

Table 1  
**Elementary and Secondary Education**  
 Projected Cuts in 2006  
 (in millions)

State	Total*	Education for the Disadvantaged	Special Education Programs	School Improvement Programs
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$1,271</b> <b>-3.8%</b>	<b>-\$568</b> <b>-3.8%</b>	<b>-\$227</b> <b>-1.9%</b>	<b>-\$422</b> <b>-7.4%</b>
Alabama	-\$19.0	-\$8.6	-\$3.6	-\$6.7
Alaska	-\$9.5	-\$1.7	-\$0.7	-\$2.1
Arizona	-\$29.4	-\$11.1	-\$3.5	-\$7.2
Arkansas	-\$12.3	-\$5.6	-\$2.2	-\$4.4
California	-\$158.3	-\$81.5	-\$24.3	-\$49.0
Colorado	-\$14.0	-\$5.6	-\$3.0	-\$4.6
Connecticut	-\$11.6	-\$4.7	-\$2.6	-\$3.8
Delaware	-\$4.2	-\$1.5	-\$0.7	-\$2.1
District of Columbia	-\$4.6	-\$2.1	-\$0.4	-\$2.1
Florida	-\$58.9	-\$27.2	-\$12.4	-\$18.7
Georgia	-\$36.5	-\$17.6	-\$6.2	-\$11.7
Hawaii	-\$7.4	-\$2.1	-\$0.8	-\$2.1
Idaho	-\$5.7	-\$2.0	-\$1.1	-\$2.2
Illinois	-\$50.7	-\$23.0	-\$10.0	-\$16.7
Indiana	-\$19.1	-\$7.7	-\$5.0	-\$6.4
Iowa	-\$8.6	-\$2.9	-\$2.4	-\$3.3
Kansas	-\$10.4	-\$3.9	-\$2.1	-\$3.4
Kentucky	-\$18.0	-\$8.3	-\$3.2	-\$6.5
Louisiana	-\$25.5	-\$12.1	-\$3.7	-\$9.2
Maine	-\$5.8	-\$2.2	-\$1.1	-\$2.5
Maryland	-\$17.4	-\$7.3	-\$4.0	-\$5.8
Massachusetts	-\$22.7	-\$9.9	-\$5.6	-\$7.2
Michigan	-\$41.1	-\$18.7	-\$7.9	-\$14.3
Minnesota	-\$14.2	-\$4.8	-\$3.8	-\$5.0
Mississippi	-\$16.1	-\$7.4	-\$2.4	-\$6.2
Missouri	-\$21.3	-\$8.6	-\$4.4	-\$7.2
Montana	-\$7.2	-\$1.8	-\$0.7	-\$2.6
Nebraska	-\$7.6	-\$2.4	-\$1.5	-\$2.8
Nevada	-\$6.8	-\$3.0	-\$1.3	-\$2.3
New Hampshire	-\$4.6	-\$1.4	-\$0.9	-\$2.3

## 1. Elementary and Secondary Education (cont'd)

	Total*	Education for the Disadvantaged	Special Education Programs	School Improvement Programs
New Jersey	-\$28.6	-\$11.7	-\$7.1	-\$9.0
New Mexico	-\$14.5	-\$4.8	-\$1.8	-\$3.7
New York	-\$101.3	-\$52.3	-\$15.1	-\$33.1
North Carolina	-\$29.2	-\$12.8	-\$6.2	-\$9.4
North Dakota	-\$5.4	-\$1.4	-\$0.5	-\$2.1
Ohio	-\$39.3	-\$16.7	-\$8.6	-\$13.8
Oklahoma	-\$16.9	-\$6.2	-\$2.9	-\$5.7
Oregon	-\$12.9	-\$5.9	-\$2.5	-\$4.3
Pennsylvania	-\$44.0	-\$20.6	-\$8.4	-\$14.9
Rhode Island	-\$5.2	-\$2.1	-\$0.9	-\$2.1
South Carolina	-\$16.9	-\$7.8	-\$3.5	-\$5.5
South Dakota	-\$6.5	-\$1.6	-\$0.6	-\$2.2
Tennessee	-\$20.7	-\$8.9	-\$4.6	-\$7.1
Texas	-\$110.2	-\$52.8	-\$18.9	-\$34.7
Utah	-\$7.8	-\$2.5	-\$2.1	-\$2.6
Vermont	-\$3.9	-\$1.3	-\$0.5	-\$2.1
Virginia	-\$24.3	-\$9.4	-\$5.6	-\$7.2
Washington	-\$22.0	-\$8.2	-\$4.4	-\$6.6
West Virginia	-\$9.5	-\$4.4	-\$1.5	-\$3.6
Wisconsin	-\$18.1	-\$7.0	-\$4.2	-\$6.3
Wyoming	-\$4.4	-\$1.4	-\$0.6	-\$2.1

### Technical Notes

This table shows projected cuts in four major education accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged (account 91 0900), Special Education (91 0300), School Improvement (91 1000), Impact Aid (91 9102). (Impact Aid is not shown separately because it is smaller.) Each of these accounts is in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education subfunction (501).

*Education for the Disadvantaged* 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.

*Special Education* includes funding for special education grants (K-12), special education preschool grants, and grants for infants and families.

*School Improvement* 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).

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) 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 within each account, this analysis assumes that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2005 funding under that account. The analysis also assumes that a small proportion of the cuts in each account (less than 1%) would not be borne by states. This percentage is 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.

**Table 2**  
**Vocational and Adult Education**  
**(in dollars)**

<b>State</b>	<b>Projected Cuts in 2006</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$85 million</b> -4.2%
Alabama	-\$1,431,000
Alaska	-\$255,000
Arizona	-\$1,627,000
Arkansas	-\$881,000
California	-\$9,981,000
Colorado	-\$1,059,000
Connecticut	-\$758,000
Delaware	-\$310,000
District of Columbia	-\$273,000
Florida	-\$4,615,000
Georgia	-\$2,498,000
Hawaii	-\$391,000
Idaho	-\$434,000
Illinois	-\$3,272,000
Indiana	-\$1,756,000
Iowa	-\$828,000
Kansas	-\$760,000
Kentucky	-\$1,310,000
Louisiana	-\$1,519,000
Maine	-\$379,000
Maryland	-\$1,253,000
Massachusetts	-\$1,392,000
Michigan	-\$2,690,000
Minnesota	-\$1,229,000
Mississippi	-\$989,000
Missouri	-\$1,621,000
Montana	-\$336,000
Nebraska	-\$486,000
Nevada	-\$583,000
New Hampshire	-\$372,000

## 2. Vocational and Adult Education (cont'd)

(in dollars)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$1,973,000
New Mexico	-\$626,000
New York	-\$4,839,000
North Carolina	-\$2,385,000
North Dakota	-\$260,000
Ohio	-\$3,103,000
Oklahoma	-\$1,087,000
Oregon	-\$968,000
Pennsylvania	-\$3,212,000
Rhode Island	-\$391,000
South Carolina	-\$1,294,000
South Dakota	-\$280,000
Tennessee	-\$1,717,000
Texas	-\$6,788,000
Utah	-\$775,000
Vermont	-\$254,000
Virginia	-\$1,882,000
Washington	-\$1,526,000
West Virginia	-\$596,000
Wisconsin	-\$1,471,000
Wyoming	-\$243,000

### **Technical Notes**

*Vocational and Adult Education* is account 91 0400 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 Congressional Budget Office (CBO) 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.

**Table 3**  
**Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP)**

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in millions)	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients in 2006
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$261</b> <b>-11.7%</b>	<b>-596,000</b>
Alabama	-\$2.2	-7,600
Alaska	-\$1.4	-1,000
Arizona	-\$1.1	-3,200
Arkansas	-\$1.7	-6,800
California	-\$12.0	-18,600
Colorado	-\$4.2	-12,300
Connecticut	-\$5.5	-7,800
Delaware	-\$0.7	-1,600
District of Columbia	-\$0.9	-2,300
Florida	-\$3.6	-4,100
Georgia	-\$2.8	-9,900
Hawaii	-\$0.3	-800
Idaho	-\$1.6	-3,700
Illinois	-\$15.2	-35,200
Indiana	-\$6.9	-15,600
Iowa	-\$4.9	-10,100
Kansas	-\$2.2	-6,300
Kentucky	-\$3.6	-13,100
Louisiana	-\$2.3	-1,300
Maine	-\$3.5	-6,400
Maryland	-\$4.2	-9,700
Massachusetts	-\$11.0	-17,100
Michigan	-\$14.4	-42,700
Minnesota	-\$10.4	-13,100
Mississippi	-\$1.9	-7,200
Missouri	-\$6.1	-12,200
Montana	-\$1.9	-2,600
Nebraska	-\$2.4	-3,800
Nevada	-\$0.5	-2,800
New Hampshire	-\$2.1	-3,900

### 3. Low Income Home Energy Assistance (cont'd)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in millions)	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients in 2006
New Jersey	-\$10.2	-20,000
New Mexico	-\$1.4	-7,000
New York	-\$33.2	-93,800
North Carolina	-\$4.9	-26,800
North Dakota	-\$2.1	-1,900
Ohio	-\$13.4	-35,700
Oklahoma	-\$2.1	-10,000
Oregon	-\$3.3	-6,900
Pennsylvania	-\$17.8	-38,400
Rhode Island	-\$1.8	-3,300
South Carolina	-\$1.8	-3,400
South Dakota	-\$1.7	-2,100
Tennessee	-\$3.6	-7,000
Texas	-\$5.9	-3,600
Utah	-\$2.0	-4,500
Vermont	-\$1.6	-2,500
Virginia	-\$5.1	-12,000
Washington	-\$5.4	-7,300
West Virginia	-\$2.4	-8,200
Wisconsin	-\$9.3	-17,400
Wyoming	-\$0.8	-1,200

**Technical Notes**

The *Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program* is account 75 1502 in subfunction (609).

Cuts are measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) 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 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 2006 were achieved solely by reducing the number of households receiving assistance, not by reducing the average benefit level.

The number of households who could lose LIHEAP assistance in each state is calculated as the estimated percentage cut in LIHEAP funding in 2006 (11.7 percent) multiplied by the number of number of LIHEAP households actually served in FY 2005 (as projected by the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, the organization of state LIHEAP directors).

**Table 4**  
**Special Supplemental Nutrition Program**  
**For Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)**

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in dollars)	Projected Loss In Number of Recipients in 2006
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$104 million</b> <b>-2.0%</b>	<b>-164,000</b>
Alabama	-\$1,657,000	-2,500
Alaska	-\$452,000	-600
Arizona	-\$2,487,000	-3,100
Arkansas	-\$1,178,000	-1,800
California	-\$17,899,000	-26,800
Colorado	-\$1,051,000	-1,700
Connecticut	-\$722,000	-1,100
Delaware	-\$218,000	-400
District of Columbia	-\$273,000	-300
Florida	-\$4,897,000	-7,700
Georgia	-\$3,224,000	-5,400
Hawaii	-\$611,000	-700
Idaho	-\$420,000	-800
Illinois	-\$3,753,000	-5,700
Indiana	-\$1,563,000	-2,700
Iowa	-\$813,000	-1,400
Kansas	-\$823,000	-1,300
Kentucky	-\$1,512,000	-2,400
Louisiana	-\$1,928,000	-2,900
Maine	-\$258,000	-500
Maryland	-\$1,312,000	-2,200
Massachusetts	-\$1,391,000	-2,400
Michigan	-\$2,645,000	-4,600
Minnesota	-\$1,391,000	-2,400
Mississippi	-\$1,323,000	-2,100
Missouri	-\$1,623,000	-2,800
Montana	-\$293,000	-400
Nebraska	-\$503,000	-800
Nevada	-\$592,000	-900
New Hampshire	-\$211,000	-300

#### 4. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program For Women, Infants, and Children (cont'd)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in dollars)	Projected Loss In Number Of Recipients 2006
New Jersey	-\$1,895,000	-3,000
New Mexico	-\$847,000	-1,200
New York	-\$6,927,000	-9,800
North Carolina	-\$2,855,000	-4,500
North Dakota	-\$227,000	-300
Ohio	-\$3,197,000	-5,500
Oklahoma	-\$1,402,000	-1,900
Oregon	-\$1,332,000	-2,100
Pennsylvania	-\$2,830,000	-5,000
Rhode Island	-\$298,000	-500
South Carolina	-\$1,312,000	-2,200
South Dakota	-\$303,000	-400
Tennessee	-\$2,083,000	-3,200
Texas	-\$9,998,000	-18,000
Utah	-\$731,000	-1,400
Vermont	-\$237,000	-300
Virginia	-\$1,619,000	-2,700
Washington	-\$2,210,000	-3,300
West Virginia	-\$668,000	-1,000
Wisconsin	-\$1,341,000	-2,300
Wyoming	-\$154,000	-200

**Technical Notes**

The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) is account 91 3510 in subfunction (605).

Unlike the approach taken with most other programs in this analysis, this calculation of cuts in the WIC program does not use the CBO baseline. That is because the CBO baseline for WIC for fiscal year 2006 includes contingency funds provided in fiscal year 2005 that remain available and thus do not need to be provided again in fiscal year 2006. In lieu of the CBO baseline for fiscal year 2006, the analysis uses the funding level for WIC benefits approved by the House in June 2005, which was intended to serve an average monthly caseload of 8.2 million participants. The nationwide cut in WIC funding is calculated as 2 percent of this House-approved amount. To determine the projected level of funding cuts each state would face, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to each state's 2004 funding level. To determine the projected participation each state would face, this analysis assumed that the reduction would be proportionate to each state's 2004 average monthly caseload level. This table illustrates the loss in the number of individuals who could receive WIC benefits if the cut in 2006 was implemented by reducing the number of participants receiving assistance by 2 percent (relative to the 8.2 million intended to be served by the House bill). U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories and tribal organizations.



**Table 5**  
**Children and Families Services**

*Includes Head Start and Services for Abused and Neglected Children*

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in millions)	Projected Loss In Number of Head Start Participants in 2006
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$656</b> <b>-7.2%</b>	<b>-27,000</b> <b>-3.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$10.1	-500
Alaska	-\$1.2	*
Arizona	-\$9.8	-400
Arkansas	-\$6.1	-300
California	-\$78.1	-3,000
Colorado	-\$6.5	-300
Connecticut	-\$4.9	-200
Delaware	-\$1.2	-100
District of Columbia	-\$2.3	-100
Florida	-\$25.1	-1,100
Georgia	-\$16.0	-700
Hawaii	-\$2.2	-100
Idaho	-\$2.2	-100
Illinois	-\$25.4	-1,200
Indiana	-\$9.3	-400
Iowa	-\$4.9	-200
Kansas	-\$4.9	-200
Kentucky	-\$10.1	-500
Louisiana	-\$13.7	-700
Maine	-\$2.6	-100
Maryland	-\$7.5	-300
Massachusetts	-\$10.2	-400
Michigan	-\$22.1	-1,100
Minnesota	-\$6.9	-300
Mississippi	-\$14.9	-800
Missouri	-\$11.3	-500
Montana	-\$2.0	-100
Nebraska	-\$3.4	-200
Nevada	-\$2.4	-100
New Hampshire	-\$1.3	*

## 5. Children and Families Services (cont'd)

*Includes Head Start and Services for Abused and Neglected Children*

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in millions)	Projected Loss In Number Of Head Start Participants in 2006
New Jersey	-\$12.2	-500
New Mexico	-\$4.9	-200
New York	-\$40.5	-1,500
North Carolina	-\$13.5	-600
North Dakota	-\$1.6	-100
Ohio	-\$23.3	-1,100
Oklahoma	-\$7.5	-400
Oregon	-\$5.7	-300
Pennsylvania	-\$21.6	-900
Rhode Island	-\$2.1	-100
South Carolina	-\$7.9	-400
South Dakota	-\$1.8	-100
Tennessee	-\$11.3	-500
Texas	-\$45.5	-2,000
Utah	-\$3.7	-200
Vermont	-\$1.3	*
Virginia	-\$9.5	-400
Washington	-\$9.6	-300
West Virginia	-\$4.8	-200
Wisconsin	-\$8.7	-400
Wyoming	-\$1.2	-100

\* Fewer than 50 children are projected to lose Head Start.

### Technical Notes

*Children and Families 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.

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) 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 in this account (about 5 percent) 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 also illustrates the potential loss in the number of children in Head Start. These estimates were calculated by determining the reduction in Head Start funding if the previously-passed House levels are reduced by an additional two percent, which would bring the combined nationwide Head Start funding reduction to 3 percent compared with the 2006 CBO baseline. State estimates were computed by multiplying 3 percent by the number of children participating in Head Start in September 2004. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories.

**Table 6**  
**Child Care Assistance**

<b>State</b>	<b>Projected Loss in Funds, 2006</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$86 million</b> -4.0%
Alabama	-\$1,710,000
Alaska	-\$170,000
Arizona	-\$2,030,000
Arkansas	-\$1,030,000
California	-\$9,430,000
Colorado	-\$960,000
Connecticut	-\$600,000
Delaware	-\$190,000
District of Columbia	-\$130,000
Florida	-\$4,680,000
Georgia	-\$3,080,000
Hawaii	-\$350,000
Idaho	-\$480,000
Illinois	-\$3,220,000
Indiana	-\$1,710,000
Iowa	-\$760,000
Kansas	-\$780,000
Kentucky	-\$1,480,000
Louisiana	-\$1,980,000
Maine	-\$290,000
Maryland	-\$1,110,000
Massachusetts	-\$1,080,000
Michigan	-\$2,450,000
Minnesota	-\$1,070,000
Mississippi	-\$1,360,000
Missouri	-\$1,620,000
Montana	-\$240,000
Nebraska	-\$490,000
Nevada	-\$550,000
New Hampshire	-\$200,000

## 6. Child Care Assistance (cont'd)

State	Projected Loss in Funds, 2006
New Jersey	-\$1,540,000
New Mexico	-\$770,000
New York	-\$4,510,000
North Carolina	-\$2,670,000
North Dakota	-\$170,000
Ohio	-\$2,830,000
Oklahoma	-\$1,310,000
Oregon	-\$920,000
Pennsylvania	-\$2,580,000
Rhode Island	-\$250,000
South Carolina	-\$1,550,000
South Dakota	-\$240,000
Tennessee	-\$1,870,000
Texas	-\$8,680,000
Utah	-\$920,000
Vermont	-\$120,000
Virginia	-\$1,660,000
Washington	-\$1,380,000
West Virginia	-\$590,000
Wisconsin	-\$1,250,000
Wyoming	-\$120,000

### Technical Notes

This table shows projected cuts federal discretionary child care assistance grants under the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which is account 75 1515 of subfunction (609). These estimates were calculated with assistance from the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP).

The nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) 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 level.

**Table 7**  
**Section 8 Housing Vouchers**

<b>State</b>	<b>Projected Loss in Housing Vouchers in 2006</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-72,000</b>
Alabama	-1,400
Alaska	-300
Arizona	-800
Arkansas	-700
California	-5,800
Colorado	-1,200
Connecticut	-1,300
Delaware	-100
District of Columbia	-400
Florida	-3,500
Georgia	-1,900
Hawaii	-700
Idaho	-400
Illinois	-3,200
Indiana	-1,500
Iowa	-700
Kansas	-400
Kentucky	-1,500
Louisiana	-1,500
Maine	-300
Maryland	-1,500
Massachusetts	-1,900
Michigan	-400
Minnesota	-500
Mississippi	-500
Missouri	-1,300
Montana	-100
Nebraska	-200
Nevada	-300
New Hampshire	-100

## 7. Section 8 Housing Vouchers (cont'd)

State	Projected Loss in Housing Vouchers in 2006
New Jersey	-2,900
New Mexico	-500
New York	-9,700
North Carolina	-1,700
North Dakota	-200
Ohio	-2,500
Oklahoma	-1,200
Oregon	-1,200
Pennsylvania	-3,100
Rhode Island	-500
South Carolina	-800
South Dakota	-200
Tennessee	-1,000
Texas	-4,700
Utah	-400
Vermont	-200
Virginia	-1,400
Washington	-1,600
West Virginia	-600
Wisconsin	-1,100
Wyoming	-100

### **Technical Notes**

Tenant-based rental assistance vouchers are account 86 0302 in subfunction (604).

Cuts for this program are not measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) baseline but relative to an alternative baseline. The official CBO baseline does not correct for an unintended drop in the number of vouchers funded in the FY 2005 housing appropriations act. Shortly after that legislation was enacted, HUD determined that insufficient funding had been provided, and applied a prorated cut of 4.1 percent to each public housing agency's budget. The President's budget for FY 2006 as well as the pending House and Senate appropriations bills seek to correct this error and restore the vouchers cut due to the proration. Congress is also planning to adjust some agencies' funding to compensate them for certain anomalies in the voucher funding formula.

This analysis therefore measures the cuts against a baseline for 2005 and 2006 that reflects the current congressional intent to restore this funding. These estimates also omit a number of vouchers that we cannot attribute to a particular state. For a more detailed explanation of this issue, see Barbara Sard, Douglas Rice, and Will Fischer, "High Stakes for the Voucher Program in the 2006 Appropriations Bill," [www.cbpp.org/8-24-05hous.htm](http://www.cbpp.org/8-24-05hous.htm).

Table 8  
**Ryan White HIV/AIDS Funding**  
**(Titles I and II only)**

(in dollars)

<b>State</b>	<b>Projected Cuts 2006</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$63 million -3.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$385,000
Alaska	-\$31,000
Arizona	-\$586,000
Arkansas	-\$157,000
California	-\$7,097,000
Colorado	-\$411,000
Connecticut	-\$851,000
Delaware	-\$170,000
District of Columbia	-\$1,437,000
Florida	-\$5,801,000
Georgia	-\$1,729,000
Hawaii	-\$105,000
Idaho	-\$32,000
Illinois	-\$1,914,000
Indiana	-\$362,000
Iowa	-\$66,000
Kansas	-\$97,000
Kentucky	-\$228,000
Louisiana	-\$944,000
Maine	-\$42,000
Maryland	-\$1,721,000
Massachusetts	-\$1,112,000
Michigan	-\$763,000
Minnesota	-\$227,000
Mississippi	-\$300,000
Missouri	-\$567,000
Montana	-\$27,000
Nebraska	-\$60,000
Nevada	-\$347,000
New Hampshire	-\$40,000

**8. Ryan White HIV/AIDS Funding**  
**(Titles I and II only) (con'td)**  
(in dollars)

State	Projected Cuts 2006
New Jersey	-\$2,451,000
New Mexico	-\$106,000
New York	-\$9,476,000
North Carolina	-\$719,000
North Dakota	-\$9,000
Ohio	-\$643,000
Oklahoma	-\$201,000
Oregon	-\$301,000
Pennsylvania	-\$1,992,000
Rhode Island	-\$101,000
South Carolina	-\$657,000
South Dakota	-\$22,000
Tennessee	-\$672,000
Texas	-\$3,776,000
Utah	-\$103,000
Vermont	-\$28,000
Virginia	-\$868,000
Washington	-\$538,000
West Virginia	-\$69,000
Wisconsin	-\$177,000
Wyoming	-\$11,000

**Technical Notes**

The *Ryan White HIV/AIDS* program is part of the Health Resources and Services Administration account (75 0350) 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. Thus, while Ryan White funds are cut by \$75 million overall, this table looks at 83 percent of those cuts or \$63 million.

Cuts in overall Ryan White HIV/AIDS funding were measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) 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 formula funds provided to communities within states.



Table 9

**Maternal & Child Health Block Grant (Title V)**  
(in dollars)

<b>State</b>	<b>Projected Cuts in 2006</b>
<b>Title V Total</b>	<b>-\$54 million -7.3%</b>
<b>Core Title V Formula Grants</b>	<b>-\$42 million</b>
Alabama	-\$921,000
Alaska	-\$88,000
Arizona	-\$580,000
Arkansas	-\$558,000
California	-\$3,576,000
Colorado	-\$565,000
Connecticut	-\$371,000
Delaware	-\$151,000
District of Columbia	-\$534,000
Florida	-\$1,553,000
Georgia	-\$1,286,000
Hawaii	-\$178,000
Idaho	-\$252,000
Illinois	-\$1,708,000
Indiana	-\$915,000
Iowa	-\$503,000
Kansas	-\$368,000
Kentucky	-\$887,000
Louisiana	-\$1,059,000
Maine	-\$262,000
Maryland	-\$919,000
Massachusetts	-\$889,000
Michigan	-\$1,477,000
Minnesota	-\$701,000
Mississippi	-\$767,000
Missouri	-\$967,000
Montana	-\$190,000
Nebraska	-\$311,000
Nevada	-\$147,000
New Hampshire	-\$154,000

## 9. Maternal and Child Health Block Grant

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$916,000
New Mexico	-\$350,000
New York	-\$3,241,000
North Carolina	-\$1,300,000
North Dakota	-\$140,000
Ohio	-\$1,730,000
Oklahoma	-\$578,000
Oregon	-\$488,000
Pennsylvania	-\$1,902,000
Rhode Island	-\$140,000
South Carolina	-\$888,000
South Dakota	-\$175,000
Tennessee	-\$921,000
Texas	-\$2,802,000
Utah	-\$463,000
Vermont	-\$130,000
Virginia	-\$965,000
Washington	-\$713,000
West Virginia	-\$499,000
Wisconsin	-\$837,000
Wyoming	-\$97,000

### Technical Notes

The Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant (Title V) is a part of account 75 0350 in subfunction (551). The account provides core federal grants to support the efforts of state and local public health departments to reduce infant mortality, improve prenatal care for pregnant women, provide child health prevention services and to provide rehabilitation and community services to aid children with special health care needs. A portion of Title V funding also supports special-purpose and regional grants.

The state by state cuts shown here are for the core formula grants only and not the special-purpose or regional grants. In 2005, these formula grants constituted about 78 percent of Title V funding, according to data provided by the Association of Maternal and Child Health Providers. This analysis assumed that these grants would absorb a proportionate share (78 percent) of the projected cut to overall Title V funding. Thus, while Title V funds are cut by \$54 million overall, this table looks at 78 percent of those cuts or \$42 million.

Cuts in overall Title V funding were measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) baseline for this program. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To project the cuts for each state, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be proportionate to the state's 2005 funding level for core formula grants.

**Table 10**  
**Community Development Block Grant**  
**(in dollars)**

<b>State</b>	<b>Projected Cuts in 2006</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$403 million -9.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$5,245,000
Alaska	-\$403,000
Arizona	-\$6,052,000
Arkansas	-\$2,824,000
California	-\$51,640,000
Colorado	-\$4,034,000
Connecticut	-\$4,438,000
Delaware	-\$807,000
District of Columbia	-\$2,017,000
Florida	-\$17,751,000
Georgia	-\$8,876,000
Hawaii	-\$2,421,000
Idaho	-\$1,210,000
Illinois	-\$19,365,000
Indiana	-\$7,665,000
Iowa	-\$4,438,000
Kansas	-\$3,227,000
Kentucky	-\$4,841,000
Louisiana	-\$6,858,000
Maine	-\$2,017,000
Maryland	-\$6,052,000
Massachusetts	-\$12,103,000
Michigan	-\$14,524,000
Minnesota	-\$6,455,000
Mississippi	-\$3,631,000
Missouri	-\$7,262,000
Montana	-\$807,000
Nebraska	-\$2,017,000
Nevada	-\$2,017,000
New Hampshire	-\$1,614,000

## 10. Community Development Block Grant (cont'd)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$10,893,000
New Mexico	-\$2,421,000
New York	-\$38,326,000
North Carolina	-\$7,665,000
North Dakota	-\$807,000
Ohio	-\$17,751,000
Oklahoma	-\$3,227,000
Oregon	-\$4,034,000
Pennsylvania	-\$24,206,000
Rhode Island	-\$2,017,000
South Carolina	-\$4,438,000
South Dakota	-\$807,000
Tennessee	-\$5,648,000
Texas	-\$27,837,000
Utah	-\$2,421,000
Vermont	-\$807,000
Virginia	-\$6,858,000
Washington	-\$6,858,000
West Virginia	-\$2,824,000
Wisconsin	-\$7,262,000
Wyoming	-\$403,000

### **Technical Notes**

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is part of the Community Development Fund, which is account 86 0162 in 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 nationwide cut is measured relative to the 2006 CBO baseline, which reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation.

To determine the projected level of cuts by state, this analysis assumed that the cuts would be distributed to each state in proportion to the funding it received under the CDBG in 2005. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to territories.

Table 11  
**EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water  
 State Revolving Funds**  
 (in millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$261</b> <b>-13.2%</b>
Alabama	-\$3.0
Alaska	-\$1.6
Arizona	-\$1.8
Arkansas	-\$1.8
California	-\$19.2
Colorado	-\$2.1
Connecticut	-\$3.3
Delaware	-\$1.3
District of Columbia	-\$1.3
Florida	-\$9.1
Georgia	-\$4.5
Hawaii	-\$2.1
Idaho	-\$1.3
Illinois	-\$12.1
Indiana	-\$6.5
Iowa	-\$3.6
Kansas	-\$2.4
Kentucky	-\$3.4
Louisiana	-\$3.0
Maine	-\$2.1
Maryland	-\$6.5
Massachusetts	-\$9.1
Michigan	-\$11.5
Minnesota	-\$4.9
Mississippi	-\$2.4
Missouri	-\$7.4
Montana	-\$1.3
Nebraska	-\$1.4
Nevada	-\$1.3
New Hampshire	-\$2.7

## 11. EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (cont'd)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006 (in dollars)
New Jersey	-\$11.0
New Mexico	-\$1.3
New York	-\$29.6
North Carolina	-\$4.8
North Dakota	-\$1.3
Ohio	-\$15.1
Oklahoma	-\$2.2
Oregon	-\$3.0
Pennsylvania	-\$10.6
Rhode Island	-\$1.8
South Carolina	-\$2.8
South Dakota	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$3.9
Texas	-\$12.3
Utah	-\$1.4
Vermont	-\$1.3
Virginia	-\$5.5
Washington	-\$4.7
West Virginia	-\$4.2
Wisconsin	-\$7.3
Wyoming	-\$1.3

### **Technical Notes**

The Environmental Protection Agency's clean water and drinking water state revolving funds are part of EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grants (account 68 0103) in subfunction (304).

The state revolving funds provide federal funding to states to construct wastewater treatment facilities, improve drinking water infrastructure, and enhance water quality.

The nationwide cut in funding was measured relative to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) baseline for these revolving funds. That baseline reflects the 2005 funding level adjusted only for inflation. To project the cuts for each state, this analysis assumed that each state's share of the cuts would equal its share of nationwide funding in 2001. (Each state's share of these funds is fixed by law and has not changed in several years.)