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**FINANCIAL LIMITS**

- Members limited to 15 individual requests, an increase of 5 from FY22.

- All CPF funding capped to 1 percent of discretionary spending (estimated at approximately $16 billion in FY2023).

- Appropriations subcommittee chairs issued guidance on which federal accounts accept requests.

**TRANSPARENCY**

- Funded requests available the same day as the subcommittee markup, or 24 hours before full committee consideration, if there was no subcommittee markup.

- Members are required to post requests on their official House website simultaneously with their submission to the committee.

- Appropriations Committee posts all House members’ project requests, including a consolidated table of accessible data.
REDUCE POTENTIAL FOR ABUSE

• Evidence of “community support” required

• Members must certify that they, their spouse, and their immediate family have no financial interest in the projects they request. Exceeds House rules by including immediate families of Members.

• Ban on directing funding to for-profit grantees. Members may request funding for state or local governmental grantees and for eligible non-profits.

• Requiring the Government Accountability Office to audit a sample of enacted projects and report its findings to Congress.
FY23 House Directed Spending Participation by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GOP</th>
<th>Non-participating</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members Requesting</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59% (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: House Appropriations Committee “Community Project Funding Request Table,” May 27, 2022.
## FY22 & FY23 Appropriations Committee Funded Projects

### Requests vs. Funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>4,743</td>
<td>+ 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>+ 58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval rate</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>+ 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amount Requested vs. Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Millions</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>$ 12.3 b</td>
<td>$ 22 b</td>
<td>+ 78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Approved</td>
<td>$ 4.2 b</td>
<td>$ 8.7 b</td>
<td>+ 107%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval rate</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>+ 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### House Projects Approved by Party

- **FY22**
  - Republican: 42%
  - Democrat: 58%

- **FY23**
  - Republican: 40%
  - Democrat: 60%

Source: House Subcommittee reports on approved requests.
FY23 House Appropriations Requests by Subcommittee

- Largest requests still in Transportation
  - Transportation Committee didn’t field earmarks in FY23
- Labor HHS rises to second, Energy and Water slipped to third
- Defense continues with few accounts available, and limited requests

Source: House Appropriations Committee “Community Project Funding Request Table,” May 27, 2021.
FY23 Approved House Projects by Subcommittee

- Approval rate similar to FY22: 39%
- Split 60 / 40 overall between parties
- Increase of 107% in approved funding; in part reflects increased request cap.

Source: House Subcommittee reports on approved requests.
Compared with the FY22 requests, the parties have seen an overall increase in their FY23 requests, with some notable exceptions.

- Both parties continue to be most interested in Transportation, HUD.
- Partisan preferences differ: Rs Energy & Water, Milcon VA; Dems, Labor HHS.
FY23 House Directed Spending Funding by State

- Four states without participating members: AK, MT, ND, SD.
- Distribution reflects size of delegation. Top five: CA, FL, TX, NY, IL.

$166m average

Source: House Subcommittee reports on approved requests.
Florida: $51.21 (2x average)

- Florida ranks highest, but had no Senate requests.

- LA, ME, CT, MS round out top five.

Source: House Subcommittee reports on approved requests, 2021 US Census estimates.
## Comparison of Participating House Appropriations Committee Members in FY2023 Funded Earmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>House Members</th>
<th>Funded earmarks</th>
<th>Average Amount Funded</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Appropriators</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>$24.6m</td>
<td>$7.1b</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriators</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>$28m</td>
<td>$1.6b</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: House Appropriations Subcommittee reports on funded requests.
FY2023 Senate Directed Spending
“Congressionally Directed Spending,”
Senate Appropriations Committee

FINANCIAL LIMITS

- All CDS funding capped at 1 percent of discretionary spending (estimated at approximately $16 billion in FY2023)

TRANSPARENCY

- Senators required to post their requests and financial certification disclosures online.
- Each request made publicly available online in a searchable format after committee markup.
- Funding decisions made publicly available for at least 48 hours before a floor vote.
“Congressionally Directed Spending,”
Senate Appropriations Committee

REDUCE POTENTIAL FOR ABUSE

• No personal or immediate family financial interest. Public certification required in writing that there is no such interest.

• Point of order against directed spending that was not included in either the House or Senate bills.

• Ban congressionally directed spending items to for-profit entities

• Government Accountability Office required to audit a sample of funded projects and report its findings to Congress
# FY23 Senate Earmark Requests by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Senators Requesting</th>
<th>Non-participating</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of FY22&23 Funded Senate Earmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests</td>
<td>8,055</td>
<td>14,048</td>
<td>+ 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>+ 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval rate</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>- 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
<td>$26.9 b</td>
<td>$39.9 b</td>
<td>+ 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Approved</td>
<td>$5.7 b</td>
<td>$8 b</td>
<td>+ 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval rate</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Senate Subcommittee reports on approved requests.
FY23 Senate Requests by Subcommittee

- Senate funding requests double that of the House
- Interior 2\textsuperscript{nd} in Senate, 4\textsuperscript{th} in House. Statewide projects?
- No Defense accounts open for directed spending.

FY23 Senate Approvals by Subcommittee

- More requests = lower chance of success: 20%.
- Equitable partisan distribution across bills, reflects balance in Senate: 53 / 47.

Source: Senate Subcommittee reports on approved requests.
Comparison of FY22 and FY23 Senate Requests by Party

- Increases in requested funding all categories except Financial Services.
- Preferences similar between parties: Transportation, Interior, Labor, MilCon, and Energy.
Alabama $716 m

- Spending doesn’t reflect state populations: AL, OK, HI, AK, and MO are top five. CA ranks 6.
- FL, IA, ID, IN, KY, MT, ND, NE, TN, TX, UT, and WY with no requests.

$211 m average

38 states w/ participating Senator
12 states w/o participating Senator

Source: Senate Appropriations Subcommittee reports on funded requests.
On a per capita basis, Alaska (Murkowski) dominates: 7.5x average

VT (Leahy), HI (Schatz), ME (Collins), and RI (Reed) round out top five. All top five states have Appropriations members.

Lack of GOP participation skews distribution: TX and FL have no requests.

Source: Senate Appropriations Subcommittee reports on funded requests.
## Comparison of Participating Senate Appropriations Committee Members in FY2023 Funded Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>Funded earmarks</th>
<th>Per Capita Average</th>
<th>Average # Funded</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Appropriators</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>$24.45</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>$3.4 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriators</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>$102.74</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>$4.6 b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Senate Appropriations Subcommittee reports on funded requests.
Congressional Directed Spending Overall in FY23

Combined House and Senate Approved Directed Spending per Capita

- Alaska $668.28 per resident
- $93.06 average

- Combining pushes FL and TX below the average, due to lack of Senate participation. Coordination?
- AK, VT, HI, ME, and RI still stand out as top five.
- Only two states with zero participation: MT and ND.
# Differences in House & Senate Approved Multiple Requests FY23

## Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Approved</th>
<th>2+ requests</th>
<th>Intrastate</th>
<th>Multistate</th>
<th>Partisan</th>
<th>Bipartisan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Approved</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Approved</th>
<th>2+ request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Approved</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Pre-Moratorium Earmarks and FY22 & 23 Directed Spending (in 2022 dollars)

- Discretionary cap keeps overall spending far below pre-moratorium levels.

- Different process, different priorities: Defense hardly registers, whereas Transportation HUD, Labor HHS, and Interior now exceed pre-moratorium spending.

CONCLUSIONS

• Broad participation continued

• Requests increased 57%, funding increased 107%
• Still much less funding than old system; changed spending priorities continue.
• More partisan divide: 60 / 40
• No Appropriations advantage, generally equitable distribution

• Transparency good, but could use improvement in publicizing funding decisions.

• GOP rules still undermine broad participation. No change.
• Requests increased 74%, funding increased 40%.
• Still much less funding than old system; changed spending priorities continue.
• More equitable partisan divide: 53 / 47
• Continued equity concerns: appropriators overrepresented, uneven participation, per capita outliers like AK, VT, HI.
• Transparency good, but could use improvement in publicizing funding decisions.