# THE DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC EARMARKS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, FY 1980-1989

Education, Higher - U.S. Finance
Federal aid to higher education

James Savage
Office of the President
University of California
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd Floor
Oakland, California 94612



Working Paper 89-5

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

# THE DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC EARMARKS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, FY 1980-1989

James Savage
Office of the President
University of California
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd Floor
Oakland, California 94612

Working Paper 89-5

March 7, 1989
Institute of Governmental Studies
Berkeley, CA 94720

# THE DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC EARMARKS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, FY 1980-1989

JAMES SAVAGE
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
300 LAKESIDE DRIVE, 22nd FLOOR
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612
(415) 987-9143

MARCH 7, 1989

## SUMMARY

*From FY 1980 through FY 1989, more than $900 million has been earmarked for at least 300 academic facility and research projects.

*The distribution of earmarked projects creates extreme geographical inequities and primarily benefits only a handful of states and academic institutions.

*More than 40 percent of earmarks went to just five states, while two-thirds of the projects went to only ten states. The top ten earmarking institutions received nearly 40 percent of all projects, while the top twenty schools received nearly 60 percent of all earmarked funds.

*The top ten state recipients of federal research funds also obtained more than a third of all earmarks. Earmarking helps the rich states get richer.

Perhaps the most divisive issue in higher education is the subject of academic earmarking. Earmarking, often called pork barreling, describes the practice where a member of Congress inserts language in federal legislation that calls for a federal agency to fund an academic institution's facilities or research in a manner that bypasses peer and merit review. Thus, the definition of an earmarked project is one that would not exist without the intervention of Congress. Whether earmarking undermines science and wastes scarce federal resources, or corrects a bias that favors elite research universities, is a hotly debated topic in the higher education community.

Although from time-to-time lists of earmarks have been published, the debate over earmarking would be enhanced by a more comprehensive review of such projects. Such a list would be helpful in determining, for example, the magnitude and trends in earmarking, the identity of the institutions receiving earmarks, and the type of projects being funded in this manner. In addition, this information is necessary in order to answer the question, does earmarking provide an equitable distribution of federal resources or does earmarking simply create inequities of its own making. The data presented here attempt to begin to answer such questions and to make this information available to the higher education community.

The data show that from FY 1980 through FY 1989, more than $900 million has been earmarked for at least 300 academic facility

and research projects in the federal government's appropriations bills. As shown in table 1, earmarking has been on the rise, with a doubling in projects and their dollar value in FY 1988 and FY 1989 over FY 1987. (All tables appear at the end of the text.) Only the November 1987 two-year budget agreement which capped domestic spending, and action taken by Senator Sam Nunn (D-GA) to defeat more than $40 million in defense earmarks, prevented an increase in the dollar value of earmarks in FY 1989 over FY 1988. In addition, the practice of earmarking has enhanced rather than rectified any geographical and institutional inequity in the distribution of scarce federal science resources. Furthermore, the practice of earmarking is spreading through the various Appropriations subcommittees, while the Association of American Universities (AAU) moratorium on earmarking has not prevented its own member institutions from seeking earmarks. The moratorium, however, may be partially responsible for a reduction in the dollar value of AAU earmarks in FY 1989, although there was an increase in the actual number of these projects.

## The Data

In 1986, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee requested that the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress report on how much earmarking was taking place and which institutions were receiving projects. Using the SCORPIO computer program, CRS keyed on the names of all academic institutions mentioned in federal legislation enacted into law

for FY 1980-87. A list of academic institutions receiving earmarked funds was then derived from the computer runs, and reported to the Congress in 1987.* In addition to the CRS data, for several years the University of California (UC) has monitored the growth and distribution of the academic earmarks contained in the federal government's appropriations bills; the data for FY 1988-89 are based on figures collected by UC. Although CRS has identified a handful of authorizations for earmarks, appropriations bills are the basis of study because most earmarkers employ appropriations legislation to fund their projects. Perhaps because the number of authorizations bills passing through Congress has declined in the last decade, earmarkers have chosen to bypass the more uncertain authorizations process and fund their projects by the more direct route of appropriations legislation. The CRS and UC data include earmarks contained in appropriations bills, supplemental appropriations, and continuing resolutions.

The combined CRS and UC lists provide the most detailed longitudinal data on the sources and distribution of academic earmarks. Both CRS and UC caution, however, that the lists are incomplete. With some exceptions, academic institutions can be

---

*"Appropriations Enacted for Specific Colleges and Universities by the 96th Through the 99th Congress," Congressional Research Service Report 87-20 EPW, January 14, 1987.

identified only when they are mentioned by name, usually in appropriations report language. Thus, many academic earmarks not referred to by name in the reports do not appear in the accompanying tables. This is particularly true in the case of the earmarked "special projects grants" contained in the Agriculture appropriations bill; relatively few of these grants are listed by CRS or UC. In addition, some projects have become institutionalized, such that the funding agency is so used to seeing the earmark that it is funded without it having to appear in the appropriations report. Consequently, the total number of earmarks and their dollar value are no doubt underestimated in the data presented here, at least by several hundred million dollars over the ten year period.

In the case where several schools share an earmark and where the dollar value of the earmark per institution is unidentified, the dollar value is divided equally among the schools. Thus, when three universities share a $300,000 earmark, they are listed in the accompanying tables as having each received a $100,000 project.

Some institutions may object to being listed by either CRS or UC; they would deny that their projects are the result of pork barrel politics. (Iowa State University, for example, contends that NSF director Erich Bloch was wrong when he recently identified that

school as the recipient of pork.*) Each citation of an academic project in a report has its own history, and on a very rare occasion some project may indeed have its origins in a manner other than earmarking. Thus, the tables in this report refer to "apparent" earmarks. These citations, however, are in the public record and a strong prima facie case can be made that they are earmarks; of all the tens of thousands of federal contracts and grants awarded to universities each year as well as other forms of federal support to higher education, only these projects appear in appropriations bills.

Finally, excluded from the lists are historically black colleges, federally supported institutions in the District of Columbia, and federally supported schools for the deaf.

Earmarking and Geographical Inequity

The common argument made in behalf of earmarking is that the current merit review system for the distribution of research funds is biased in favor of elite universities. Coupled with the lack of a meaningful federal facilities program, "emerging" academic institutions claim that they must seek earmarked facilities to improve their scientific infrastructure to be competitive in obtaining research awards. Inequities found in

---

*"NSF's Bloch Attacks Iowa State's Pork," Science, November 18, 1988, p. 1007.

the current system, therefore, are said to be remedied in part through earmarking.

Tables 2 and 3, however, indicate that rather than making the distribution of funds more equitable, earmarking primarily benefits only a handful of states and academic institutions. Table 1 ranks the recipients of earmarked funds by states during FY 1980-89. As measured by quintile, more than 40 percent of the funds went to just five states, while two-thirds of the earmark dollars went to only ten states. Of these states, West Virginia was the one state to rank in the bottom ten in terms of federal research support. These bottom ten states received just eight percent of the earmarks. Many of these schools that participate in earmarking receive relatively few federal dollars while their participation helps to justify a practice that shifts significant resources to a few states and institutions.

On the other hand, three of the top ten earmarkers include Massachusetts, New York, and Illinois, which rank in the National Science Foundation's list of top ten state recipients of federal research funds. Ironically, NSF's top ten research states received more than a third of all earmarks. Rather than creating geographical equity, earmarking helps the rich states get richer.

In addition, it is worth noting that institutions belonging to the Association of American Universities (AAU), which adopted a

voluntary moratorium on earmarking in 1987, have received $264,639,833, or nearly 30 percent of the earmarked funds. In FY 1987, AAU schools received 14 earmarks valued at $49,316,000; 16 earmarks in FY 1988 valued at $62,340,000; and 21 earmarks in FY 1989 valued at $46,903,000.

A similar concentration of earmarked resources exists when looking at specific institutions, as shown in Table 3. The top ten earmarking universities have received nearly 40 percent of all the pork, while the top twenty schools have received nearly 60 percent of all earmarked funds. Moreover, many of these colleges and universities are located in states that receive substantial amounts of federal academic research dollars administered through peer or merit review. These geographical regions that benefit from both earmarking and peer reviewed funding are "double-dipping" into the federal science budget, thereby enhancing rather than correcting whatever geographical inequities may exist in the peer review system. As Congressman Sherwood Boehler (R-NY), the ranking minority member on the House Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee recently noted, "Boston, for example, is not a city lacking for federal research funds, and the federal government does not have a responsibility to ensure that an equal number of top scientists get off at each stop on the Boston subway." Massachusetts is the leading earmarking recipient, and is the fourth ranking recipient of federal research funds for colleges and universities.

Contrary to the argument made by defenders of earmarking that it is an equitable solution to the perceived bias of peer review, earmarking in fact creates inequities of its own. Opponents of earmarking need to educate members of Congress about these inequitable distribution effects. A federal facilities program that allocates resources through a merit review process, and employs geographic distribution as a criterion in judging projects, is a more effective remedy than earmarking for solving whatever geographic inequities that may exist.

Earmarking by Appropriations Subcommittee

To understand the practice of earmarking and its potential for future growth, it is important to examine briefly its source, the House and Senate Appropriations committees. The earmarks identified by CRS and UC have their origins in nine Appropriations subcommittees, as shown in Table 4. Over the years the bulk of the earmarks come from five subcommittees: Energy & Water, Agriculture, Defense, Interior, and Labor-HHS-Education. The figures for the House and Senate subcommittees are added together, because though there are important differences in behavior, both bodies must agree to an earmark before it is included in a conference report. The primary distinction between the House and the Senate is that the Senate approves of more earmarks, but what typically occurs is that the House and Senate projects are added together during conference. For example, for FY 1988 the Senate earmarked $30 million more than the House,

and $50 million more for FY 1989. This difference between the Senate and House may be due to individual senators having a larger territory to represent than a representative, and therefore more schools and thus more earmarks. Or, as political scientists have noted, the House Appropriations Committee traditionally has played the role of protector of the purse, and is marginally more frugal than its Senate counterpart in allocating earmarks.

The aggregate figures in Table 4 are somewhat deceptive, however, and it is more useful to examine the earmarks year-by-year, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5 shows how the practice of earmarking has spread through the Appropriations subcommittees during the last ten fiscal years. During this period the heaviest earmarking has taken place in the Energy & Water, Agriculture, Defense, and Interior subcommittees. Opponents of earmarking, however, should be particularly troubled by the rise of pork barreling in the Treasury-Postal, Transportation, and Commerce subcommittees in FY 1988 and FY 1989. Whether these subcommittees are committed to earmarking remains to be seen. There still may be time to convince the members of these subcommittees of the inequities and potential harm of pork barreling. In any case, some sort of strategy is required to limit pork barreling to the subcommittees where it appears endemic.

Although earmarking has been growing in some subcommittees, during the last three years it has been relatively restrained in the Labor-HHS-Education and HUD-Independent Agencies subcommittees. These two subcommittees have funded only 6 earmarks valued at $10.3 million since FY 1987. What makes this relative lack of pork particularly interesting is that the opportunities for earmarking are so extensive in these subcommittees. In addition to funding the bulk of domestic research and education programs important to higher eduction, they appropriate 46 percent of all discretionary domestic spending. Other subcommittees with far fewer resources earmark substantially more than Labor-HHS-Education and HUD-Independent Agencies.

The two reasons that explain why so little earmarking has taken place in these subcommittees are well-known in Washington. First, members who engage in earmarking are reluctant to pork barrel merit reviewed programs. Thus, the HHS biomedical research budget and the National Science Foundation have escaped earmarking. Even merit reviewed programs in other subcommittees have been protected. Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ), for example, has tried and failed in both the Interior and Treasury-Postal subcommittees to earmark the merit reviewed National Endowment for the Arts budget.

Second, the key to determining whether earmarking will take place is the attitude of the subcommittee chair. Both Senator William

Proxmire (D-WI) and Representative Edward Boland (D-MA) opposed earmarking in the HUD-Independent Agencies subcommittee, which has registered just two identifiable earmarks in ten years. In the Labor-HHS-Education subcommittee, Representative William Natcher (D-KY) has been the champion against earmarking. In the early 1980's, however, even Natcher was unable to prevent the earmarking of the bill by Speaker O'Neill, who earmarked projects for institutions in Boston, or by senators Mark Hatfield (R-OR) and Lowell Weicker (R-CT). Hatfield at the time was the chair of the full Appropriations Committee and Weicker chaired the subcommittee. Since that time, Natcher's efforts, and to a lesser extent those of Senate chairman Lawton Chiles (D-FL), have limited the subcommittee bill to just two earmarks.

These observations have been confirmed with more than twenty interviews with Appropriations professional staff and personal staff to members who serve on the committees, most of whom expressed hostility towards earmarking:

> "I can't recall any instances where other members on the subcommittee requested academic earmarks. It was clear to all that Mr. Boland opposed earmarks for academic institutions."

> "It's the policy of the subcommittee chair [to determine if earmarking will be allowed]. Natcher doesn't like it

and defeats the Senate in conference. Both Natcher and Boland have been around a long time. Because of their longevity, they create committee culture and history though policy."

"We take care of our district and state, but we don't earmark NSF because no one else earmarks NSF."

"Congress appropriates; it's up to the executive branch to carry that out. You let the experts spend the money. This is the opinion of both Proxmire and [Senator Jake] Garn."

"[Earmarking depends on the] chairman's fundamental view of right or wrong." [Natcher's] "whole life is devoted to a system of merit versus politics."

"The peer review process was more likely to lead to the distribution of federal resources where the most value would result."

"For [Representative Sidney] Yates, it's absolutely a policy [against earmarking the National Endowments], it just destroys the whole process of competitive review."

Unfortunately for those who oppose pork, Boland, Chiles, and Proxmire have retired, and it is too early to determine what positions on earmarking will be taken by those who have replaced them.

Some subcommittees appear lost to earmarking, especially Energy & Water and Agriculture. Representative Robert Traxler (D-MI), the new chair of the House HUD-Independent Agencies subcommittee, probably summed up the Energy & Water situation by noting that, "Energy & Water will earmark until the pyramids turn to putty." One staffer noted, "It's a way of life in Energy & Water; before academics it was the Corps of Engineers."

The same evaluation can be made of the Agriculture subcommittee, although some higher education associations, particularly AAU, have condoned this behavior. AAU has suggested that earmarking in the Agriculture bill is acceptable because of this subcommittee's long history of earmarking projects and because of the special relation Congress has with land-grant institutions.

The Agriculture bill may always be filled with earmarks, but AAU's tolerance of this pork is politically unwise and undermines the entire effort of fighting earmarks. This is true for several reasons: First, such a position is insulting to members who sit on subcommittees other than Agriculture. These members will hardly join the fight against earmarking when they are informed that a technology center, trade center, biology center, or polymers institute earmarked in their bill undermines science and wastes federal funds, but if these same projects are funded by the Agriculture subcommittee they are acceptable to the higher education community. These projects, at best marginally related

to agriculture, have indeed been earmarked in the Agriculture bill. Second, such a position gives earmarkers a green light to shift their projects to the Agriculture subcommittee, and thus escape the condemnation AAU reserves for the other subcommittees' earmarks. Indeed, some universities have found it impossible to gain earmarked biomedical facilities from the Labor-HHS-Education bill, and so they have turned successfully to the Energy & Water and Agriculture subcommittees. Third, such a position undercuts the efforts of other organizations to restrain earmarking in the Agriculture bill. The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), for example, is seeking to increase the merit reviewed research funds in the Agriculture budget largely as a response to the increase in earmarked "special project grants." In short, by condoning one form of earmarking on basis of a vague reference to history, earmarking of all kinds is encouraged.

## Conclusion

A valuable argument against earmarking may be their inequitable distribution among states and institutions. The dissemination of this data may convince some members of Congress that earmarking is not only bad for science, but that it is simply an unfair allocation of scarce resources. In addition, the principal lessons to be learned by examining the subcommittee data are, first, that opponents of earmarking must win the subcommittee chairs over to their position. Also, a thorough head count

should be made of all subcommittee members, as well as all members of Congress, to identify where they stand on the issue, to see if they have supported or initiated earmarks, and to determine if they can be won over to the fight against pork barrel. Second, most members appear to be reluctant to earmark merit reviewed programs. Opponents of pork must try to bring as many current sources of earmarking under merit review as possible; a federal facilities program by itself will probably not be sufficient to control earmarking.

# TABLES

APPARENT ACADEMIC EARMARKS, FY 1980-89

| FY | Dollar Value | Number of Earmarks |
|---|---|---|
| 1980 | $10,740,000 | 7 |
| 1981 | | |
| 1982 | 9,370,999 | 9 |
| 1983 | 77,400,000 | 13 |
| 1984 | 39,320,000 | 6 |
| 1985 | 104,085,000 | 36 |
| 1986 | 115,885,000 | 39 |
| 1987 | 113,800,000 | 41 |
| 1988 | 232,292,000 | 72 |
| 1989 | 202,537,000 | 87 |
| Total | $905,429,999 | 310 |

Sources: FY 1980-87: Congressional Research Service
FY 1988-89: University of California

# APPARENT ACADEMIC EARMARKS CONTAINED IN THE FY 1980-89 APPROPRIATIONS, RANKED BY STATE

| Earmark Rank | Earmarked Funds | Percent of Funds by Quintile (Cumulative) | FY 1987 Federal Research Rank |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Massachusetts | $92,416,000 | | 4 |
| 2. New York | 82,901,333 | | 2 |
| 3. Oregon | 78,150,000 | | 23 |
| 4. Florida | 62,377,500 | | 16 |
| 5. Illinois | 60,819,000 | 41.6% | 7 |
| 6. Louisiana | 56,700,000 | | 30 |
| 7. South Carolina | 37,700,000 | | 35 |
| 8. West Virginia | 34,423,000 | | 45 |
| 9. Alabama | 34,400,000 | | 22 |
| 10. New Hampshire | 30,045,000 | 62.9 | 33 |
| 11. Pennsylvania | 26,800,000 | | 6 |
| 12. Hawaii | 25,317,500 | | 34 |
| 13. Iowa | 24,858,000 | | 27 |
| 14. Mississippi | 23,426,000 | | 39 |
| 15. Arizona | 22,575,000 | 76.5 | 25 |
| 16. California | 21,740,000 | | 1 |
| 17. North Dakota | 20,259,333 | | 41 |
| 18. Oklahoma | 17,515,000 | | 38 |
| 19. Washington | 15,920,000 | | 12 |
| 20. District of Columbia | 15,020,000 | 86.5 | 29 |
| 21. Indiana | 13,050,000 | | 19 |
| 22. Texas | 11,700,000 | | 5 |
| 23. Nevada | 11,100,000 | | 44 |
| 24. Utah | 11,000,000 | | 24 |
| 25. North Carolina | 9,900,000 | 92.8 | 9 |
| 26. Kansas | 9,321,000 | | 32 |
| 27. New Jersey | 8,810,000 | | 21 |
| 28. New Mexico | 6,100,000 | | 28 |
| 29. Ohio | 5,700,000 | | 10 |
| 30. Kentucky | 5,304,000 | 96.7 | 37 |
| 31. Rhode Island | 5,000,000 | | 31 |
| 32. Maryland | 4,350,000 | | 3 |
| 33. Connecticut | 3,750,000 | | 13 |
| 34. Idaho | 3,690,000 | | 48 |
| 35. Wisconsin | 3,550,000 | 98.9 | 11 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 36. Michigan | 3,250,000 | | 8 |
| 37. Minnesota | 1,800,000 | | 20 |
| 38. Vermont | 1,450,000 | | 40 |
| 39. Arkansas | 1,200,000 | | 46 |
| 40. Georgia | 517,000 | 99.8 | 14 |
| 41. Virginia | 450,000 | | 17 |
| 42. Nebraska | 315,000 | | 36 |
| 43. Alaska | 290,000 | | 42 |
| 44. Missouri | 225,000 | | 18 |
| 45. South Dakota | 195,333 | 99.9 | 51 |
| 46. Montana | 50,000 | 100.0% | 47 |

Total $905,429,999

Notes: No earmarks were identified for the states of Maine, Tennessee, Delaware, Colorado, or Wyoming.

States receiving federal research awards ranked 1 through 10 received 35.4 percent of earmarked funds; states ranked 11 through 20 received 11.2 percent of earmarked funds; 21 through 30 received 28.4 percent; 31 through 40 received 17.1 percent; and 41 through 51 received 7.8 percent. The District of Columbia is included in federal ranking at number 29.

Source of Federal Ranking: NSF Science Resource Studies.

# APPARENT ACADEMIC EARMARKS CONTAINED IN THE FY 1980-89 APPROPRIATIONS, RANKED BY UNIVERSITIES OR COLLEGES RECEIVING MORE THAN $1 MILLION

| Earmark Rank | Earmarked Funds | Percent of Funds by Decatile (Cumulative) | FY 1986 Federal Research Rank*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Oregon Health Sci U | $52,400,000 | | |
| 2. *U Rochester | 45,000,000 | | 24 |
| 3. U West Virginia | 34,023,000 | | |
| 4. U Alabama | 33,800,000 | | 43 |
| 5. *U Illinois | 32,000,000 | | 17 |
| 6. Tufts U | 31,696,000 | | 72 |
| 7. *U Florida | 31,037,500 | | 38 |
| 8. Florida St U | 30,740,000 | | 87 |
| 9. Louisiana St U | 28,950,000 | | 63 |
| 10. Boston U | 27,500,000 | 38.3% | 40 |
| 11. *Northwestern U | 26,319,000 | | 47 |
| 12. U Hawaii | 25,317,500 | | 70 |
| 13. U South Carolina | 25,200,000 | | |
| 14. *Iowa St U | 20,258,000 | | 88 |
| 15. Loma Linda U | 19,500,000 | | |
| 16. Rochester Inst Tech | 15,752,000 | | |
| 17. Dartmouth C (Thayer Eng) | 15,000,000 | | 92 |
| 17. U New Hampshire | 15,000,000 | | |
| 18. *Tulane U | 14,250,000 | | 99 |
| 19. *Catholic U | 14,200,000 | 59.4 | |
| 20. Arizona St U | 14,000,000 | | |
| 21. Oregon St U | 13,950,000 | | 54 |
| 22. Northeastern U | 13,500,000 | | |
| 22. Boston C | 11,500,000 | | |
| 23. Washington St U | 11,095,000 | | 96 |
| 24. U Utah | 11,000,000 | | 33 |
| 25. *U Oregon | 10,800,000 | | 91 |
| 26. North Dakota St U | 10,359,333 | | |
| 27. U North Dakota | 9,900,000 | | |
| 28. *U North Carolina | 9,800,000 | 72.2 | 25 |
| 28. *Indiana U | 9,800,000 | | 49 |
| 29. *Pennsylvania St U | 9,750,000 | | 18 |
| 30. U Oklahoma | 8,800,000 | | 36 |
| 31. *U Arizona | 8,575,000 | | 41 |
| 32. St U New York | 8,500,000 | | |
| 33. Xavier U | 8,250,000 | | |
| 34. South Carolina Med U | 8,000,000 | | |
| 35. Drexel U | 7,925,000 | | |
| 36. New Jersey U Med & Dent | 7,500,000 | | |
| 37. Mississippi St U | 7,450,000 | 81.5 | 98 |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38. | Oklahoma St U | 6,715,000 | | 85 |
| 39. | U Nevada, Las Vegas | 6,000,000 | | |
| 40. | Temple U | 5,700,000 | | 100 |
| 41. | *Ohio St U | 5,500,000 | | 22 |
| 42. | *Cornell U | 5,349,333 | | 9 |
| 43. | U Kentucky | 5,304,000 | | |
| 44. | U New Mexico | 5,000,000 | | 58 |
| 44. | *Brown U | 5,000,000 | | 65 |
| 45. | Kansas St U | 4,930,000 | | |
| 46. | Vorhees C | 4,500,000 | 87.5 | |
| 47. | Drake U | 4,200,000 | | |
| 48. | U Nevada | 4,100,000 | | |
| 49. | Loyola U (La.) | 4,000,000 | | |
| 50. | U Idaho | 3,690,000 | | |
| 51. | U Mississippi | 3,650,000 | | |
| 52. | *U Wisconsin | 3,550,000 | | 8 |
| 53. | Baylor U Medical C | 3,300,000 | | 45 |
| 54. | *Purdue U | 3,250,000 | | 41 |
| 55. | *Columbia U | 3,000,000 | | 6 |
| 55. | Loyola U (Md.) | 3,000,000 | 91.5 | |
| 55. | U Texas, El Paso | 3,000,000 | | |
| 55. | *Brandeis U | 3,000,000 | | |
| 56. | Texas Tech U | 2,600,000 | | |
| 57. | S Illinois U | 2,500,000 | | |
| 57. | U Bridgeport | 2,500,000 | | |
| 58. | U Kansas | 2,391,000 | | 90 |
| 59. | *Michigan St U | 2,250,000 | | 39 |
| 60. | Cal St U, Northridge | 2,050,000 | | |
| 61. | Mississippi Valley St U | 2,000,000 | | |
| 61. | Thomas Jefferson U | 2,000,000 | 94.2 | |
| 61. | E Central U (Ok.) | 2,000,000 | | |
| 62. | U Massachusetts | 1,920,000 | | 75 |
| 63. | Gonzaga U | 1,875,000 | | |
| 64. | *MIT | 1,800,000 | | 2 |
| 64. | *U Minnesota | 1,800,000 | | 15 |
| 65. | *U Washington | 1,700,000 | | 4 |
| 66. | SE Massachusetts U | 1,500,000 | | |
| 67. | U Vermont | 1,450,000 | | |
| 68. | *U Pennsylvania | 1,425,000 | | 14 |
| 69. | *Johns Hopkins U | 1,350,000 | 96.0 | 1 |
| 70. | U Connecticut | 1,250,000 | | 61 |
| 70. | Seattle Com C | 1,250,000 | | |
| 70. | Delgado C | 1,250,000 | | |
| 71. | U Arkansas | 1,200,000 | | |
| 72. | New Mexico St U | 1,100,000 | | 51 |
| 73. | Texas A&M U | 1,050,000 | | 43 |
| 74. | E Michigan U | 1,000,000 | | |
| 74. | U Nevada, Reno | 1,000,000 | | |
| 74. | Oregon Graduate Center | 1,000,000 | 97.1 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Other Schools (Earmarks Less Than $1 Million) | 26,083,333 | 100.0% |
| Total | $905,429,999 | |

(AAU earmarks total $264,639833, or 29.2 percent of all earmarks. This figure includes earmarks valued at less than $1 million.)

***Rank appears if institution is among the top 100 receiving federal research awards. (Source: NSF Science Resource Studies)

# APPARENT ACADEMIC EARMARKS, BY APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, FY 1980-89

| | | % of total |
|---|---|---|
| Energy & Water | $342,892,000 | 37.9% |
| Agriculture | 217,701,999 | 24.0 |
| Defense | 90,570,000 | 10.0 |
| Interior | 90,014,000 | 9.9 |
| Labor-HHS-Ed | 82,100,000 | 9.1 |
| Treasury, Postal | 42,550,000 | 4.7 |
| Transportation | 17,350,000 | 1.9 |
| Commerce | 12,552,000 | 1.4 |
| HUD-Independent | 9,700,000 | 1.1 |
| | $905,429,999 | 100.0% |

APPARENT ACADEMIC EARMARKS,
BY APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, BY FISCAL YEAR,
FY 1980-89

| FY | Total (All Bills) | Energy & Water | Agri-culture | Defense |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 7/ $10,740,000 | | 5/ $4,240,000 | |
| 1981 | | | | |
| 1982 | 9/ $9,370,999 | 1/ $1,052,000 | 7/ $7,318,999 | |
| 1983 | 13/ $77,400,000 | 1/ $6,100,000 | 3/ $11,550,000 | |
| 1984 | 6/ $39,320,000 | 2/ $10,000,000 | 1/ $1,000,000 | 1/ $820,000 |
| 1985 | 36/ $104,085,000 | 6/ $29,550,000 | 16/ $39,015,000 | |
| 1986 | 39/ $115,885,000 | 5/ $35,300,000 | 16/ $15,516,000 | 9/ $39,750,000 |
| 1987 | 41/ $113,800,000 | 9/ $58,700,000 | 21/ $38,000,000 | |
| 1988 | 72/ $232,292,000 | 28/ $128,290,000 | 28/ $49,202,000 | 2/ $28,500,000 |
| 1989 | 87/ $202,537,000 | 9/ $73,900,000 | 49/ $51,860,000 | 3/ $21,500,000 |
| Total | 310/ $905,429,999 | 63/ $342,892,000 | 146/ $217,701,999 | 15/ $90,570,000 |

Note: Number of Earmarks/
Dollar Value of Earmarks

| FY | Total (All Bills) | Interior | Labor-HHS-Ed | Treasury-Postal |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 7/ $10,740,000 | | 2/ $6,500,000 | |
| 1981 | | | | |
| 1982 | 9/ $9,370,000 | 1/ $1,000,000 | | |
| 1983 | 13/ $77,400,000 | 4/ $26,100,000 | 5/ $33,650,000 | |
| 1984 | 6/ $39,320,000 | | 1/ $19,000,000 | |
| 1985 | 36/ $104,085,000 | 7/ $17,670,000 | 4/ $5,550,000 | |
| 1986 | 39/ $115,885,000 | 6/ $16,519,000 | 3/ $8,800,000 | |
| 1987 | 41/ $113,800,000 | 5/ $12,500,000 | 3/ $4,000,000 | |
| 1988 | 72/ $232,292,000 | 6/ $6,300,000 | | 1/ $4,000,000 |
| 1989 | 87/ $202,537,000 | 6/ $9,925,000 | 2/ $4,600,000 | 9/ $38,550,000 |
| Total | 310/ $905,429,999 | 35/ $90,014,000 | 20/ $82,100,000 | 10/ $42,550,000 |

Note: Number of Earmarks/
Dollar Value of Earmarks

| FY | Total (All Bills) | Trans-portation | Commerce | HUD-Independent Agencies |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1980 | 7/ $10,740,000 | | | |
| 1981 | | | | |
| 1982 | 9/ $9,370,999 | | | |
| 1983 | 13/ $77,400,000 | | | |
| 1984 | 6/ $39,320,000 | 1/ $8,500,000 | | |
| 1985 | 36/ $104,085,000 | 1/ $300,000 | 1/ $4,000,000 | 1/ $8,000,000 |
| 1986 | 39/ $115,885,000 | | | |
| 1987 | 41/ $113,800,000 | | 3/ $600,000 | |
| 1988 | 72/ $232,292,000 | 3/ $8,550,000 | 3/ $5,750,000 | 1/ $1,700,000 |
| 1989 | 87/ $202,537,000 | | 9/ $2,202,000 | |
| Total | 310/ $905,429,999 | 5/ $17,350,000 | 16/ $12,552,000 | 2/ $9,700,000 |

Note: Number of Earmarks/
Dollar Value of Earmarks

# APPARENT ACADEMIC EARMARKS CONTAINED IN THE FY 1980-89 APPROPRIATIONS, BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, EARMARK AMOUNT, AND PROJECT

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ALABAMA** | | | | |
| U Alabama | 86 | EW | $8,000,000 | Energy Cntr |
| U Alabama | 87 | LHHS | 2,900,000 | Injury Cntr |
| U Alabama | 87 | EW | 12,300,000 | Energy Cntr |
| U Alabama | 88 | EW | 10,600,000 | Optics Cntr |
| U Alabama | 88 | INT | Unstated | Fishery Rsch |
| Auburn U | 89 | AG | 300,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| Auburn U | 89 | AG | 300,000 | Fishery Station |
| | | | $34,400,000 | |
| **ALASKA** | | | | |
| U Alaska | 80 | AG | $290,000 | Soil Rsch |
| | | | $290,000 | |
| **ARIZONA** | | | | |
| Arizona St U | 88 | EW | $4,000,000 | Science Cntr |
| *U Arizona | 88 | INT | 4,000,000 | Copper Cntr |
| *U Arizona | 88 | AG | 4,575,000 | Biotech Cntr |
| Arizona St U | 89 | EW | 10,000,000 | Goldwater Cntr |
| | | | $22,575,000 | |
| **ARKANSAS** | | | | |
| U Arkansas | 80 | AG | $750,000 | Small Farm Rsch |
| U Arkansas | 89 | AG | 200,000 | Poultry Cntr |
| U Arkansas | 89 | COM | 250,000 | Radiation Lab |
| | | | $1,200,000 | |
| **CALIFORNIA** | | | | |
| Cal St U, Northridge | 85 | LHHS | $1,250,000 | Votech Inst |
| U Ca, Riverside | 86 | AG | 100,000 | Plant Rsch |
| Loma Linda U | 88 | EW | 8,500,000 | Proton Beam |
| Cal St U, Northridge | 89 | TP | 800,000 | Grant |
| Loma Linda U | 89 | EW | 11,000,000 | Proton Beam |
| *U Ca, Berkeley | 89 | AG | 45,000 | Mosquito Rsch |
| U Ca, Davis | 89 | AG | 45,000 | Mosquito Rsch |
| | | | $21,740,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CONNECTICUT | | | | |
| U Connecticut | 83 | LHHS | $750,000 | Health Cntr |
| U Bridgeport | 88 | COM | 2,500,000 | Tech Inst |
| U Connecticut | 89 | COM | 500,000 | Undersea Rsch |
| | | | $3,750,000 | |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | | | |
| Catholic U | 84 | EW | $5,000,000 | Vitreous Lab |
| Georgetown U | 84 | D | 820,000 | Fuel Rsch |
| Catholic U | 85 | EW | 9,200,000 | Vitreous Lab |
| | | | $15,020,000 | |
| FLORIDA | | | | |
| *U Florida | 82 | AG | $387,500 | Tropical Rsch |
| Florida St U | 85 | EW | 7,000,000 | Supercomputer |
| Florida St U | 87 | EW | 11,400,000 | Supercomputer |
| *U Florida | 88 | D | 25,000,000 | Semiconduct Std |
| *U Florida | 88 | AG | 50,000 | Biotech Std |
| Florida St U | 88 | EW | 11,740,000 | Supercomputer |
| Florida St U | 88 | EW | 600,000 | Energy Cntr |
| U Miami | 88 | EW | 600,000 | Energy Cntr |
| *U Florida | 89 | AG | 600,000 | Biotech Inst |
| *U Florida | 89 | D | 5,000,000 | Tech Transfer |
| | | | $62,377,500 | |
| GEORGIA | | | | |
| U Georgia | 88 | AG | $50,000 | Containment Std |
| U Georgia | 89 | AG | 467,000 | Containment Lab |
| | | | $517,000 | |
| HAWAII | | | | |
| U Hawaii | 82 | AG | $387,500 | Tropical Rsch |
| U Hawaii | 83 | AG | 750,000 | Pacific Cntr |
| U Hawaii | 86 | AG | 480,000 | Tri-Fly Rsch |
| U Hawaii | 87 | AG | 500,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| U Hawaii | 88 | EW | 600,000 | Energy Inst |
| U Hawaii | 88 | INT | 600,000 | Minerals Cntr |
| U Hawaii | 88 | EW | 5,000,000 | Materials Cntr |
| U Hawaii | 88 | AG | 3,000,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| U Hawaii | 89 | TP | 14,000,000 | Materials Cntr |
| | | | $25,317,500 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| IDAHO | | | | |
| U Idaho | 88 | INT | $500,000 | Water Resch |
| U Idaho | 89 | TP | 3,000,000 | Environment Lab |
| U Idaho | 89 | INT | 190,000 | Grazing Rsch |
| | | | $3,690,000 | |
| ILLINOIS | | | | |
| S Illinois U | 82 | INT | $1,000,000 | Mining Cntr |
| S Illinois U | 83 | INT | 1,500,000 | Mining Cntr |
| *Northwestern U | 86 | INT | 10,319,000 | Industry Cntr |
| *U Illinois | 86 | AG | 3,000,000 | Plant Cntr Std |
| *U Illinois | 87 | AG | 2,000,000 | Rsch Agreement |
| *U Illinois | 87 | AG | 27,000,000 | Plant Cntr |
| *Northwestern U | 88 | EW | 6,000,000 | Energy Cntr |
| *Northwestern U | 89 | EW | 10,000,000 | Energy Grant |
| | | | $60,819,000 | |
| INDIANA | | | | |
| *Purdue U | 85 | EW | $250,000 | Reactor Rsch |
| *Purdue U | 85 | AG | 3,000,000 | Forestry Cntr |
| *Indiana U | 86 | LHHS | 6,000,000 | Education Cntr |
| *Indiana U | 87 | EW | 3,800,000 | Education Cntr |
| | | | $13,050,000 | |
| IOWA | | | | |
| *Iowa St U | 85 | AG | $225,000 | Ag Policy Inst |
| Drake U | 85 | AG | 4,000,000 | Law Program |
| *Iowa St U | 86 | D | 650,000 | Rsch |
| Drake U | 87 | COM | 200,000 | Law Cntr |
| *Iowa St U | 87 | EW | 6,000,000 | Material Cntr |
| *Iowa St U | 87 | EW | 5,000,000 | Food Rsch |
| *Iowa St U | 87 | AG | 50,000 | Food Cntr Std |
| *Iowa St U | 88 | EW | Unstated | Irraditor Std |
| *Iowa St U | 88 | AG | 6,375,000 | Food Cntr |
| *Iowa St U | 88 | AG | 500,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| *Iowa St U | 89 | AG | 1,000,000 | Trade Cntr |
| *Iowa St U | 89 | AG | 168,000 | Water Rsch |
| *Iowa St U | 89 | AG | 290,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| Indian Hills Com C | 89 | AG | 400,000 | Tech Cntr |
| | | | $24,858,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KANSAS | | | | |
| *U Kansas | 85 | AG | $200,000 | Remote Sensing |
| *U Kansas | 86 | D | 2,000,000 | Neurotoxin Rsch |
| Wichita St U | 86 | D | 2,000,000 | Aviation Rsch |
| Kansas St U | 87 | EW | 1,900,000 | Rsch |
| Kansas St U | 87 | AG | 100,000 | Rsch Cntr Std |
| Kansas St U | 87 | AG | 285,000 | Insect Rsch |
| Kansas St U | 87 | AG | 95,000 | Livestock Rsch |
| Kansas St U | 87 | EW | 1,200,000 | Chemical Rsch |
| *U Kansas | 87 | AG | 191,000 | Remote Sensing |
| Kansas St U | 89 | AG | 1,350,000 | Plant Cntr |
| | | | $9,321,000 | |
| KENTUCKY | | | | |
| U Kentucky | 88 | AG | $227,000 | Trade Cntr |
| U Kentucky | 88 | AG | 50,000 | Industry Cntr |
| U Kentucky | 89 | COM | 227,000 | Trade Cntr |
| U Kentucky | 89 | AG | 300,000 | Somerset Prog |
| U Kentucky | 89 | AG | 4,500,000 | Tech Cntr |
| | | | $5,304,000 | |
| LOUISIANA | | | | |
| Delgado C | 85 | LHHS | $1,250,000 | Votech Inst |
| Loyola U | 85 | COM | 4,000,000 | Law Program |
| *Tulane U | 86 | EW | 6,000,000 | Energy Cntr |
| Louisiana St U | 88 | EW | 12,000,000 | Micro Cntr |
| Louisiana St U | 88 | EW | 250,000 | Injection Test |
| Louisiana St U | 88 | D | 3,500,000 | Biomed Cntr |
| Louisiana St U | 89 | AG | 200,000 | Redfish Rsch |
| Louisiana St U | 89 | AG | 13,000,000 | Micro Cntr |
| *Tulane U | 89 | D | 8,250,000 | Hazardous Rsch |
| Xavier C | 89 | D | 8,250,000 | Hazardous Rsch |
| | | | $56,700,000 | |
| MARYLAND | | | | |
| *Johns Hopkins U | 87 | LHHS | $1,000,000 | Rsch |
| Loyola C | 89 | TP | 3,000,000 | Info Cntr |
| *Johns Hopkins U | 89 | INT | 350,000 | Fire Rsch |
| | | | $4,350,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MASSACHUSETTS | | | | |
| Tufts U | 80 | AG | $2,000,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| Tufts U | 82 | AG | 5,896,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| Tufts U | 83 | AG | 9,000,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| Boston C | 83 | LHHS | 7,500,000 | Library |
| Boston U | 84 | LHHS | 19,000,000 | Engineering Cnt |
| Tufts U | 84 | AG | 1,000,000 | Hazardous Waste |
| Tufts U | 85 | AG | 1,800,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| *MIT | 85 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *MIT | 86 | INT | 550,000 | Dust Rsch |
| Northeastern U | 86 | D | 13,500,000 | Engineer Cntr |
| Tufts U | 86 | AG | 1,000,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| Tufts U | 87 | AG | 1,000,000 | Nutrition Cntr |
| Tufts U | 87 | INT | 10,000,000 | Energy Facility |
| *MIT | 87 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| SE Massachusetts U | 87 | AG | 500,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| U Massachusetts | 87 | EW | 800,000 | Energy Cntr |
| Boston U | 88 | EW | 8,500,000 | Physics Cntr |
| Boston C | 88 | EW | 4,000,000 | Cntr |
| U Massachusetts | 88 | EW | 250,000 | Heating Plant |
| U Massachusetts | 88 | AG | 60,000 | Endive Resch |
| SE Massachusetts U | 88 | AG | 1,000,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| U Massachusetts | 89 | AG | 60,000 | Endive Rsch |
| *Brandeis U | 89 | EW | 3,000,000 | Energy Lab |
| U Massachusetts | 89 | TP | 750,000 | Harbors Inst |
| | | | $92,416,000 | |
| MICHIGAN | | | | |
| E Michigan U | 86 | LHHS | $1,000,000 | Welch Hall |
| *Michigan St U | 88 | AG | 1,000,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| *Michigan St U | 89 | AG | 1,250,000 | Toxicology Cntr |
| | | | $3,250,000 | |
| MINNESOTA | | | | |
| *U Minnesota | 85 | INT | $625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *U Minnesota | 86 | INT | 550,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *U Minnesota | 87 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| | | | $1,800,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MISSISSIPPI | | | | |
| Mississippi St U | 82 | AG | $500,000 | Beef Rsch |
| Mississippi St U | 85 | AG | 3,000,000 | Forestry Cntr |
| Mississippi St U | 85 | AG | 700,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| Mississippi St U | 85 | AG | 3,500,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| U Southern Mississippi | 86 | AG | 500,000 | Polymer Inst |
| Mississippi St U | 87 | AG | 500,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| Mississippi St U | 87 | AG | 250,000 | Gull Rsch |
| Mississippi Valley St | 87 | AG | 750,000 | Curriculum Dvp |
| U Mississippi | 88 | COM | 3,000,000 | Rsch Grant |
| U Mississippi | 88 | AG | 50,000 | Products Std |
| U Southern Mississippi | 88 | AG | 3,750,000 | Polymer Inst |
| Mississippi Valley St | 88 | AG | 625,000 | Curriculum Dvp |
| U Mississippi | 88 | INT | 600,000 | Mineral Inst |
| Mississippi St U | 88 | AG | 1,000,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| Alcorn St U | 89 | AG | 176,000 | Conservation St |
| U Mississippi | 89 | AG | 1,000,000 | Sediment Lab |
| U Mississippi | 89 | AG | 400,000 | Products Rsch |
| U Southern Mississippi | 89 | AG | 2,500,000 | Polymers Inst |
| Mississippi Valley St | 89 | AG | 625,000 | Curriculum Dvp |
| | | | $23,426,000 | |
| MISSOURI | | | | |
| *U Missouri | 85 | AG | $225,000 | Ag Policy Inst |
| | | | $225,000 | |
| MONTANA | | | | |
| Montana St U | 89 | AG | $50,000 | Bioscience Cntr |
| | | | $50,000 | |
| NEBRASKA | | | | |
| *U Nebraska | 88 | AG | $65,000 | Rapeseed Rsch |
| *U Nebraska | 89 | AG | 250,000 | Technology Cntr |
| | | | $315,000 | |
| NEVADA | | | | |
| U Nevada | 86 | D | $3,500,000 | Computer Rsch |
| U Nevada | 88 | INT | 600,000 | Gold Leaching |
| U Nevada, Reno | 89 | EW | 1,000,000 | Nuclear Waste |
| U Nevada, Las Vegas | 89 | EW | 6,000,000 | Nuclear Waste |
| | | | $11,100,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | | | | |
| U New Hampshire | 83 | INT | $15,000,000 | Technology Cntr |
| Hampshire C | 85 | INT | 45,000 | Guard Dog Rsch |
| Dartmouth C | 85 | INT | 15,000,000 | Facilities |
| | | | $30,045,000 | |
| NEW JERSEY | | | | |
| Rutgers U | 88 | AG | $50,000 | Bioscience Std |
| Rutgers U | 88 | AG | 260,000 | Cranberry Rsch |
| U Medicine & Dentistry | 88 | EW | 7,500,000 | Medical Cntr |
| Rutgers U | 89 | AG | 375,000 | Blueberry Rsch |
| Rutgers U | 89 | AG | 250,000 | Biology Cntr |
| Farleigh Dickinson U | 89 | COM | 375,000 | Undersea Rsch |
| | | | $8,810,000 | |
| NEW MEXICO | | | | |
| New Mexico St U | 85 | AG | $1,000,000 | Airway Property |
| New Mexico St U | 86 | AG | 100,000 | Plant Rsch |
| U New Mexico | 89 | TP | 5,000,000 | Technology Cntr |
| | | | $6,100,000 | |
| NEW YORK | | | | |
| *Cornell U | 82 | AG | $49,333 | Grasshopper Std |
| Rochester Inst Tech | 82 | EW | 1,052,000 | Rsch Cntr |
| *U Rochester | 83 | EW | 6,100,000 | Fusion Prog |
| *Columbia U | 84 | EW | 5,000,000 | Chemical Cntr |
| State U New York | 84 | TR | 8,500,000 | Training Vessel |
| *Columbia U | 85 | EW | 3,000,000 | Chemical Cntr |
| New York U | 85 | TR | 300,000 | Urban Trans Std |
| Rochester Inst Tech | 85 | LHHS | 1,800,000 | Area Health Std |
| *U Rochester | 85 | EW | 7,800,000 | Fusion Rsch |
| *Cornell U | 86 | AG | 100,000 | Basic Resch |
| *Cornell U | 86 | D | 5,000,000 | Supercomputer |
| Rochester Inst Tech | 86 | LHHS | 1,800,000 | Health Ed Cntr |
| Rochester Inst Tech | 86 | D | 11,100,000 | Engineer Rsch |
| *U Rochester | 86 | EW | 7,800,000 | Fusion Rsch |
| *Columbia U | 88 | EW | Unstated | Chemical Cntr |
| *U Rochester | 88 | EW | 10,400,000 | Fusion Rsch |
| *Cornell U | 89 | AG | 200,000 | Renovation |
| *U Rochester | 89 | EW | 12,900,000 | Fusion Rsch |
| | | | $82,901,333 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NORTH CAROLINA | | | | |
| *U North Carolina | 85 | HUD | $8,000,000 | Undersea Rsch |
| *U North Carolina | 88 | HUD | 1,700,000 | Inhalation Lab |
| *U North Carolina | 89 | COM | 100,000 | Undersea Rsch |
| *Duke U | 89 | COM | 100,000 | Undersea Rsch |
| | | | $9,900,000 | |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | | | |
| North Dakota St U | 82 | AG | $49,333 | Grasshopper Std |
| North Dakota St U | 85 | AG | 9,100,000 | Radiation Lab |
| North Dakota St U | 85 | INT | 125,000 | Blackbird Rsch |
| North Dakota St U | 86 | AG | 340,000 | Sunflower Rsch |
| U North Dakota | 86 | INT | 4,000,000 | Energy Cntr |
| North Dakota St U | 87 | AG | 60,000 | Grasshopper Std |
| North Dakota St U | 87 | AG | 144,000 | Sunflower Rsch |
| North Dakota St U | 87 | AG | 75,000 | Dried Bean Rsch |
| U North Dakota | 88 | EW | 200,000 | Energy Cntr |
| North Dakota St U | 89 | AG | -69,000 | Grasshopper Std |
| North Dakota St U | 89 | AG | 535,000 | Ag Cntr |
| U North Dakota | 89 | AG | 4,200,000 | Earth Systems |
| U North Dakota | 89 | AG | 1,000,000 | Groundwater Std |
| U North Dakota | 89 | AG | 500,000 | Cloud Rsch |
| | | | $20,259,333 | |
| OHIO | | | | |
| *Ohio St U | 80 | LHHS | $5,500,000 | Vocation Cntr |
| U Akron | 87 | COM | 200,000 | Law Cntr |
| | | | $5,700,000 | |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | |
| U Oklahoma | 83 | LHHS | $2,000,000 | Carl Albert Cnt |
| U Oklahoma | 83 | LHHS | 3,000,000 | Carl Albert Cnt |
| Oklahoma St U | 85 | AG | 65,000 | Trade Cntr Std |
| Oklahoma St U | 86 | D | 1,000,000 | Univ Rsch Init |
| Oklahoma St U | 86 | AG | 5,000,000 | Trade Cntr |
| U Oklahoma | 88 | EW | 3,500,000 | Energy Facility |
| Oklahoma St U | 88 | COM | 250,000 | Trade Cntr |
| East Central U | 88 | EW | 2,000,000 | Science Cntr |
| Oklahoma St U | 88 | AG | 100,000 | Trade Cntr |
| Oklahoma St U | 88 | AG | 50,000 | Vet Cntr |
| U Oklahoma | 89 | AG | 300,000 | Drought Std |
| Oklahoma St U | 89 | COM | 250,000 | Trade Cntr |
| | | | $17,515,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| OREGON | | | | |
| Oregon St U | 83 | AG | $1,800,000 | Forest Fuel Std |
| Oregon Health Sci U | 83 | LHHS | 20,400,000 | Biomed Info Cnt |
| Oregon St U | 85 | AG | 1,000,000 | Forestry Cntr |
| *U Oregon | 85 | EW | 2,300,000 | Science Cntr |
| Oregon Health Sci U | 85 | AG | 10,000,000 | Facility |
| Oregon Grad Cntr | 86 | D | 1,000,000 | Conductor Rsch |
| *U Oregon | 86 | EW | 8,500,000 | Science Cntr |
| Oregon St U | 87 | AG | 900,000 | Wheat Lab |
| Oregon Health Sci U | 88 | EW | 10,000,000 | Science Cntr |
| Oregon St U | 88 | AG | 10,000,000 | Ag Facility |
| Oregon St U | 88 | AG | 250,000 | Meadowfoam Rsch |
| Oregon Health Sci U | 89 | EW | 12,000,000 | Basic Rsch Cntr |
| | | | $78,150,000 | |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 80 | LHHS | $1,000,000 | Health Facility |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 83 | INT | 4,800,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 85 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 86 | AG | 50,000 | Ag Cntr Std |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 86 | INT | 550,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 86 | AG | 300,000 | Coal Injury Std |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 87 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| *Pennsylvania St U | 87 | AG | 1,800,000 | Ag Science Cntr |
| Drexel U | 88 | EW | 6,500,000 | Tech Cntr |
| Temple U | 88 | TR | 5,700,000 | Transport Demo |
| *U Pennsylvania | 88 | TR | 1,425,000 | Rail Station |
| Drexel U | 88 | TR | 1,425,000 | Rail Station |
| Thomas Jefferson U | 89 | TP | 2,000,000 | Trauma Cntr |
| | | | $26,800,000 | |
| RHODE ISLAND | | | | |
| *Brown U | 86 | EW | $5,000,000 | Technology Cntr |
| | | | $5,000,000 | |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | | | |
| U South Carolina | 87 | EW | $16,300,000 | Energy Cntr |
| U South Carolina | 87 | COM | 200,000 | Law Cntr |
| U South Carolina | 88 | EW | 8,000,000 | Cancer Inst |
| U South Carolina | 88 | EW | 700,000 | Instrumentation |
| Vorhees C | 89 | LHHS | 4,500,000 | Health Cntr |
| South Carolina Med U | 89 | EW | 8,000,000 | Cancer Cntr |
| | | | $37,700,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | |
| South Dakota St U | 82 | AG | $49,333 | Grasshopper Std |
| South Dakota St U | 86 | AG | 46,000 | Sunflower Rsch |
| South Dakota St U | 89 | AG | 100,000 | Biostress Lab |
| | | | $195,333 | |
| TEXAS | | | | |
| Baylor Medical C | 80 | AG | $1,000,000 | Child Lab |
| Texas Tech U | 80 | AG | 200,000 | Land/Soil Rsch |
| Baylor Medical C | 85 | AG | 300,000 | Children Cntr |
| Texas Tech U | 85 | AG | 900,000 | Plant Rsch |
| Baylor Medical C | 86 | AG | 1,000,000 | Children Cntr |
| Texas Tech U | 86 | AG | 1,400,000 | Plant Rsch |
| Texas Tech U | 86 | AG | 100,000 | Plant Rsch |
| Baylor Medical C | 87 | AG | 1,000,000 | Children Cntr |
| Texas A&M | 88 | EW | 600,000 | Hydrogen Rsch |
| U Texas, Southwest | 89 | AG | 950,000 | Biomedical Cntr |
| U Texas, El Paso | 89 | TP | 3,000,000 | Materials Rsch |
| Texas A&M | 89 | AG | 1,250,000 | Bioscience Inst |
| | | | $11,700,000 | |
| UTAH | | | | |
| U Utah | 88 | TP | $4,000,000 | Polymers Rsch |
| U Utah | 89 | TP | 7,000,000 | Polymers Rsch |
| | | | $11,000,000 | |
| VERMONT | | | | |
| U Vermont | 89 | AG | $1,400,000 | Stafford-Aiken |
| U Vermont | 89 | AG | 50,000 | Maple Rsch |
| | | | $1,450,000 | |
| VIRGINIA | | | | |
| Virginia/Maryland Veterinary C | 87 | AG | $300,000 | Classrooms |
| Virginia/Maryland Veterinary C | 89 | AG | 50,000 | Facility Std |
| Virginia Tech | 89 | AG | 100,000 | Biotech Cntr |
| | | | $450,000 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **WASHINGTON** | | | | |
| Seattle Com C | 85 | LHHS | $1,250,000 | Votech Inst |
| Washington St U | 86 | AG | 2,000,000 | Food Cntr |
| *U Washington | 87 | AG | 500,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| *U Washington | 87 | LHHS | 100,000 | Alcohol Rsch |
| Washington St U | 88 | AG | 5,540,000 | Food Cntr |
| *U Washington | 88 | AG | 1,000,000 | Aquaculture Std |
| *U Washington | 89 | INT | 100,000 | Alcohol Rsch |
| Washington St U | 89 | AG | 150,000 | Pea Rsch |
| Washington St U | 89 | AG | 3,405,000 | Food Cntr |
| Gonzaga U | 89 | AG | 1,875,000 | Info Cntr |
| | | | $15,920,000 | |
| **WEST VIRGINIA** | | | | |
| West Virginia U | 83 | INT | $4,800,000 | Dust Rsch |
| West Virginia U | 85 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| West Virginia U | 86 | INT | 550,000 | Dust Rsch |
| West Virginia U | 87 | INT | 625,000 | Dust Rsch |
| West Virginia U | 88 | AG | 50,000 | Forest Rsch |
| West Virginia U | 88 | EW | 250,000 | Manufact Std |
| West Virginia U | 88 | EW | 6,000,000 | Energy Cntr |
| West Virginia U | 88 | AG | 375,000 | Poultry Lab |
| West Virginia U | 88 | AG | 9,000,000 | Energy Cntr |
| West Virginia U | 89 | AG | 575,000 | Trade Cntr |
| West Virginia U | 89 | AG | 1,888,000 | Poultry Cntr |
| West Virginia U | 89 | INT | 50,000 | Forest Std |
| West Virginia U | 89 | INT | 235,000 | FBC Probe Std |
| West Virginia U | 89 | INT | 9,000,000 | Coal Cntr |
| Marshall U | 89 | COM | 200,000 | Manufact Rsch |
| Wheeling Jesuit C | 89 | COM | 200,000 | Software Cntr |
| | | | $34,423,000 | |
| **WISCONSIN** | | | | |
| *U Wisconsin | 88 | AG | $250,000 | Lands Rsch |
| *U Wisconsin | 89 | AG | 3,000,000 | Poverty Cntr |
| *U Wisconsin | 89 | AG | 250,000 | Lands Rsch |
| *U Wisconsin | 89 | AG | 50,000 | Biotech Cntr |
| | | | $3,550,000 | |
| TOTAL | | | $905,429,999 | |

*Denotes AAU Institution; AAU Total: $264,639,833.

Sources: FY 80-87: CRS, Library of Congress
FY 88-89: University of California