covina							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,373**	308	394	670	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,478**	305	454	719	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+7.7**	–1.1	+15.3	+7.3	—	—	
Westminster							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,365**	259	482	624	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,545**	256	568	721	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+13.2**	–1.1	+17.8	+15.5	—	—	
Whittier							
FY 2002 ($000)	**1,029**	246	312	472	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**1,173**	243	413	517	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+14.0**	–1.1	+32.5	+9.5	—	—	
Woodland							
FY 2002 ($000)	**577**	144	200	233	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**714**	143	280	291	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+23.7**	–1.1	+39.9	+25.2	—	—	
Yorba Linda							
FY 2002 ($000)	**312**	173	53	85	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**331**	171	85	75	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+6.2**	–1.1	+59.3	–12.1	—	—	
Yuba							
FY 2002 ($000)	**531**	108	268	155	—	—	A
All Census 2000 ($000)	**622**	107	311	204	—	—	A
Change (%)	**+17.1**	–1.1	+15.8	+32.1	—	—	

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
New York (continued)										
Union Town ($000)	1,640	1,701	+61	–48	—	—	—	+113	+33	–37
Change (%)	—	—	*+3.7*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+6.9*	*+2.0*	*–2.3*
Utica ($000)	4,041	3,620	–421	–102	—	—	—	+46	–53	–311
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.4*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+1.1*	*–1.3*	*–7.7*
West Seneca ($000)	314	327	+13	–9	—	—	—	+6	+13	+2
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.2*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+2.1*	*+4.3*	*+0.6*
White Plains ($000)	1,284	1,153	–131	–32	—	—	—	–50	+31	–81
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.2*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–3.9*	*+2.4*	*–6.3*
Yonkers ($000)	4,624	4,539	–85	–125	—	—	—	+26	+218	–203
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.8*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.6*	*+4.7*	*–4.4*
Dutchess County ($000)	1,674	2,053	+379	–54	—	—	—	+0	+123	+310
Change (%)	—	—	*+22.6*	*–3.2*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+7.3*	*+18.5*
Erie County ($000)	3,370	3,379	+9	–90	—	—	—	+61	–75	+112
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.3*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+1.8*	*–2.2*	*+3.3*
Monroe County ($000)	2,307	2,216	–91	–58	—	—	—	+0	+31	–63
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.9*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+1.3*	*–2.7*
Nassau County ($000)	17,778	18,581	+803	–501	—	—	—	+453	+465	+385
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.5*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+2.5*	*+2.6*	*+2.2*
Onondaga County ($000)	2,321	2,544	+223	–67	—	—	—	+169	+75	+46
Change (%)	—	—	*+9.6*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+7.3*	*+3.2*	*+2.0*
Orange County ($000)	2,159	2,011	–148	–53	—	—	—	+0	+18	–113
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.9*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+0.8*	*–5.2*
Rockland County ($000)	2,171	2,618	+447	–69	+27	+402	+87	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+20.6*	*–3.2*	*+1.3*	*+18.5*	*+4.0*	—	—	—
Suffolk County ($000)	4,513	4,560	+46	–120	–158	+289	+36	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.0*	*–2.7*	*–3.5*	*+6.4*	*+0.8*	—	—	—
Westchester County ($000)	6,668	6,981	+313	–185	—	—	—	+375	+97	+27
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.7*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+5.6*	*+1.5*	*+0.4*
Nonentitlement ($000)	56,533	57,150	+617	+1,123	–969	—	—	—	+816	–352
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.1*	*+2.0*	*–1.7*	—	—	—	*+1.4*	*–0.6*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
North Carolina										
Asheville ($000)	1,686	1,553	–133	–43	—	—	—	–118	–6	+34
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.9*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–7.0*	*–0.4*	*+2.0*
Burlington ($000)	432	531	+99	–14	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+23.0*	*–3.2*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chapel Hill ($000)	448	724	+275	–19	+8	+156	+130	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+61.5*	*–4.3*	*+1.8*	*+34.9*	*+29.0*	—	—	—
Charlotte ($000)	4,662	5,651	+989	–149	+208	+455	+475	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+21.2*	*–3.2*	*+4.5*	*+9.8*	*+10.2*	—	—	—
Concord ($000)	424	470	+47	–12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+11.1*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Durham ($000)	1,841	2,348	+507	–62	+73	+260	+236	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+27.6*	*–3.4*	*+4.0*	*+14.1*	*+12.8*	—	—	—
Fayetteville ($000)	1,186	1,426	+240	–38	+92	+102	+83	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+20.2*	*–3.2*	*+7.8*	*+8.6*	*+7.0*	—	—	—
Gastonia ($000)	741	792	+51	–21	+3	+61	+7	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.8*	*–2.8*	*+0.5*	*+8.2*	*+0.9*	—	—	—
Goldsboro ($000)	0	504	+504	+504	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Greensboro ($000)	2,076	2,356	+280	–62	+17	+178	+148	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+13.5*	*–3.0*	*+0.8*	*+8.6*	*+7.1*	—	—	—
Greenville ($000)	0	978	+978	+978	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hickory ($000)	316	392	+75	–10	+11	+36	+40	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+23.9*	*–3.3*	*+3.4*	*+11.2*	*+12.6*	—	—	—
High Point ($000)	926	944	+18	–25	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.9*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jacksonville ($000)	615	641	+26	–17	–38	+53	+27	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.2*	*–2.7*	*–6.1*	*+8.7*	*+4.4*	—	—	—
Kannapolis ($000)	684	510	–175	–14	—	—	—	–142	–1	–17
Change (%)	—	—	*–25.5*	*–2.1*	—	—	—	*–20.7*	*–0.2*	*–2.5*
Lenoir ($000)	0	181	+181	+181	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
North Carolina (continued)										
Morganton ($000)	147	188	+41	–5	–2	+26	+22	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+27.9*	*–3.4*	*–1.3*	*+17.4*	*+15.2*	—	—	—
Raleigh ($000)	2,396	2,813	+417	–74	+86	+210	+196	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+17.4*	*–3.1*	*+3.6*	*+8.8*	*+8.2*	—	—	—
Rocky Mount ($000)	0	829	+829	+829	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Salisbury ($000)	424	395	–29	–11	—	—	—	–39	+7	+13
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.9*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–9.1*	*+1.7*	*+3.0*
Wilmington ($000)	1,041	1,012	–28	–27	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.7*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Winston-Salem ($000)	1,896	2,255	+359	–59	+45	+185	+188	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+18.9*	*–3.1*	*+2.4*	*+9.8*	*+9.9*	—	—	—
Cumberland County ($000)	0	1,733	+1,733	+1,733	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wake County ($000)	1,617	2,182	+565	–58	+260	+253	+109	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+35.0*	*–3.6*	*+16.1*	*+15.7*	*+6.7*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	48,139	50,814	+2,675	–265	+199	+2,731	+9	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+5.6*	*–0.6*	*+0.4*	*+5.7*	*+0.0*	—	—	—
North Dakota										
Bismarck ($000)	477	428	–49	–11	–9	–33	+5	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.3*	*–2.4*	*–1.9*	*–6.9*	*+1.0*	—	—	—
Fargo ($000)	881	861	–20	–23	+7	–20	+15	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.3*	*–2.6*	*+0.8*	*–2.2*	*+1.7*	—	—	—
Grand Forks ($000)	600	522	–77	–14	–28	–32	–4	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.9*	*–2.3*	*–4.7*	*–5.3*	*–0.6*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	6,300	5,644	–656	+230	–196	—	—	—	–323	–367
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.4*	*+3.7*	*–3.1*	—	—	—	*–5.1*	*–5.8*
Ohio										
Akron ($000)	8,942	8,331	–611	–235	—	—	—	–54	–377	+55
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.8*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*–0.6*	*–4.2*	*+0.6*
Alliance ($000)	895	844	–51	–24	—	—	—	–8	–26	+7
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.7*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*–0.9*	*–2.9*	*+0.8*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A: Population	Formula A: Poverty	Formula A: Overcrowding	Formula A: Growth Lag	Formula B: Poverty	Formula B: Pre-1940 Housing
Ohio (continued)										
Barberton ($000)	997	908	–89	–26	—	—	—	–14	–45	–5
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.0*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*–1.4*	*–4.5*	*–0.5*
Bowling Green ($000)	443	381	–62	–10	–12	–17	–24	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–14.0*	*–2.3*	*–2.6*	*–3.8*	*–5.3*	—	—	—
Canton ($000)	3,866	3,564	–302	–100	—	—	—	–21	–147	–33
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.8*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*–0.5*	*–3.8*	*–0.9*
Cincinnati ($000)	17,510	16,317	–1,193	–461	—	—	—	+229	–754	–207
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.8*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+1.3*	*–4.3*	*–1.2*
Cleveland ($000)	33,150	29,569	–3,581	–842	—	—	—	–1,216	–1,071	–452
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.8*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–3.7*	*–3.2*	*–1.4*
Cleveland Heights ($000)	2,023	2,102	+79	–58	—	—	—	+100	+8	+29
Change (%)	—	—	*+3.9*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+4.9*	*+0.4*	*+1.4*
Columbus ($000)	9,116	8,032	–1,084	–212	–123	–736	–13	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.9*	*–2.3*	*–1.4*	*–8.1*	*–0.1*	—	—	—
Dayton ($000)	8,733	7,786	–947	–222	—	—	—	+33	–477	–280
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.8*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+0.4*	*–5.5*	*–3.2*
East Cleveland ($000)	1,324	1,356	+32	–38	—	—	—	+132	–48	–15
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.4*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+10.0*	*–3.6*	*–1.1*
Elyria ($000)	728	769	+41	–21	—	—	—	+90	–64	+36
Change (%)	—	—	*+5.7*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+12.4*	*–8.8*	*+4.9*
Euclid ($000)	1,219	1,222	+3	–35	—	—	—	+57	+11	–30
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.2*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+4.6*	*+0.9*	*–2.4*
Fairborn ($000)	0	332	+332	+332	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hamilton City ($000)	1,960	1,847	–113	–52	—	—	—	+14	–100	+26
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.7*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.7*	*–5.1*	*+1.3*
Kent ($000)	470	379	–91	–10	–19	–50	–12	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–19.4*	*–2.1*	*–4.1*	*–10.7*	*–2.5*	—	—	—
Kettering ($000)	415	593	+178	–17	—	—	—	+174	–4	+25
Change (%)	—	—	*+42.9*	*–4.1*	—	—	—	*+41.9*	*–0.9*	*+6.1*
Lakewood ($000)	2,593	2,623	+30	–72	—	—	—	+93	–20	+29
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.2*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+3.6*	*–0.8*	*+1.1*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Ohio (continued)										
Lancaster ($000)	689	684	–5	–19	—	—	—	+51	–49	+12
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.8*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+7.4*	*–7.2*	*+1.7*
Lima ($000)	1,496	1,495	–0	–42	—	—	—	+134	–46	–46
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.0*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+9.0*	*–3.1*	*–3.1*
Lorain ($000)	1,528	1,516	–13	–42	—	—	—	+151	–119	–3
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.8*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+9.9*	*–7.8*	*–0.2*
Mansfield ($000)	1,116	1,188	+72	–33	—	—	—	+106	–57	+55
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.4*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+9.5*	*–5.1*	*+4.9*
Marietta ($000)	568	535	–33	–15	—	—	—	+16	–15	–20
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.8*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+2.9*	*–2.6*	*–3.5*
Massillon ($000)	957	903	–54	–25	—	—	—	+15	–47	+3
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.7*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+1.6*	*–4.9*	*+0.3*
Mentor ($000)	0	226	+226	+226	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Middletown ($000)	844	785	–59	–21	—	—	—	–42	–40	+45
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.0*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–5.0*	*–4.8*	*+5.4*
Newark ($000)	1,049	1,026	–22	–28	—	—	—	+27	–49	+28
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.1*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+2.5*	*–4.6*	*+2.7*
Parma ($000)	904	1,070	+166	–31	—	—	—	+180	+6	+10
Change (%)	—	—	*+18.4*	*–3.4*	—	—	—	*+19.9*	*+0.7*	*+1.2*
Springfield ($000)	2,585	2,418	–167	–68	—	—	—	+112	–149	–61
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.5*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+4.3*	*–5.8*	*–2.4*
Steubenville ($000)	1,063	945	–118	–27	—	—	—	+25	–54	–62
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.1*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+2.4*	*–5.1*	*–5.9*
Toledo ($000)	9,557	9,492	–65	–263	—	—	—	+745	–436	–111
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.7*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+7.8*	*–4.6*	*–1.2*
Warren ($000)	1,649	1,608	–41	–45	—	—	—	+86	–67	–15
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.5*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+5.2*	*–4.0*	*–0.9*
Youngstown ($000)	5,888	4,997	–891	–144	—	—	—	–52	–330	–365
Change (%)	—	—	*–15.1*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–0.9*	*–5.6*	*–6.2*
Butler County ($000)	0	1,415	+1,415	+1,415	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
Ohio (continued)										
Cuyahoga County ($000)	3,578	3,615	+37	–95	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.0*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Franklin County ($000)	2,337	2,286	–51	–60	–70	+76	+3	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.2*	*–2.6*	*–3.0*	*+3.2*	*+0.1*	—	—	—
Hamilton County ($000)	3,665	3,740	+75	–99	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.1*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lake County ($000)	1,443	1,656	+213	–204	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+14.7*	*–14.2*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montgomery County ($000)	2,724	2,358	–366	–62	–177	–71	–56	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–13.4*	*–2.3*	*–6.5*	*–2.6*	*–2.1*	—	—	—
Stark County ($000)	1,703	1,739	+36	–46	—	—	—	+0	–69	+151
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.1*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*–4.0*	*+8.9*
Summit County ($000)	1,767	1,706	–61	–45	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.4*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	55,766	56,421	+656	+1,045	–526	—	—	—	–1,575	+1,711
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.2*	*+1.9*	*–0.9*	—	—	—	*–2.8*	*+3.1*
Oklahoma										
Broken Arrow ($000)	489	461	–28	–12	+17	–42	+8	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.8*	*–2.5*	*+3.5*	*–8.6*	*+1.7*	—	—	—
Edmond ($000)	455	490	+35	–13	+18	+33	–3	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+7.8*	*–2.8*	*+4.0*	*+7.2*	*–0.6*	—	—	—
Enid ($000)	718	662	–56	–18	—	—	—	+56	–6	–88
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.7*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+7.7*	*–0.8*	*–12.2*
Lawton ($000)	1,203	1,094	–110	–29	–9	–24	–48	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.1*	*–2.4*	*–0.8*	*–2.0*	*–4.0*	—	—	—
Midwest City ($000)	637	603	–34	–16	–24	+49	–42	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.3*	*–2.5*	*–3.8*	*+7.7*	*–6.7*	—	—	—
Norman ($000)	1,037	1,053	+16	–28	+1	+48	–5	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.6*	*–2.7*	*+0.1*	*+4.6*	*–0.5*	—	—	—
Oklahoma City ($000)	6,676	6,511	–165	–172	–68	+103	–28	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.5*	*–2.6*	*–1.0*	*+1.5*	*–0.4*	—	—	—
Shawnee ($000)	572	492	–80	–13	—	—	—	–17	–30	–20
Change (%)	—	—	*–14.0*	*–2.3*	—	—	—	*–3.0*	*–5.3*	*–3.4*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A: Population	Formula A: Poverty	Formula A: Overcrowding	Formula A: Growth Lag	Formula B: Poverty	Formula B: Pre-1940 Housing
Oklahoma (continued)										
Tulsa ($000)	5,030	4,654	–377	–123	–131	–287	+164	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.5*	*–2.4*	*–2.6*	*–5.7*	*+3.3*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	20,860	19,798	–1,062	+1,396	–922	–1,241	–295	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.1*	*+6.7*	*–4.4*	*–5.9*	*–1.4*	—	—	—
Oregon										
Ashland ($000)	0	256	+256	+256	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Beaverton ($000)	0	722	+722	+722	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Corvallis ($000)	0	678	+678	+678	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eugene ($000)	1,614	1,712	+98	–45	+12	+122	+10	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.1*	*–2.8*	*+0.7*	*+7.5*	*+0.6*	—	—	—
Gresham ($000)	676	1,085	+409	–29	+27	+244	+166	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+60.5*	*–4.2*	*+4.0*	*+36.1*	*+24.6*	—	—	—
Hillsboro ($000)	0	773	+773	+773	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medford ($000)	646	757	+112	–20	+22	+61	+49	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+17.3*	*–3.1*	*+3.4*	*+9.4*	*+7.6*	—	—	—
Portland ($000)	12,338	12,360	+22	–335	—	—	—	–379	–50	+785
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.2*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*–3.1*	*–0.4*	*+6.4*
Salem ($000)	1,455	1,780	+324	–47	+26	+163	+182	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+22.3*	*–3.2*	*+1.8*	*+11.2*	*+12.5*	—	—	—
Springfield ($000)	711	758	+47	–20	–1	+63	+5	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.6*	*–2.8*	*–0.1*	*+8.9*	*+0.7*	—	—	—
Clackamas County ($000)	2,506	2,584	+78	–68	+20	+34	+92	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+3.1*	*–2.7*	*+0.8*	*+1.4*	*+3.7*	—	—	—
Multnomah County ($000)	876	365	–511	–10	–155	–243	–102	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–58.4*	*–1.1*	*–17.8*	*–27.8*	*–11.7*	—	—	—
Washington County ($000)	2,831	2,439	–392	–1,598	+223	+495	+488	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–13.9*	*–56.5*	*+7.9*	*+17.5*	*+17.2*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	15,357	16,665	+1,308	+375	+68	+436	+429	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+8.5*	*+2.4*	*+0.4*	*+2.8*	*+2.8*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
Pennsylvania										
Abington ($000)	951	990	+39	–28	—	—	—	+72	–3	–3
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.1*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+7.6*	*–0.3*	*–0.3*
Allentown ($000)	3,287	3,359	+71	–92	—	—	—	+65	+131	–33
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.2*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+2.0*	*+4.0*	*–1.0*
Altoona ($000)	2,682	2,440	–242	–68	—	—	—	–3	–53	–118
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.0*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–0.1*	*–2.0*	*–4.4*
Bensalem Township ($000)	460	479	+20	–13	–27	+48	+11	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.3*	*–2.8*	*–5.9*	*+10.5*	*+2.4*	—	—	—
Bethlehem ($000)	2,008	2,067	+60	–57	—	—	—	+58	+11	+48
Change (%)	—	—	*+3.0*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+2.9*	*+0.5*	*+2.4*
Bristol Township ($000)	715	789	+75	–23	—	—	—	+86	+5	+8
Change (%)	—	—	*+10.5*	*–3.2*	—	—	—	*+12.0*	*+0.6*	*+1.1*
Carlisle ($000)	445	516	+71	–14	—	—	—	+42	+13	+30
Change (%)	—	—	*+15.9*	*–3.2*	—	—	—	*+9.5*	*+2.9*	*+6.7*
Chester ($000)	2,059	1,811	–248	–52	—	—	—	+15	–59	–152
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.1*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+0.7*	*–2.9*	*–7.4*
Easton ($000)	1,220	1,181	–39	–33	—	—	—	–6	+5	–4
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.2*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*–0.5*	*+0.4*	*–0.4*
Erie ($000)	4,654	4,386	–267	–123	—	—	—	+40	–118	–67
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.7*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+0.9*	*–2.5*	*–1.4*
Harrisburg ($000)	3,008	2,590	–418	–73	—	—	—	–42	–112	–191
Change (%)	—	—	*–13.9*	*–2.4*	—	—	—	*–1.4*	*–3.7*	*–6.4*
Haverford ($000)	1,161	1,209	+48	–34	—	—	—	+59	+1	+22
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.1*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+5.1*	*+0.1*	*+1.9*
Hazleton ($000)	1,194	1,158	–36	–32	—	—	—	+11	–12	–3
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.0*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.9*	*–1.0*	*–0.2*
Johnstown ($000)	2,265	1,967	–298	–56	—	—	—	–43	–76	–123
Change (%)	—	—	*–13.2*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–1.9*	*–3.3*	*–5.4*
Lancaster ($000)	2,335	2,173	–162	–60	—	—	—	+11	–35	–78
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.9*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+0.5*	*–1.5*	*–3.3*
Lebanon ($000)	1,058	1,033	–26	–29	—	—	—	+2	–3	+4
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.4*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.2*	*–0.3*	*+0.4*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Pennsylvania (continued)										
Lower Merion ($000)	1,428	1,399	–29	–39	—	—	—	+17	+2	–9
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.0*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+1.2*	*+0.1*	*–0.6*
McKeesport ($000)	1,707	1,516	–191	–43	—	—	—	–53	–42	–53
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.2*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–3.1*	*–2.4*	*–3.1*
Millcreek Township ($000)	0	311	+311	+311	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Norristown ($000)	1,242	1,253	+12	–35	—	—	—	–29	+62	+14
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.9*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*–2.3*	*+5.0*	*+1.1*
Penn Hills ($000)	710	866	+157	–25	—	—	—	+159	+5	+18
Change (%)	—	—	*+22.1*	*–3.5*	—	—	—	*+22.3*	*+0.7*	*+2.6*
Philadelphia ($000)	70,683	63,784	–6,899	–1,787	—	—	—	+589	–388	–5,313
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.8*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+0.8*	*–0.5*	*–7.5*
Pittsburgh ($000)	22,750	20,671	–2,079	–587	—	—	—	–325	–592	–575
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.1*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*–1.4*	*–2.6*	*–2.5*
Reading ($000)	4,116	3,808	–308	–105	—	—	—	–99	+123	–227
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.5*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*–2.4*	*+3.0*	*–5.5*
Scranton ($000)	4,321	4,192	–129	–117	—	—	—	+19	–73	+42
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.0*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.4*	*–1.7*	*+1.0*
Sharon ($000)	863	843	–20	–24	—	—	—	–5	–25	+34
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.3*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*–0.6*	*–2.9*	*+3.9*
State College ($000)	1,018	888	–130	–23	–23	–24	–59	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.8*	*–2.3*	*–2.3*	*–2.4*	*–5.8*	—	—	—
Upper Darby ($000)	2,500	2,342	–157	–66	—	—	—	+2	+34	–128
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.3*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+0.1*	*+1.4*	*–5.1*
Wilkes-Barre ($000)	2,448	2,380	–69	–67	—	—	—	+46	–20	–28
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.8*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+1.9*	*–0.8*	*–1.1*
Williamsport ($000)	1,732	1,555	–178	–43	—	—	—	–2	–34	–99
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.3*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–0.1*	*–1.9*	*–5.7*
York ($000)	2,168	2,089	–79	–58	—	—	—	–2	+7	–25
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.6*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*–0.1*	*+0.3*	*–1.2*
Allegheny County ($000)	19,213	19,393	+180	–522	—	—	—	+849	–227	+80
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.9*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+4.4*	*–1.2*	*+0.4*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A: Population	Formula A: Poverty	Formula A: Overcrowding	Formula A: Growth Lag	Formula B: Poverty	Formula B: Pre-1940 Housing
Pennsylvania (continued)										
Beaver County ($000)	4,950	4,697	–252	–126	—	—	—	+138	–300	+36
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.1*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+2.8*	*–6.1*	*+0.7*
Berks County ($000)	3,276	3,322	+46	–88	—	—	—	+0	+25	+108
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.4*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+0.8*	*+3.3*
Bucks County ($000)	2,763	2,923	+161	–77	—	—	—	+0	+58	+180
Change (%)	—	—	*+5.8*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+2.1*	*+6.5*
Chester County ($000)	3,355	3,388	+34	–89	—	—	—	+0	+87	+36
Change (%)	—	—	*+1.0*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+2.6*	*+1.1*
Dauphin County ($000)	0	1,879	+1,879	+1,879	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Delaware County ($000)	4,564	4,955	+391	–132	—	—	—	+520	+54	–50
Change (%)	—	—	*+8.6*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+11.4*	*+1.2*	*–1.1*
Lancaster County ($000)	3,990	4,140	+150	–109	—	—	—	+0	+10	+249
Change (%)	—	—	*+3.8*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+0.3*	*+6.2*
Luzerne County ($000)	6,129	6,033	–95	–161	—	—	—	+307	–125	–116
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.6*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+5.0*	*–2.0*	*–1.9*
Montgomery County ($000)	4,322	4,504	+182	–119	—	—	—	+0	+113	+188
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.2*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+2.6*	*+4.4*
Washington County ($000)	5,669	5,315	–354	–143	—	—	—	+153	–263	–101
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.2*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+2.7*	*–4.6*	*–1.8*
Westmoreland County ($000)	5,110	5,257	+147	–140	—	—	—	+520	–282	+50
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.9*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+10.2*	*–5.5*	*+1.0*
York County ($000)	3,018	3,218	+200	–85	—	—	—	+0	+42	+243
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.6*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+1.4*	*+8.1*
Nonentitlement ($000)	57,916	59,085	+1,169	+268	–607	—	—	—	–90	+1,598
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.0*	*+0.5*	*–1.0*	—	—	—	*–0.2*	*+2.8*
Rhode Island										
Cranston ($000)	1,229	1,294	+65	–35	—	—	—	+77	+5	+18
Change (%)	—	—	*+5.3*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+6.3*	*+0.4*	*+1.4*
East Providence ($000)	807	960	+153	–26	—	—	—	+148	+12	+20
Change (%)	—	—	*+18.9*	*–3.2*	—	—	—	*+18.3*	*+1.4*	*+2.4*
Pawtucket ($000)	2,559	2,527	–31	–70	—	—	—	+22	+108	–91
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.2*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+0.9*	*+4.2*	*–3.6*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Rhode Island (continued)										
Providence ($000)	7,671	6,953	–717	–193	—	—	—	–394	+258	–388
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.3*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–5.1*	*+3.4*	*–5.1*
Warwick ($000)	857	1,041	+184	–28	—	—	—	+178	+15	+19
Change (%)	—	—	*+21.4*	*–3.3*	—	—	—	*+20.8*	*+1.7*	*+2.2*
Woonsocket ($000)	1,569	1,641	+72	–45	—	—	—	+43	+45	+28
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.6*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+2.8*	*+2.9*	*+1.8*
Nonentitlement ($000)	5,669	6,039	+371	+245	–81	—	—	—	+158	+49
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.5*	*+4.3*	*–1.4*	—	—	—	*+2.8*	*+0.9*
South Carolina										
Aiken ($000)	0	263	+263	+263	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Anderson ($000)	1,042	946	–96	–28	—	—	—	–53	–17	+2
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.2*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*–5.1*	*–1.6*	*+0.2*
Charleston ($000)	1,482	1,317	–165	–35	—	—	—	–160	–17	+46
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.1*	*–2.3*	—	—	—	*–10.8*	*–1.1*	*+3.1*
Columbia ($000)	1,763	1,551	–212	–42	—	—	—	–276	+66	+40
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.0*	*–2.4*	—	—	—	*–15.6*	*+3.7*	*+2.3*
Florence ($000)	544	420	–123	–11	–16	–64	–33	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–22.7*	*–2.0*	*–2.9*	*–11.7*	*–6.1*	—	—	—
Greenville ($000)	1,421	1,351	–71	–39	—	—	—	+65	–67	–29
Change (%)	—	—	*–5.0*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+4.5*	*–4.7*	*–2.0*
Myrtle Beach ($000)	0	244	+244	+244	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rock Hill ($000)	633	556	–77	–15	+1	–20	–43	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.2*	*–2.3*	*+0.1*	*–3.2*	*–6.8*	—	—	—
Spartanburg ($000)	914	921	+7	–26	—	—	—	+125	–37	–55
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.8*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+13.7*	*–4.0*	*–6.0*
Sumter ($000)	0	476	+476	+476	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Charleston County ($000)	1,221	2,498	+1,277	–66	+385	+827	+131	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+104.6*	*–5.4*	*+31.5*	*+67.8*	*+10.7*	—	—	—
Greenville County ($000)	2,687	2,919	+232	–77	+42	+250	+17	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+8.6*	*–2.9*	*+1.6*	*+9.3*	*+0.6*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula B Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
South Carolina (continued)										
Lexington County ($000)	0	1,209	+1,209	+1,209	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Richland County ($000)	0	1,680	+1,680	+1,680	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Spartanburg County ($000)	0	1,599	+1,599	+1,599	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	32,517	27,101	–5,416	–3,068	–275	+268	–2,342	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–16.7*	*–9.4*	*–0.8*	*+0.8*	*–7.2*	—	—	—
South Dakota										
Rapid City ($000)	699	614	–86	–16	–16	–38	–16	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.2*	*–2.3*	*–2.2*	*–5.4*	*–2.3*	—	—	—
Sioux Falls ($000)	1,024	1,002	–22	–26	—	—	—	+0	+25	–21
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.2*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+0.0*	*+2.4*	*–2.0*
Nonentitlement ($000)	8,178	7,661	–517	+306	–167	—	—	—	–276	–379
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.3*	*+3.7*	*–2.0*	—	—	—	*–3.4*	*–4.6*
Tennessee										
Bristol ($000)	266	285	+19	–8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+7.0*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chattanooga ($000)	2,393	2,246	–147	–61	—	—	—	+251	–90	–247
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.1*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+10.5*	*–3.8*	*–10.3*
Clarksville ($000)	934	982	+48	–26	+41	+18	+15	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+5.2*	*–2.8*	*+4.4*	*+2.0*	*+1.6*	—	—	—
Jackson ($000)	799	728	–71	–19	+4	–63	+7	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–8.9*	*–2.4*	*+0.5*	*–7.9*	*+0.9*	—	—	—
Johnson City ($000)	653	604	–48	–16	–10	–21	–2	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.4*	*–2.4*	*–1.5*	*–3.2*	*–0.3*	—	—	—
Kingsport ($000)	520	514	–6	–14	+5	+10	–8	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.2*	*–2.6*	*+0.9*	*+1.9*	*–1.5*	—	—	—
Knoxville ($000)	2,643	2,336	–306	–62	–67	–91	–87	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.6*	*–2.3*	*–2.5*	*–3.4*	*–3.3*	—	—	—
Memphis ($000)	11,878	10,033	–1,844	–265	–226	–1,075	–278	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–15.5*	*–2.2*	*–1.9*	*–9.1*	*–2.3*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Formula B Growth Lag	Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
Tennessee (continued)										
Murfreesboro ($000)	594	728	+134	–19	+46	+88	+19	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+22.5*	*–3.2*	*+7.7*	*+14.9*	*+3.2*	—	—	—
Nashville-Davidson ($000)	6,229	6,139	–91	–162	–112	+11	+173	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.5*	*–2.6*	*–1.8*	*+0.2*	*+2.8*	—	—	—
Oak Ridge ($000)	279	308	+29	–9	—	—	—	+30	+3	+6
Change (%)	—	—	*+10.6*	*–3.2*	—	—	—	*+10.9*	*+0.9*	*+2.0*
Knox County ($000)	1,425	1,227	–198	–32	+8	–132	–41	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–13.9*	*–2.3*	*+0.6*	*–9.3*	*–2.9*	—	—	—
Shelby County ($000)	1,404	1,390	–15	–37	+35	–3	–11	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.1*	*–2.6*	*+2.5*	*–0.2*	*–0.7*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	29,189	31,007	+1,818	+2,146	+325	–35	–618	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.2*	*+7.4*	*+1.1*	*–0.1*	*–2.1*	—	—	—
Texas										
Abilene ($000)	1,536	1,372	–164	–36	–33	–36	–59	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.7*	*–2.4*	*–2.1*	*–2.4*	*–3.9*	—	—	—
Amarillo ($000)	2,531	2,222	–309	–59	–41	–205	–4	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.2*	*–2.3*	*–1.6*	*–8.1*	*–0.1*	—	—	—
Arlington ($000)	2,970	3,883	+913	–102	+64	+436	+515	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+30.7*	*–3.4*	*+2.2*	*+14.7*	*+17.3*	—	—	—
Austin ($000)	8,351	9,173	+822	–242	+306	+121	+636	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+9.8*	*–2.9*	*+3.7*	*+1.5*	*+7.6*	—	—	—
Baytown City ($000)	1,148	1,028	–120	–27	–28	–50	–15	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.5*	*–2.4*	*–2.5*	*–4.4*	*–1.3*	—	—	—
Beaumont ($000)	2,340	2,123	–217	–60	—	—	—	+109	–132	–133
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.3*	*–2.6*	—	—	—	*+4.6*	*–5.6*	*–5.7*
Brownsville ($000)	4,017	3,987	–30	–105	+66	+111	–101	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.7*	*–2.6*	*+1.6*	*+2.8*	*–2.5*	—	—	—
Bryan ($000)	1,109	1,158	+49	–31	+1	+44	+35	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.4*	*–2.8*	*+0.1*	*+4.0*	*+3.1*	—	—	—
Carrollton ($000)	755	962	+207	–25	+35	+96	+101	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+27.4*	*–3.4*	*+4.7*	*+12.7*	*+13.4*	—	—	—
College Station ($000)	1,237	1,378	+141	–36	+16	+195	–35	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+11.4*	*–2.9*	*+1.3*	*+15.8*	*–2.8*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Texas (continued)										
Conroe ($000)	0	668	+668	+668	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Corpus Christi ($000)	5,165	4,217	–948	–111	–86	–420	–331	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–18.4*	*–2.2*	*–1.7*	*–8.1*	*–6.4*	—	—	—
Dallas ($000)	20,219	21,659	+1,441	–571	–27	+464	+1,575	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+7.1*	*–2.8*	*–0.1*	*+2.3*	*+7.8*	—	—	—
Denison ($000)	507	460	–46	–13	—	—	—	–11	–11	–12
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.2*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–2.1*	*–2.1*	*–2.4*
Denton ($000)	1,114	1,007	–106	–27	+5	–94	+9	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.5*	*–2.4*	*+0.5*	*–8.5*	*+0.8*	—	—	—
Edinburg ($000)	938	1,108	+170	–29	+38	+144	+17	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+18.1*	*–3.1*	*+4.1*	*+15.4*	*+1.8*	—	—	—
El Paso ($000)	12,859	10,478	–2,381	–276	–147	–959	–998	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–18.5*	*–2.1*	*–1.1*	*–7.5*	*–7.8*	—	—	—
Flower Mound Town ($000)	0	233	+233	+233	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fort Worth ($000)	8,071	8,018	–53	–211	+7	–64	+216	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.7*	*–2.6*	*+0.1*	*–0.8*	*+2.7*	—	—	—
Galveston ($000)	1,951	1,764	–187	–50	—	—	—	+54	–95	–97
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.6*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+2.8*	*–4.9*	*–5.0*
Garland ($000)	2,123	2,608	+485	–69	+3	+166	+384	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+22.8*	*–3.2*	*+0.1*	*+7.8*	*+18.1*	—	—	—
Grand Prairie ($000)	1,408	1,661	+252	–44	+27	+149	+120	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+17.9*	*–3.1*	*+1.9*	*+10.6*	*+8.6*	—	—	—
Harlingen ($000)	1,390	1,174	–215	–31	–1	–96	–87	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–15.5*	*–2.2*	*–0.1*	*–6.9*	*–6.3*	—	—	—
Houston ($000)	36,752	36,978	+226	–975	+42	–100	+1,259	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.6*	*–2.7*	*+0.1*	*–0.3*	*+3.4*	—	—	—
Irving ($000)	2,321	2,811	+490	–74	+21	+107	+435	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+21.1*	*–3.2*	*+0.9*	*+4.6*	*+18.8*	—	—	—
Killeen ($000)	1,059	1,141	+82	–30	+34	+47	+32	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+7.8*	*–2.8*	*+3.2*	*+4.4*	*+3.0*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Poverty	Overcrowding	Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Pre-1940 Housing
Texas (continued)										
Laredo ($000)	4,401	4,405	+4	–116	+91	+60	–30	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.1*	*–2.6*	*+2.1*	*+1.4*	*–0.7*	—	—	—
Lewisville ($000)	0	664	+664	+664	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Longview ($000)	1,091	953	–138	–25	–31	–81	–1	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.6*	*–2.3*	*–2.8*	*–7.4*	*–0.1*	—	—	—
Lubbock ($000)	3,365	2,853	–512	–75	–65	–167	–204	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–15.2*	*–2.2*	*–1.9*	*–5.0*	*–6.1*	—	—	—
Marshall ($000)	558	504	–55	–14	—	—	—	+20	–38	–23
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.8*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*+3.7*	*–6.8*	*–4.1*
McAllen ($000)	2,650	2,169	–482	–57	+19	–268	–176	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–18.2*	*–2.2*	*+0.7*	*–10.1*	*–6.6*	—	—	—
McKinney City ($000)	0	502	+502	+502	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mesquite ($000)	1,085	1,118	+32	–29	+11	–14	+64	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+3.0*	*–2.7*	*+1.0*	*–1.3*	*+5.9*	—	—	—
Midland ($000)	1,379	1,122	–256	–30	–34	–107	–85	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–18.6*	*–2.1*	*–2.5*	*–7.8*	*–6.2*	—	—	—
Mission ($000)	1,005	995	–10	–26	+34	+20	–37	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.0*	*–2.6*	*+3.4*	*+2.0*	*–3.7*	—	—	—
Missouri City ($000)	0	326	+326	+326	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Braunfels ($000)	0	394	+394	+394	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Richland Hills ($000)	0	395	+395	+395	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Odessa ($000)	1,732	1,402	–330	–37	–47	–130	–116	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–19.1*	*–2.1*	*–2.7*	*–7.5*	*–6.7*	—	—	—
Orange ($000)	586	545	–41	–16	—	—	—	–2	–22	–1
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.9*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*–0.3*	*–3.7*	*–0.2*
Pasadena ($000)	2,139	2,388	+249	–63	–1	+193	+120	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+11.6*	*–2.9*	*–0.0*	*+9.0*	*+5.6*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Texas (continued)										
Pharr ($000)	1,365	1,342	–23	–35	+22	+12	–22	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.7*	*–2.6*	*+1.6*	*+0.9*	*–1.6*	—	—	—
Plano ($000)	903	1,480	+577	–39	+205	+235	+176	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+63.9*	*–4.3*	*+22.8*	*+26.0*	*+19.5*	—	—	—
Port Arthur ($000)	1,973	1,681	–292	–48	—	—	—	–25	–115	–104
Change (%)	—	—	*–14.8*	*–2.4*	—	—	—	*–1.3*	*–5.8*	*–5.3*
Richardson ($000)	576	786	+210	–21	+8	+101	+122	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+36.5*	*–3.6*	*+1.4*	*+17.5*	*+21.2*	—	—	—
Round Rock ($000)	0	425	+425	+425	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
San Angelo ($000)	1,466	1,119	–347	–30	–36	–156	–125	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–23.6*	*–2.0*	*–2.5*	*–10.6*	*–8.5*	—	—	—
San Antonio ($000)	20,695	17,711	–2,985	–467	+93	–1,841	–770	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–14.4*	*–2.3*	*+0.5*	*–8.9*	*–3.7*	—	—	—
San Benito ($000)	707	621	–86	–16	–1	–27	–42	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–12.2*	*–2.3*	*–0.2*	*–3.8*	*–5.9*	—	—	—
San Marcos ($000)	0	616	+616	+616	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sherman ($000)	446	401	–45	–11	–7	–41	+15	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.1*	*–2.4*	*–1.7*	*–9.3*	*+3.3*	—	—	—
Sugar Land ($000)	0	387	+387	+387	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Temple ($000)	789	638	–151	–17	–1	–109	–25	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–19.2*	*–2.1*	*–0.1*	*–13.8*	*–3.1*	—	—	—
Texarkana ($000)	600	571	–29	–15	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–4.9*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Texas City ($000)	671	532	–139	–14	–21	–75	–29	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–20.7*	*–2.1*	*–3.1*	*–11.2*	*–4.3*	—	—	—
Tyler ($000)	1,338	1,155	–183	–30	–18	–109	–25	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–13.7*	*–2.3*	*–1.4*	*–8.2*	*–1.9*	—	—	—
Victoria ($000)	1,020	783	–238	–21	–15	–134	–68	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–23.3*	*–2.0*	*–1.4*	*–13.2*	*–6.7*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula B Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Texas (continued)										
Waco ($000)	2,323	2,058	–265	–54	–28	–154	–28	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.4*	*–2.3*	*–1.2*	*–6.6*	*–1.2*	—	—	—
Wichita Falls ($000)	1,972	1,617	–354	–46	—	—	—	–96	–109	–104
Change (%)	—	—	*–18.0*	*–2.3*	—	—	—	*–4.9*	*–5.5*	*–5.3*
Bexar County ($000)	2,729	2,123	–606	–56	–172	–180	–197	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–22.2*	*–2.1*	*–6.3*	*–6.6*	*–7.2*	—	—	—
Brazoria County ($000)	0	2,353	+2,353	+2,353	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dallas County ($000)	1,937	2,482	+546	–65	+187	+191	+232	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+28.2*	*–3.4*	*+9.7*	*+9.9*	*+12.0*	—	—	—
Fort Bend County ($000)	2,007	2,124	+117	–453	+258	+161	+151	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+5.8*	*–22.6*	*+12.9*	*+8.0*	*+7.5*	—	—	—
Harris County ($000)	11,924	12,818	+893	–338	–33	+705	+560	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+7.5*	*–2.8*	*–0.3*	*+5.9*	*+4.7*	—	—	—
Hidalgo County ($000)	9,021	10,314	+1,293	–272	+224	+1,303	+38	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+14.3*	*–3.0*	*+2.5*	*+14.4*	*+0.4*	—	—	—
Montgomery County ($000)	0	2,043	+2,043	+2,043	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tarrant County ($000)	4,009	3,864	–144	–507	+63	+69	+230	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.6*	*–12.7*	*+1.6*	*+1.7*	*+5.7*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	88,104	85,210	–2,894	–1,913	+1,502	–2,361	–122	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.3*	*–2.2*	*+1.7*	*–2.7*	*–0.1*	—	—	—
Utah										
Clearfield ($000)	0	287	+287	+287	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Layton ($000)	0	418	+418	+418	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ogden ($000)	1,744	1,395	–349	–38	—	—	—	–254	+21	–78
Change (%)	—	—	*–20.0*	*–2.2*	—	—	—	*–14.5*	*+1.2*	*–4.5*
Orem ($000)	771	752	–19	–20	+12	+15	–26	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.4*	*–2.6*	*+1.5*	*+2.0*	*–3.4*	—	—	—
Provo ($000)	2,091	2,096	+5	–55	+6	+30	+25	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.2*	*–2.6*	*+0.3*	*+1.4*	*+1.2*	—	—	—

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A: Population	Formula A: Poverty	Formula A: Overcrowding	Formula A: Growth Lag	Formula B: Poverty	Formula B: Pre-1940 Housing
Utah (continued)										
Salt Lake City ($000)	5,459	4,934	–525	–137	—	—	—	–476	–38	+126
Change (%)	—	—	*–9.6*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–8.7*	*–0.7*	*+2.3*
Sandy City ($000)	549	490	–59	–13	–3	–8	–36	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–10.8*	*–2.4*	*–0.5*	*–1.4*	*–6.5*	—	—	—
Taylorsville ($000)	0	466	+466	+466	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Jordan ($000)	449	487	+38	–13	+52	+9	–10	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+8.4*	*–2.9*	*+11.5*	*+2.0*	*–2.2*	—	—	—
West Valley ($000)	1,186	1,138	–48	–30	+16	–84	+50	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–4.0*	*–2.5*	*+1.4*	*–7.1*	*+4.2*	—	—	—
Salt Lake County ($000)	3,760	3,033	–727	–559	+64	–250	+18	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–19.3*	*–14.9*	*+1.7*	*–6.6*	*+0.5*	—	—	—
Nonentitlement ($000)	7,805	8,544	+739	–50	+388	+329	+71	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+9.5*	*–0.6*	*+5.0*	*+4.2*	*+0.9*	—	—	—
Vermont										
Burlington ($000)	1,057	1,063	+6	–29	—	—	—	+73	–9	–29
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.5*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+6.9*	*–0.8*	*–2.8*
Nonentitlement ($000)	8,522	8,548	+26	+325	–54	—	—	—	+58	–302
Change (%)	—	—	*+0.3*	*+3.8*	*–0.6*	—	—	—	*+0.7*	*–3.5*
Virginia										
Alexandria ($000)	1,285	1,532	+247	–40	–12	+132	+167	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+19.2*	*–3.1*	*–0.9*	*+10.3*	*+13.0*	—	—	—
Bristol ($000)	330	344	+14	–10	—	—	—	+52	–40	+11
Change (%)	—	—	*+4.2*	*–2.9*	—	—	—	*+15.7*	*–12.0*	*+3.5*
Charlottesville ($000)	724	667	–57	–18	–9	–5	–25	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–7.9*	*–2.4*	*–1.2*	*–0.7*	*–3.5*	—	—	—
Chesapeake ($000)	1,527	1,505	–22	–40	+55	–29	–7	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.4*	*–2.6*	*+3.6*	*–1.9*	*–0.5*	—	—	—
Colonial Heights ($000)	117	109	–8	–3	–7	–5	+7	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.5*	*–2.5*	*–5.7*	*–4.1*	*+5.7*	—	—	—
Danville ($000)	1,270	1,265	–5	–36	—	—	—	+104	–46	–27
Change (%)	—	—	*–0.4*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+8.2*	*–3.6*	*–2.1*

Appendix B: All Census 1990 Versus All Census 2000 Grants

Grantee	Grant Amount: 1990 Census	2000 Census	Total Change	Grant Allocation Change Due to: New Entitlements	Formula A Population	Formula A Poverty	Formula A Overcrowding	Formula A Growth Lag	Formula B Poverty	Formula B Pre-1940 Housing
Virginia (continued)										
Fredericksburg ($000)	0	285	+285	+285	—	—	—	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hampton ($000)	1,474	1,375	–99	–36	–38	–16	–9	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–6.7*	*–2.5*	*–2.6*	*–1.1*	*–0.6*	—	—	—
Hopewell ($000)	305	260	–46	–7	–15	–19	–5	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–14.9*	*–2.2*	*–5.0*	*–6.1*	*–1.6*	—	—	—
Lynchburg ($000)	957	1,083	+126	–29	—	—	—	+164	–49	+40
Change (%)	—	—	*+13.1*	*–3.1*	—	—	—	*+17.1*	*–5.1*	*+4.2*
Newport News ($000)	2,281	2,022	–259	–53	–66	–89	–51	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–11.4*	*–2.3*	*–2.9*	*–3.9*	*–2.2*	—	—	—
Norfolk ($000)	6,278	6,455	+178	–186	—	—	—	+593	–241	+12
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.8*	*–3.0*	—	—	—	*+9.4*	*–3.8*	*+0.2*
Petersburg ($000)	755	816	+60	–23	—	—	—	+154	–52	–19
Change (%)	—	—	*+8.0*	*–3.0*	—	—	—	*+20.4*	*–6.9*	*–2.5*
Portsmouth ($000)	2,251	2,185	–66	–62	—	—	—	+120	–134	+10
Change (%)	—	—	*–2.9*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+5.3*	*–5.9*	*+0.4*
Richmond ($000)	6,129	6,021	–108	–168	—	—	—	+235	–134	–42
Change (%)	—	—	*–1.8*	*–2.7*	—	—	—	*+3.8*	*–2.2*	*–0.7*
Roanoke ($000)	2,163	2,206	+43	–61	—	—	—	+137	–65	+32
Change (%)	—	—	*+2.0*	*–2.8*	—	—	—	*+6.3*	*–3.0*	*+1.5*
Suffolk ($000)	784	655	–129	–17	+5	–80	–37	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–16.4*	*–2.2*	*+0.6*	*–10.2*	*–4.7*	—	—	—
Virginia Beach ($000)	3,212	3,089	–123	–81	–126	+114	–29	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*–3.8*	*–2.5*	*–3.9*	*+3.6*	*–0.9*	—	—	—
Arlington County ($000)	2,442	2,238	–205	–60	—	—	—	–163	+30	–12
Change (%)	—	—	*–8.4*	*–2.5*	—	—	—	*–6.7*	*+1.2*	*–0.5*
Chesterfield County ($000)	1,405	1,497	+92	–39	+33	+80	+18	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+6.5*	*–2.8*	*+2.3*	*+5.7*	*+1.3*	—	—	—
Fairfax County ($000)	6,291	7,454	+1,163	–197	+35	+614	+711	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+18.5*	*–3.1*	*+0.6*	*+9.8*	*+11.3*	—	—	—
Henrico County ($000)	1,613	1,804	+190	–48	+9	+143	+86	—	—	—
Change (%)	—	—	*+11.8*	*–2.9*	*+0.6*	*+8.9*	*+5.3*	—	—	—

have experienced substantial decreases in Community Development Block Grant funding. The specific clause is as follows:

> Where the boundaries for a metropolitan city or urban county used for the 1980 census have changed as a result of annexation, the current population used to compute extent of growth lag shall be adjusted by multiplying the current population by the ratio of the population based on the 1980 census within the boundaries used for the 1980 census to the population based on the 1980 census within the current boundaries.