

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

Table 1
Elementary and Secondary Education

*Includes Education for the Disadvantaged, Impact Aid, School Improvement funding,
and Special Education (including special education for preschoolers and infants)*

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$4,564.3 -12%	-\$11,544.8
Alabama	-\$68.9	-\$174.8
Alaska	-\$35.7	-\$102.3
Arizona	-\$103.2	-\$264.3
Arkansas	-\$43.9	-\$110.4
California	-\$523.8	-\$1,219.8
Colorado	-\$55.0	-\$146.5
Connecticut	-\$46.2	-\$123.4
Delaware	-\$14.9	-\$40.6
District of Columbia	-\$13.0	-\$30.0
Florida	-\$222.2	-\$565.2
Georgia	-\$126.5	-\$308.0
Hawaii	-\$26.8	-\$73.6
Idaho	-\$21.7	-\$59.3
Illinois	-\$187.7	-\$477.1
Indiana	-\$80.8	-\$220.4
Iowa	-\$38.1	-\$108.7
Kansas	-\$41.1	-\$111.1
Kentucky	-\$63.6	-\$159.4
Louisiana	-\$84.3	-\$203.6
Maine	-\$21.9	-\$59.2
Maryland	-\$69.1	-\$183.0
Massachusetts	-\$92.1	-\$243.6
Michigan	-\$149.7	-\$379.5
Minnesota	-\$62.2	-\$176.2
Mississippi	-\$53.5	-\$131.5
Missouri	-\$82.6	-\$219.5
Montana	-\$25.7	-\$72.1
Nebraska	-\$30.4	-\$85.0
Nevada	-\$25.3	-\$65.4
New Hampshire	-\$18.2	-\$51.9

Elementary and Secondary Education

*Includes Education for the Disadvantaged, Impact Aid, School Improvement funding,
and Special Education (including special education for preschoolers and infants)*

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$118.4	-\$318.6
New Mexico	-\$52.7	-\$140.4
New York	-\$329.9	-\$764.6
North Carolina	-\$112.4	-\$291.7
North Dakota	-\$18.9	-\$53.0
Ohio	-\$152.3	-\$401.1
Oklahoma	-\$63.2	-\$169.0
Oregon	-\$47.4	-\$120.3
Pennsylvania	-\$159.2	-\$399.0
Rhode Island	-\$18.7	-\$49.1
South Carolina	-\$63.3	-\$161.1
South Dakota	-\$23.3	-\$65.5
Tennessee	-\$80.5	-\$211.4
Texas	-\$385.6	-\$942.9
Utah	-\$34.8	-\$99.3
Vermont	-\$13.2	-\$35.9
Virginia	-\$99.5	-\$269.0
Washington	-\$86.8	-\$233.3
West Virginia	-\$32.1	-\$79.2
Wisconsin	-\$73.0	-\$197.8
Wyoming	-\$15.2	-\$41.8

Technical Notes

This table shows projected cuts in four major education accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged (900), Special Education (300), Impact Aid (102), and School Improvement (300). Each of these accounts is in subfunction 501. Cuts for three of these four accounts are broken out separately below: Education for the Disadvantaged (Table 2), Special Education (Table 3), and School Improvement (Table 4).

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data

Table 2
Education for the Disadvantaged

Education for the Disadvantaged programs constitute one component of the larger group of programs found in Table 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education)

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Increase in Funding 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$867.6 -5%	\$807.5
Alabama	-\$13.2	\$12.3
Alaska	-\$2.6	\$2.5
Arizona	-\$17.0	\$15.8
Arkansas	-\$8.6	\$8.0
California	-\$125.1	\$116.5
Colorado	-\$8.7	\$8.1
Connecticut	-\$7.2	\$6.7
Delaware	-\$2.3	\$2.1
District of Columbia	-\$3.2	\$3.0
Florida	-\$41.8	\$38.9
Georgia	-\$27.0	\$25.1
Hawaii	-\$3.2	\$2.9
Idaho	-\$3.1	\$2.9
Illinois	-\$35.4	\$32.9
Indiana	-\$11.7	\$10.9
Iowa	-\$4.4	\$4.1
Kansas	-\$6.0	\$5.6
Kentucky	-\$12.7	\$11.8
Louisiana	-\$18.6	\$17.3
Maine	-\$3.3	\$3.1
Maryland	-\$11.3	\$10.5
Massachusetts	-\$15.1	\$14.1
Michigan	-\$28.7	\$26.7
Minnesota	-\$7.3	\$6.8
Mississippi	-\$11.3	\$10.5
Missouri	-\$13.2	\$12.3
Montana	-\$2.8	\$2.6
Nebraska	-\$3.7	\$3.4
Nevada	-\$4.5	\$4.2
New Hampshire	-\$2.2	\$2.0

Education for the Disadvantaged

Education for the Disadvantaged programs constitute one component of the larger group of programs found in Table 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education)

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Increase in Funding 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$17.9	\$16.7
New Mexico	-\$7.3	\$6.8
New York	-\$80.2	\$74.7
North Carolina	-\$19.6	\$18.3
North Dakota	-\$2.2	\$2.0
Ohio	-\$25.6	\$23.8
Oklahoma	-\$9.5	\$8.8
Oregon	-\$9.0	\$8.4
Pennsylvania	-\$31.6	\$29.4
Rhode Island	-\$3.2	\$3.0
South Carolina	-\$11.9	\$11.1
South Dakota	-\$2.4	\$2.3
Tennessee	-\$13.6	\$12.7
Texas	-\$81.1	\$75.5
Utah	-\$3.9	\$3.6
Vermont	-\$2.0	\$1.9
Virginia	-\$14.4	\$13.4
Washington	-\$12.7	\$11.8
West Virginia	-\$6.7	\$6.3
Wisconsin	-\$10.8	\$10.0
Wyoming	-\$2.1	\$1.9

Technical Notes

Education for the Disadvantaged is account 900 in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education subfunction (501). This account includes funding under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for schools in low-income communities as well as several smaller funding streams: Reading First, Even Start, Title I Comprehensive School Reform, State Agency Program - Migrant, and State Agency Program - Neglected and Delinquent.

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2005 funding under the Education for the Disadvantaged account. When determining the estimated cuts to states from reductions in overall funding for Education for the Disadvantaged, this analysis assumed that a small proportion of the cuts (less than 1%) in this account would not be borne by states. This percentage was calculated by determining the proportion of 2005 funding that was not provided to states and localities. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data

Table 3
Special Education Programs

Special Education programs constitute one component of the larger group of programs found in Table 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education)

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$2,295.8 -18%	-\$7,599.4
Alabama	-\$36.1	-\$119.6
Alaska	-\$7.2	-\$23.9
Arizona	-\$35.6	-\$118.0
Arkansas	-\$22.7	-\$75.1
California	-\$246.5	-\$815.8
Colorado	-\$30.1	-\$99.6
Connecticut	-\$26.5	-\$87.9
Delaware	-\$6.7	-\$22.1
District of Columbia	-\$3.5	-\$11.6
Florida	-\$125.1	-\$414.1
Georgia	-\$62.3	-\$206.2
Hawaii	-\$8.1	-\$26.7
Idaho	-\$11.0	-\$36.3
Illinois	-\$101.3	-\$335.5
Indiana	-\$51.0	-\$169.0
Iowa	-\$24.2	-\$80.2
Kansas	-\$21.5	-\$71.2
Kentucky	-\$32.5	-\$107.6
Louisiana	-\$37.8	-\$125.3
Maine	-\$11.1	-\$36.8
Maryland	-\$40.1	-\$132.6
Massachusetts	-\$56.4	-\$186.6
Michigan	-\$79.6	-\$263.4
Minnesota	-\$38.1	-\$126.1
Mississippi	-\$23.8	-\$78.9
Missouri	-\$45.0	-\$148.8
Montana	-\$7.5	-\$24.8
Nebraska	-\$14.8	-\$49.1
Nevada	-\$13.4	-\$44.5
New Hampshire	-\$9.6	-\$31.6

Special Education Programs

Special Education programs constitute one component of the larger group of programs found in Table 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education)

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$71.8	-\$237.6
New Mexico	-\$18.1	-\$60.0
New York	-\$152.9	-\$506.2
North Carolina	-\$62.9	-\$208.1
North Dakota	-\$5.5	-\$18.1
Ohio	-\$86.9	-\$287.6
Oklahoma	-\$29.2	-\$96.8
Oregon	-\$25.6	-\$84.9
Pennsylvania	-\$85.1	-\$281.6
Rhode Island	-\$8.9	-\$29.4
South Carolina	-\$35.1	-\$116.3
South Dakota	-\$6.5	-\$21.6
Tennessee	-\$46.3	-\$153.3
Texas	-\$191.3	-\$633.3
Utah	-\$21.5	-\$71.2
Vermont	-\$5.3	-\$17.5
Virginia	-\$56.2	-\$186.1
Washington	-\$44.4	-\$146.8
West Virginia	-\$15.2	-\$50.4
Wisconsin	-\$42.0	-\$138.9
Wyoming	-\$5.6	-\$18.4

Technical Notes

Special Education is account 300 in the subfunction (501). This account includes funding for special education grants (K-12), special education preschool grants, and grants for infants and families.

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2005 funding under the major funding streams included in this account which represent 98 percent of total 2005 funding under this account. When determining the estimated cuts to states from reductions in overall funding for Special Education, this analysis assumed that a small proportion of the cuts (less than 1%) in this account would not be borne by states. This percentage was calculated by determining the proportion of 2005 funding that was not provided to states and localities. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data

Table 4
School Improvement Programs

School Improvement programs constitute one component of the larger group of programs found in Table 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education)

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$1,187.0 -19%	-\$4,102.7
Alabama	-\$18.9	-\$65.3
Alaska	-\$5.9	-\$20.5
Arizona	-\$20.5	-\$70.7
Arkansas	-\$12.4	-\$42.9
California	-\$138.6	-\$478.9
Colorado	-\$13.1	-\$45.2
Connecticut	-\$10.8	-\$37.5
Delaware	-\$5.9	-\$20.5
District of Columbia	-\$5.8	-\$20.1
Florida	-\$52.8	-\$182.4
Georgia	-\$33.2	-\$114.7
Hawaii	-\$6.0	-\$20.6
Idaho	-\$6.3	-\$21.6
Illinois	-\$47.1	-\$162.9
Indiana	-\$18.0	-\$62.3
Iowa	-\$9.3	-\$32.3
Kansas	-\$9.6	-\$33.3
Kentucky	-\$18.3	-\$63.2
Louisiana	-\$26.0	-\$89.8
Maine	-\$7.0	-\$24.1
Maryland	-\$16.3	-\$56.3
Massachusetts	-\$20.4	-\$70.5
Michigan	-\$40.6	-\$140.2
Minnesota	-\$14.1	-\$48.7
Mississippi	-\$17.5	-\$60.6
Missouri	-\$20.5	-\$70.9
Montana	-\$7.3	-\$25.2
Nebraska	-\$8.0	-\$27.5
Nevada	-\$6.6	-\$22.8
New Hampshire	-\$6.4	-\$22.3

School Improvement Programs

School Improvement programs constitute one component of the larger group of programs found in Table 1 (Elementary and Secondary Education)

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$25.4	-\$87.9
New Mexico	-\$10.4	-\$35.8
New York	-\$93.5	-\$323.3
North Carolina	-\$26.6	-\$92.0
North Dakota	-\$6.0	-\$20.9
Ohio	-\$39.2	-\$135.3
Oklahoma	-\$16.1	-\$55.5
Oregon	-\$12.1	-\$41.7
Pennsylvania	-\$42.2	-\$145.9
Rhode Island	-\$6.0	-\$20.6
South Carolina	-\$15.6	-\$53.7
South Dakota	-\$6.1	-\$21.2
Tennessee	-\$20.0	-\$69.0
Texas	-\$98.1	-\$339.2
Utah	-\$7.5	-\$25.9
Vermont	-\$5.9	-\$20.3
Virginia	-\$20.5	-\$70.8
Washington	-\$18.6	-\$64.2
West Virginia	-\$10.1	-\$35.0
Wisconsin	-\$17.8	-\$61.4
Wyoming	-\$5.8	-\$20.2

Technical Notes

School Improvement is account 1000 in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education subfunction (501). This account includes several funding streams designed to help improve school quality, including Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology Grants, funding for school assessments, funding directed to small and rural schools and 21st Century Learning Center funding (which provides funding for before and after-school enrichment programs in schools in low-income communities).

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2005 funding under the major funding streams included in this account which represent 89 percent of total 2005 funding under this account. When determining the estimated cuts to states from reductions in overall funding for School Improvement, this analysis assumed that a small proportion of the cuts (less than 1%) in this account would not be borne by states. This percentage was calculated by determining the proportion of 2005 funding that was not provided to states and localities. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data

Table 5
Vocational and Adult Education
 (in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$1,275.0 -58%	-\$5,855.1
Alabama	-\$21.7	-\$99.5
Alaska	-\$3.9	-\$17.7
Arizona	-\$24.6	-\$113.1
Arkansas	-\$13.3	-\$61.3
California	-\$151.1	-\$694.1
Colorado	-\$16.0	-\$73.6
Connecticut	-\$11.5	-\$52.7
Delaware	-\$4.7	-\$21.6
District of Columbia	-\$4.1	-\$19.0
Florida	-\$69.9	-\$321.0
Georgia	-\$37.8	-\$173.7
Hawaii	-\$5.9	-\$27.2
Idaho	-\$6.6	-\$30.2
Illinois	-\$49.5	-\$227.5
Indiana	-\$26.6	-\$122.1
Iowa	-\$12.5	-\$57.6
Kansas	-\$11.5	-\$52.8
Kentucky	-\$19.8	-\$91.1
Louisiana	-\$23.0	-\$105.7
Maine	-\$5.7	-\$26.3
Maryland	-\$19.0	-\$87.2
Massachusetts	-\$21.1	-\$96.8
Michigan	-\$40.7	-\$187.1
Minnesota	-\$18.6	-\$85.5
Mississippi	-\$15.0	-\$68.8
Missouri	-\$24.5	-\$112.7
Montana	-\$5.1	-\$23.3
Nebraska	-\$7.4	-\$33.8
Nevada	-\$8.8	-\$40.6
New Hampshire	-\$5.6	-\$25.8

Vocational and Adult Education

(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$29.9	-\$137.2
New Mexico	-\$9.5	-\$43.6
New York	-\$73.3	-\$336.6
North Carolina	-\$36.1	-\$165.9
North Dakota	-\$3.9	-\$18.1
Ohio	-\$47.0	-\$215.8
Oklahoma	-\$16.5	-\$75.6
Oregon	-\$14.7	-\$67.3
Pennsylvania	-\$48.6	-\$223.4
Rhode Island	-\$5.9	-\$27.2
South Carolina	-\$19.6	-\$90.0
South Dakota	-\$4.2	-\$19.5
Tennessee	-\$26.0	-\$119.4
Texas	-\$102.8	-\$472.1
Utah	-\$11.7	-\$53.9
Vermont	-\$3.8	-\$17.6
Virginia	-\$28.5	-\$130.9
Washington	-\$23.1	-\$106.1
West Virginia	-\$9.0	-\$41.5
Wisconsin	-\$22.3	-\$102.3
Wyoming	-\$3.7	-\$16.9

Technical Notes

Vocational and Adult Education is account 400 in subfunction (501). This account includes funding for vocational education, adult education, English literacy and civics education, and Technical Preparation State Grants.

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2005 funding under the major funding streams included in this account which represent 89 percent of total 2005 funding under this account. When determining the estimated cuts to states from reductions in overall funding for Vocational and Adult education, this analysis assumed that a small proportion of the cuts (less than 1%) in this account would not be borne by states. This percentage was calculated by determining the proportion of 2005 funding that was not provided to states and localities. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

Table 6
**Special Supplemental Nutrition Program
For Women, Infants, and Children**
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts 2010	Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients 2010
U.S. Total	-\$470.2 -8%	-\$657.5	-670,000
Alabama	-\$7.5	-\$10.5	-10,200
Alaska	-\$2.0	-\$2.9	-2,300
Arizona	-\$11.3	-\$15.7	-12,900
Arkansas	-\$5.3	-\$7.5	-7,600
California	-\$81.0	-\$113.3	-109,700
Colorado	-\$4.8	-\$6.6	-7,100
Connecticut	-\$3.3	-\$4.6	-4,400
Delaware	-\$1.0	-\$1.4	-1,600
District of Columbia	-\$1.2	-\$1.7	-1,400
Florida	-\$22.2	-\$31.0	-31,700
Georgia	-\$14.6	-\$20.4	-22,100
Hawaii	-\$2.8	-\$3.9	-2,800
Idaho	-\$1.9	-\$2.7	-3,100
Illinois	-\$17.0	-\$23.7	-23,400
Indiana	-\$7.1	-\$9.9	-11,100
Iowa	-\$3.7	-\$5.1	-5,600
Kansas	-\$3.7	-\$5.2	-5,400
Kentucky	-\$6.8	-\$9.6	-9,900
Louisiana	-\$8.7	-\$12.2	-12,000
Maine	-\$1.2	-\$1.6	-1,900
Maryland	-\$5.9	-\$8.3	-9,100
Massachusetts	-\$6.3	-\$8.8	-9,800
Michigan	-\$12.0	-\$16.7	-18,800
Minnesota	-\$6.3	-\$8.8	-9,900
Mississippi	-\$6.0	-\$8.4	-8,700
Missouri	-\$7.3	-\$10.3	-11,300
Montana	-\$1.3	-\$1.9	-1,800
Nebraska	-\$2.3	-\$3.2	-3,300
Nevada	-\$2.7	-\$3.7	-3,800
New Hampshire	-\$1.0	-\$1.3	-1,400

**Special Supplemental Nutrition Program
For Women, Infants, and Children**
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts 2010	Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients 2010
New Jersey	-\$8.6	-\$12.0	-12,200
New Mexico	-\$3.8	-\$5.4	-5,100
New York	-\$31.3	-\$43.8	-40,100
North Carolina	-\$12.9	-\$18.1	-18,500
North Dakota	-\$1.0	-\$1.4	-1,100
Ohio	-\$14.5	-\$20.2	-22,700
Oklahoma	-\$6.3	-\$8.9	-7,900
Oregon	-\$6.0	-\$8.4	-8,500
Pennsylvania	-\$12.8	-\$17.9	-20,400
Rhode Island	-\$1.4	-\$1.9	-1,900
South Carolina	-\$5.9	-\$8.3	-9,100
South Dakota	-\$1.4	-\$1.9	-1,700
Tennessee	-\$9.4	-\$13.2	-13,200
Texas	-\$45.2	-\$63.3	-73,600
Utah	-\$3.3	-\$4.6	-5,700
Vermont	-\$1.1	-\$1.5	-1,400
Virginia	-\$7.3	-\$10.2	-11,200
Washington	-\$10.0	-\$14.0	-13,500
West Virginia	-\$3.0	-\$4.2	-4,300
Wisconsin	-\$6.1	-\$8.5	-9,400
Wyoming	-\$0.7	-\$1.0	-1,000

Technical Notes

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) is account 3501 in subfunction (605).

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. The baseline for fiscal year 2005 was adjusted downward because contingency funds were provided in fiscal year 2005 that will not need to be provided in future years. The adjusted fiscal year 2005 baseline was inflated for subsequent years by the same factor used in the unadjusted OMB baseline. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2004 funding level. This table illustrates the loss in the number of individuals who could receive WIC benefits if the cut in 2010 were achieved by reducing the number of households receiving assistance. This calculation was done by computing a reduction of 8.2 percent in the number of WIC participants compared to the estimated level for 2005. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories and tribal organizations.

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

Table 7
Children and Family Services
Includes Head Start and Services for Abused and Neglected Children
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010	Projected Loss In Number of Head Start Participants in 2010
U.S. Total	-\$1,143.9 -13%	-\$3,310.9	-118,000
Alabama	-\$18.5	-\$53.6	-2,100
Alaska	-\$2.1	-\$6.1	-200
Arizona	-\$18.0	-\$52.1	-1,700
Arkansas	-\$11.2	-\$32.5	-1,400
California	-\$143.5	-\$415.3	-12,900
Colorado	-\$12.0	-\$34.7	-1,300
Connecticut	-\$9.0	-\$25.9	-900
Delaware	-\$2.3	-\$6.6	-300
District of Columbia	-\$4.2	-\$12.2	-400
Florida	-\$46.2	-\$133.6	-4,600
Georgia	-\$29.5	-\$85.3	-3,100
Hawaii	-\$4.0	-\$11.6	-400
Idaho	-\$4.0	-\$11.7	-400
Illinois	-\$46.6	-\$135.0	-5,200
Indiana	-\$17.0	-\$49.3	-1,900
Iowa	-\$9.1	-\$26.2	-1,000
Kansas	-\$8.9	-\$25.9	-1,000
Kentucky	-\$18.6	-\$53.9	-2,100
Louisiana	-\$25.1	-\$72.7	-2,900
Maine	-\$4.8	-\$13.9	-500
Maryland	-\$13.7	-\$39.7	-1,300
Massachusetts	-\$18.7	-\$54.0	-1,700
Michigan	-\$40.5	-\$117.3	-4,600
Minnesota	-\$12.6	-\$36.6	-1,300
Mississippi	-\$27.4	-\$79.4	-3,500
Missouri	-\$20.7	-\$59.9	-2,300
Montana	-\$3.6	-\$10.5	-400
Nebraska	-\$6.3	-\$18.2	-700
Nevada	-\$4.3	-\$12.6	-400
New Hampshire	-\$2.4	-\$7.0	-200

Children and Family Services
Includes Head Start and Services for Abused and Neglected Children
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010	Projected Loss In Number of Head Start Participants in 2010
New Jersey	-\$22.4	-\$64.8	-2,000
New Mexico	-\$9.0	-\$26.0	-1,000
New York	-\$74.5	-\$215.5	-6,400
North Carolina	-\$24.8	-\$71.7	-2,500
North Dakota	-\$3.0	-\$8.6	-300
Ohio	-\$42.8	-\$123.9	-5,000
Oklahoma	-\$13.8	-\$40.0	-1,800
Oregon	-\$10.4	-\$30.2	-1,100
Pennsylvania	-\$39.7	-\$114.9	-4,000
Rhode Island	-\$3.8	-\$11.1	-400
South Carolina	-\$14.4	-\$41.8	-1,600
South Dakota	-\$3.2	-\$9.4	-400
Tennessee	-\$20.8	-\$60.2	-2,100
Texas	-\$83.5	-\$241.7	-8,800
Utah	-\$6.8	-\$19.7	-700
Vermont	-\$2.4	-\$6.8	-200
Virginia	-\$17.5	-\$50.7	-1,800
Washington	-\$17.7	-\$51.2	-1,400
West Virginia	-\$8.7	-\$25.3	-1,000
Wisconsin	-\$15.9	-\$46.1	-1,800
Wyoming	-\$2.1	-\$6.2	-200

Technical Notes

Children and Family Services is account 1536 in subfunction (506) and includes funding for Head Start and services for abused and neglected children or children at risk for abuse or neglect as well as several smaller funding streams. In addition, under current law, this account includes the Community Services Block Grant and several smaller community development programs. Under the President's budget proposals, these grants would be consolidated along with other community development funding into a new block grant in the Department of Commerce. Thus, the community development funding is excluded from the analysis of this account. See Table 12 for projected cuts in community development funding under the President's consolidation proposal.

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face in this account, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2005 funding under the major funding streams included in this account which represent 87 percent of funding under this account. When determining the estimated cuts to states from reductions in overall funding for Children and Family Services, this analysis assumed that a small proportion of the cuts (about 5 percent) in this account would not be borne by states. This percentage was calculated by determining the proportion of 2005 funding that was not provided to states and localities.

This table illustrates the loss in the number of children who could participate in Head Start. These estimates were calculated by assuming that Head Start funding would be cut in 2010 by the same proportion as the overall account (13 percent). State estimates were computed by calculating a 13 percent reduction in the number of children participating in Head Start based on the number participating in September 2004. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data

Table 8
**Projected Loss In Number Of Families
Receiving Rental Assistance Vouchers in 2010**

State	
U.S. Total	-370,000
Alabama	-5,200
Alaska	-700
Arizona	-3,600
Arkansas	-4,000
California	-52,900
Colorado	-4,900
Connecticut	-6,100
Delaware	-800
District of Columbia	-2,000
Florida	-15,900
Georgia	-8,700
Hawaii	-2,200
Idaho	-1,100
Illinois	-15,900
Indiana	-6,600
Iowa	-3,800
Kansas	-2,000
Kentucky	-5,600
Louisiana	-6,800
Maine	-2,200
Maryland	-7,900
Massachusetts	-12,600
Michigan	-8,600
Minnesota	-5,400
Mississippi	-3,200
Missouri	-7,100
Montana	-1,000
Nebraska	-2,000
Nevada	-2,100
New Hampshire	-1,600

Projected Loss In Number Of Families Receiving Rental Assistance Vouchers in 2010

State

New Jersey	-11,500
New Mexico	-2,400
New York	-36,300
North Carolina	-9,800
North Dakota	-1,300
Ohio	-15,500
Oklahoma	-4,000
Oregon	-5,600
Pennsylvania	-14,600
Rhode Island	-1,700
South Carolina	-4,200
South Dakota	-1,000
Tennessee	-5,500
Texas	-25,000
Utah	-1,800
Vermont	-1,000
Virginia	-7,800
Washington	-8,000
West Virginia	-2,600
Wisconsin	-4,900
Wyoming	-400

Technical Notes

Cuts for this program are not measured relative to the OMB baseline because that baseline significantly understates the amount needed in 2010 to provide the same number of vouchers as in 2005. The OMB baseline — as called for in the standard baseline rules — projects future funding for this program by starting with the net funding for the program in 2005 and adjusting that amount by a standard measure of inflation (the GDP price index). But, in this instance, the standard baseline rules lead to a significant understatement of the amounts needed to maintain current services in future years. The net funding for the housing voucher program in 2005 was artificially low because it includes a \$1.6 billion offset from rescissions of unused prior year funds (similar rescissions are not expected in 2010). And, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the cost of providing each voucher is expected to rise somewhat faster than the increase in the GDP price index over the next five years, primarily because of the growing gap between market rents and the incomes of low-income families.

We estimated the amount needed to provide the same number of vouchers in 2010 as in 2005 by calculating the cost of each voucher in 2005, adjusting that by CBO's estimate of the growth in the cost of providing each voucher, and multiplying the inflated amount by the number of vouchers in 2005. We then compared the projected funding for housing vouchers in 2010 in the President's budget with this estimate of the amount needed to fund the 2005 number of vouchers in 2010.

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

**Table 9
Projected Loss In Number Of Children Served
By Child Care Assistance in 2009**

State	
U.S. Total	-300,000
Alabama	-5,400
Alaska	-800
Arizona	-4,800
Arkansas	-1,700
California	-29,600
Colorado	-3,100
Connecticut	-2,000
Delaware	-1,400
District of Columbia	-2,300
Florida	-22,600
Georgia	-8,200
Hawaii	-1,800
Idaho	-1,100
Illinois	-23,000
Indiana	-4,600
Iowa	-2,000
Kansas	-2,100
Kentucky	-5,800
Louisiana	-7,500
Maine	-800
Maryland	-4,300
Massachusetts	-6,200
Michigan	-16,500
Minnesota	-5,000
Mississippi	-3,500
Missouri	-6,100
Montana	-700
Nebraska	-1,600
Nevada	-900
New Hampshire	-1,000

Projected Loss In Number Of Children Served By Child Care Assistance in 2009

State

New Jersey	-5,200
New Mexico	-2,900
New York	-19,900
North Carolina	-14,400
North Dakota	-800
Ohio	-12,600
Oklahoma	-4,200
Oregon	-3,400
Pennsylvania	-9,900
Rhode Island	-1,400
South Carolina	-3,200
South Dakota	-600
Tennessee	-7,800
Texas	-15,900
Utah	-1,300
Vermont	-600
Virginia	-3,400
Washington	-8,700
West Virginia	-1,900
Wisconsin	-4,500
Wyoming	-700

Technical Notes

This table shows projected cuts in the number of children receiving child care assistance in 2009. These estimates were calculated by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) with consultation from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Child care assistance includes assistance funded with the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant funds, and funds from the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). The CCDF includes both discretionary and mandatory funding while TANF and SSBG are mandatory programs.

The estimate that 300,000 children fewer children will receive child care assistance in 2009 as compared to 2004 was computed by the Administration and is published in their budget documents. This analysis assumed that each state's share of the total loss in child care slots would equal each state's share of all U.S. children receiving child care assistance in 2003. Figures on the number of children receiving child care assistance are available for CCDF, but not for TANF and SSBG. CLASP estimated the total number of assisted children in 2003, nationally and by state, as follows: They calculated the cost per assisted child in CCDF funded child care in 2003 using HHS data on participation and expenditures. They summed total child care expenditures by state using the CCDF spending data plus expenditures for TANF child care in 2003 and SSBG child care (derived as each state's total SSBG expenditures times percent of SSBG spent on child care). They used SSBG spending data for 2002 because 2003 data are not yet available. In calculating both total spending and costs per child, both federal and state funds were included. CLASP applied the same unit cost to all funding streams. The actual distribution of the 300,000 children could differ from these estimates based on changes in the formula allocation of federal funding as well as state policy choices regarding eligibility requirements, co-payments, reimbursement rates, and the use of TANF funds for child care.

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

Table 10
Low Income Home Energy Assistance
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients in 2010
U.S. Total	-\$165.2 -8%	-\$219.0	-360,000
Alabama	-\$1.4	-\$1.9	-5,500
Alaska	-\$0.9	-\$1.2	-500
Arizona	-\$0.7	-\$0.9	-1,800
Arkansas	-\$1.1	-\$1.4	-3,800
California	-\$7.6	-\$10.1	-8,800
Colorado	-\$2.7	-\$3.5	-5,200
Connecticut	-\$3.5	-\$4.6	-5,400
Delaware	-\$0.5	-\$0.6	-1,100
District of Columbia	-\$0.5	-\$0.7	-1,200
Florida	-\$2.2	-\$3.0	-5,600
Georgia	-\$1.8	-\$2.4	-4,700
Hawaii	-\$0.2	-\$0.2	-400
Idaho	-\$1.0	-\$1.4	-2,200
Illinois	-\$9.6	-\$12.7	-12,700
Indiana	-\$4.3	-\$5.8	-11,400
Iowa	-\$3.1	-\$4.1	-5,100
Kansas	-\$1.4	-\$1.9	-2,100
Kentucky	-\$2.3	-\$3.0	-12,000
Louisiana	-\$1.5	-\$1.9	-4,200
Maine	-\$2.2	-\$3.0	-3,200
Maryland	-\$2.7	-\$3.5	-4,100
Massachusetts	-\$6.9	-\$9.2	-8,900
Michigan	-\$9.1	-\$12.1	-21,500
Minnesota	-\$6.6	-\$8.7	-8,400
Mississippi	-\$1.2	-\$1.6	-2,900
Missouri	-\$3.8	-\$5.1	-8,900
Montana	-\$1.2	-\$1.6	-1,100
Nebraska	-\$1.5	-\$2.0	-3,900
Nevada	-\$0.3	-\$0.4	-1,800
New Hampshire	-\$1.3	-\$1.7	-1,800

Low Income Home Energy Assistance (in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients in 2010
New Jersey	-\$6.4	-\$8.5	-10,100
New Mexico	-\$0.9	-\$1.1	-2,500
New York	-\$21.0	-\$27.9	-56,000
North Carolina	-\$3.1	-\$4.2	-14,100
North Dakota	-\$1.3	-\$1.8	-1,000
Ohio	-\$8.5	-\$11.3	-26,600
Oklahoma	-\$1.3	-\$1.7	-6,000
Oregon	-\$2.1	-\$2.7	-3,900
Pennsylvania	-\$11.3	-\$15.0	-32,200
Rhode Island	-\$1.1	-\$1.5	-1,700
South Carolina	-\$1.1	-\$1.5	-3,500
South Dakota	-\$1.1	-\$1.4	-1,000
Tennessee	-\$2.3	-\$3.0	-5,700
Texas	-\$3.7	-\$5.0	-3,900
Utah	-\$1.2	-\$1.6	-2,100
Vermont	-\$1.0	-\$1.3	-1,500
Virginia	-\$3.2	-\$4.3	-7,500
Washington	-\$3.4	-\$4.5	-3,800
West Virginia	-\$1.5	-\$2.0	-3,700
Wisconsin	-\$5.9	-\$7.8	-8,400
Wyoming	-\$0.5	-\$0.7	-600

Technical Notes

The *Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program* is account 1509 in subfunction (609).

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2004 gross funding level, before tribal set-asides. This table illustrates the loss in the number of households that could receive LIHEAP assistance if the cut in 2010 was achieved solely by reducing the number of households receiving assistance, not by reducing the average benefit level. This calculation was done by computing an 8 percent reduction in the number of LIHEAP participants compared to 2004 levels.

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

Table 11
**Ryan White HIV/AIDS Funding
 (Titles I and II only)**
 (in millions)

State	Projected Cuts 2010	Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$191.4 -10%	-\$550.3
Alabama	-\$1.3	-\$3.8
Alaska	-\$0.1	-\$0.3
Arizona	-\$2.2	-\$6.2
Arkansas	-\$0.6	-\$1.7
California	-\$26.3	-\$75.7
Colorado	-\$1.4	-\$4.2
Connecticut	-\$3.2	-\$9.1
Delaware	-\$0.6	-\$1.8
District of Columbia	-\$5.3	-\$15.3
Florida	-\$21.5	-\$61.9
Georgia	-\$6.1	-\$17.5
Hawaii	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Idaho	-\$0.1	-\$0.3
Illinois	-\$7.1	-\$20.4
Indiana	-\$1.3	-\$3.9
Iowa	-\$0.2	-\$0.7
Kansas	-\$0.4	-\$1.0
Kentucky	-\$0.8	-\$2.3
Louisiana	-\$3.3	-\$9.5
Maine	-\$0.2	-\$0.5
Maryland	-\$6.4	-\$18.4
Massachusetts	-\$4.1	-\$11.9
Michigan	-\$2.8	-\$8.1
Minnesota	-\$0.8	-\$2.4
Mississippi	-\$1.1	-\$3.2
Missouri	-\$2.1	-\$6.0
Montana	-\$0.1	-\$0.3
Nebraska	-\$0.2	-\$0.6
Nevada	-\$1.3	-\$3.7
New Hampshire	-\$0.1	-\$0.4

**Ryan White HIV/AIDS Funding
(Titles I and II only)
(in millions)**

New Jersey	-\$9.1	-\$26.1
New Mexico	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
New York	-\$35.2	-\$101.1
North Carolina	-\$2.5	-\$7.2
North Dakota	\$0.0	-\$0.1
Ohio	-\$2.4	-\$6.9
Oklahoma	-\$0.7	-\$2.0
Oregon	-\$1.1	-\$3.2
Pennsylvania	-\$7.4	-\$21.2
Rhode Island	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
South Carolina	-\$2.3	-\$6.5
South Dakota	-\$0.1	-\$0.2
Tennessee	-\$2.5	-\$7.2
Texas	-\$13.3	-\$38.3
Utah	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Vermont	-\$0.1	-\$0.3
Virginia	-\$3.0	-\$8.7
Washington	-\$2.0	-\$5.7
West Virginia	-\$0.2	-\$0.7
Wisconsin	-\$0.6	-\$1.8
Wyoming	\$0.0	-\$0.1

Technical Notes

The *Ryan White HIV/AIDS* program is part of the Health Resources and Services Administration account (350) in the health care services subfunction (551). Ryan White HIV/AIDS includes two funding streams that are awarded to states and cities on a formula basis and several additional funding streams that are awarded as competitive grants to service providers. This table provides estimates of the cuts in the two funding streams awarded on a formula basis to states and cities. In 2004, these two sets of formula grants constituted 83 percent of total Ryan White HIV/AIDS funding. This analysis assumed that these two sets of formula grants would absorb 83 percent of the projected cut to overall Ryan White HIV/AIDS funding.

Cuts in overall Ryan White HIV/AIDS funding were measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this program. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To determine the projected level of cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2004 funding level, including funding provided to cities within states.

WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data

Table 12
**Projected Funding Cuts Under President's
 Proposed "Strengthening America's
 Communities" Block Grant**
 (in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$2,120.6 -36%	-\$9,225.8
Alabama	-\$28.6	-\$124.6
Alaska	-\$3.3	-\$14.4
Arizona	-\$32.5	-\$141.5
Arkansas	-\$16.9	-\$73.3
California	-\$260.7	-\$1,134.2
Colorado	-\$21.8	-\$94.9
Connecticut	-\$23.3	-\$101.2
Delaware	-\$4.9	-\$21.3
District of Columbia	-\$13.6	-\$59.2
Florida	-\$90.1	-\$392.0
Georgia	-\$48.7	-\$211.9
Hawaii	-\$8.8	-\$38.2
Idaho	-\$7.2	-\$31.3
Illinois	-\$102.8	-\$447.2
Indiana	-\$38.5	-\$167.4
Iowa	-\$23.2	-\$100.7
Kansas	-\$16.0	-\$69.6
Kentucky	-\$26.5	-\$115.1
Louisiana	-\$37.2	-\$162.0
Maine	-\$11.2	-\$48.9
Maryland	-\$30.7	-\$133.5
Massachusetts	-\$64.3	-\$279.7
Michigan	-\$73.7	-\$320.5
Minnesota	-\$33.4	-\$145.5
Mississippi	-\$21.5	-\$93.6
Missouri	-\$41.7	-\$181.6
Montana	-\$5.7	-\$24.8
Nebraska	-\$12.3	-\$53.5
Nevada	-\$14.6	-\$63.7
New Hampshire	-\$7.7	-\$33.7

**Projected Funding Cuts Under President's
Proposed "Strengthening America's
Communities" Block Grant**
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$64.3	-\$279.7
New Mexico	-\$11.6	-\$50.4
New York	-\$197.8	-\$860.4
North Carolina	-\$47.8	-\$208.1
North Dakota	-\$4.4	-\$19.1
Ohio	-\$90.7	-\$394.8
Oklahoma	-\$18.5	-\$80.4
Oregon	-\$23.5	-\$102.3
Pennsylvania	-\$121.3	-\$527.7
Rhode Island	-\$9.7	-\$42.3
South Carolina	-\$23.2	-\$100.9
South Dakota	-\$5.1	-\$22.1
Tennessee	-\$29.9	-\$130.3
Texas	-\$136.2	-\$592.4
Utah	-\$12.6	-\$55.0
Vermont	-\$5.4	-\$23.6
Virginia	-\$34.2	-\$148.7
Washington	-\$38.3	-\$166.8
West Virginia	-\$16.5	-\$71.7
Wisconsin	-\$36.7	-\$159.6
Wyoming	-\$3.5	-\$15.0

Technical Notes

The President's budget includes a proposal to consolidate 18 community development funding streams into a single block grant called "Strengthening America's Communities" or SAC. The two largest programs being consolidated into this new SAC block grant are the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG). The new SAC block grant would be administered by the Commerce Department.

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To estimate the cuts from this proposal, we projected the funding level for the new SAC block grant by assuming that it would remain the same proportion of its subfunction (452) as it was in 2006. We then compared this funding level to the level of funding for the 18 programs that would be consolidated into the new SAC under the OMB baseline (that is, the cost of these programs in 2005, adjusted for inflation).

To determine the projected level of cuts by state, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be distributed in proportion to the funding received by states under the two major programs being folded into the new SAC - CSBG and CDBG. These two programs represent 85 percent of the 2005 funding for all of the programs that would be consolidated under the President's proposal. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

**WHERE WOULD THE CUTS BE MADE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET?
State Data**

Table 13
Projected Loss in Grants in Aid to States and Localities
(in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
U.S. Total	-\$21,793.1	-\$70,661.6
Alabama	-\$325.2	-\$1,054.4
Alaska	-\$130.0	-\$421.5
Arizona	-\$348.3	-\$1,129.2
Arkansas	-\$204.9	-\$664.3
California	-\$3,094.8	-\$10,034.5
Colorado	-\$254.1	-\$823.8
Connecticut	-\$262.6	-\$851.5
Delaware	-\$60.8	-\$197.1
District of Columbia	-\$102.3	-\$331.6
Florida	-\$997.3	-\$3,233.5
Georgia	-\$644.3	-\$2,089.2
Hawaii	-\$111.0	-\$359.9
Idaho	-\$95.2	-\$308.7
Illinois	-\$904.5	-\$2,932.8
Indiana	-\$365.1	-\$1,183.7
Iowa	-\$178.1	-\$577.4
Kansas	-\$174.6	-\$566.2
Kentucky	-\$303.2	-\$983.2
Louisiana	-\$361.3	-\$1,171.4
Maine	-\$90.5	-\$293.4
Maryland	-\$353.0	-\$1,144.7
Massachusetts	-\$511.1	-\$1,657.2
Michigan	-\$678.3	-\$2,199.4
Minnesota	-\$307.2	-\$996.1
Mississippi	-\$235.4	-\$763.4
Missouri	-\$374.0	-\$1,212.7
Montana	-\$87.2	-\$282.8
Nebraska	-\$119.0	-\$385.8
Nevada	-\$133.3	-\$432.1
New Hampshire	-\$78.1	-\$253.1

Projected Loss in Grants in Aid to States and Localities (in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2010	Total Projected Cuts 2006 - 2010
New Jersey	-\$601.4	-\$1,950.1
New Mexico	-\$169.7	-\$550.1
New York	-\$1,896.2	-\$6,148.3
North Carolina	-\$521.9	-\$1,692.3
North Dakota	-\$72.2	-\$234.0
Ohio	-\$793.3	-\$2,572.1
Oklahoma	-\$259.4	-\$841.2
Oregon	-\$237.3	-\$769.3
Pennsylvania	-\$938.2	-\$3,041.9
Rhode Island	-\$92.4	-\$299.6
South Carolina	-\$255.7	-\$829.0
South Dakota	-\$78.0	-\$252.8
Tennessee	-\$396.9	-\$1,287.1
Texas	-\$1,524.0	-\$4,941.4
Utah	-\$146.0	-\$473.3
Vermont	-\$62.6	-\$203.0
Virginia	-\$423.1	-\$1,371.8
Washington	-\$408.9	-\$1,325.8
West Virginia	-\$163.9	-\$531.5
Wisconsin	-\$338.7	-\$1,098.3
Wyoming	-\$62.2	-\$201.8

Technical Notes

According to the President's budget, grants in aid to states from domestic discretionary programs would be cut by \$5.9 billion in 2006 as compared to the 2005 level adjusted for inflation. In 2006, this cut in domestic discretionary grants in aid to states constituted one-third of the total cut in domestic discretionary funding (\$18 billion).

Cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To estimate the cut in domestic discretionary grants in aid to states after 2007, this analysis assumed that cuts in grants in aid would remain one-third of the total cut in domestic discretionary funding. Projected cuts by state were calculated by assuming that the cuts would be distributed proportionately to overall grants in aid to states (excluding Medicaid) in 2005. (Data on the distribution of grants in aid to states for domestic discretionary programs are not available, but overall grants in aid by state excluding Medicaid can be computed). U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.