

## Index to State-by-State Tables

<b>Table A: Grants in Aid to States and Localities</b> .....	22
--	----

### **Tables B.1 – B.13**

#### **Projected Cuts Under the President's Proposed Budget Relative to Funding in FY 2007**

Table B.1: K-12 Education.....	24
Table B.2: Vocational and Adult Education.....	26
Table B.3: Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDB) .....	28
Table B.4: Head Start .....	30
Table B.5: EPA Clean Water/Safe Water State Revolving Funds .....	32
Table B.6: Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) .....	34
Table B.7: Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) .....	36
Table B.8: Public Housing Capital Fund.....	38
Table B.9: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) .....	40
Table B.10: State and Local Law Enforcement Formula Grants .....	42
Table B.11: Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) .....	44
Table B.12: Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) .....	46
Table B.13: Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) .....	48

### **Tables C.1 – C.9**

#### **Projected Cuts Under the President's Proposed Budget Relative to Funding in FY 2001 and the Peak Year (the year in which funding was at its highest level adjusting for inflation)**

Table C.1: K-12 Education .....	50
Table C.2: Vocational and Adult Education.....	52
Table C.3: Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).....	54
Table C.4: Head Start.....	56
Table C.5: EPA Clean Water/Safe Water State Revolving Funds .....	58
Table C.6: Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP).....	60
Table C.7: Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) .....	62
Table C.8: Public Housing Capital Fund.....	64
Table C.9: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).....	66

**Table A. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Grants in Aid to States and Localities**  
(Grants other than Medicaid in millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2006 level adjusted for inflation
	<b>Cut in 2008</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$12,724</b>
Alabama	-\$196.2
Alaska	-\$67.0
Arizona	-\$145.7
Arkansas	-\$93.5
California	-\$1,778.6
Colorado	-\$149.8
Connecticut	-\$153.3
Delaware	-\$31.7
District of Columbia	-\$56.2
Florida	-\$730.9
Georgia	-\$350.3
Hawaii	-\$62.5
Idaho	-\$44.0
Illinois	-\$529.7
Indiana	-\$192.8
Iowa	-\$99.2
Kansas	-\$98.7
Kentucky	-\$168.4
Louisiana	-\$474.3
Maine	-\$79.6
Maryland	-\$189.2
Massachusetts	-\$236.2
Michigan	-\$404.2
Minnesota	-\$150.0
Mississippi	-\$324.4
Missouri	-\$181.9
Montana	-\$58.9
Nebraska	-\$77.1
Nevada	-\$85.8
New Hampshire	-\$42.3
New Jersey	-\$333.5
New Mexico	-\$126.4
New York	-\$1,089.9
North Carolina	-\$184.7
North Dakota	-\$34.9
Ohio	-\$416.3
Oklahoma	-\$112.4
Oregon	-\$122.8
Pennsylvania	-\$474.0
Rhode Island	-\$60.6
South Carolina	-\$160.9
South Dakota	-\$50.6
Tennessee	-\$229.6
Texas	-\$803.7
Utah	-\$157.3
Vermont	-\$34.4
Virginia	-\$185.7
Washington	-\$240.9
West Virginia	-\$95.6
Wisconsin	-\$183.0
Wyoming	-\$124.2

### Technical Notes - Table A

This table shows the projected distribution of overall cuts in grants in aid to states and localities, including both discretionary and mandatory programs but excluding Medicaid. The table shows the cuts relative to the 2006 level of grants in aid to states adjusted for inflation.

The cuts are distributed based on the distribution of overall grants in aid to states and localities, excluding Medicaid. These data are taken from Tables 8-6 and 8-16 in the FY 2008 Analytic Perspectives volume that accompanies the President's FY 2008 budget.

The data in this table assume that the cuts in grants in aid to states and localities would be in proportion to the overall distribution of those grants. Because the actual distribution of the proposed cuts may differ from the current distribution of funding under the grant programs, the data in this table are illustrative of the magnitude of the cuts, not precise estimates.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

**Table B1. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Elementary and Secondary Education**

(Millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$2,081</b> <b>-5.8%</b>	<b>-\$6,883</b> <b>-3.9%</b>
Alabama	-\$30.7	-\$103.0
Alaska	-\$15.9	-\$57.4
Arizona	-\$42.5	-\$136.8
Arkansas	-\$19.5	-\$65.3
California	-\$205.9	-\$635.8
Colorado	-\$25.4	-\$88.0
Connecticut	-\$21.2	-\$73.5
Delaware	-\$7.5	-\$27.3
District of Columbia	-\$5.7	-\$18.6
Florida	-\$96.6	-\$322.0
Georgia	-\$53.5	-\$169.5
Hawaii	-\$12.8	-\$46.3
Idaho	-\$10.6	-\$38.2
Illinois	-\$82.1	-\$265.3
Indiana	-\$38.5	-\$129.6
Iowa	-\$19.3	-\$70.8
Kansas	-\$19.3	-\$67.4
Kentucky	-\$28.3	-\$94.2
Louisiana	-\$35.8	-\$114.7
Maine	-\$10.8	-\$39.4
Maryland	-\$31.5	-\$106.5
Massachusetts	-\$42.1	-\$146.8
Michigan	-\$67.1	-\$221.1
Minnesota	-\$31.2	-\$113.4
Mississippi	-\$23.5	-\$76.8
Missouri	-\$38.2	-\$131.9
Montana	-\$12.1	-\$44.6
Nebraska	-\$14.3	-\$51.8
Nevada	-\$11.4	-\$37.0
New Hampshire	-\$9.5	-\$35.4
New Jersey	-\$54.5	-\$192.8
New Mexico	-\$22.2	-\$76.2
New York	-\$130.7	-\$393.0
North Carolina	-\$50.3	-\$168.6
North Dakota	-\$9.1	-\$33.4
Ohio	-\$70.1	-\$234.5
Oklahoma	-\$28.6	-\$101.7
Oregon	-\$20.8	-\$69.7
Pennsylvania	-\$70.1	-\$226.4
Rhode Island	-\$8.7	-\$29.8
South Carolina	-\$28.0	-\$92.2
South Dakota	-\$10.8	-\$38.9
Tennessee	-\$36.7	-\$125.5
Texas	-\$160.2	-\$509.9
Utah	-\$17.1	-\$62.5
Vermont	-\$6.8	-\$25.3
Virginia	-\$45.6	-\$160.5
Washington	-\$39.2	-\$135.3
West Virginia	-\$14.4	-\$49.5
Wisconsin	-\$34.5	-\$117.4
Wyoming	-\$7.6	-\$28.2

### Technical Notes - Table B1

This table shows projected cuts in K-12 education, which we define as the sum of four major Department of Education spending accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged, Special Education, School Improvement, and Impact Aid. Each of these accounts is in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education category of the budget, known technically as budget subfunction 501.

The Education for the Disadvantaged 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, the Migrant State Agency Program, and the Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program. The Special Education account includes funding for special education grants (K-12), special education preschool grants, and grants for infants and families. The School Improvement 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 low-income communities).

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to these accounts' 2007 funding level adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume these four accounts will maintain the same share of the subfunction as they comprise in 2008 (88 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in each of the four accounts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding for that account in 2008 as projected by the U.S. Department of Education. For example, if a given state is projected to receive 3 percent of the total funding for the Education for the Disadvantaged account in 2008, this analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for that account. For each of the four accounts, we assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

We do not show cuts for K-12 education in 2008 because the cuts are relatively small and in some states are not reliably distinguishable from zero. Nationwide, we estimate that K-12 funding is cut by 0.2 percent (\$70 million) relative to the 2007 level adjusted for inflation. By 2012, these cuts grow to 5.8 percent (\$2.1 billion) relative to the 2007 level adjusted for inflation. Because each state currently receives a somewhat different share of each account, and each account is cut by a different percentage, each state's percentage cut in 2012 may differ somewhat from 5.8 percent.

Table B2. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan

## Vocational and Adult Education

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$832</b>	<b>-\$965</b>	<b>-\$4,543</b>
	<b>-41.0%</b>	<b>-44.3%</b>	<b>-43.2%</b>
Alabama	-\$15.1	-\$17.4	-\$82.1
Alaska	-\$3.3	-\$3.7	-\$17.7
Arizona	-\$14.2	-\$16.5	-\$77.7
Arkansas	-\$9.0	-\$10.4	-\$48.9
California	-\$85.8	-\$100.9	-\$471.8
Colorado	-\$10.5	-\$12.1	-\$57.4
Connecticut	-\$6.6	-\$7.8	-\$36.3
Delaware	-\$3.3	-\$3.8	-\$17.9
District of Columbia	-\$3.3	-\$3.8	-\$17.9
Florida	-\$36.7	-\$43.1	-\$201.9
Georgia	-\$23.3	-\$27.0	-\$127.1
Hawaii	-\$4.0	-\$4.6	-\$21.6
Idaho	-\$4.7	-\$5.4	-\$25.5
Illinois	-\$30.7	-\$35.7	-\$168.0
Indiana	-\$18.6	-\$21.3	-\$101.0
Iowa	-\$9.4	-\$10.7	-\$50.7
Kansas	-\$8.0	-\$9.2	-\$43.6
Kentucky	-\$14.1	-\$16.3	-\$76.7
Louisiana	-\$16.5	-\$19.0	-\$89.8
Maine	-\$4.0	-\$4.5	-\$21.5
Maryland	-\$11.7	-\$13.6	-\$64.0
Massachusetts	-\$13.7	-\$15.9	-\$74.8
Michigan	-\$27.5	-\$31.7	-\$149.6
Minnesota	-\$13.1	-\$15.0	-\$71.0
Mississippi	-\$10.5	-\$12.1	-\$57.2
Missouri	-\$16.4	-\$18.9	-\$89.5
Montana	-\$3.8	-\$4.4	-\$20.7
Nebraska	-\$5.3	-\$6.1	-\$29.0
Nevada	-\$4.0	-\$4.8	-\$22.3
New Hampshire	-\$4.0	-\$4.5	-\$21.4
New Jersey	-\$16.7	-\$19.7	-\$92.1
New Mexico	-\$6.3	-\$7.3	-\$34.3
New York	-\$40.8	-\$48.2	-\$225.1
North Carolina	-\$22.7	-\$26.2	-\$123.7
North Dakota	-\$3.3	-\$3.7	-\$17.8
Ohio	-\$33.5	-\$38.5	-\$182.2
Oklahoma	-\$11.8	-\$13.6	-\$64.3
Oregon	-\$9.7	-\$11.2	-\$53.0
Pennsylvania	-\$32.0	-\$37.0	-\$174.6
Rhode Island	-\$4.0	-\$4.6	-\$21.6
South Carolina	-\$13.1	-\$15.1	-\$71.2
South Dakota	-\$3.3	-\$3.8	-\$17.8
Tennessee	-\$16.9	-\$19.6	-\$92.2
Texas	-\$63.6	-\$73.9	-\$347.8
Utah	-\$9.0	-\$10.2	-\$48.5
Vermont	-\$3.3	-\$3.7	-\$17.7
Virginia	-\$18.3	-\$21.2	-\$100.0
Washington	-\$15.4	-\$17.7	-\$83.7
West Virginia	-\$6.6	-\$7.6	-\$36.0
Wisconsin	-\$15.8	-\$18.2	-\$86.1
Wyoming	-\$3.3	-\$3.7	-\$17.7

### Technical Notes - Table B2

The programs included in this analysis fall under the budget account called “Career, Technical, and Adult Education.” The account is part of the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education category of the budget, known technically as budget subfunction 501.

The account includes two large programs — a formula grant program to states for both secondary and post-secondary vocational education (“Career and Technical Education State Grants”) and a formula grant program to states for adult education, including adult and family literacy programs, high school equivalency programs, and English language and civics instruction for immigrants. In addition, the account includes a separate, smaller grant program to states for technical preparation state grants, which we combine with the larger Career and Technical Education State Grants. The account also includes several much smaller programs that do not provide funding directly to states.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level for these programs adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President’s proposals, we assume these four accounts will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (3 percent) under the President's proposed budget. (Note that these programs are part of the same budget subfunction as K-12 education programs. Thus, while these programs comprise a small share of overall funding in this subfunction, they comprise a substantial share — about one-quarter — of the part of the subfunction outside of K-12 education programs.)

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in Career and Technical Education grants would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding from those grants in 2008 as projected by the U.S. Department of Education. For example, if a given state is projected to receive 3 percent of total projected funding for Career and Technical Education grants in 2008, this analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the cut for these grants. Similarly, the analysis assumes that the much smaller proposed cuts in adult education would be apportioned based on the basis of each state’s share of funding for adult education.

For both vocational and adult education, we assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

**Table B3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Child Care and Development Block Grant**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$39</b>	<b>-\$128</b>	<b>-\$462</b>
	<b>-1.9%</b>	<b>-5.7%</b>	<b>-4.2%</b>
Alabama	-\$0.8	-\$2.5	-\$9.0
Alaska	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$0.9
Arizona	-\$0.9	-\$3.1	-\$11.3
Arkansas	-\$0.5	-\$1.6	-\$5.6
California	-\$4.4	-\$14.3	-\$51.7
Colorado	-\$0.5	-\$1.5	-\$5.4
Connecticut	-\$0.3	-\$0.9	-\$3.2
Delaware	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$1.0
District of Columbia	-\$0.1	-\$0.2	-\$0.7
Florida	-\$2.2	-\$7.1	-\$25.6
Georgia	-\$1.5	-\$4.8	-\$17.5
Hawaii	-\$0.1	-\$0.5	-\$1.7
Idaho	-\$0.2	-\$0.7	-\$2.6
Illinois	-\$1.4	-\$4.8	-\$17.2
Indiana	-\$0.8	-\$2.6	-\$9.3
Iowa	-\$0.3	-\$1.1	-\$4.0
Kansas	-\$0.4	-\$1.2	-\$4.2
Kentucky	-\$0.7	-\$2.2	-\$7.9
Louisiana	-\$0.9	-\$2.9	-\$10.3
Maine	-\$0.1	-\$0.4	-\$1.5
Maryland	-\$0.5	-\$1.6	-\$5.7
Massachusetts	-\$0.5	-\$1.6	-\$5.7
Michigan	-\$1.1	-\$3.6	-\$13.0
Minnesota	-\$0.5	-\$1.6	-\$5.7
Mississippi	-\$0.6	-\$2.0	-\$7.1
Missouri	-\$0.7	-\$2.4	-\$8.7
Montana	-\$0.1	-\$0.4	-\$1.3
Nebraska	-\$0.2	-\$0.7	-\$2.6
Nevada	-\$0.3	-\$0.9	-\$3.2
New Hampshire	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$1.1
New Jersey	-\$0.7	-\$2.3	-\$8.2
New Mexico	-\$0.3	-\$1.1	-\$4.1
New York	-\$2.0	-\$6.7	-\$24.1
North Carolina	-\$1.3	-\$4.1	-\$14.9
North Dakota	-\$0.1	-\$0.2	-\$0.8
Ohio	-\$1.3	-\$4.2	-\$15.1
Oklahoma	-\$0.6	-\$1.9	-\$7.0
Oregon	-\$0.4	-\$1.4	-\$5.0
Pennsylvania	-\$1.2	-\$3.9	-\$14.0
Rhode Island	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$1.2
South Carolina	-\$0.7	-\$2.3	-\$8.3
South Dakota	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$1.2
Tennessee	-\$0.8	-\$2.8	-\$10.0
Texas	-\$4.1	-\$13.4	-\$48.4
Utah	-\$0.4	-\$1.4	-\$5.0
Vermont	-\$0.1	-\$0.2	-\$0.6
Virginia	-\$0.7	-\$2.4	-\$8.7
Washington	-\$0.6	-\$2.1	-\$7.4
West Virginia	-\$0.3	-\$0.8	-\$3.0
Wisconsin	-\$0.6	-\$1.8	-\$6.6
Wyoming	-\$0.1	-\$0.2	-\$0.6



**Table B3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Child Care and Development Block Grant**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>	<b>Cut in 2012</b>	<b>5 year cut (2008-2012)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$39</b> <b>-1.9%</b>	<b>-\$128</b> <b>-5.7%</b>	<b>-\$462</b> <b>-4.2%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.05	-\$0.17	-\$0.60
Guam	-\$0.08	-\$0.25	-\$0.91
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.03	-\$0.11	-\$0.39
Puerto Rico	-\$0.67	-\$2.20	-\$7.94
Virgin Islands	-\$0.03	-\$0.11	-\$0.41

**Technical Notes - Table B3**

This table shows projected cuts in federal discretionary funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant account under the Department of Health and Human Services. The account is part of the "Other Income Security" category of the budget, known technically as subfunction 609.

This analysis does not include the non-discretionary federal funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume this program will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as it comprises in 2008 (27 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding for the account overall in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a given state is projected to receive 3 percent of the total funding for this account in 2008, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

Table B4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan

## Head Start

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$232</b> <b>-3.3%</b>	<b>-\$658</b> <b>-8.7%</b>	<b>-\$2,525</b> <b>-6.9%</b>
Alabama	-\$3.6	-\$10.2	-\$39.2
Alaska	-\$0.4	-\$1.2	-\$4.6
Arizona	-\$3.5	-\$9.9	-\$38.1
Arkansas	-\$2.2	-\$6.2	-\$23.7
California	-\$28.2	-\$79.8	-\$306.0
Colorado	-\$2.3	-\$6.6	-\$25.1
Connecticut	-\$1.8	-\$5.0	-\$19.1
Delaware	-\$0.4	-\$1.3	-\$4.9
District of Columbia	-\$0.9	-\$2.4	-\$9.2
Florida	-\$8.9	-\$25.2	-\$96.8
Georgia	-\$5.7	-\$16.2	-\$62.0
Hawaii	-\$0.8	-\$2.2	-\$8.4
Idaho	-\$0.8	-\$2.2	-\$8.4
Illinois	-\$9.2	-\$26.0	-\$99.6
Indiana	-\$3.3	-\$9.2	-\$35.4
Iowa	-\$1.7	-\$4.9	-\$19.0
Kansas	-\$1.7	-\$4.9	-\$18.7
Kentucky	-\$3.7	-\$10.3	-\$39.7
Louisiana	-\$4.9	-\$14.0	-\$53.7
Maine	-\$0.9	-\$2.6	-\$10.2
Maryland	-\$2.6	-\$7.5	-\$28.7
Massachusetts	-\$3.7	-\$10.4	-\$39.9
Michigan	-\$7.9	-\$22.5	-\$86.3
Minnesota	-\$2.4	-\$6.9	-\$26.5
Mississippi	-\$5.5	-\$15.5	-\$59.5
Missouri	-\$4.0	-\$11.4	-\$43.8
Montana	-\$0.7	-\$2.0	-\$7.7
Nebraska	-\$1.2	-\$3.5	-\$13.3
Nevada	-\$0.8	-\$2.3	-\$8.9
New Hampshire	-\$0.5	-\$1.3	-\$4.9
New Jersey	-\$4.4	-\$12.4	-\$47.5
New Mexico	-\$1.8	-\$5.0	-\$19.2
New York	-\$14.7	-\$41.6	-\$159.4
North Carolina	-\$4.8	-\$13.6	-\$52.0
North Dakota	-\$0.6	-\$1.6	-\$6.3
Ohio	-\$8.4	-\$23.7	-\$90.8
Oklahoma	-\$2.7	-\$7.8	-\$29.8
Oregon	-\$2.0	-\$5.7	-\$21.9
Pennsylvania	-\$7.7	-\$21.9	-\$84.0
Rhode Island	-\$0.7	-\$2.1	-\$8.1
South Carolina	-\$2.8	-\$7.9	-\$30.4
South Dakota	-\$0.6	-\$1.8	-\$6.9
Tennessee	-\$4.0	-\$11.4	-\$43.9
Texas	-\$16.2	-\$45.9	-\$176.1
Utah	-\$1.3	-\$3.6	-\$13.9
Vermont	-\$0.5	-\$1.3	-\$5.0
Virginia	-\$3.4	-\$9.5	-\$36.5
Washington	-\$3.4	-\$9.6	-\$36.9
West Virginia	-\$1.7	-\$4.9	-\$18.6
Wisconsin	-\$3.1	-\$8.7	-\$33.4
Wyoming	-\$0.4	-\$1.2	-\$4.6

**Table B4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Head Start**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>	<b>Cut in 2012</b>	<b>5 year cut (2008-2012)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$232</b> <b>-3.3%</b>	<b>-\$658</b> <b>-8.7%</b>	<b>-\$2,525</b> <b>-6.9%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.07	-\$0.21	-\$0.79
Guam	-\$0.07	-\$0.21	-\$0.80
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.06	-\$0.16	-\$0.61
Puerto Rico	-\$8.44	-\$23.91	-\$91.73
Virgin Islands	-\$0.27	-\$0.77	-\$2.94

**Technical Notes - Table B4**

This table shows projected cuts in Head Start. Head Start is part of the Department of Health and Human Services' Children and Families Services account, and is in the Social Services category of the budget, known technically as budget subfunction 506.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in Head Start would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national Head Start funding in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For example, if a given state is projected to receive 3 percent of total funding in 2008, it would absorb 3 percent of the Head Start cut.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in Head Start would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of national Head Start funding in 2008 as projected by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For example, if a given state received 3 percent of total projected funding in 2008, it would absorb 3 percent of the Head Start cut. National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Table B5. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water State Revolving Funds**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>	<b>Cut in 2012</b>	<b>5 year cut (2008-2012)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$428</b> <b>-21.9%</b>	<b>-\$549</b> <b>-26.1%</b>	<b>-\$2,513</b> <b>-24.8%</b>
Alabama	-\$4.9	-\$6.3	-\$28.9
Alaska	-\$2.6	-\$3.4	-\$15.5
Arizona	-\$3.0	-\$3.8	-\$17.5
Arkansas	-\$2.9	-\$3.7	-\$16.9
California	-\$31.5	-\$40.4	-\$184.9
Colorado	-\$3.5	-\$4.5	-\$20.7
Connecticut	-\$5.4	-\$6.9	-\$31.7
Delaware	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
District of Columbia	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
Florida	-\$14.9	-\$19.1	-\$87.3
Georgia	-\$7.5	-\$9.6	-\$43.7
Hawaii	-\$3.4	-\$4.4	-\$20.0
Idaho	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
Illinois	-\$19.9	-\$25.6	-\$116.9
Indiana	-\$10.6	-\$13.6	-\$62.3
Iowa	-\$6.0	-\$7.7	-\$35.0
Kansas	-\$4.0	-\$5.1	-\$23.3
Kentucky	-\$5.6	-\$7.2	-\$32.9
Louisiana	-\$4.8	-\$6.2	-\$28.4
Maine	-\$3.4	-\$4.4	-\$20.0
Maryland	-\$10.7	-\$13.7	-\$62.5
Massachusetts	-\$15.0	-\$19.2	-\$87.8
Michigan	-\$18.9	-\$24.3	-\$111.2
Minnesota	-\$8.1	-\$10.4	-\$47.5
Mississippi	-\$4.0	-\$5.1	-\$23.3
Missouri	-\$12.2	-\$15.7	-\$71.7
Montana	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
Nebraska	-\$2.3	-\$2.9	-\$13.2
Nevada	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
New Hampshire	-\$4.4	-\$5.6	-\$25.8
New Jersey	-\$18.0	-\$23.1	-\$105.6
New Mexico	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
New York	-\$48.6	-\$62.4	-\$285.3
North Carolina	-\$8.0	-\$10.2	-\$46.7
North Dakota	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
Ohio	-\$24.8	-\$31.8	-\$145.5
Oklahoma	-\$3.6	-\$4.6	-\$20.9
Oregon	-\$5.0	-\$6.4	-\$29.2
Pennsylvania	-\$17.5	-\$22.4	-\$102.4
Rhode Island	-\$3.0	-\$3.8	-\$17.4
South Carolina	-\$4.5	-\$5.8	-\$26.5
South Dakota	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
Tennessee	-\$6.4	-\$8.2	-\$37.6
Texas	-\$20.1	-\$25.8	-\$118.2
Utah	-\$2.3	-\$3.0	-\$13.6
Vermont	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7
Virginia	-\$9.0	-\$11.6	-\$52.9
Washington	-\$7.7	-\$9.8	-\$45.0
West Virginia	-\$6.9	-\$8.8	-\$40.3
Wisconsin	-\$11.9	-\$15.3	-\$69.9
Wyoming	-\$2.2	-\$2.8	-\$12.7

### Technical Notes - Table B5

The Environmental Protection Agency's clean water and drinking water state revolving funds are part of EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grants in the Pollution Control and Abatement category of the budget, known technically as subfunction 304. These programs provide federal funding to states for wastewater treatment facilities, improvements to drinking water infrastructure, and water quality improvement projects.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level for these two revolving funds, adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume that the funding for these programs will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (21 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funds under the statutory allocation formula normally used to allocate these revolving funds. For example, if the formula says that a given state shall receive 3 percent of the funding under these revolving funds, we assume it would absorb 3 percent of the cut.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

Table B6. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan

## Low-Income Home Energy Assistance

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Potential loss of participants In 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$420</b>	<b>-978,900</b>	<b>-\$525</b>	<b>-\$2,401</b>
	<b>-19.1%</b>	<b>-19.1%</b>	<b>-22.2%</b>	<b>-21.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$3.6	-9,300	-\$4.5	-\$20.8
Alaska	-\$1.3	-1,700	-\$1.7	-\$7.8
Arizona	-\$1.7	-3,500	-\$2.1	-\$9.5
Arkansas	-\$2.9	-11,000	-\$3.6	-\$16.4
California	-\$21.0	-30,300	-\$25.6	-\$118.1
Colorado	-\$7.3	-18,300	-\$9.0	-\$41.2
Connecticut	-\$7.8	-11,900	-\$10.1	-\$45.6
Delaware	-\$1.1	-2,500	-\$1.4	-\$6.2
District of Columbia	-\$1.5	-4,300	-\$1.8	-\$8.4
Florida	-\$6.0	-8,700	-\$7.4	-\$33.8
Georgia	-\$4.6	-16,600	-\$5.7	-\$26.2
Hawaii	-\$0.5	-1,300	-\$0.6	-\$2.6
Idaho	-\$2.6	-6,200	-\$3.2	-\$14.8
Illinois	-\$26.3	-59,100	-\$32.2	-\$148.2
Indiana	-\$11.7	-25,300	-\$14.3	-\$65.9
Iowa	-\$8.0	-16,300	-\$9.9	-\$45.5
Kansas	-\$3.8	-8,100	-\$4.7	-\$21.6
Kentucky	-\$6.0	-20,300	-\$7.4	-\$34.0
Louisiana	-\$4.0	-6,800	-\$4.9	-\$22.3
Maine	-\$4.3	-8,600	-\$5.8	-\$25.9
Maryland	-\$6.6	-15,800	-\$8.3	-\$37.8
Massachusetts	-\$16.3	-25,800	-\$20.9	-\$94.7
Michigan	-\$24.0	-84,200	-\$29.7	-\$136.2
Minnesota	-\$16.6	-22,400	-\$20.8	-\$94.9
Mississippi	-\$3.0	-11,800	-\$3.8	-\$17.4
Missouri	-\$10.1	-21,600	-\$12.5	-\$57.1
Montana	-\$2.6	-3,900	-\$3.3	-\$15.1
Nebraska	-\$4.0	-6,200	-\$4.9	-\$22.7
Nevada	-\$0.9	-3,300	-\$1.1	-\$5.1
New Hampshire	-\$2.8	-5,700	-\$3.7	-\$16.5
New Jersey	-\$15.5	-29,700	-\$19.7	-\$89.8
New Mexico	-\$2.1	-10,600	-\$2.6	-\$11.9
New York	-\$49.4	-156,900	-\$63.3	-\$287.3
North Carolina	-\$7.2	-40,400	-\$9.2	-\$42.0
North Dakota	-\$2.4	-2,900	-\$3.0	-\$13.8
Ohio	-\$22.9	-58,200	-\$28.1	-\$129.2
Oklahoma	-\$3.1	-17,800	-\$3.9	-\$17.8
Oregon	-\$5.5	-11,100	-\$6.7	-\$30.8
Pennsylvania	-\$28.1	-62,400	-\$35.3	-\$161.2
Rhode Island	-\$2.7	-5,100	-\$3.4	-\$15.6
South Carolina	-\$2.8	-4,000	-\$3.5	-\$15.9
South Dakota	-\$2.0	-3,500	-\$2.6	-\$11.7
Tennessee	-\$6.2	-11,400	-\$7.6	-\$35.0
Texas	-\$10.1	-8,500	-\$12.4	-\$56.8
Utah	-\$3.3	-6,600	-\$4.0	-\$18.6
Vermont	-\$2.0	-3,700	-\$2.7	-\$12.1
Virginia	-\$8.0	-19,400	-\$10.1	-\$46.0
Washington	-\$8.8	-13,700	-\$10.8	-\$49.7
West Virginia	-\$4.0	-13,800	-\$4.9	-\$22.6
Wisconsin	-\$15.0	-26,200	-\$18.8	-\$85.8
Wyoming	-\$1.3	-1,800	-\$1.6	-\$7.3

### Technical Notes - Table B6

This table shows projected cuts in the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is part of the "Other Income Security" category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 609. The LIHEAP account consists of a formula grant program and a much smaller contingency fund.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level for these two funding streams, adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume that each of the two LIHEAP funding streams will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (24 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in LIHEAP formula grants would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of the statutory allocation formula normally used to distribute the funds. For example, if a given state is supposed to receive 3 percent of total projected funding from LIHEAP's formula grants, we assume it would absorb 3 percent of the cut in those grants. Separately, the analysis assumes that any proposed cuts (or increases) in LIHEAP contingency funds would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of actual contingency funding in 2005, the most recent available year, not including grants related to Hurricane Katrina.

The table also illustrates the magnitude of the inflation-adjusted funding losses from 2007 to 2008 in terms of households potentially eliminated from LIHEAP. LIHEAP programs have a number of ways they can respond to funding losses, including reducing the number of households or reducing the amount of assistance provided per household. If states were to expend the same amount of federal funding per household in 2008 as they did in 2007, adjusted for inflation, they would have to serve 978,900 fewer households in 2008. This analysis assumes that the participation reductions would be apportioned to each state in proportion to its share of the total number of LIHEAP households assisted in 2005, based on data from the National Energy Assistance Directors Association. (The latest available LIHEAP participation estimates are for 2006; however, we used participant data for 2005 because of the large effects of Hurricane Katrina on the distribution of LIHEAP assistance in 2006.) Looked at another way, the estimate assumes that, in each state, LIHEAP assistance would decline by 19.1 percent in 2008 to comport with the 19.1 percent loss in inflation-adjusted funding since 2007.

**Table B7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$642</b>	<b>-\$690</b>	<b>-\$3,330</b>
	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$11.7	-\$12.6	-\$60.8
Alaska	-\$2.4	-\$2.6	-\$12.5
Arizona	-\$5.3	-\$5.7	-\$27.4
Arkansas	-\$8.7	-\$9.3	-\$45.1
California	-\$57.0	-\$61.2	-\$295.5
Colorado	-\$5.5	-\$6.0	-\$28.8
Connecticut	-\$7.7	-\$8.3	-\$40.0
Delaware	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.6
District of Columbia	-\$10.5	-\$11.3	-\$54.4
Florida	-\$18.6	-\$20.0	-\$96.3
Georgia	-\$17.2	-\$18.5	-\$89.1
Hawaii	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.6
Idaho	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.3
Illinois	-\$30.2	-\$32.4	-\$156.5
Indiana	-\$9.3	-\$10.0	-\$48.2
Iowa	-\$6.9	-\$7.4	-\$35.9
Kansas	-\$5.2	-\$5.6	-\$27.0
Kentucky	-\$10.8	-\$11.6	-\$55.9
Louisiana	-\$15.0	-\$16.1	-\$77.8
Maine	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.5
Maryland	-\$8.8	-\$9.4	-\$45.5
Massachusetts	-\$15.9	-\$17.1	-\$82.6
Michigan	-\$23.6	-\$25.4	-\$122.4
Minnesota	-\$7.7	-\$8.3	-\$39.9
Mississippi	-\$10.2	-\$10.9	-\$52.7
Missouri	-\$17.7	-\$19.0	-\$91.7
Montana	-\$3.1	-\$3.3	-\$15.8
Nebraska	-\$4.5	-\$4.8	-\$23.1
Nevada	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.6
New Hampshire	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.6
New Jersey	-\$17.5	-\$18.8	-\$90.7
New Mexico	-\$3.6	-\$3.9	-\$18.8
New York	-\$55.4	-\$59.6	-\$287.5
North Carolina	-\$16.8	-\$18.0	-\$87.0
North Dakota	-\$3.1	-\$3.3	-\$16.1
Ohio	-\$24.9	-\$26.8	-\$129.2
Oklahoma	-\$7.6	-\$8.1	-\$39.2
Oregon	-\$5.1	-\$5.5	-\$26.4
Pennsylvania	-\$27.0	-\$29.1	-\$140.3
Rhode Island	-\$3.5	-\$3.8	-\$18.3
South Carolina	-\$9.8	-\$10.6	-\$51.0
South Dakota	-\$2.7	-\$2.9	-\$14.2
Tennessee	-\$12.6	-\$13.5	-\$65.3
Texas	-\$30.8	-\$33.1	-\$159.6
Utah	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.2
Vermont	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.6
Virginia	-\$10.2	-\$11.0	-\$53.1
Washington	-\$7.5	-\$8.1	-\$39.1
West Virginia	-\$7.2	-\$7.7	-\$37.1
Wisconsin	-\$7.8	-\$8.4	-\$40.3
Wyoming	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$17.6



**Table B7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>	<b>Cut in 2012</b>	<b>5 year cut (2008-2012)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$642</b>	<b>-\$690</b>	<b>-\$3,330</b>
	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.88	-\$0.95	-\$4.56
Guam	-\$0.83	-\$0.90	-\$4.32
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.52	-\$0.56	-\$2.71
Puerto Rico	-\$26.91	-\$28.93	-\$139.60
Virgin Islands	-\$1.15	-\$1.24	-\$5.97

**Technical Notes - Table B7**

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Health and Human Services' Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), which is in the Social Services category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 506. CSBG funds community action agencies to provide a range of services including child care, before- and after-school care, health care to underserved populations, housing assistance, emergency housing, food assistance, domestic violence-related services, transportation assistance, legal assistance, and specialized services for individuals with disabilities.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 CSBG funding level adjusted for inflation. Because the President proposes to eliminate CSBG in 2008, we assume CSBG funding would remain zeroed out in years 2009 through 2012 under the President's budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in CSBG would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of the actual funding in 2006, the most recent available year, based on data from the agency website. We assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

Table B8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan

## Public Housing Capital Fund

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$461</b> <b>-18.6%</b>	<b>-\$534</b> <b>-20.0%</b>	<b>-\$2,467</b> <b>-19.2%</b>
Alabama	-\$14.2	-\$16.4	-\$75.8
Alaska	-\$0.5	-\$0.6	-\$2.7
Arizona	-\$2.1	-\$2.5	-\$11.4
Arkansas	-\$4.2	-\$4.9	-\$22.5
California	-\$19.2	-\$22.3	-\$102.9
Colorado	-\$3.0	-\$3.4	-\$15.8
Connecticut	-\$6.4	-\$7.4	-\$34.1
Delaware	-\$1.0	-\$1.1	-\$5.3
District of Columbia	-\$6.3	-\$7.3	-\$33.8
Florida	-\$15.6	-\$18.1	-\$83.4
Georgia	-\$17.4	-\$20.2	-\$93.1
Hawaii	-\$2.6	-\$3.0	-\$14.1
Idaho	-\$0.2	-\$0.3	-\$1.2
Illinois	-\$33.5	-\$38.8	-\$179.1
Indiana	-\$6.1	-\$7.1	-\$32.8
Iowa	-\$1.1	-\$1.3	-\$6.1
Kansas	-\$2.5	-\$2.9	-\$13.5
Kentucky	-\$8.4	-\$9.8	-\$45.2
Louisiana	-\$16.3	-\$18.9	-\$87.2
Maine	-\$1.2	-\$1.4	-\$6.6
Maryland	-\$8.8	-\$10.2	-\$47.1
Massachusetts	-\$12.8	-\$14.8	-\$68.3
Michigan	-\$8.9	-\$10.3	-\$47.7
Minnesota	-\$6.8	-\$7.8	-\$36.2
Mississippi	-\$6.2	-\$7.2	-\$33.0
Missouri	-\$7.6	-\$8.8	-\$40.8
Montana	-\$0.7	-\$0.8	-\$3.5
Nebraska	-\$1.9	-\$2.2	-\$10.2
Nevada	-\$2.1	-\$2.4	-\$11.1
New Hampshire	-\$1.1	-\$1.3	-\$6.0
New Jersey	-\$16.0	-\$18.5	-\$85.6
New Mexico	-\$1.6	-\$1.9	-\$8.6
New York	-\$78.0	-\$90.4	-\$417.3
North Carolina	-\$12.2	-\$14.1	-\$65.3
North Dakota	—*	—*	—*
Ohio	-\$19.8	-\$23.0	-\$106.2
Oklahoma	-\$4.1	-\$4.8	-\$22.1
Oregon	-\$2.2	-\$2.5	-\$11.7
Pennsylvania	-\$32.1	-\$37.2	-\$171.7
Rhode Island	-\$2.9	-\$3.4	-\$15.8
South Carolina	-\$5.1	-\$6.0	-\$27.5
South Dakota	-\$0.4	-\$0.5	-\$2.1
Tennessee	-\$12.5	-\$14.5	-\$67.0
Texas	-\$18.8	-\$21.8	-\$100.8
Utah	-\$0.7	-\$0.8	-\$3.6
Vermont	-\$0.6	-\$0.6	-\$3.0
Virginia	-\$10.7	-\$12.4	-\$57.2
Washington	-\$6.1	-\$7.1	-\$32.8
West Virginia	-\$2.0	-\$2.4	-\$10.9
Wisconsin	-\$4.1	-\$4.8	-\$22.0
Wyoming	-\$0.2	-\$0.2	-\$1.1

**Table B8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Public Housing Capital Fund  
(Millions of dollars)**

**Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation**

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>	<b>Cut in 2012</b>	<b>5 year cut (2008-2012)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$461</b> <b>-18.6%</b>	<b>-\$534</b> <b>-20.0%</b>	<b>-\$2,467</b> <b>-19.2%</b>
American Samoa	—	—	—
Guam	-\$0.53	-\$0.62	-\$2.85
N. Mariana Islands	—	—	—
Puerto Rico	-\$26.96	-\$31.24	-\$144.28
Virgin Islands	-\$1.59	-\$1.84	-\$8.51

**Technical Notes - Table B8**

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Public Housing Capital Fund, which is in the Housing Assistance category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 604.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume this program will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as it comprises in 2008 (6 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in CSBG would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. National totals include the cuts absorbed by U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

\* For the last several years, North Dakota has received a negative funding level from HUD for the Public Housing Capital Fund. This may indicate that the state has been obligated to remit money to HUD for past overcharges. This analysis assumes North Dakota's share of the national cut in the Public Housing Capital Fund is \$0.

**Table B9. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Community Development Block Grant  
(Millions of dollars)**

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>	<b>Cut in 2012</b>	<b>5 year cut (2008-2012)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$807</b> <b>-21.3%</b>	<b>-\$1,055</b> <b>-26.0%</b>	<b>-\$4,792</b> <b>-24.5%</b>
Alabama	-\$10.1	-\$13.2	-\$59.9
Alaska	-\$1.0	-\$1.3	-\$5.7
Arizona	-\$11.1	-\$14.5	-\$65.7
Arkansas	-\$5.6	-\$7.4	-\$33.4
California	-\$95.7	-\$125.0	-\$567.9
Colorado	-\$7.8	-\$10.2	-\$46.5
Connecticut	-\$8.5	-\$11.2	-\$50.7
Delaware	-\$1.5	-\$1.9	-\$8.8
District of Columbia	-\$3.8	-\$5.0	-\$22.6
Florida	-\$33.0	-\$43.1	-\$195.7
Georgia	-\$16.9	-\$22.1	-\$100.2
Hawaii	-\$3.1	-\$4.1	-\$18.5
Idaho	-\$2.5	-\$3.3	-\$14.8
Illinois	-\$35.9	-\$46.9	-\$213.1
Indiana	-\$14.4	-\$18.8	-\$85.3
Iowa	-\$8.4	-\$11.0	-\$50.0
Kansas	-\$5.7	-\$7.5	-\$33.9
Kentucky	-\$9.3	-\$12.2	-\$55.4
Louisiana	-\$12.7	-\$16.6	-\$75.5
Maine	-\$4.0	-\$5.3	-\$24.0
Maryland	-\$11.4	-\$14.9	-\$67.6
Massachusetts	-\$22.5	-\$29.3	-\$133.4
Michigan	-\$27.0	-\$35.2	-\$160.1
Minnesota	-\$11.9	-\$15.5	-\$70.6
Mississippi	-\$7.2	-\$9.4	-\$42.7
Missouri	-\$13.8	-\$18.0	-\$81.9
Montana	-\$1.9	-\$2.5	-\$11.2
Nebraska	-\$4.0	-\$5.2	-\$23.6
Nevada	-\$4.1	-\$5.4	-\$24.6
New Hampshire	-\$2.7	-\$3.5	-\$16.1
New Jersey	-\$20.7	-\$27.0	-\$122.7
New Mexico	-\$4.3	-\$5.6	-\$25.6
New York	-\$71.5	-\$93.5	-\$424.7
North Carolina	-\$14.6	-\$19.0	-\$86.5
North Dakota	-\$1.3	-\$1.7	-\$7.7
Ohio	-\$33.2	-\$43.3	-\$196.9
Oklahoma	-\$6.2	-\$8.1	-\$36.8
Oregon	-\$7.5	-\$9.8	-\$44.5
Pennsylvania	-\$45.4	-\$59.4	-\$269.8
Rhode Island	-\$3.5	-\$4.6	-\$20.8
South Carolina	-\$8.0	-\$10.4	-\$47.2
South Dakota	-\$1.6	-\$2.1	-\$9.7
Tennessee	-\$10.2	-\$13.4	-\$60.8
Texas	-\$52.2	-\$68.2	-\$310.1
Utah	-\$4.2	-\$5.5	-\$25.0
Vermont	-\$1.7	-\$2.2	-\$10.1
Virginia	-\$12.5	-\$16.4	-\$74.4
Washington	-\$12.6	-\$16.4	-\$74.7
West Virginia	-\$5.1	-\$6.7	-\$30.5
Wisconsin	-\$13.7	-\$17.9	-\$81.2
Wyoming	-\$0.9	-\$1.1	-\$5.1

### Technical Notes - Table B9

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant formula grants, which are part of the Community Development Fund account in the Community Development category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 451. CDBG provides funds to state and local governments for a wide range of community and economic development activities, as well as housing-related activities such as rehabilitation of blighted buildings and assistance for the homeless.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume that these grants will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding level as they comprise in 2008 (86 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

The cut to CDBG could be larger than shown here. The President's budget includes a set of "rescissions" (or retroactive cuts) to Economic Development Initiative grants — funding for specified community development activities — in his fiscal year 2008 budget proposal. The fiscal year 2007 continuing resolution, enacted after the President delivered his proposals for 2008, does not include funding for any of these initiatives, however. Thus, if overall funding for the community development category of programs were at the President's requested level, the savings secured from these rescissions would need to come from other programs in this category, including presumably the CDBG formula grants, which constitute a majority of the subfunction. In this analysis, we did not assume that the savings from the rescissions would get taken out of the formula grants.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in CDBG formula would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national CDBG funding in 2008 (not including a funding adjustment related to the Economic Development Initiative), as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. National totals include cuts absorbed by U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Table B10. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
State and Local Law Enforcement Formula Grants**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$937</b>	<b>-\$1,006</b>	<b>-\$4,857</b>
	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$7.5	-\$8.0	-\$38.8
Alaska	-\$1.3	-\$1.4	-\$6.5
Arizona	-\$28.6	-\$30.7	-\$148.0
Arkansas	-\$5.3	-\$5.7	-\$27.6
California	-\$217.7	-\$233.8	-\$1,128.6
Colorado	-\$13.5	-\$14.5	-\$69.8
Connecticut	-\$6.4	-\$6.9	-\$33.3
Delaware	-\$2.7	-\$2.9	-\$14.2
District of Columbia	-\$3.1	-\$3.4	-\$16.3
Florida	-\$53.0	-\$56.9	-\$274.5
Georgia	-\$15.9	-\$17.1	-\$82.6
Hawaii	-\$2.9	-\$3.1	-\$14.9
Idaho	-\$3.5	-\$3.8	-\$18.2
Illinois	-\$31.7	-\$34.0	-\$164.1
Indiana	-\$9.5	-\$10.3	-\$49.5
Iowa	-\$5.2	-\$5.6	-\$26.9
Kansas	-\$5.6	-\$6.0	-\$29.1
Kentucky	-\$6.1	-\$6.6	-\$31.8
Louisiana	-\$9.1	-\$9.8	-\$47.1
Maine	-\$2.5	-\$2.7	-\$12.9
Maryland	-\$14.1	-\$15.1	-\$72.9
Massachusetts	-\$20.0	-\$21.5	-\$103.6
Michigan	-\$18.3	-\$19.6	-\$94.7
Minnesota	-\$8.6	-\$9.3	-\$44.7
Mississippi	-\$4.8	-\$5.2	-\$24.9
Missouri	-\$10.3	-\$11.0	-\$53.3
Montana	-\$2.4	-\$2.6	-\$12.4
Nebraska	-\$4.6	-\$4.9	-\$23.6
Nevada	-\$10.6	-\$11.4	-\$54.9
New Hampshire	-\$2.7	-\$2.9	-\$14.0
New Jersey	-\$20.5	-\$22.0	-\$106.3
New Mexico	-\$6.0	-\$6.5	-\$31.2
New York	-\$85.6	-\$91.9	-\$443.8
North Carolina	-\$18.1	-\$19.4	-\$93.7
North Dakota	-\$1.3	-\$1.4	-\$6.6
Ohio	-\$16.4	-\$17.6	-\$84.8
Oklahoma	-\$7.4	-\$7.9	-\$38.3
Oregon	-\$11.3	-\$12.1	-\$58.4
Pennsylvania	-\$19.4	-\$20.9	-\$100.7
Rhode Island	-\$3.6	-\$3.9	-\$18.7
South Carolina	-\$9.5	-\$10.2	-\$49.4
South Dakota	-\$1.3	-\$1.4	-\$6.9
Tennessee	-\$12.2	-\$13.1	-\$63.4
Texas	-\$70.5	-\$75.7	-\$365.4
Utah	-\$5.5	-\$5.9	-\$28.3
Vermont	-\$1.2	-\$1.3	-\$6.5
Virginia	-\$13.1	-\$14.1	-\$68.0
Washington	-\$13.5	-\$14.5	-\$70.0
West Virginia	-\$3.2	-\$3.5	-\$16.8
Wisconsin	-\$9.5	-\$10.2	-\$49.3
Wyoming	-\$1.3	-\$1.4	-\$6.9

### **Technical Notes - Table B10**

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Justice's justice assistance grants and state criminal alien assistance program, which are part of the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance account in the Criminal Justice Assistance category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 754.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2007 funding level adjusted for inflation. Because the President proposes to eliminate these grants in 2008, we assume they would remain zeroed out in years 2009 through 2012 under the President's budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in these formula grants would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of national funding in the latest available year, according to an agency website. National totals include cuts absorbed by U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately. We also assume that a small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by federal agencies or non-formula grants, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

**Table B11. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Commodity Supplemental Food Program**

	<b>Elderly Recipients Losing CSFP Food Assistance in 2008</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-440,000</b>
	<b>-100%</b>
Alabama	—
Alaska	-2,200
Arizona	-14,100
Arkansas	—
California	-51,700
Colorado	-12,200
Connecticut	—
Delaware	—
District of Columbia	-7,100
Florida	—
Georgia	—
Hawaii	—
Idaho	—
Illinois	-13,500
Indiana	-4,500
Iowa	-3,600
Kansas	-5,500
Kentucky	-16,200
Louisiana	-50,000
Maine	—
Maryland	—
Massachusetts	—
Michigan	-73,900
Minnesota	-13,500*
Mississippi	-7,000
Missouri	-10,100
Montana	-7,000
Nebraska	-12,400
Nevada	-5,500
New Hampshire	-5,600
New Jersey	—
New Mexico	-16,400
New York	-28,300
North Carolina	-1,300
North Dakota	-3,000
Ohio	-13,000
Oklahoma	—
Oregon	-1,500
Pennsylvania	-15,400
Rhode Island	—
South Carolina	-3,800
South Dakota	-3,400*
Tennessee	-13,600
Texas	-13,200
Utah	—
Vermont	-4,100
Virginia	—
Washington	-2,100
West Virginia	—
Wisconsin	-5,300
Wyoming	—



### Technical Notes - Table B11

— State has no program.

This table shows projected cuts in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), which is part of the Department of Agriculture's Commodity Assistance Program account in the Food and Nutrition category of the federal budget, known technically as budget subfunction 605. CSFP provides monthly nutritious food packages primarily to low-income seniors aged 60 and older in 32 states, the District of Columbia, and two Indian reservations.

The President's budget proposes to eliminate funding for CSFP. This step would terminate CSFP food assistance for the 440,000 low-income seniors who USDA estimates receive CSFP in 2007. (CSFP also provides food packages to low-income pregnant and post-partum women, infants, and children up to age 6. The President's budget assumes that some of these families will continue to receive food assistance from WIC.)

To project the number of seniors receiving CSFP assistance by state — and hence the number losing assistance if the program is eliminated — this analysis assumed that each state contains the same percentage of elderly participants as it had in 2006. This may underestimate somewhat the number of participants in Louisiana, which is still rebounding from lower participation in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Louisiana served about 80,000 low-income seniors prior to the hurricane. Figures for two states (Minnesota and South Dakota) include cuts to Indian reservations in those states.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

**Table B12. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
WIC - Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children**

(Millions of dollars)

Relative to 2007 level adjusted for inflation

	Increase in 2008	Cut in 2012	Potential loss of participants in 2012	5 year cut (2008-2012)
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>+\$83</b> <b>+1.6%</b>	<b>-\$235</b> <b>-4.1%</b>	<b>-334,000</b> <b>-4.1%</b>	<b>-\$631</b> <b>-2.3%</b>
Alabama	+\$1.4	-\$3.9	-5,000	-\$10.4
Alaska	+\$0.4	-\$1.0	-1,000	-\$2.7
Arizona	+\$1.5	-\$4.2	-7,300	-\$11.3
Arkansas	+\$0.9	-\$2.5	-3,600	-\$6.6
California	+\$13.8	-\$39.2	-55,600	-\$105.4
Colorado	+\$0.8	-\$2.4	-3,600	-\$6.4
Connecticut	+\$0.6	-\$1.6	-2,100	-\$4.4
Delaware	+\$0.2	-\$0.5	-800	-\$1.5
District of Columbia	+\$0.2	-\$0.6	-600	-\$1.5
Florida	+\$3.9	-\$11.1	-15,800	-\$29.9
Georgia	+\$2.7	-\$7.7	-11,400	-\$20.6
Hawaii	+\$0.5	-\$1.3	-1,300	-\$3.5
Idaho	+\$0.3	-\$0.9	-1,500	-\$2.5
Illinois	+\$3.0	-\$8.5	-11,400	-\$22.8
Indiana	+\$1.2	-\$3.5	-5,700	-\$9.4
Iowa	+\$0.6	-\$1.7	-2,700	-\$4.7
Kansas	+\$0.6	-\$1.7	-2,900	-\$4.5
Kentucky	+\$1.3	-\$3.7	-5,200	-\$9.9
Louisiana	+\$1.6	-\$4.4	-5,100	-\$11.9
Maine	+\$0.2	-\$0.7	-1,000	-\$1.8
Maryland	+\$1.1	-\$3.0	-4,800	-\$8.2
Massachusetts	+\$1.2	-\$3.3	-4,800	-\$9.0
Michigan	+\$2.3	-\$6.4	-9,500	-\$17.3
Minnesota	+\$1.2	-\$3.4	-5,300	-\$9.2
Mississippi	+\$1.0	-\$3.0	-4,000	-\$8.0
Missouri	+\$1.2	-\$3.5	-5,500	-\$9.5
Montana	+\$0.2	-\$0.6	-800	-\$1.5
Nebraska	+\$0.4	-\$1.1	-1,700	-\$3.0
Nevada	+\$0.4	-\$1.3	-2,100	-\$3.4
New Hampshire	+\$0.2	-\$0.6	-700	-\$1.6
New Jersey	+\$1.5	-\$4.3	-6,200	-\$11.7
New Mexico	+\$0.6	-\$1.7	-2,700	-\$4.5
New York	+\$5.4	-\$15.4	-19,900	-\$41.4
North Carolina	+\$2.3	-\$6.5	-9,600	-\$17.4
North Dakota	+\$0.1	-\$0.4	-600	-\$1.1
Ohio	+\$2.6	-\$7.3	-11,400	-\$19.6
Oklahoma	+\$0.9	-\$2.5	-4,900	-\$6.7
Oregon	+\$1.0	-\$2.8	-4,200	-\$7.6
Pennsylvania	+\$2.2	-\$6.2	-10,000	-\$16.8
Rhode Island	+\$0.3	-\$0.7	-900	-\$1.9
South Carolina	+\$1.1	-\$3.2	-4,500	-\$8.6
South Dakota	+\$0.2	-\$0.5	-900	-\$1.4
Tennessee	+\$1.7	-\$4.8	-6,500	-\$12.8
Texas	+\$7.7	-\$21.9	-36,600	-\$58.9
Utah	+\$0.5	-\$1.5	-2,700	-\$4.1
Vermont	+\$0.2	-\$0.5	-700	-\$1.4
Virginia	+\$1.5	-\$4.2	-5,800	-\$11.2
Washington	+\$1.7	-\$4.9	-6,600	-\$13.2
West Virginia	+\$0.5	-\$1.4	-2,100	-\$3.8
Wisconsin	+\$1.1	-\$3.2	-4,600	-\$8.5
Wyoming	+\$0.1	-\$0.3	-500	-\$0.8

### Technical Notes - Table B12

This table shows projected cuts to the Department of Agriculture's WIC account, in the Food and Nutrition Assistance category of the budget, known technically as subfunction 605.

Total national funding cuts are measured relative to the 2007 funding level adjusted for inflation. For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume that the program will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding level as it comprises in 2008 (93 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of WIC funding in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a given state is projected to receive 3 percent of the total program funding for 2008, the analysis assumes that the state would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account.

The table also illustrates the loss in the number of women, infants, and children who could receive WIC benefits if the cut in 2012 were achieved by reducing the number of individuals receiving assistance. This analysis assumes that the participation cuts would be apportioned to each state in proportion to each state's share of the total number of WIC participants in 2006. The estimate assumes that WIC participation is reduced by 4.1 percent in 2012 to comport with the 4.1 percent funding cut projected for WIC under the President's budget.

National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

**Table B13. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)  
(Millions of dollars)**

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$500</b>
	<b>-29.4%</b>
Alabama	-\$7.7
Alaska	-\$1.1
Arizona	-\$9.5
Arkansas	-\$4.7
California	-\$60.7
Colorado	-\$7.8
Connecticut	-\$6.0
Delaware	-\$1.4
District of Columbia	-\$1.0
Florida	-\$29.1
Georgia	-\$14.8
Hawaii	-\$2.2
Idaho	-\$2.3
Illinois	-\$21.6
Indiana	-\$10.6
Iowa	-\$5.0
Kansas	-\$4.7
Kentucky	-\$7.0
Louisiana	-\$7.7
Maine	-\$2.2
Maryland	-\$9.4
Massachusetts	-\$11.0
Michigan	-\$17.2
Minnesota	-\$8.7
Mississippi	-\$4.9
Missouri	-\$9.8
Montana	-\$1.6
Nebraska	-\$3.0
Nevada	-\$3.8
New Hampshire	-\$2.2
New Jersey	-\$14.8
New Mexico	-\$3.2
New York	-\$32.8
North Carolina	-\$14.4
North Dakota	-\$1.1
Ohio	-\$19.6
Oklahoma	-\$6.0
Oregon	-\$6.1
Pennsylvania	-\$21.1
Rhode Island	-\$1.8
South Carolina	-\$7.1
South Dakota	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$10.0
Texas	-\$37.8
Utah	-\$4.0
Vermont	-\$1.1
Virginia	-\$12.6
Washington	-\$10.5
West Virginia	-\$3.1
Wisconsin	-\$9.4
Wyoming	-\$0.9

**Table B13. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan**  
**Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)**  
(Millions of dollars)

	<b>Cut in 2008</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$500</b>
	<b>-29.4%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.01
Guam	-\$0.09
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.02
Puerto Rico	-\$2.59
Virgin Islands	-\$0.09

**Technical Notes - Table B13**

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Health and Human Services' Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), which is in the Social Services category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 506. SSBG provides funding to states for a broad range of social services, including services for people with disabilities, abused and neglected children, and seniors.

The President's budget would cut SSBG by \$500 million — 29 percent — in fiscal year 2008. These cuts in 2008 are measured relative to the 2007 SSBG funding level not adjusted for inflation. Under budgeting rules followed by both the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office, mandatory programs are assumed to be funded at the levels provided for in the statutes that authorize the programs. In the case of a mandatory block grant, this means that the "baseline" funding level for the program is the funding level written into the statute. SSBG is funded on the mandatory side of the budget, but under the President's budget proposal this cut would count as a one-time reduction in discretionary funding. We do not examine cuts in years other than 2008 because this is an analysis of discretionary cuts and the changes to SSBG in later years would count as mandatory and not discretionary changes.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in SSBG in 2008 would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of funding in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. We assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

**Table C1. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Elementary and Secondary Education**  
(Millions of dollars)

U.S. Total	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2003) adjusted for inflation	
	Increase in 2008	Increase in 2012	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
	+\$6,386 +23.5%	+\$4,852 +16.6%	-\$3,978 -10.6%	-\$6,278 -15.6%
Alabama	+\$93.0	+\$71.1	-\$58.3	-\$91.4
Alaska	+\$21.7	+\$10.9	-\$29.2	-\$43.7
Arizona	+\$123.4	+\$89.2	-\$76.9	-\$126.0
Arkansas	+\$58.4	+\$44.6	-\$37.7	-\$58.6
California	+\$772.3	+\$602.3	-\$388.8	-\$644.6
Colorado	+\$68.8	+\$51.9	-\$42.2	-\$67.3
Connecticut	+\$59.2	+\$45.3	-\$34.1	-\$54.8
Delaware	+\$14.6	+\$10.0	-\$19.0	-\$26.1
District of Columbia	+\$14.6	+\$10.1	-\$18.6	-\$25.6
Florida	+\$310.1	+\$241.4	-\$153.7	-\$256.6
Georgia	+\$187.0	+\$144.5	-\$101.1	-\$164.9
Hawaii	+\$19.8	+\$11.6	-\$24.8	-\$36.3
Idaho	+\$23.1	+\$16.6	-\$20.9	-\$30.7
Illinois	+\$280.4	+\$217.9	-\$145.3	-\$239.2
Indiana	+\$121.1	+\$94.5	-\$58.7	-\$98.6
Iowa	+\$43.7	+\$32.7	-\$30.4	-\$46.8
Kansas	+\$49.4	+\$36.6	-\$32.9	-\$51.7
Kentucky	+\$86.1	+\$65.7	-\$56.3	-\$87.3
Louisiana	+\$117.6	+\$89.3	-\$78.6	-\$121.4
Maine	+\$22.1	+\$15.7	-\$22.6	-\$32.3
Maryland	+\$96.7	+\$74.8	-\$50.8	-\$83.6
Massachusetts	+\$119.3	+\$92.5	-\$60.5	-\$100.6
Michigan	+\$214.1	+\$164.6	-\$127.8	-\$202.5
Minnesota	+\$71.5	+\$53.3	-\$48.0	-\$75.0
Mississippi	+\$72.4	+\$54.4	-\$54.8	-\$82.2
Missouri	+\$104.7	+\$79.2	-\$66.1	-\$104.3
Montana	+\$17.5	+\$9.9	-\$27.8	-\$38.8
Nebraska	+\$30.6	+\$21.8	-\$25.0	-\$37.9
Nevada	+\$37.8	+\$29.1	-\$21.2	-\$34.3
New Hampshire	+\$17.6	+\$12.2	-\$21.0	-\$29.2
New Jersey	+\$146.4	+\$112.6	-\$76.9	-\$127.3
New Mexico	+\$50.9	+\$35.1	-\$38.0	-\$60.4
New York	+\$515.7	+\$402.8	-\$268.0	-\$438.8
North Carolina	+\$155.7	+\$120.2	-\$82.6	-\$135.7
North Dakota	+\$12.8	+\$7.1	-\$22.2	-\$30.4
Ohio	+\$218.3	+\$168.5	-\$123.0	-\$198.0
Oklahoma	+\$65.3	+\$46.9	-\$52.7	-\$79.8
Oregon	+\$64.1	+\$49.4	-\$36.1	-\$58.2
Pennsylvania	+\$237.7	+\$184.3	-\$131.0	-\$211.6
Rhode Island	+\$22.4	+\$16.5	-\$18.8	-\$27.8
South Carolina	+\$91.5	+\$71.0	-\$48.0	-\$78.8
South Dakota	+\$17.2	+\$10.1	-\$23.8	-\$33.9
Tennessee	+\$107.8	+\$83.0	-\$60.6	-\$97.9
Texas	+\$558.8	+\$433.0	-\$291.9	-\$480.6
Utah	+\$39.6	+\$29.7	-\$24.7	-\$39.3
Vermont	+\$11.0	+\$7.0	-\$19.0	-\$25.3
Virginia	+\$119.4	+\$90.4	-\$65.7	-\$108.4
Washington	+\$104.4	+\$78.0	-\$62.5	-\$101.3
West Virginia	+\$37.8	+\$28.0	-\$31.1	-\$46.0
Wisconsin	+\$101.5	+\$77.6	-\$58.9	-\$94.6
Wyoming	+\$11.9	+\$7.3	-\$19.8	-\$26.7

### Technical Notes - Table C1

This table shows projected cuts in K-12 education, which we define as the sum of four major Department of Education spending accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged, Special Education, School Improvement, and Impact Aid. Each of these accounts is in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education category of the budget, known technically as budget subfunction 501.

The Education for the Disadvantaged 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, the Migrant State Agency Program, and the Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program. The Special Education account includes funding for special education grants (K-12), special education preschool grants, and grants for infants and families. The School Improvement 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 low-income communities).

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to these accounts' 2001 and 2003 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2003 is the peak year for K-12 combined education funding since 2001.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume these four accounts will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding level as they comprise in 2008 (88 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in each of the four accounts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding for that account in 2008 as calculated by the U.S. Department of Education. For each of the four accounts, we assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

**Table C2. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan**  
**Vocational and Adult Education**  
(Millions of dollars)

U.S. Total	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2004) adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
	<b>-\$960</b> <b>-44.5%</b>	<b>-\$1,102</b> <b>-47.6%</b>	<b>-\$1,147</b> <b>-48.9%</b>	<b>-\$1,303</b> <b>-51.8%</b>
Alabama	-\$17.2	-\$19.7	-\$20.5	-\$23.3
Alaska	-\$3.6	-\$4.1	-\$4.3	-\$4.8
Arizona	-\$16.4	-\$18.8	-\$19.6	-\$22.2
Arkansas	-\$10.3	-\$11.7	-\$12.2	-\$13.9
California	-\$101.7	-\$118.0	-\$121.9	-\$139.4
Colorado	-\$12.0	-\$13.8	-\$14.3	-\$16.3
Connecticut	-\$7.8	-\$9.0	-\$9.3	-\$10.7
Delaware	-\$3.7	-\$4.2	-\$4.4	-\$5.0
District of Columbia	-\$3.7	-\$4.2	-\$4.4	-\$5.0
Florida	-\$43.5	-\$50.4	-\$52.1	-\$59.6
Georgia	-\$26.9	-\$30.8	-\$32.1	-\$36.4
Hawaii	-\$4.5	-\$5.2	-\$5.4	-\$6.1
Idaho	-\$5.3	-\$6.0	-\$6.3	-\$7.1
Illinois	-\$35.6	-\$41.0	-\$42.6	-\$48.5
Indiana	-\$21.0	-\$24.0	-\$25.1	-\$28.3
Iowa	-\$10.5	-\$11.9	-\$12.5	-\$14.1
Kansas	-\$9.0	-\$10.3	-\$10.8	-\$12.2
Kentucky	-\$16.1	-\$18.4	-\$19.2	-\$21.8
Louisiana	-\$18.8	-\$21.4	-\$22.4	-\$25.3
Maine	-\$4.5	-\$5.1	-\$5.3	-\$6.0
Maryland	-\$13.6	-\$15.7	-\$16.3	-\$18.5
Massachusetts	-\$15.9	-\$18.3	-\$19.0	-\$21.7
Michigan	-\$31.3	-\$35.8	-\$37.3	-\$42.3
Minnesota	-\$14.8	-\$16.8	-\$17.6	-\$19.9
Mississippi	-\$12.0	-\$13.7	-\$14.3	-\$16.2
Missouri	-\$18.7	-\$21.4	-\$22.3	-\$25.3
Montana	-\$4.3	-\$4.8	-\$5.1	-\$5.7
Nebraska	-\$6.0	-\$6.8	-\$7.2	-\$8.1
Nevada	-\$4.8	-\$5.6	-\$5.8	-\$6.7
New Hampshire	-\$4.4	-\$5.1	-\$5.3	-\$6.0
New Jersey	-\$20.0	-\$23.2	-\$23.9	-\$27.4
New Mexico	-\$7.2	-\$8.2	-\$8.6	-\$9.7
New York	-\$48.9	-\$56.8	-\$58.6	-\$67.2
North Carolina	-\$26.1	-\$29.9	-\$31.2	-\$35.4
North Dakota	-\$3.6	-\$4.1	-\$4.3	-\$4.9
Ohio	-\$37.9	-\$43.2	-\$45.2	-\$51.1
Oklahoma	-\$13.4	-\$15.2	-\$15.9	-\$18.0
Oregon	-\$11.1	-\$12.7	-\$13.2	-\$15.0
Pennsylvania	-\$36.7	-\$42.0	-\$43.8	-\$49.7
Rhode Island	-\$4.5	-\$5.2	-\$5.4	-\$6.1
South Carolina	-\$14.9	-\$17.1	-\$17.8	-\$20.2
South Dakota	-\$3.7	-\$4.2	-\$4.4	-\$4.9
Tennessee	-\$19.5	-\$22.3	-\$23.3	-\$26.4
Texas	-\$73.7	-\$84.8	-\$88.1	-\$100.2
Utah	-\$9.9	-\$11.2	-\$11.8	-\$13.3
Vermont	-\$3.6	-\$4.1	-\$4.3	-\$4.8
Virginia	-\$21.1	-\$24.3	-\$25.3	-\$28.7
Washington	-\$17.5	-\$20.0	-\$20.9	-\$23.7
West Virginia	-\$7.5	-\$8.6	-\$9.0	-\$10.2
Wisconsin	-\$17.9	-\$20.3	-\$21.3	-\$24.0
Wyoming	-\$3.6	-\$4.1	-\$4.3	-\$4.8



### Technical Notes - Table C2

The programs included in this analysis fall under the budget account called “Career, Technical, and Adult Education.” The account is part of the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education category of the budget, known technically as budget subfunction 501.

The account includes two large programs — a formula grant program to states for both secondary and post-secondary vocational education (“Career and Technical Education State Grants”) and a formula grant program to states for adult education, including adult and family literacy programs, high school equivalency programs, and English language and civics instruction for immigrants. In addition, the account includes a separate, smaller grant program to states for technical preparation state grants, which we combine with the larger Career and Technical Education State Grants. The account also includes several much smaller programs that do not provide funding directly to states.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2004 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2004 was the peak year of funding for these programs since 2001.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President’s proposals, we assume these four programs will maintain the same share of the subfunction’s overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (3 percent) under the President’s proposed budget. (Note that these programs are part of the same budget subfunction as K-12 education programs. Thus, while these programs comprise a small share of overall funding in this subfunction, they comprise a substantial share — about one-quarter — of the part of the subfunction outside of K-12 education programs.)

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in Career and Technical Education grants would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state’s projected share of national funding from those grants in 2008 as calculated by the U.S. Department of Education.

For both vocational and adult education, we assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

**Table C3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Child Care and Development Block Grant**

(Millions of dollars)

U.S. Total	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2002) adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
	<b>-\$302</b> <b>-12.8%</b>	<b>-\$410</b> <b>-16.2%</b>	<b>-\$383</b> <b>-15.7%</b>	<b>-\$498</b> <b>-19.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$5.9	-\$8.0	-\$7.5	-\$9.7
Alaska	-\$0.6	-\$0.8	-\$0.8	-\$1.0
Arizona	-\$7.4	-\$10.0	-\$9.3	-\$12.1
Arkansas	-\$3.7	-\$5.0	-\$4.7	-\$6.0
California	-\$33.8	-\$45.9	-\$42.9	-\$55.7
Colorado	-\$3.5	-\$4.8	-\$4.4	-\$5.8
Connecticut	-\$2.1	-\$2.9	-\$2.7	-\$3.5
Delaware	-\$0.6	-\$0.9	-\$0.8	-\$1.1
District of Columbia	-\$0.4	-\$0.6	-\$0.6	-\$0.7
Florida	-\$16.7	-\$22.7	-\$21.2	-\$27.5
Georgia	-\$11.4	-\$15.5	-\$14.5	-\$18.8
Hawaii	-\$1.1	-\$1.5	-\$1.4	-\$1.9
Idaho	-\$1.7	-\$2.3	-\$2.2	-\$2.8
Illinois	-\$11.2	-\$15.3	-\$14.2	-\$18.5
Indiana	-\$6.1	-\$8.3	-\$7.7	-\$10.1
Iowa	-\$2.6	-\$3.5	-\$3.3	-\$4.3
Kansas	-\$2.7	-\$3.7	-\$3.5	-\$4.5
Kentucky	-\$5.2	-\$7.0	-\$6.6	-\$8.5
Louisiana	-\$6.7	-\$9.1	-\$8.5	-\$11.1
Maine	-\$1.0	-\$1.3	-\$1.2	-\$1.6
Maryland	-\$3.7	-\$5.1	-\$4.7	-\$6.2
Massachusetts	-\$3.7	-\$5.1	-\$4.8	-\$6.2
Michigan	-\$8.5	-\$11.6	-\$10.8	-\$14.0
Minnesota	-\$3.7	-\$5.1	-\$4.8	-\$6.2
Mississippi	-\$4.7	-\$6.3	-\$5.9	-\$7.7
Missouri	-\$5.7	-\$7.7	-\$7.2	-\$9.3
Montana	-\$0.8	-\$1.1	-\$1.0	-\$1.4
Nebraska	-\$1.7	-\$2.3	-\$2.1	-\$2.8
Nevada	-\$2.1	-\$2.8	-\$2.6	-\$3.4
New Hampshire	-\$0.7	-\$0.9	-\$0.9	-\$1.1
New Jersey	-\$5.4	-\$7.3	-\$6.8	-\$8.9
New Mexico	-\$2.7	-\$3.6	-\$3.4	-\$4.4
New York	-\$15.7	-\$21.4	-\$20.0	-\$26.0
North Carolina	-\$9.7	-\$13.2	-\$12.4	-\$16.1
North Dakota	-\$0.5	-\$0.7	-\$0.7	-\$0.9
Ohio	-\$9.8	-\$13.4	-\$12.5	-\$16.2
Oklahoma	-\$4.5	-\$6.2	-\$5.8	-\$7.5
Oregon	-\$3.3	-\$4.5	-\$4.2	-\$5.4
Pennsylvania	-\$9.2	-\$12.5	-\$11.6	-\$15.1
Rhode Island	-\$0.8	-\$1.1	-\$1.0	-\$1.3
South Carolina	-\$5.4	-\$7.4	-\$6.9	-\$8.9
South Dakota	-\$0.8	-\$1.1	-\$1.0	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$6.5	-\$8.8	-\$8.3	-\$10.7
Texas	-\$31.6	-\$43.0	-\$40.2	-\$52.2
Utah	-\$3.3	-\$4.4	-\$4.2	-\$5.4
Vermont	-\$0.4	-\$0.6	-\$0.5	-\$0.7
Virginia	-\$5.7	-\$7.7	-\$7.2	-\$9.4
Washington	-\$4.8	-\$6.6	-\$6.1	-\$8.0
West Virginia	-\$2.0	-\$2.7	-\$2.5	-\$3.3
Wisconsin	-\$4.3	-\$5.9	-\$5.5	-\$7.2
Wyoming	-\$0.4	-\$0.5	-\$0.5	-\$0.7

**Table C3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Child Care and Development Block Grant**

(Millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2002) adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
	<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$302</b> <b>-12.8%</b>	<b>-\$410</b> <b>-16.2%</b>	<b>-\$383</b> <b>-15.7%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.39	-\$0.53	-\$0.50	-\$0.65
Guam	-\$0.59	-\$0.81	-\$0.75	-\$0.98
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.25	-\$0.34	-\$0.32	-\$0.42
Puerto Rico	-\$5.18	-\$7.05	-\$6.58	-\$8.55
Virgin Islands	-\$0.27	-\$0.37	-\$0.34	-\$0.45

**Technical Notes - Table C3**

This table shows projected cuts in federal discretionary funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant account under the Department of Health and Human Services. The account is part of the "Other Income Security" category of the budget, known technically as subfunction 609.

This account does not include the non-discretionary federal child care funding.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2002 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for this program since 2001.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume this program will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as it comprises in 2008 (27 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding for the account overall in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget.

**Table C4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Head Start**

(Millions of dollars)

U.S. Total	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2002) adjusted for inflation		
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	Cut in 2008	Potential loss of slots in 2008	
				Cut in 2012	Cut in 2012
	<b>-\$540</b>	<b>-\$989</b>	<b>-\$826</b>	<b>-98,600</b>	<b>-\$1,296</b>
	<b>-7.4%</b>	<b>-12.6%</b>	<b>-10.8%</b>	<b>-10.8%</b>	<b>-15.8%</b>
Alabama	-\$8.4	-\$15.4	-\$12.8	-1,800	-\$20.1
Alaska	-\$1.0	-\$1.8	-\$1.5	-200	-\$2.4
Arizona	-\$8.2	-\$14.9	-\$12.5	-1,400	-\$19.5
Arkansas	-\$5.1	-\$9.3	-\$7.8	-1,200	-\$12.2
California	-\$65.5	-\$119.9	-\$100.1	-10,700	-\$157.1
Colorado	-\$5.4	-\$9.9	-\$8.2	-1,100	-\$12.9
Connecticut	-\$4.1	-\$7.5	-\$6.2	-800	-\$9.8
Delaware	-\$1.0	-\$1.9	-\$1.6	-200	-\$2.5
District of Columbia	-\$2.0	-\$3.6	-\$3.0	-400	-\$4.7
Florida	-\$20.7	-\$37.9	-\$31.7	-3,900	-\$49.7
Georgia	-\$13.3	-\$24.3	-\$20.3	-2,500	-\$31.8
Hawaii	-\$1.8	-\$3.3	-\$2.8	-300	-\$4.3
Idaho	-\$1.8	-\$3.3	-\$2.7	-300	-\$4.3
Illinois	-\$21.3	-\$39.0	-\$32.6	-4,300	-\$51.1
Indiana	-\$7.6	-\$13.9	-\$11.6	-1,500	-\$18.2
Iowa	-\$4.1	-\$7.4	-\$6.2	-800	-\$9.7
Kansas	-\$4.0	-\$7.3	-\$6.1	-900	-\$9.6
Kentucky	-\$8.5	-\$15.5	-\$13.0	-1,700	-\$20.4
Louisiana	-\$11.5	-\$21.0	-\$17.6	-2,400	-\$27.6
Maine	-\$2.2	-\$4.0	-\$3.3	-400	-\$5.2
Maryland	-\$6.1	-\$11.3	-\$9.4	-1,100	-\$14.7
Massachusetts	-\$8.5	-\$15.6	-\$13.0	-1,400	-\$20.5
Michigan	-\$18.5	-\$33.8	-\$28.2	-3,800	-\$44.3
Minnesota	-\$5.7	-\$10.4	-\$8.7	-1,100	-\$13.6
Mississippi	-\$12.7	-\$23.3	-\$19.5	-2,900	-\$30.5
Missouri	-\$9.4	-\$17.2	-\$14.3	-1,900	-\$22.5
Montana	-\$1.6	-\$3.0	-\$2.5	-300	-\$4.0
Nebraska	-\$2.8	-\$5.2	-\$4.3	-600	-\$6.8
Nevada	-\$1.9	-\$3.5	-\$2.9	-300	-\$4.6
New Hampshire	-\$1.1	-\$1.9	-\$1.6	-200	-\$2.5
New Jersey	-\$10.2	-\$18.6	-\$15.5	-1,600	-\$24.4
New Mexico	-\$4.1	-\$7.5	-\$6.3	-800	-\$9.9
New York	-\$34.1	-\$62.5	-\$52.1	-5,300	-\$81.8
North Carolina	-\$11.1	-\$20.4	-\$17.0	-2,100	-\$26.7
North Dakota	-\$1.4	-\$2.5	-\$2.1	-300	-\$3.2
Ohio	-\$19.4	-\$35.6	-\$29.7	-4,100	-\$46.6
Oklahoma	-\$6.4	-\$11.7	-\$9.8	-1,500	-\$15.3
Oregon	-\$4.7	-\$8.6	-\$7.2	-1,000	-\$11.2
Pennsylvania	-\$18.0	-\$32.9	-\$27.5	-3,800	-\$43.1
Rhode Island	-\$1.7	-\$3.2	-\$2.6	-300	-\$4.2
South Carolina	-\$6.5	-\$11.9	-\$9.9	-1,300	-\$15.6
South Dakota	-\$1.5	-\$2.7	-\$2.3	-300	-\$3.6
Tennessee	-\$9.4	-\$17.2	-\$14.4	-1,800	-\$22.5
Texas	-\$37.7	-\$69.0	-\$57.6	-7,400	-\$90.4
Utah	-\$3.0	-\$5.4	-\$4.5	-600	-\$7.1
Vermont	-\$1.1	-\$2.0	-\$1.6	-200	-\$2.6
Virginia	-\$7.8	-\$14.3	-\$11.9	-1,500	-\$18.7
Washington	-\$7.9	-\$14.5	-\$12.1	-1,200	-\$19.0
West Virginia	-\$4.0	-\$7.3	-\$6.1	-800	-\$9.6
Wisconsin	-\$7.2	-\$13.1	-\$10.9	-1,500	-\$17.2
Wyoming	-\$1.0	-\$1.8	-\$1.5	-200	-\$2.3

**Table C4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Head Start**

(Millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2002) adjusted for inflation		
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	Cut in 2008	Potential loss of slots in 2008	Cut in 2012
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$540</b> <b>-7.4%</b>	<b>-\$989</b> <b>-12.6%</b>	<b>-\$826</b> <b>-10.8%</b>	<b>-98,600</b> <b>-10.8%</b>	<b>-\$1,296</b> <b>-15.8%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.17	-\$0.31	-\$0.26	-170	-\$0.41
Guam	-\$0.17	-\$0.31	-\$0.26	-50	-\$0.41
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.13	-\$0.24	-\$0.20	-60	-\$0.31
Puerto Rico	-\$19.64	-\$35.95	-\$30.00	-4,000	-\$47.09
Virgin Islands	-\$0.63	-\$1.15	-\$0.96	-100	-\$1.51

**Technical Notes - Table C4**

This table shows projected cuts in Head Start. Head Start is part of the Department of Health and Human Services' Children and Families Services account, and is in the Social Services category of the budget, known technically as budget subfunction 506.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2002 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for Head Start since 2001.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume this program will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as it comprises in 2008 (63 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in Head Start would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national Head Start funding in 2008 as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

The table also illustrates the magnitude of the inflation-adjusted funding losses from 2002 to 2008 in terms of children potentially eliminated from Head Start. Head Start programs have a number of ways they can respond to funding losses: reduce the number of children served, raise additional funds elsewhere, or make cuts in the program — such as cutting back on teacher salaries, classroom materials, educational activities, or specialized health and developmental. If Head Start programs were to expend the same amount of federal funding per child in 2008 as they did in 2002, adjusted for inflation, they would have to serve 98,600 fewer children in 2008 than they would otherwise. This analysis assumes that the participation cuts would be apportioned to each state in proportion to its share of the total number of Head Start slots in 2006. Looked at another way, the estimate assumes that, in each state, Head Start enrollment would decline by 10.8 percent in 2008 to comport with the 10.8 percent loss in inflation-adjusted funding since 2002.

**Table C5. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water State Revolving Funds  
(Millions of dollars)**

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$1,036</b> <b>-40.4%</b>	<b>-\$1,201</b> <b>-43.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$11.9	-\$13.8
Alaska	-\$6.4	-\$7.4
Arizona	-\$7.2	-\$8.3
Arkansas	-\$7.0	-\$8.1
California	-\$76.2	-\$88.4
Colorado	-\$8.5	-\$9.9
Connecticut	-\$13.1	-\$15.1
Delaware	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
District of Columbia	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
Florida	-\$36.0	-\$41.7
Georgia	-\$18.0	-\$20.9
Hawaii	-\$8.3	-\$9.6
Idaho	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
Illinois	-\$48.2	-\$55.9
Indiana	-\$25.7	-\$29.8
Iowa	-\$14.4	-\$16.7
Kansas	-\$9.6	-\$11.2
Kentucky	-\$13.6	-\$15.7
Louisiana	-\$11.7	-\$13.6
Maine	-\$8.2	-\$9.6
Maryland	-\$25.8	-\$29.9
Massachusetts	-\$36.2	-\$42.0
Michigan	-\$45.8	-\$53.1
Minnesota	-\$19.6	-\$22.7
Mississippi	-\$9.6	-\$11.1
Missouri	-\$29.5	-\$34.3
Montana	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
Nebraska	-\$5.4	-\$6.3
Nevada	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
New Hampshire	-\$10.6	-\$12.4
New Jersey	-\$43.5	-\$50.5
New Mexico	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
New York	-\$117.6	-\$136.4
North Carolina	-\$19.2	-\$22.3
North Dakota	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
Ohio	-\$60.0	-\$69.6
Oklahoma	-\$8.6	-\$10.0
Oregon	-\$12.0	-\$14.0
Pennsylvania	-\$42.2	-\$49.0
Rhode Island	-\$7.2	-\$8.3
South Carolina	-\$10.9	-\$12.7
South Dakota	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
Tennessee	-\$15.5	-\$18.0
Texas	-\$48.7	-\$56.5
Utah	-\$5.6	-\$6.5
Vermont	-\$5.2	-\$6.1
Virginia	-\$21.8	-\$25.3
Washington	-\$18.5	-\$21.5
West Virginia	-\$16.6	-\$19.3
Wisconsin	-\$28.8	-\$33.4
Wyoming	-\$5.2	-\$6.1

### Technical Notes - Table C5

The Environmental Protection Agency's clean water and drinking water state revolving funds are part of EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grants in the Pollution Control and Abatement category of the budget, known technically as subfunction 304. The state revolving funds provide federal funding to states for wastewater treatment facilities, improvements to drinking water infrastructure, and water quality improvement projects.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 funding level adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for these loan funds in recent years.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume these programs will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (21 percent).

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funds under the statutory allocation formula normally used to allocate these revolving funds.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**3/1/2007**

**Table C6. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance  
(Millions of dollars)**

Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation

U.S. Total	Potential loss of		
	Cut in 2008	participants in 2008	Cut in 2012
	<b>-\$582</b>	<b>-1,263,200</b>	<b>-\$699</b>
	<b>-24.6%</b>	<b>-24.6%</b>	<b>-27.5%</b>
Alabama	-\$4.7	-12,100	-\$5.7
Alaska	-\$3.6	-2,200	-\$4.1
Arizona	-\$1.9	-4,600	-\$2.3
Arkansas	-\$3.2	-14,200	-\$3.9
California	-\$18.7	-39,100	-\$23.5
Colorado	-\$6.8	-23,700	-\$8.5
Connecticut	-\$16.9	-15,400	-\$19.7
Delaware	-\$2.1	-3,200	-\$2.5
District of Columbia	-\$1.4	-5,500	-\$1.7
Florida	-\$6.8	-11,200	-\$8.3
Georgia	-\$5.9	-21,400	-\$7.2
Hawaii	-\$0.6	-1,600	-\$0.7
Idaho	-\$3.1	-8,000	-\$3.7
Illinois	-\$25.3	-76,300	-\$31.5
Indiana	-\$12.6	-32,700	-\$15.5
Iowa	-\$10.1	-21,100	-\$12.3
Kansas	-\$3.9	-10,400	-\$4.8
Kentucky	-\$6.8	-26,200	-\$8.3
Louisiana	-\$3.9	-8,800	-\$4.9
Maine	-\$13.1	-11,100	-\$15.0
Maryland	-\$10.2	-20,400	-\$12.1
Massachusetts	-\$30.4	-33,200	-\$35.7
Michigan	-\$27.3	-108,700	-\$33.4
Minnesota	-\$23.7	-29,000	-\$28.3
Mississippi	-\$4.6	-15,200	-\$5.4
Missouri	-\$12.1	-27,900	-\$14.8
Montana	-\$3.5	-5,000	-\$4.3
Nebraska	-\$4.8	-8,000	-\$5.9
Nevada	-\$0.7	-4,300	-\$0.9
New Hampshire	-\$7.2	-7,400	-\$8.3
New Jersey	-\$26.1	-38,400	-\$30.9
New Mexico	-\$2.5	-13,700	-\$3.0
New York	-\$91.8	-202,400	-\$107.9
North Carolina	-\$13.5	-52,200	-\$15.9
North Dakota	-\$4.8	-3,800	-\$5.6
Ohio	-\$24.2	-75,100	-\$29.8
Oklahoma	-\$3.7	-22,900	-\$4.5
Oregon	-\$5.7	-14,400	-\$7.1
Pennsylvania	-\$42.6	-80,600	-\$50.8
Rhode Island	-\$4.9	-6,600	-\$5.8
South Carolina	-\$4.5	-5,200	-\$5.3
South Dakota	-\$4.2	-4,500	-\$4.9
Tennessee	-\$6.4	-14,700	-\$7.9
Texas	-\$10.8	-11,000	-\$13.3
Utah	-\$3.3	-8,500	-\$4.1
Vermont	-\$5.6	-4,800	-\$6.5
Virginia	-\$12.4	-25,000	-\$14.8
Washington	-\$9.0	-17,700	-\$11.2
West Virginia	-\$4.4	-17,800	-\$5.4
Wisconsin	-\$20.9	-33,900	-\$25.1
Wyoming	-\$1.3	-2,400	-\$1.6



### Technical Notes - Table C6

This table shows projected cuts in the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is part of the "Other Income Security" category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 609. The LIHEAP account consists of a formula grant program and a much smaller contingency fund.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2002 funding level adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for LIHEAP in recent years.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume these funds will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (24 percent).

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in LIHEAP formula grants would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of the statutory allocation formula normally used to distribute the funds. Separately, the analysis assumes that any proposed cuts (or increases) in LIHEAP contingency funds would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of actual contingency funding according to data from 2005, the most recent available year, not including grants related to Hurricane Katrina.

The table also illustrates the magnitude of the inflation-adjusted funding losses from 2001 to 2008 in terms of households potentially eliminated from LIHEAP. LIHEAP programs have a number of ways they can respond to funding losses, including reducing the number of households assisted or reducing the amount of assistance provided per household. If states were to expend the same amount of federal funding per household in 2008 as they did in 2001, adjusted for inflation, they would have to serve nearly 1.3 million fewer households in 2008. This analysis assumes that the participation reductions would be apportioned to each state in proportion to each state's share of the total number of LIHEAP households assisted in 2005, based on data from the National Energy Assistance Directors Association. (The latest available LIHEAP participation estimates are for 2006; however, we used participant data for 2005 because of the large effects of Hurricane Katrina on the distribution of LIHEAP assistance in 2006.) Looked at another way, the estimate assumes that, in each state, LIHEAP assistance would decline by 24.6 percent in 2008 to comport with the 24.6 percent loss in funding since 2001.

**Table C7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)**  
(Millions of dollars)

U.S. Total	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2002) adjusted for inflation	
	Cut In 2008	Cut In 2012	Cut In 2008	Cut In 2012
	<b>-\$707</b> -100.0%	<b>-\$760</b> -100.0%	<b>-\$756</b> -100.0%	<b>-\$813</b> -100.0%
Alabama	-\$12.9	-\$13.9	-\$13.8	-\$14.8
Alaska	-\$2.6	-\$2.8	-\$2.8	-\$3.0
Arizona	-\$5.8	-\$6.3	-\$6.2	-\$6.7
Arkansas	-\$9.6	-\$10.3	-\$10.2	-\$11.0
California	-\$62.8	-\$67.4	-\$67.1	-\$72.1
Colorado	-\$6.1	-\$6.6	-\$6.5	-\$7.0
Connecticut	-\$8.5	-\$9.1	-\$9.1	-\$9.8
Delaware	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
District of Columbia	-\$11.6	-\$12.4	-\$12.4	-\$13.3
Florida	-\$20.5	-\$22.0	-\$21.9	-\$23.5
Georgia	-\$18.9	-\$20.3	-\$20.2	-\$21.8
Hawaii	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
Idaho	-\$3.7	-\$3.9	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
Illinois	-\$33.2	-\$35.7	-\$35.6	-\$38.2
Indiana	-\$10.2	-\$11.0	-\$11.0	-\$11.8
Iowa	-\$7.6	-\$8.2	-\$8.1	-\$8.8
Kansas	-\$5.7	-\$6.2	-\$6.1	-\$6.6
Kentucky	-\$11.9	-\$12.8	-\$12.7	-\$13.6
Louisiana	-\$16.5	-\$17.8	-\$17.7	-\$19.0
Maine	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
Maryland	-\$9.7	-\$10.4	-\$10.3	-\$11.1
Massachusetts	-\$17.5	-\$18.9	-\$18.8	-\$20.2
Michigan	-\$26.0	-\$27.9	-\$27.8	-\$29.9
Minnesota	-\$8.5	-\$9.1	-\$9.1	-\$9.7
Mississippi	-\$11.2	-\$12.0	-\$12.0	-\$12.9
Missouri	-\$19.5	-\$20.9	-\$20.8	-\$22.4
Montana	-\$3.4	-\$3.6	-\$3.6	-\$3.9
Nebraska	-\$4.9	-\$5.3	-\$5.2	-\$5.6
Nevada	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
New Hampshire	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
New Jersey	-\$19.3	-\$20.7	-\$20.6	-\$22.1
New Mexico	-\$4.0	-\$4.3	-\$4.3	-\$4.6
New York	-\$61.1	-\$65.6	-\$65.3	-\$70.2
North Carolina	-\$18.5	-\$19.9	-\$19.8	-\$21.2
North Dakota	-\$3.4	-\$3.7	-\$3.6	-\$3.9
Ohio	-\$27.4	-\$29.5	-\$29.3	-\$31.5
Oklahoma	-\$8.3	-\$9.0	-\$8.9	-\$9.6
Oregon	-\$5.6	-\$6.0	-\$6.0	-\$6.5
Pennsylvania	-\$29.8	-\$32.0	-\$31.9	-\$34.2
Rhode Island	-\$3.9	-\$4.2	-\$4.2	-\$4.5
South Carolina	-\$10.8	-\$11.6	-\$11.6	-\$12.4
South Dakota	-\$3.0	-\$3.2	-\$3.2	-\$3.5
Tennessee	-\$13.9	-\$14.9	-\$14.8	-\$15.9
Texas	-\$33.9	-\$36.4	-\$36.2	-\$39.0
Utah	-\$3.6	-\$3.9	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
Vermont	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
Virginia	-\$11.3	-\$12.1	-\$12.1	-\$13.0
Washington	-\$8.3	-\$8.9	-\$8.9	-\$9.6
West Virginia	-\$7.9	-\$8.5	-\$8.4	-\$9.1
Wisconsin	-\$8.6	-\$9.2	-\$9.2	-\$9.8
Wyoming	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.0	-\$4.3

**Table C7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)**  
(Millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation		Relative to peak level (2002) adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$707</b> <b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-\$760</b> <b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-\$756</b> <b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-\$813</b> <b>-100.0%</b>
American Samoa	-\$0.97	-\$1.04	-\$1.04	-\$1.11
Guam	-\$0.92	-\$0.99	-\$0.98	-\$1.05
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.57	-\$0.62	-\$0.61	-\$0.66
Puerto Rico	-\$29.65	-\$31.86	-\$31.71	-\$34.08
Virgin Islands	-\$1.27	-\$1.36	-\$1.36	-\$1.46

**Technical Notes - Table C7**

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Health and Human Services' Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), which is in the Social Services category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 506. CSBG funds community action agencies to provide a range of services including child care, before- and after-school care, health care to underserved populations, housing assistance, emergency housing, food assistance, domestic violence-related services, transportation assistance, legal assistance, and specialized services for individuals with disabilities.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2002 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for CSBG since 2001.) Because the President proposes to eliminate CSBG in 2008, we assume CSBG funding would remain zeroed out in years 2009 through 2012 under the President's budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in CSBG would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of the actual funding in 2006, the most recent available year, based on data from the agency website. We assume that a very small share of the total national cut, not shown separately, would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies, in proportion to their share of total projected spending in the account in 2008.

**Table C8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Public Housing Capital Fund**

(Millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$1,513</b> <b>-42.8%</b>	<b>-\$1,664</b> <b>-43.8%</b>
Alabama	-\$46.5	-\$51.1
Alaska	-\$1.7	-\$1.9
Arizona	-\$7.0	-\$7.7
Arkansas	-\$13.8	-\$15.2
California	-\$63.1	-\$69.4
Colorado	-\$9.7	-\$10.7
Connecticut	-\$20.9	-\$23.0
Delaware	-\$3.2	-\$3.6
District of Columbia	-\$20.7	-\$22.8
Florida	-\$51.1	-\$56.2
Georgia	-\$57.1	-\$62.8
Hawaii	-\$8.6	-\$9.5
Idaho	-\$0.7	-\$0.8
Illinois	-\$109.9	-\$120.8
Indiana	-\$20.1	-\$22.1
Iowa	-\$3.7	-\$4.1
Kansas	-\$8.3	-\$9.1
Kentucky	-\$27.7	-\$30.5
Louisiana	-\$53.5	-\$58.8
Maine	-\$4.1	-\$4.5
Maryland	-\$28.9	-\$31.8
Massachusetts	-\$41.9	-\$46.1
Michigan	-\$29.2	-\$32.1
Minnesota	-\$22.2	-\$24.4
Mississippi	-\$20.3	-\$22.3
Missouri	-\$25.0	-\$27.5
Montana	-\$2.1	-\$2.4
Nebraska	-\$6.2	-\$6.9
Nevada	-\$6.8	-\$7.5
New Hampshire	-\$3.7	-\$4.1
New Jersey	-\$52.5	-\$57.7
New Mexico	-\$5.3	-\$5.8
New York	-\$256.0	-\$281.5
North Carolina	-\$40.1	-\$44.0
North Dakota	—*	—*
Ohio	-\$65.1	-\$71.6
Oklahoma	-\$13.5	-\$14.9
Oregon	-\$7.2	-\$7.9
Pennsylvania	-\$105.3	-\$115.8
Rhode Island	-\$9.7	-\$10.6
South Carolina	-\$16.9	-\$18.6
South Dakota	-\$1.3	-\$1.4
Tennessee	-\$41.1	-\$45.2
Texas	-\$61.8	-\$68.0
Utah	-\$2.2	-\$2.5
Vermont	-\$1.8	-\$2.0
Virginia	-\$35.1	-\$38.6
Washington	-\$20.1	-\$22.1
West Virginia	-\$6.7	-\$7.4
Wisconsin	-\$13.5	-\$14.8
Wyoming	-\$0.7	-\$0.7

**Table C8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Public Housing Capital Fund**  
(Millions of dollars)

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$1,513</b> <b>-42.8%</b>	<b>-\$1,664</b> <b>-43.8%</b>
American Samoa	—	—
Guam	-\$1.75	-\$1.92
N. Mariana Islands	—	—
Puerto Rico	-\$88.50	-\$97.30
Virgin Islands	-\$5.22	-\$5.74

**Technical Notes - Table C8**

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Public Housing Capital Fund, which is in the Housing Assistance category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 604.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 funding level adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for CSBG in recent years.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume this program will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as it comprises in 2008 (6 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in CSBG would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national funding in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

\* For the last several years, North Dakota has received a negative funding level from HUD for the Public Housing Capital Fund. This may indicate that the state has been obligated to remit money to HUD for past overcharges. This analysis assumes North Dakota's share of the national cut in the Public Housing Capital Fund is \$0.

**Table C9. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 08 Budget Plan  
Community Development Block Grant  
(Millions of dollars)**

	Relative to 2001 level adjusted for inflation	
	Cut in 2008	Cut in 2012
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$2,225</b> <b>-42.8%</b>	<b>-\$2,577</b> <b>-46.2%</b>
Alabama	-\$27.8	-\$32.2
Alaska	-\$2.7	-\$3.1
Arizona	-\$30.5	-\$35.3
Arkansas	-\$15.5	-\$18.0
California	-\$263.7	-\$305.4
Colorado	-\$21.6	-\$25.0
Connecticut	-\$23.5	-\$27.3
Delaware	-\$4.1	-\$4.7
District of Columbia	-\$10.5	-\$12.1
Florida	-\$90.9	-\$105.2
Georgia	-\$46.5	-\$53.9
Hawaii	-\$8.6	-\$9.9
Idaho	-\$6.9	-\$7.9
Illinois	-\$98.9	-\$114.6
Indiana	-\$39.6	-\$45.9
Iowa	-\$23.2	-\$26.9
Kansas	-\$15.7	-\$18.2
Kentucky	-\$25.7	-\$29.8
Louisiana	-\$35.1	-\$40.6
Maine	-\$11.2	-\$12.9
Maryland	-\$31.4	-\$36.3
Massachusetts	-\$61.9	-\$71.7
Michigan	-\$74.4	-\$86.1
Minnesota	-\$32.8	-\$37.9
Mississippi	-\$19.8	-\$23.0
Missouri	-\$38.0	-\$44.1
Montana	-\$5.2	-\$6.0
Nebraska	-\$10.9	-\$12.7
Nevada	-\$11.4	-\$13.2
New Hampshire	-\$7.5	-\$8.6
New Jersey	-\$57.0	-\$66.0
New Mexico	-\$11.9	-\$13.7
New York	-\$197.2	-\$228.4
North Carolina	-\$40.2	-\$46.5
North Dakota	-\$3.6	-\$4.2
Ohio	-\$91.4	-\$105.9
Oklahoma	-\$17.1	-\$19.8
Oregon	-\$20.7	-\$23.9
Pennsylvania	-\$125.3	-\$145.1
Rhode Island	-\$9.7	-\$11.2
South Carolina	-\$21.9	-\$25.4
South Dakota	-\$4.5	-\$5.2
Tennessee	-\$28.2	-\$32.7
Texas	-\$144.0	-\$166.7
Utah	-\$11.6	-\$13.5
Vermont	-\$4.7	-\$5.5
Virginia	-\$34.6	-\$40.0
Washington	-\$34.7	-\$40.2
West Virginia	-\$14.2	-\$16.4
Wisconsin	-\$37.7	-\$43.7
Wyoming	-\$2.4	-\$2.7

### Technical Notes - Table C9

This table shows projected cuts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant formula grants, which are part of the Community Development Fund account in the Community Development category of the federal budget, known technically as subfunction 451. CDBG provides funds to state and local governments for a wide range of community and economic development activities, as well as housing-related activities such as rehabilitation of blighted buildings and assistance for the homeless.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 funding level adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for CDBG in recent years.) For years 2009 through 2012 of the President's proposals, we assume that these grants will maintain the same share of the subfunction's overall funding as they comprise in 2008 (86 percent) under the President's proposed budget.

The cut to CDBG could be larger than shown here. The President's budget includes a set of "rescissions" (or retroactive cuts) to Economic Development Initiative grants — funding for specified community development activities — in his fiscal year 2008 budget proposal. The fiscal year 2007 continuing resolution, enacted after the President delivered his proposals for 2008, does not include funding for any of these initiatives, however. Thus, if overall funding for the community development category of programs were at the President's requested level, the savings secured from these rescissions would need to come from other programs in this category, including presumably the CDBG formula grants, which constitute a majority of the subfunction. In this analysis, we did not assume that the savings from the rescissions would get taken out of the formula grants.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts in CDBG formula would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's projected share of national CDBG funding in 2008 (not including a funding adjustment related to the Economic Development Initiative), as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.