

Index to State-by-State Tables

Table A: Grants in Aid to States and Localities.....	1
---	---

Tables B.1 – B.14

Table B.1	K-12 Education.....	3
Table B.2	Vocational and Adult Education.....	5
Table B.3	Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).....	7
Table B.4	Head Start.....	9
Table B.5	WIA Adult Activities Grants to States.....	11
Table B.6	WIA Dislocated Worker Activities Program.....	13
Table B.7	WIA Youth Activities Grants to States.....	15
Table B.8	Public Housing Capital Fund (PHCF).....	17
Table B.9	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).....	19
Table B.10	Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP).....	21
Table B.11	Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF).....	23
Table B.12	Justice Assistance Grants (JAG).....	25
Table B.13	Community Services Block Grant (CSBG).....	27
Table B.14	Social Services Block Grant (SSBG).....	29

Table C: Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers.....	31
--	----

Table A. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan

Grants in Aid to States and Localities

(Grants other than Medicaid in millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2003)
U.S. Total	-\$18,897.1	-\$9,561.4	-\$32,740.3
	-7.4%	-3.9%	-12.1%
Alabama	-\$285.5	-\$144.4	-\$494.6
Alaska	-\$100.1	-\$50.7	-\$173.5
Arizona	-\$315.8	-\$159.8	-\$547.2
Arkansas	-\$179.0	-\$90.6	-\$310.1
California	-\$2,641.3	-\$1,336.4	-\$4,576.1
Colorado	-\$228.6	-\$115.7	-\$396.0
Connecticut	-\$242.9	-\$122.9	-\$420.8
Delaware	-\$53.8	-\$27.2	-\$93.1
District of Columbia	-\$101.5	-\$51.4	-\$175.9
Florida	-\$878.2	-\$444.3	-\$1,521.5
Georgia	-\$571.8	-\$289.3	-\$990.7
Hawaii	-\$85.0	-\$43.0	-\$147.2
Idaho	-\$81.9	-\$41.4	-\$141.9
Illinois	-\$814.5	-\$412.1	-\$1,411.2
Indiana	-\$346.1	-\$175.1	-\$599.6
Iowa	-\$158.5	-\$80.2	-\$274.6
Kansas	-\$146.6	-\$74.2	-\$254.0
Kentucky	-\$271.9	-\$137.6	-\$471.0
Louisiana	-\$317.0	-\$160.4	-\$549.3
Maine	-\$81.0	-\$41.0	-\$140.3
Maryland	-\$318.3	-\$161.1	-\$551.5
Massachusetts	-\$454.1	-\$229.8	-\$786.8
Michigan	-\$606.4	-\$306.8	-\$1,050.6
Minnesota	-\$283.5	-\$143.4	-\$491.1
Mississippi	-\$206.7	-\$104.6	-\$358.1
Missouri	-\$335.3	-\$169.6	-\$580.9
Montana	-\$79.6	-\$40.3	-\$138.0
Nebraska	-\$102.0	-\$51.6	-\$176.7
Nevada	-\$111.6	-\$56.5	-\$193.4
New Hampshire	-\$67.0	-\$33.9	-\$116.1
New Jersey	-\$540.5	-\$273.5	-\$936.5
New Mexico	-\$153.1	-\$77.5	-\$265.2
New York	-\$1,708.7	-\$864.6	-\$2,960.4
North Carolina	-\$486.4	-\$246.1	-\$842.7
North Dakota	-\$61.5	-\$31.1	-\$106.6
Ohio	-\$718.3	-\$363.4	-\$1,244.5
Oklahoma	-\$228.3	-\$115.5	-\$395.6
Oregon	-\$211.4	-\$107.0	-\$366.3
Pennsylvania	-\$806.5	-\$408.1	-\$1,397.3
Rhode Island	-\$80.2	-\$40.6	-\$138.9
South Carolina	-\$237.1	-\$119.9	-\$410.7
South Dakota	-\$64.8	-\$32.8	-\$112.3
Tennessee	-\$345.5	-\$174.8	-\$598.5
Texas	-\$1,398.6	-\$707.7	-\$2,423.2
Utah	-\$123.6	-\$62.5	-\$214.2
Vermont	-\$53.9	-\$27.3	-\$93.4
Virginia	-\$374.7	-\$189.6	-\$649.3
Washington	-\$355.8	-\$180.0	-\$616.4
West Virginia	-\$135.6	-\$68.6	-\$234.9
Wisconsin	-\$296.6	-\$150.1	-\$513.9
Wyoming	-\$50.7	-\$25.6	-\$87.8

Technical Notes - Table A – Grants in Aid to States and Localities

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 total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001, 2003, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2003 was the peak year of funding for grants in aid to states between 2001 and 2008.)

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 8-17 in the FY 2009 Analytic Perspectives volume that accompanies the President's FY 2009 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

2/20/2008

Table B1. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan

K-12 Education

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Change in 2009	
	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2004)
U.S. Total	+\$7079.5	-\$3,723.6
	+23.7%	-9.1%
Alabama	\$105.6	-\$48.9
Alaska	\$14.9	-\$31.8
Arizona	\$125.2	-\$82.9
Arkansas	\$69.3	-\$31.7
California	\$786.2	-\$399.6
Colorado	\$79.5	-\$42.1
Connecticut	\$62.0	-\$30.6
Delaware	\$15.4	-\$13.8
District of Columbia	\$11.5	-\$13.2
Florida	\$321.7	-\$155.6
Georgia	\$195.7	-\$98.2
Hawaii	\$20.5	-\$21.2
Idaho	\$25.4	-\$17.2
Illinois	\$266.8	-\$129.8
Indiana	\$124.7	-\$57.7
Iowa	\$55.6	-\$24.3
Kansas	\$52.5	-\$30.1
Kentucky	\$91.8	-\$46.3
Louisiana	\$122.7	-\$61.0
Maine	\$28.5	-\$15.9
Maryland	\$93.7	-\$47.9
Massachusetts	\$126.6	-\$57.6
Michigan	\$213.5	-\$110.1
Minnesota	\$81.6	-\$43.0
Mississippi	\$82.3	-\$38.9
Missouri	\$120.7	-\$57.6
Montana	\$22.3	-\$21.0
Nebraska	\$38.5	-\$20.4
Nevada	\$42.4	-\$20.7
New Hampshire	\$20.5	-\$15.0
New Jersey	\$162.6	-\$77.1
New Mexico	\$55.5	-\$36.1
New York	\$425.0	-\$231.3
North Carolina	\$183.4	-\$84.6
North Dakota	\$11.9	-\$17.7
Ohio	\$224.9	-\$111.8
Oklahoma	\$84.9	-\$45.6
Oregon	\$71.1	-\$35.4
Pennsylvania	\$222.5	-\$117.3
Rhode Island	\$22.5	-\$14.7
South Carolina	\$100.1	-\$44.6
South Dakota	\$16.1	-\$20.3
Tennessee	\$124.2	-\$56.9
Texas	\$626.3	-\$291.5
Utah	\$40.8	-\$24.3
Vermont	\$10.4	-\$13.6
Virginia	\$129.6	-\$68.2
Washington	\$108.6	-\$63.1
West Virginia	\$45.3	-\$21.2
Wisconsin	\$99.4	-\$50.6
Wyoming	\$10.5	-\$15.2

**Table B1. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
K-12 Education**

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Change in 2009	
	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2004)
U.S. Total	+\$7079.5	-\$3,723.6
	+23.7%	-9.1%
American Samoa	\$7.1	-\$3.5
Guam	\$8.2	-\$5.4
N. Mariana Islands	\$4.2	-\$1.8
Puerto Rico	\$141.3	-\$78.7
Virgin Islands	\$6.1	-\$4.6
Indian Tribes	\$52.1	-\$20.3

Technical Notes - Table B.1 - Elementary and Secondary Education

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the national difference between the President's proposed 2009 funding level for K-12 formula grants to states and the funding levels provided for K-12 formula grants in past years.

In this analysis, K-12 formula grants to states include all of the K-12 programs for which the Department of Education provides state-by-state allocation estimates. Most of these programs fall within the four major Department of Education spending accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged, Special Education, School Improvement, and Impact Aid.

Within the Education for the Disadvantaged account, the analysis 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, the Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program, and school improvement grants. The President's budget requested funding for two new initiatives within this account — \$95 million for Math Now and \$300 million for Pell Grants for Kids. The analysis does not include either of these programs, both of which are competitive grants programs, because there is no way to know how those funds would be distributed by state.

Within the Special Education account, the analysis includes funding for special education grants (K-12), special education preschool grants, and grants for infants and families. Within the Impact Aid account, we analyzed basic support payments, construction, and payments for children with disabilities. Within the School Improvement account, the analysis includes funding for Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology Grants, innovative programs grants, funding for school assessments, mathematics and science partnerships, 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).

In addition to programs within the four major Department of Education spending accounts, this analysis includes Indian education grants to local education agencies, safe and drug-free schools and communities state grants, and language acquisition state grants.

The figures exclude the effects of two additional cuts proposed by the President that would chiefly affect Alaska and Hawaii. The President proposes to eliminate an education program for Natives Alaskans and a similar program for Native Hawaiians. Both programs are in the School Improvement account.

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 this program between 2001 and 2008.) We do not show cuts for K-12 education based on the President's proposed 2009 funding level relative to the 2008 funding level because the cuts are very small. Nationwide, we estimate that K-12 funding is cut by 0.3 percent (\$111 million) relative to the 2008 level adjusted for inflation.

To calculate the total difference in K-12 formula grants funding each state would receive under the President's budget as compared to prior years, we determine the state-specific differences in funding for each of the programs included in the analysis. For each program, we assume that the difference in funding for a state would equal that state's projected share of funding for the program in 2009 (as calculated by the Department of Education) multiplied by the difference in funding between the President's budget and the prior year's level for that program. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of the national funding under Title I grants, this analysis assumes that the difference in Title I grant funding for that state would equal 3 percent of \$453 million — the national difference in funding for Title I grants. In the case of programs for which the President has stopped funding, the difference in funding for a state is calculated based on a state's estimated share of funding for the program in 2008, as calculated by the Department of Education.

Because each state currently receives a somewhat different share of funding for each of the programs included in this analysis, and the percentage difference in funding for each of these programs is not the same, each state's estimated percentage difference between the President's proposed funding levels and prior years' levels for K-12 formula grant funding may differ somewhat from the national figure of 4.3 percent.

National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

Table B2. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan

Vocational and Adult Education

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2004)
U.S. Total	-\$1,403.3	-\$1,662.1	-\$1,855.9
	-70.9%	-74.3%	-76.3%
Alabama	-\$21.7	-\$26.5	-\$26.9
Alaska	-\$4.5	-\$5.4	-\$5.5
Arizona	-\$27.2	-\$32.8	-\$33.3
Arkansas	-\$13.8	-\$16.8	-\$17.1
California	-\$139.5	-\$174.4	-\$176.2
Colorado	-\$16.9	-\$20.5	-\$20.8
Connecticut	-\$11.6	-\$14.3	-\$14.5
Delaware	-\$5.2	-\$6.2	-\$6.3
District of Columbia	-\$4.4	-\$5.3	-\$5.4
Florida	-\$66.1	-\$82.0	-\$82.9
Georgia	-\$42.3	-\$51.3	-\$52.1
Hawaii	-\$6.2	-\$7.5	-\$7.6
Idaho	-\$7.4	-\$8.8	-\$9.0
Illinois	-\$49.0	-\$60.2	-\$61.1
Indiana	-\$28.5	-\$34.4	-\$35.0
Iowa	-\$13.6	-\$16.3	-\$16.6
Kansas	-\$12.2	-\$14.7	-\$15.0
Kentucky	-\$20.0	-\$24.5	-\$24.9
Louisiana	-\$23.6	-\$28.6	-\$29.1
Maine	-\$6.3	-\$7.6	-\$7.7
Maryland	-\$19.1	-\$23.5	-\$23.8
Massachusetts	-\$21.4	-\$26.5	-\$26.8
Michigan	-\$44.0	-\$53.2	-\$54.1
Minnesota	-\$19.5	-\$23.6	-\$23.9
Mississippi	-\$15.6	-\$18.9	-\$19.3
Missouri	-\$25.8	-\$31.2	-\$31.8
Montana	-\$6.0	-\$7.1	-\$7.2
Nebraska	-\$7.8	-\$9.5	-\$9.6
Nevada	-\$8.4	-\$10.4	-\$10.5
New Hampshire	-\$6.2	-\$7.4	-\$7.5
New Jersey	-\$28.0	-\$35.1	-\$35.5
New Mexico	-\$10.0	-\$12.1	-\$12.3
New York	-\$65.8	-\$83.0	-\$83.8
North Carolina	-\$38.7	-\$47.0	-\$47.8
North Dakota	-\$4.6	-\$5.5	-\$5.6
Ohio	-\$50.1	-\$60.6	-\$61.5
Oklahoma	-\$16.9	-\$20.5	-\$20.8
Oregon	-\$15.6	-\$18.8	-\$19.1
Pennsylvania	-\$49.5	-\$60.3	-\$61.3
Rhode Island	-\$6.1	-\$7.4	-\$7.6
South Carolina	-\$21.1	-\$25.5	-\$26.0
South Dakota	-\$4.8	-\$5.7	-\$5.8
Tennessee	-\$26.0	-\$31.8	-\$32.4
Texas	-\$103.0	-\$126.2	-\$128.1
Utah	-\$14.1	-\$16.8	-\$17.0
Vermont	-\$4.5	-\$5.4	-\$5.5
Virginia	-\$27.5	-\$33.9	-\$34.3
Washington	-\$24.1	-\$29.2	-\$29.6
West Virginia	-\$9.4	-\$11.5	-\$11.7
Wisconsin	-\$24.0	-\$28.9	-\$29.4
Wyoming	-\$4.5	-\$5.3	-\$5.4

**Table B2. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Vocational and Adult Education**
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2004)
U.S. Total	-\$1,403.3	-\$1,662.1	-\$1,855.9
	-70.9%	-74.3%	-76.3%
American Samoa	-\$0.4	-\$0.4	-\$0.4
Guam	-\$0.7	-\$0.8	-\$0.8
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.4	-\$0.4	-\$0.5
Puerto Rico	-\$20.9	-\$25.9	-\$26.4
Virgin Islands	-\$0.7	-\$0.8	-\$0.9
Indian Tribes	-\$14.8	-\$16.8	-\$17.2

Technical Notes - Table B.2 - Vocational and Adult Education

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of projected cuts in adult and vocational education funding for the Career, Technical, and Adult Education account, which is part of Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education under the Department of Education.

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 (Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants and English Literacy and Civics Education State Grants). In addition, the account includes a separate, smaller grant program to states for technical preparation state grants (Tech Prep Education State Grants). The account also includes several much smaller programs that do not provide funding directly to states and are not included in this analysis.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001, 2004, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2004 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in adult and vocational education funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of adult and vocational education funding in 2009, as calculated by the Department of Education. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total adult and vocational education funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

**Table B3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$39.3	-\$389.2	-\$474.0
	-1.9%	-15.9%	-18.7%
Alabama	-\$0.8	-\$7.5	-\$9.2
Alaska	-\$0.1	-\$0.8	-\$0.9
Arizona	-\$1.0	-\$9.7	-\$11.9
Arkansas	-\$0.5	-\$4.8	-\$5.9
California	-\$4.4	-\$43.3	-\$52.7
Colorado	-\$0.5	-\$4.5	-\$5.5
Connecticut	-\$0.3	-\$2.6	-\$3.2
Delaware	-\$0.1	-\$0.9	-\$1.0
District of Columbia	-\$0.1	-\$0.5	-\$0.7
Florida	-\$2.1	-\$21.2	-\$25.8
Georgia	-\$1.5	-\$15.1	-\$18.5
Hawaii	-\$0.1	-\$1.4	-\$1.7
Idaho	-\$0.2	-\$2.3	-\$2.8
Illinois	-\$1.4	-\$14.2	-\$17.3
Indiana	-\$0.8	-\$7.9	-\$9.7
Iowa	-\$0.3	-\$3.4	-\$4.2
Kansas	-\$0.4	-\$3.6	-\$4.3
Kentucky	-\$0.7	-\$6.7	-\$8.2
Louisiana	-\$0.8	-\$8.0	-\$9.8
Maine	-\$0.1	-\$1.3	-\$1.6
Maryland	-\$0.5	-\$4.7	-\$5.8
Massachusetts	-\$0.5	-\$4.7	-\$5.7
Michigan	-\$1.1	-\$10.8	-\$13.1
Minnesota	-\$0.5	-\$4.9	-\$6.0
Mississippi	-\$0.6	-\$6.1	-\$7.4
Missouri	-\$0.7	-\$7.4	-\$9.0
Montana	-\$0.1	-\$1.1	-\$1.4
Nebraska	-\$0.2	-\$2.2	-\$2.7
Nevada	-\$0.3	-\$2.8	-\$3.4
New Hampshire	-\$0.1	-\$0.9	-\$1.1
New Jersey	-\$0.7	-\$6.7	-\$8.1
New Mexico	-\$0.4	-\$3.5	-\$4.2
New York	-\$2.0	-\$19.6	-\$23.9
North Carolina	-\$1.3	-\$12.7	-\$15.5
North Dakota	-\$0.1	-\$0.7	-\$0.9
Ohio	-\$1.3	-\$12.8	-\$15.6
Oklahoma	-\$0.6	-\$6.0	-\$7.3
Oregon	-\$0.4	-\$4.3	-\$5.2
Pennsylvania	-\$1.2	-\$11.7	-\$14.3
Rhode Island	-\$0.1	-\$1.0	-\$1.2
South Carolina	-\$0.7	-\$6.9	-\$8.5
South Dakota	-\$0.1	-\$1.0	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$0.9	-\$8.6	-\$10.5
Texas	-\$4.2	-\$41.9	-\$51.0
Utah	-\$0.4	-\$4.3	-\$5.3
Vermont	-\$0.1	-\$0.6	-\$0.7
Virginia	-\$0.7	-\$7.3	-\$8.9
Washington	-\$0.6	-\$6.4	-\$7.7
West Virginia	-\$0.3	-\$2.6	-\$3.1
Wisconsin	-\$0.6	-\$5.7	-\$6.9
Wyoming	-\$0.1	-\$0.5	-\$0.6

**Table B3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)**
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Cut in 2009		
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$39.3	-\$389.2	-\$474.0
	-1.9%	-15.9%	-18.7%
American Samoa	\$0.0	-\$0.5	-\$0.6
Guam	-\$0.1	-\$0.8	-\$0.9
N. Mariana Islands	\$0.0	-\$0.4	-\$0.4
Puerto Rico	-\$0.6	-\$6.3	-\$7.7
Virgin Islands	\$0.0	-\$0.4	-\$0.4
Indian Tribes	-\$0.8	-\$7.8	-\$9.5

Technical Notes - Table B.3 - Child Care Development Block Grant

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in federal discretionary funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) account under the Department of Health and Human Services. This analysis does not include the non-discretionary federal funding for CCDBG.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001, 2002, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in CCDBG funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of discretionary CCDBG funding in 2009, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total discretionary CCDBG funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

Table B4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan

Head Start

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to peak level	
	Relative to 2001 level	(2002)
U.S. Total	-\$629.3	-\$924.5
	-8.2%	-11.6%
Alabama	-\$9.8	-\$14.3
Alaska	-\$1.1	-\$1.7
Arizona	-\$9.5	-\$13.9
Arkansas	-\$5.9	-\$8.7
California	-\$76.1	-\$111.8
Colorado	-\$6.3	-\$9.2
Connecticut	-\$4.7	-\$7.0
Delaware	-\$1.2	-\$1.8
District of Columbia	-\$2.3	-\$3.4
Florida	-\$24.1	-\$35.4
Georgia	-\$15.4	-\$22.7
Hawaii	-\$2.1	-\$3.1
Idaho	-\$2.1	-\$3.1
Illinois	-\$24.8	-\$36.4
Indiana	-\$8.8	-\$12.9
Iowa	-\$4.7	-\$6.9
Kansas	-\$4.7	-\$6.8
Kentucky	-\$9.9	-\$14.5
Louisiana	-\$13.4	-\$19.6
Maine	-\$2.5	-\$3.7
Maryland	-\$7.1	-\$10.5
Massachusetts	-\$9.9	-\$14.6
Michigan	-\$21.5	-\$31.5
Minnesota	-\$6.6	-\$9.7
Mississippi	-\$14.8	-\$21.7
Missouri	-\$10.9	-\$16.0
Montana	-\$1.9	-\$2.8
Nebraska	-\$3.3	-\$4.8
Nevada	-\$2.2	-\$3.3
New Hampshire	-\$1.2	-\$1.8
New Jersey	-\$11.8	-\$17.3
New Mexico	-\$4.8	-\$7.0
New York	-\$39.6	-\$58.2
North Carolina	-\$12.9	-\$19.0
North Dakota	-\$1.6	-\$2.3
Ohio	-\$22.6	-\$33.2
Oklahoma	-\$7.4	-\$10.9
Oregon	-\$5.4	-\$8.0
Pennsylvania	-\$20.9	-\$30.7
Rhode Island	-\$2.0	-\$3.0
South Carolina	-\$7.6	-\$11.1
South Dakota	-\$1.7	-\$2.5
Tennessee	-\$10.9	-\$16.0
Texas	-\$43.8	-\$64.4
Utah	-\$3.5	-\$5.1
Vermont	-\$1.2	-\$1.8
Virginia	-\$9.1	-\$13.3
Washington	-\$9.2	-\$13.5
West Virginia	-\$4.6	-\$6.8
Wisconsin	-\$8.3	-\$12.2
Wyoming	-\$1.1	-\$1.7

**Table B4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Head Start**

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to peak level	
	Relative to 2001 level	(2002)
U.S. Total	-\$629.3	-\$924.5
	-8.2%	-11.6%
American Samoa	-\$0.2	-\$0.3
Guam	-\$0.2	-\$0.3
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.2	-\$0.2
Puerto Rico	-\$22.8	-\$33.5
Virgin Islands	-\$0.7	-\$1.1
Indian Tribes	-\$17.8	-\$26.1

Technical Notes - Table B.4 - Head Start

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut for the Head Start program under the Department of Health and Human Services.

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 between 2001 and 2008.) We do not show the cut for Head Start based on the President's proposed 2009 funding level relative to the 2008 funding level because the cut is very small. Nationwide, we estimate that Head Start funding is cut by 0.1 percent (\$10 million) relative to the 2008 level adjusted for inflation.

The difference in Head Start funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of Head Start funding in 2009, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of Head Start funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories and tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

Table B5. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan

WIA Adult Activities Grants to States

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$152.6	-\$451.4
	-17.7%	-38.8%
Alabama	-\$1.9	-\$5.7
Alaska	-\$0.6	-\$1.7
Arizona	-\$2.8	-\$8.3
Arkansas	-\$1.4	-\$4.2
California	-\$20.7	-\$61.3
Colorado	-\$1.8	-\$5.4
Connecticut	-\$1.2	-\$3.5
Delaware	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
District of Columbia	-\$0.5	-\$1.6
Florida	-\$5.1	-\$15.2
Georgia	-\$3.7	-\$11.0
Hawaii	-\$0.5	-\$1.4
Idaho	-\$0.4	-\$1.2
Illinois	-\$7.4	-\$22.0
Indiana	-\$3.3	-\$9.9
Iowa	-\$0.6	-\$1.8
Kansas	-\$1.0	-\$3.0
Kentucky	-\$2.8	-\$8.3
Louisiana	-\$3.3	-\$9.8
Maine	-\$0.5	-\$1.6
Maryland	-\$1.5	-\$4.4
Massachusetts	-\$2.8	-\$8.3
Michigan	-\$7.6	-\$22.4
Minnesota	-\$1.3	-\$3.8
Mississippi	-\$2.9	-\$8.4
Missouri	-\$3.0	-\$8.9
Montana	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Nebraska	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Nevada	-\$0.6	-\$1.8
New Hampshire	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
New Jersey	-\$3.1	-\$9.2
New Mexico	-\$1.0	-\$3.0
New York	-\$10.6	-\$31.3
North Carolina	-\$3.5	-\$10.4
North Dakota	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Ohio	-\$7.0	-\$20.8
Oklahoma	-\$1.3	-\$4.0
Oregon	-\$2.4	-\$7.0
Pennsylvania	-\$5.6	-\$16.6
Rhode Island	-\$0.5	-\$1.5
South Carolina	-\$3.4	-\$10.1
South Dakota	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Tennessee	-\$3.6	-\$10.5
Texas	-\$13.1	-\$38.7
Utah	-\$0.7	-\$2.0
Vermont	-\$0.4	-\$1.1
Virginia	-\$1.7	-\$4.9
Washington	-\$3.3	-\$9.8
West Virginia	-\$0.9	-\$2.7
Wisconsin	-\$1.6	-\$4.7
Wyoming	-\$0.4	-\$1.1

**Table B5. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
WIA Adult Activities Grants to States**
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$152.6	-\$451.4
	-17.7%	-38.8%
American Samoa	\$0.0	-\$0.1
Guam	-\$0.2	-\$0.5
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.1	-\$0.2
Puerto Rico	-\$6.5	-\$19.3
Virgin Islands	-\$0.1	-\$0.3
Indian Tribes	—	—

Technical Notes - Table B.5 – Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult Activities State Grants

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in adult employment and training funding for the Training and Employment Services account under the Department of Labor. Adult employment and training grants to states provide funding for training and employment assistance programs serving low-income and other individuals.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in adult employment training funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of adult employment training funding in 2007, as calculated by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total adult employment training funding in 2007, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference.

Table B6. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
WIA Dislocated Worker Activities Program
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$249.1	-\$506.4	-\$637.4
	-16.9%	-29.3%	-34.2%
Alabama	-\$1.6	-\$3.3	-\$4.2
Alaska	-\$1.0	-\$2.1	-\$2.7
Arizona	-\$2.2	-\$4.5	-\$5.7
Arkansas	-\$1.6	-\$3.3	-\$4.1
California	-\$23.3	-\$47.3	-\$59.6
Colorado	-\$2.1	-\$4.3	-\$5.5
Connecticut	-\$1.6	-\$3.3	-\$4.1
Delaware	-\$0.3	-\$0.6	-\$0.8
District of Columbia	-\$0.6	-\$1.3	-\$1.6
Florida	-\$5.1	-\$10.4	-\$13.0
Georgia	-\$5.6	-\$11.3	-\$14.2
Hawaii	-\$0.3	-\$0.6	-\$0.8
Idaho	-\$0.4	-\$0.8	-\$1.0
Illinois	-\$9.4	-\$19.1	-\$24.1
Indiana	-\$4.9	-\$9.9	-\$12.5
Iowa	-\$1.2	-\$2.5	-\$3.2
Kansas	-\$1.5	-\$3.0	-\$3.7
Kentucky	-\$4.7	-\$9.6	-\$12.1
Louisiana	-\$3.9	-\$7.9	-\$10.0
Maine	-\$0.6	-\$1.3	-\$1.7
Maryland	-\$2.2	-\$4.5	-\$5.7
Massachusetts	-\$4.2	-\$8.5	-\$10.6
Michigan	-\$15.6	-\$31.7	-\$39.9
Minnesota	-\$2.0	-\$4.0	-\$5.0
Mississippi	-\$5.8	-\$11.8	-\$14.8
Missouri	-\$3.7	-\$7.5	-\$9.4
Montana	-\$0.3	-\$0.7	-\$0.8
Nebraska	-\$0.6	-\$1.3	-\$1.6
Nevada	-\$0.8	-\$1.6	-\$2.0
New Hampshire	-\$0.4	-\$0.8	-\$1.0
New Jersey	-\$5.2	-\$10.5	-\$13.2
New Mexico	-\$0.8	-\$1.7	-\$2.1
New York	-\$11.7	-\$23.7	-\$29.9
North Carolina	-\$4.6	-\$9.4	-\$11.9
North Dakota	-\$0.2	-\$0.4	-\$0.5
Ohio	-\$10.8	-\$22.0	-\$27.7
Oklahoma	-\$1.3	-\$2.6	-\$3.2
Oregon	-\$3.6	-\$7.3	-\$9.2
Pennsylvania	-\$6.4	-\$13.0	-\$16.4
Rhode Island	-\$0.9	-\$1.8	-\$2.2
South Carolina	-\$6.4	-\$13.0	-\$16.3
South Dakota	-\$0.3	-\$0.5	-\$0.7
Tennessee	-\$4.9	-\$10.0	-\$12.6
Texas	-\$15.9	-\$32.3	-\$40.7
Utah	-\$0.7	-\$1.4	-\$1.7
Vermont	-\$0.2	-\$0.4	-\$0.5
Virginia	-\$2.0	-\$4.0	-\$5.0
Washington	-\$4.5	-\$9.2	-\$11.5
West Virginia	-\$0.9	-\$1.8	-\$2.2
Wisconsin	-\$2.9	-\$5.9	-\$7.4
Wyoming	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$0.4

**Table B6. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
WIA Dislocated Worker Activities Program**
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$249.1	-\$506.4	-\$637.4
	-16.9%	-29.3%	-34.2%
American Samoa	\$0.0	-\$0.1	-\$0.1
Guam	-\$0.3	-\$0.6	-\$0.7
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.1	-\$0.2	-\$0.3
Puerto Rico	-\$9.6	-\$19.5	-\$24.5
Virgin Islands	-\$0.2	-\$0.4	-\$0.5
Indian Tribes	—	—	—

Technical Notes - Table B.6 - Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Dislocated Worker Activities Program

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in dislocated worker employment and training funding for the Training and Employment Services account under the Department of Labor. Dislocated worker employment and training grants to states provide funding for reemployment and training services for individuals displaced from their jobs.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001, 2002, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in adult employment training funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of adult employment training funding in 2007, as calculated by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total adult employment training funding in 2007, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include the Dislocated Workers Assistance National Reserve fund, not shown separately.

Table B7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
WIA Youth Activities Grants to States
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$101.7	-\$512.0	-\$522.4
	-10.8%	-37.9%	-38.3%
Alabama	-\$1.2	-\$6.2	-\$6.3
Alaska	-\$0.4	-\$1.8	-\$1.9
Arizona	-\$1.8	-\$9.2	-\$9.4
Arkansas	-\$0.9	-\$4.7	-\$4.8
California	-\$13.3	-\$67.1	-\$68.4
Colorado	-\$1.3	-\$6.3	-\$6.4
Connecticut	-\$0.8	-\$4.2	-\$4.3
Delaware	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3
District of Columbia	-\$0.4	-\$2.0	-\$2.0
Florida	-\$3.1	-\$15.8	-\$16.1
Georgia	-\$2.5	-\$12.4	-\$12.6
Hawaii	-\$0.3	-\$1.5	-\$1.5
Idaho	-\$0.3	-\$1.4	-\$1.4
Illinois	-\$5.0	-\$25.1	-\$25.6
Indiana	-\$2.3	-\$11.8	-\$12.0
Iowa	-\$0.5	-\$2.5	-\$2.6
Kansas	-\$0.7	-\$3.8	-\$3.8
Kentucky	-\$1.6	-\$8.2	-\$8.4
Louisiana	-\$2.1	-\$10.6	-\$10.9
Maine	-\$0.3	-\$1.7	-\$1.8
Maryland	-\$1.0	-\$5.0	-\$5.1
Massachusetts	-\$1.9	-\$9.7	-\$9.9
Michigan	-\$5.0	-\$25.4	-\$25.9
Minnesota	-\$0.9	-\$4.7	-\$4.8
Mississippi	-\$1.9	-\$9.6	-\$9.8
Missouri	-\$2.0	-\$10.1	-\$10.3
Montana	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3
Nebraska	-\$0.3	-\$1.6	-\$1.6
Nevada	-\$0.4	-\$1.9	-\$2.0
New Hampshire	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3
New Jersey	-\$1.9	-\$9.7	-\$9.9
New Mexico	-\$0.7	-\$3.3	-\$3.4
New York	-\$6.7	-\$33.6	-\$34.3
North Carolina	-\$2.3	-\$11.7	-\$12.0
North Dakota	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3
Ohio	-\$4.7	-\$23.7	-\$24.1
Oklahoma	-\$0.9	-\$4.4	-\$4.5
Oregon	-\$1.6	-\$7.9	-\$8.1
Pennsylvania	-\$3.8	-\$19.2	-\$19.6
Rhode Island	-\$0.4	-\$1.9	-\$2.0
South Carolina	-\$2.3	-\$11.3	-\$11.6
South Dakota	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$2.3	-\$11.5	-\$11.8
Texas	-\$8.7	-\$43.6	-\$44.5
Utah	-\$0.5	-\$2.7	-\$2.8
Vermont	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3
Virginia	-\$1.1	-\$5.8	-\$5.9
Washington	-\$2.2	-\$11.2	-\$11.4
West Virginia	-\$0.6	-\$2.8	-\$2.9
Wisconsin	-\$1.2	-\$5.9	-\$6.0
Wyoming	-\$0.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.3

**Table B7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
WIA Youth Activities Grants to States
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

	Cut in 2009		
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$101.7	-\$512.0	-\$522.4
	-10.8%	-37.9%	-38.3%
American Samoa	\$0.0	-\$0.1	-\$0.1
Guam	-\$0.1	-\$0.6	-\$0.6
N. Mariana Islands	\$0.0	-\$0.2	-\$0.2
Puerto Rico	-\$3.9	-\$19.5	-\$19.9
Virgin Islands	-\$0.1	-\$0.4	-\$0.4
Indian Tribes	-\$1.5	-\$7.7	-\$7.8

Technical Notes - Table B.7 - Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Youth Activities State Grants

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in youth activities funding for the Training and Employment Services account under the Department of Labor. Youth activities grants to states provide funding for a variety of programs that help prepare low-income youth for academic and occupational success.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001, 2002, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in youth employment training funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of adult employment training funding in 2007, as calculated by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total adult employment training funding in 2007, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference.

**Table B8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Public Housing Capital Fund (PHCF)
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$461.0	-\$1,643.4
	-18.6%	-44.8%
Alabama	-\$13.4	-\$47.9
Alaska	-\$0.5	-\$1.9
Arizona	-\$2.1	-\$7.3
Arkansas	-\$4.3	-\$15.2
California	-\$18.8	-\$67.0
Colorado	-\$2.8	-\$10.0
Connecticut	-\$5.9	-\$21.2
Delaware	-\$1.1	-\$4.0
District of Columbia	-\$5.1	-\$18.3
Florida	-\$13.0	-\$46.2
Georgia	-\$16.6	-\$59.0
Hawaii	-\$2.5	-\$8.8
Idaho	-\$0.3	-\$0.9
Illinois	-\$35.5	-\$126.7
Indiana	-\$6.2	-\$22.1
Iowa	-\$1.1	-\$4.0
Kansas	-\$2.5	-\$8.9
Kentucky	-\$8.3	-\$29.4
Louisiana	-\$10.6	-\$37.9
Maine	-\$1.2	-\$4.2
Maryland	-\$8.7	-\$30.9
Massachusetts	-\$12.7	-\$45.1
Michigan	-\$8.8	-\$31.4
Minnesota	-\$6.9	-\$24.7
Mississippi	-\$4.5	-\$16.0
Missouri	-\$7.4	-\$26.5
Montana	-\$0.7	-\$2.4
Nebraska	-\$1.9	-\$6.7
Nevada	-\$1.6	-\$5.7
New Hampshire	-\$1.2	-\$4.1
New Jersey	-\$16.1	-\$57.5
New Mexico	-\$1.4	-\$4.9
New York	-\$75.0	-\$267.4
North Carolina	-\$11.7	-\$41.6
North Dakota	-\$0.5	-\$1.7
Ohio	-\$19.5	-\$69.5
Oklahoma	-\$3.8	-\$13.4
Oregon	-\$2.2	-\$7.9
Pennsylvania	-\$32.4	-\$115.6
Rhode Island	-\$2.8	-\$10.0
South Carolina	-\$5.2	-\$18.4
South Dakota	-\$0.7	-\$2.5
Tennessee	-\$12.2	-\$43.4
Texas	-\$19.9	-\$70.9
Utah	-\$0.6	-\$2.3
Vermont	-\$0.6	-\$2.1
Virginia	-\$10.5	-\$37.3
Washington	-\$6.3	-\$22.3
West Virginia	-\$2.2	-\$7.8
Wisconsin	-\$3.8	-\$13.6
Wyoming	-\$0.2	-\$0.7

**Table B8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Public Housing Capital Fund (PHCF)**

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$461.0	-\$1,643.4
	-18.6%	-44.8%
American Samoa	—	—
Guam	-\$0.3	-\$1.0
N. Mariana Islands	—	—
Puerto Rico	-\$25.8	-\$92.0
Virgin Islands	-\$1.3	-\$4.7
Indian Tribes	—	—

Technical Notes - Table B.8 - Public Housing Capital Fund

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in the Public Housing Capital Fund under the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Public Housing Capital Fund provides funds to states according to need to maintain and improve existing public housing units.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in Public Housing Capital funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of Public Housing Capital funding in 2009, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total Public Housing Capital funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

**Table B9. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$726.9	-\$2,456.3
	-19.9%	-45.6%
Alabama	-\$9.6	-\$32.3
Alaska	-\$0.9	-\$3.1
Arizona	-\$10.5	-\$35.5
Arkansas	-\$5.3	-\$18.1
California	-\$90.1	-\$304.4
Colorado	-\$7.4	-\$24.9
Connecticut	-\$8.1	-\$27.3
Delaware	-\$1.4	-\$4.7
District of Columbia	-\$3.6	-\$12.1
Florida	-\$31.1	-\$105.1
Georgia	-\$16.0	-\$54.1
Hawaii	-\$2.9	-\$10.0
Idaho	-\$2.4	-\$8.0
Illinois	-\$33.7	-\$114.0
Indiana	-\$13.5	-\$45.7
Iowa	-\$8.0	-\$26.9
Kansas	-\$5.4	-\$18.3
Kentucky	-\$8.8	-\$29.9
Louisiana	-\$12.7	-\$42.8
Maine	-\$3.8	-\$13.0
Maryland	-\$10.7	-\$36.1
Massachusetts	-\$21.2	-\$71.8
Michigan	-\$25.3	-\$85.6
Minnesota	-\$11.2	-\$37.9
Mississippi	-\$6.8	-\$23.1
Missouri	-\$13.0	-\$43.9
Montana	-\$1.8	-\$6.0
Nebraska	-\$3.8	-\$12.7
Nevada	-\$3.9	-\$13.3
New Hampshire	-\$2.6	-\$8.7
New Jersey	-\$19.5	-\$65.9
New Mexico	-\$4.1	-\$13.8
New York	-\$67.4	-\$227.7
North Carolina	-\$13.9	-\$46.8
North Dakota	-\$1.2	-\$4.2
Ohio	-\$31.3	-\$105.7
Oklahoma	-\$5.9	-\$19.8
Oregon	-\$7.1	-\$24.0
Pennsylvania	-\$42.9	-\$144.9
Rhode Island	-\$3.3	-\$11.2
South Carolina	-\$7.5	-\$25.4
South Dakota	-\$1.6	-\$5.2
Tennessee	-\$9.7	-\$32.7
Texas	-\$49.5	-\$167.4
Utah	-\$4.0	-\$13.5
Vermont	-\$1.6	-\$5.5
Virginia	-\$11.8	-\$39.9
Washington	-\$11.9	-\$40.2
West Virginia	-\$4.9	-\$16.4
Wisconsin	-\$12.8	-\$43.4
Wyoming	-\$0.8	-\$2.8

**Table B9. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)**

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$726.9	-\$2,456.3
	-19.9%	-45.6%
American Samoa	-\$0.2	-\$0.8
Guam	-\$0.7	-\$2.3
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.3	-\$1.1
Puerto Rico	-\$21.4	-\$72.4
Virgin Islands	-\$0.4	-\$1.5
Indian Tribes	-\$14.9	-\$50.5

Technical Notes - Table B.9 - Community Development Block Grant

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program under the Department of Housing and Urban Development. 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.

This analysis examines only the Community Development formula grants to states, the largest program within the CDBG account.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in CDBG funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of CDBG funding in 2009, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total discretionary CCDBG funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference.

Table B10. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Potential loss of households relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$582 -22.5%	-1,307,200 -22.5%	-\$1,137 -36.2%	-\$1,941 -49.2%
Alabama	-\$3.3	-12,500	-\$6.1	-\$14.9
Alaska	-\$3.4	-2,300	-\$6.9	-\$8.6
Arizona	-\$1.5	-4,700	-\$2.8	-\$6.7
Arkansas	-\$2.5	-14,700	-\$4.7	-\$11.5
California	-\$17.8	-40,500	-\$32.7	-\$80.0
Colorado	-\$9.9	-24,500	-\$19.4	-\$31.7
Connecticut	-\$14.9	-15,900	-\$29.7	-\$43.4
Delaware	-\$1.3	-3,300	-\$2.6	-\$5.1
District of Columbia	-\$1.3	-5,700	-\$2.3	-\$5.7
Florida	-\$5.3	-11,600	-\$9.7	-\$23.8
Georgia	-\$4.2	-22,200	-\$7.7	-\$18.8
Hawaii	-\$0.4	-1,700	-\$0.8	-\$1.9
Idaho	-\$2.3	-8,200	-\$4.3	-\$10.5
Illinois	-\$35.7	-79,000	-\$70.2	-\$114.7
Indiana	-\$16.2	-33,800	-\$31.8	-\$51.9
Iowa	-\$11.5	-21,800	-\$22.5	-\$36.8
Kansas	-\$5.3	-10,800	-\$10.3	-\$16.9
Kentucky	-\$5.3	-27,100	-\$9.7	-\$23.9
Louisiana	-\$3.4	-9,100	-\$6.3	-\$15.4
Maine	-\$9.5	-11,500	-\$19.0	-\$27.3
Maryland	-\$6.2	-21,100	-\$11.4	-\$28.1
Massachusetts	-\$29.8	-34,400	-\$59.5	-\$86.8
Michigan	-\$33.8	-112,500	-\$66.5	-\$108.2
Minnesota	-\$24.4	-30,000	-\$48.1	-\$78.4
Mississippi	-\$2.9	-15,700	-\$5.2	-\$12.9
Missouri	-\$14.3	-28,800	-\$28.1	-\$45.8
Montana	-\$4.2	-5,200	-\$8.3	-\$12.7
Nebraska	-\$5.7	-8,300	-\$11.1	-\$18.2
Nevada	-\$0.8	-4,500	-\$1.4	-\$3.4
New Hampshire	-\$5.6	-7,700	-\$11.3	-\$16.4
New Jersey	-\$27.6	-39,700	-\$55.2	-\$80.5
New Mexico	-\$1.9	-14,200	-\$3.5	-\$8.5
New York	-\$90.3	-209,500	-\$180.3	-\$263.2
North Carolina	-\$7.3	-54,000	-\$13.3	-\$32.6
North Dakota	-\$4.4	-3,900	-\$8.8	-\$12.9
Ohio	-\$31.6	-77,700	-\$62.1	-\$101.4
Oklahoma	-\$2.9	-23,700	-\$5.3	-\$12.6
Oregon	-\$4.8	-14,900	-\$8.8	-\$21.4
Pennsylvania	-\$48.5	-83,400	-\$96.9	-\$141.4
Rhode Island	-\$4.9	-6,800	-\$9.8	-\$14.3
South Carolina	-\$2.6	-5,400	-\$4.9	-\$11.9
South Dakota	-\$3.7	-4,600	-\$7.3	-\$10.9
Tennessee	-\$5.4	-15,200	-\$9.9	-\$24.2
Texas	-\$8.8	-11,400	-\$16.1	-\$39.5
Utah	-\$4.6	-8,800	-\$9.0	-\$14.5
Vermont	-\$4.2	-4,900	-\$8.4	-\$12.3
Virginia	-\$7.6	-25,900	-\$13.9	-\$34.2
Washington	-\$7.7	-18,300	-\$14.2	-\$34.4
West Virginia	-\$3.5	-18,400	-\$6.5	-\$15.8
Wisconsin	-\$22.0	-35,100	-\$43.3	-\$70.6
Wyoming	-\$1.8	-2,400	-\$3.6	-\$5.7

Technical Notes - Table B.10 - Low Income Energy Assistance Program

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) under the Department of Health and Human Services. LIHEAP is a federal block grant that provides states, the District of Columbia, tribes and territories with formula grants to help low-income families pay their heating and cooling bills.

The total national cut in this table is measured relative to the 2001, 2002, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for energy price changes and overall inflation. (The bulk of LIHEAP funding goes to energy assistance benefits. This portion of LIHEAP funding is adjusted for energy price changes. The portion of LIHEAP funding that goes for administrative costs is adjusted by the regular inflation rate.) (Adjusted for price fluctuations, 2002 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

To calculate the difference in LIHEAP funding each state would receive under the President's budget request and a prior year's funding level, two separate calculations are necessary. This is because the LIHEAP account consists of a main formula grant and a much smaller contingency fund. Funding is not distributed the same way under the two funding streams. The President's budget provides \$289 million less in funding for the formula grants and \$293 million less for the contingency fund as compared to 2008, for a total difference in funding of \$582 million.

To calculate the total difference in funding each state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year's funding level, we determine the state-specific differences in funding each state would receive under each of the two components of LIHEAP. For each component, we assume that the difference in funding for a state would equal that state's share of funding for that component of LIHEAP multiplied by the national total difference in funding for that component. (For the formula grant funding, data on each state's share of funding is based on the formula set in statute. For the contingency funds, each state's share of funding is based on its share of contingency funding in January of 2008.) For example, if a state would receive 3 percent of the funding under the LIHEAP formula grant, this analysis assumes that the difference in the state's formula grant funding would equal 3 percent of \$289 million (the national difference in funding for the formula grant). National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

The table also shows the difference in the number of households that could be served under the President's proposed funding level assuming that states coped with reduced funding by reducing the number of households that would participate. States have broad flexibility in their LIHEAP programs so that, for any given level of funding, the state can decide how many households to serve by changing the average benefit households receive. This analysis assumes that the difference in funding under the two proposals would result in no change in the average benefit states provide and, instead, would result in states serving a different number of low-income households. National participant total represents the sum of the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

To calculate the loss in the number of LIHEAP households served nationally, we multiplied the number of LIHEAP participants in 2007 by the percentage cut in LIHEAP funding. To distribute this by state, we assumed that if a state had 3 percent of all LIHEAP households, then it would absorb 3 percent of the loss in the number of households served.

We use the latest available LIHEAP national participation estimates from the National Energy Assistance Directors Association (NEADA) for 2007. The latest available estimates of the LIHEAP state-by-state distribution of participants are for 2006; however, we use state-by-state data for 2005 because of the large effects of Hurricane Katrina on the distribution of LIHEAP assistance in 2006.

**Table B11. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)**
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$146.9	-\$1,095.1
	-20.9%	-66.4%
Alabama	-\$1.6	-\$12.2
Alaska	-\$0.9	-\$6.5
Arizona	-\$1.0	-\$7.4
Arkansas	-\$1.0	-\$7.1
California	-\$10.5	-\$78.1
Colorado	-\$1.2	-\$8.7
Connecticut	-\$1.8	-\$13.4
Delaware	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
District of Columbia	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
Florida	-\$4.9	-\$36.9
Georgia	-\$2.5	-\$18.5
Hawaii	-\$1.1	-\$8.5
Idaho	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
Illinois	-\$6.6	-\$49.4
Indiana	-\$3.5	-\$26.3
Iowa	-\$2.0	-\$14.8
Kansas	-\$1.3	-\$9.9
Kentucky	-\$1.9	-\$13.9
Louisiana	-\$1.6	-\$12.0
Maine	-\$1.1	-\$8.5
Maryland	-\$3.5	-\$26.4
Massachusetts	-\$5.0	-\$37.1
Michigan	-\$6.3	-\$47.0
Minnesota	-\$2.7	-\$20.1
Mississippi	-\$1.3	-\$9.8
Missouri	-\$4.1	-\$30.3
Montana	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
Nebraska	-\$0.7	-\$5.6
Nevada	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
New Hampshire	-\$1.5	-\$10.9
New Jersey	-\$6.0	-\$44.6
New Mexico	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
New York	-\$16.2	-\$120.6
North Carolina	-\$2.6	-\$19.7
North Dakota	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
Ohio	-\$8.2	-\$61.5
Oklahoma	-\$1.2	-\$8.8
Oregon	-\$1.7	-\$12.3
Pennsylvania	-\$5.8	-\$43.3
Rhode Island	-\$1.0	-\$7.3
South Carolina	-\$1.5	-\$11.2
South Dakota	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
Tennessee	-\$2.1	-\$15.9
Texas	-\$6.7	-\$49.9
Utah	-\$0.8	-\$5.8
Vermont	-\$0.7	-\$5.4
Virginia	-\$3.0	-\$22.4
Washington	-\$2.5	-\$19.0
West Virginia	-\$2.3	-\$17.0
Wisconsin	-\$4.0	-\$29.5
Wyoming	-\$0.7	-\$5.4

**Table B11. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)**

(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to peak level (2001)
U.S. Total	-\$146.9	-\$1,095.1
	-20.9%	-66.4%
American Samoa	-\$0.1	-\$1.0
Guam	-\$0.1	-\$0.7
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.1	-\$0.5
Puerto Rico	-\$1.9	-\$14.2
Virgin Islands	-\$0.1	-\$0.6
Indian Tribes	-\$2.2	-\$16.4

Technical Notes - Table B.11 - Clean Water State Revolving Fund

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF), included in the Environmental Protection Agency's State and Tribal Assistance Grants account. The CWSRF provides federal funding to states to help finance the construction of wastewater treatment facilities and other water quality improvement projects.

The total national cuts in this table are measured relative to the 2001 and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2001 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in CWSRF funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of CWSRF funding in 2007, as calculated by the Environmental Protection Agency. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total CWSRF funding in 2007, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

**Table B12. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Justice Assistance Grants (JAG)
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2007 level
U.S. Total	-\$173.2	-\$546.6
	-100.0%	-100.0%
Alabama	-\$2.5	-\$7.9
Alaska	-\$0.5	-\$1.4
Arizona	-\$3.6	-\$11.4
Arkansas	-\$1.7	-\$5.3
California	-\$22.1	-\$69.8
Colorado	-\$2.5	-\$7.8
Connecticut	-\$1.6	-\$5.0
Delaware	-\$0.6	-\$1.8
District of Columbia	-\$0.7	-\$2.1
Florida	-\$12.8	-\$40.5
Georgia	-\$5.2	-\$16.5
Hawaii	-\$0.6	-\$1.8
Idaho	-\$0.6	-\$2.0
Illinois	-\$7.9	-\$24.8
Indiana	-\$3.0	-\$9.5
Iowa	-\$1.3	-\$4.3
Kansas	-\$1.4	-\$4.6
Kentucky	-\$1.8	-\$5.8
Louisiana	-\$2.9	-\$9.3
Maine	-\$0.5	-\$1.4
Maryland	-\$3.9	-\$12.5
Massachusetts	-\$3.0	-\$9.5
Michigan	-\$6.1	-\$19.3
Minnesota	-\$2.4	-\$7.5
Mississippi	-\$1.3	-\$4.2
Missouri	-\$3.5	-\$11.0
Montana	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Nebraska	-\$0.8	-\$2.6
Nevada	-\$1.7	-\$5.3
New Hampshire	-\$0.5	-\$1.5
New Jersey	-\$4.3	-\$13.6
New Mexico	-\$1.4	-\$4.3
New York	-\$10.6	-\$33.4
North Carolina	-\$5.0	-\$15.8
North Dakota	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Ohio	-\$5.7	-\$17.8
Oklahoma	-\$2.1	-\$6.6
Oregon	-\$1.7	-\$5.3
Pennsylvania	-\$6.7	-\$21.2
Rhode Island	-\$0.5	-\$1.4
South Carolina	-\$3.2	-\$10.2
South Dakota	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Tennessee	-\$4.4	-\$13.9
Texas	-\$14.1	-\$44.5
Utah	-\$1.1	-\$3.4
Vermont	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Virginia	-\$3.5	-\$10.9
Washington	-\$3.1	-\$9.9
West Virginia	-\$0.8	-\$2.6
Wisconsin	-\$2.4	-\$7.6
Wyoming	-\$0.4	-\$1.4

**Table B12. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Justice Assistance Grants (JAG)
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

	Cut in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2007 level
U.S. Total	-\$173.2	-\$546.6
	-100.0%	-100.0%
American Samoa	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Guam	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Puerto Rico	-\$1.7	-\$5.3
Virgin Islands	-\$0.4	-\$1.4
Indian Tribes	—	—

Technical Notes - Table B.12 - Justice Assistance Grants

Under the President's budget, the Justice Assistance Grants are eliminated. This table shows how much each state would lose in formula funding if the program is eliminated, as proposed by the President.

The President's proposal would replace JAG with smaller competitive grant programs. This analysis does not take into account those new programs because, while some states would qualify for funding under the new programs, there is no way to know how the funds would be distributed across states.

The total national cut that would result if the program is eliminated is measured relative to the 2008 funding level adjusted for inflation.

The difference in guaranteed JAG funding each state would receive under the President's budget as compared to 2008 is calculated by multiplying the national funding cut by each state's projected share of JAG funding in 2009 under the statutory allocation formula normally used to allocate these funds.

For example, if under the formula, a state would receive 3 percent of total JAG funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to 2008 would equal 3 percent of the national funding cut. Under the JAG program, the attorney general has the authority to withhold some funding and distribute it at his discretion; this analysis assumes all funding will be distributed using the formula.

National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

**Table B13. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)
(Millions of 2009 dollars)**

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$666.8	-\$734.3	-\$785.5
	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%
Alabama	-\$12.2	-\$13.4	-\$14.3
Alaska	-\$2.6	-\$2.9	-\$3.1
Arizona	-\$5.5	-\$6.0	-\$6.5
Arkansas	-\$9.0	-\$9.9	-\$10.6
California	-\$59.1	-\$65.1	-\$69.7
Colorado	-\$5.8	-\$6.3	-\$6.8
Connecticut	-\$8.0	-\$8.8	-\$9.4
Delaware	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
District of Columbia	-\$10.9	-\$12.0	-\$12.8
Florida	-\$19.3	-\$21.2	-\$22.7
Georgia	-\$17.8	-\$19.6	-\$21.0
Hawaii	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
Idaho	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.1
Illinois	-\$31.3	-\$34.5	-\$36.9
Indiana	-\$9.7	-\$10.6	-\$11.4
Iowa	-\$7.2	-\$7.9	-\$8.5
Kansas	-\$5.4	-\$6.0	-\$6.4
Kentucky	-\$11.2	-\$12.3	-\$13.2
Louisiana	-\$15.6	-\$17.1	-\$18.3
Maine	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
Maryland	-\$9.1	-\$10.0	-\$10.7
Massachusetts	-\$16.5	-\$18.2	-\$19.5
Michigan	-\$24.5	-\$27.0	-\$28.9
Minnesota	-\$8.0	-\$8.8	-\$9.4
Mississippi	-\$10.5	-\$11.6	-\$12.4
Missouri	-\$18.4	-\$20.2	-\$21.6
Montana	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$3.9
Nebraska	-\$4.6	-\$5.1	-\$5.4
Nevada	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
New Hampshire	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
New Jersey	-\$18.2	-\$20.0	-\$21.4
New Mexico	-\$3.8	-\$4.2	-\$4.4
New York	-\$57.6	-\$63.4	-\$67.8
North Carolina	-\$17.4	-\$19.2	-\$20.5
North Dakota	-\$3.2	-\$3.6	-\$3.8
Ohio	-\$25.9	-\$28.5	-\$30.5
Oklahoma	-\$7.9	-\$8.7	-\$9.3
Oregon	-\$5.3	-\$5.8	-\$6.2
Pennsylvania	-\$28.1	-\$30.9	-\$33.1
Rhode Island	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$4.3
South Carolina	-\$10.2	-\$11.2	-\$12.0
South Dakota	-\$3.0	-\$3.3	-\$3.5
Tennessee	-\$13.1	-\$14.4	-\$15.4
Texas	-\$31.9	-\$35.2	-\$37.6
Utah	-\$3.5	-\$3.8	-\$4.1
Vermont	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2
Virginia	-\$10.6	-\$11.7	-\$12.5
Washington	-\$7.9	-\$8.7	-\$9.3
West Virginia	-\$7.4	-\$8.2	-\$8.7
Wisconsin	-\$8.1	-\$8.9	-\$9.5
Wyoming	-\$3.5	-\$3.9	-\$4.2

**Table B13. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)**
(Millions of 2009 dollars)

Cut in 2009

	Relative to 2008 level	Relative to 2001 level	Relative to peak level (2002)
U.S. Total	-\$666.8	-\$734.3	-\$785.5
	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%
American Samoa	-\$0.9	-\$1.0	-\$1.1
Guam	-\$0.9	-\$1.0	-\$1.0
N. Mariana Islands	-\$0.5	-\$0.6	-\$0.6
Puerto Rico	-\$27.9	-\$30.8	-\$32.9
Virgin Islands	-\$1.2	-\$1.3	-\$1.4
Indian Tribes	-\$4.6	-\$5.0	-\$5.4

Technical Notes - Table B.13 - Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in the Community Services Block Grant program (CSBG), under the Department of Health and Human Services. 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, 2002, and 2008 funding levels adjusted for inflation. (Adjusted for inflation, 2002 was the peak year of funding for this program between 2001 and 2008.)

The difference in CSBG funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to a prior year's funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of CSBG funding in 2008, as calculated by the Department of Health and Human Services. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total CSBG funding in 2008, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to a prior year would equal 3 percent of the national funding difference. National totals include funds not distributed to states, U.S. territories or tribes, such as administrative funds, not shown separately.

**Table B14. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)
(Millions of dollars)**

	Cut in 2009
	Relative to 2008 level
U.S. Total	-\$500.0
	-29.4%
Alabama	-\$7.6
Alaska	-\$1.1
Arizona	-\$10.2
Arkansas	-\$4.7
California	-\$60.5
Colorado	-\$7.9
Connecticut	-\$5.8
Delaware	-\$1.4
District of Columbia	-\$1.0
Florida	-\$30.0
Georgia	-\$15.6
Hawaii	-\$2.1
Idaho	-\$2.4
Illinois	-\$21.3
Indiana	-\$10.5
Iowa	-\$5.0
Kansas	-\$4.6
Kentucky	-\$7.0
Louisiana	-\$7.1
Maine	-\$2.2
Maryland	-\$9.3
Massachusetts	-\$10.7
Michigan	-\$16.8
Minnesota	-\$8.6
Mississippi	-\$4.8
Missouri	-\$9.7
Montana	-\$1.6
Nebraska	-\$2.9
Nevada	-\$4.1
New Hampshire	-\$2.2
New Jersey	-\$14.5
New Mexico	-\$3.2
New York	-\$32.1
North Carolina	-\$14.7
North Dakota	-\$1.1
Ohio	-\$19.1
Oklahoma	-\$5.9
Oregon	-\$6.1
Pennsylvania	-\$20.7
Rhode Island	-\$1.8
South Carolina	-\$7.2
South Dakota	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$10.0
Texas	-\$39.0
Utah	-\$4.2
Vermont	-\$1.0
Virginia	-\$12.7
Washington	-\$10.6
West Virginia	-\$3.0
Wisconsin	-\$9.2
Wyoming	-\$0.9

**Table B14. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan
Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)**

(Millions of dollars)

	Cut in 2009
	Relative to 2008 level
U.S. Total	-\$500.0
	-29.4%
American Samoa	\$0.0
Guam	-\$0.1
N. Mariana Islands	\$0.0
Puerto Rico	-\$2.6
Virgin Islands	-\$0.1
Indian Tribes	—

Technical Notes - Table B.14 - Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in the Social Services Block Grant program (SSBG), under the Department of Health and Human Services. 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 2009. These cuts in 2009 are measured relative to the 2008 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 compared to past years other than 2008 because SSBG has been funded at approximately the same level since 2001, as dictated by statute.

The difference in SSBG funding each state would receive under the President's budget request as compared to the funding level in 2008 is calculated by multiplying the total national cut by each state's projected share of SSBG funding in 2009, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total SSBG funding in 2009, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to 2008 would equal 3 percent of the total national cut.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

2/20/2008

**Table C. Projected Loss in the Number of Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers
Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan**

Loss of Vouchers in 2009	
	Relative to 2008 level
U.S. Total	-100,000
	-4.9%
Alabama	-1,305
Alaska	-202
Arizona	-923
Arkansas	-1,026
California	-14,079
Colorado	-1,352
Connecticut	-1,563
Delaware	-210
District of Columbia	-508
Florida	-4,168
Georgia	-2,300
Hawaii	-461
Idaho	-303
Illinois	-3,725
Indiana	-1,607
Iowa	-1,034
Kansas	-538
Kentucky	-1,474
Louisiana	-1,182
Maine	-583
Maryland	-1,826
Massachusetts	-3,404
Michigan	-2,390
Minnesota	-1,465
Mississippi	-709
Missouri	-1,878
Montana	-262
Nebraska	-537
Nevada	-603
New Hampshire	-422
New Jersey	-3,000
New Mexico	-618
New York	-9,902
North Carolina	-2,570
North Dakota	-352
Ohio	-4,199
Oklahoma	-1,109
Oregon	-1,500
Pennsylvania	-3,681
Rhode Island	-383
South Carolina	-1,144
South Dakota	-249
Tennessee	-1,486
Texas	-6,533
Utah	-491
Vermont	-275
Virginia	-1,996
Washington	-2,158
West Virginia	-664
Wisconsin	-1,270
Wyoming	-105

**Table C. Projected Loss in the Number of Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers
Under the President's FY 09 Budget Plan**

	Loss of Vouchers in 2009
	Relative to 2008 level
U.S. Total	-100,000
	-4.9%
American Samoa	—
Guam	-122
N. Mariana Islands	-15
Puerto Rico	-1,292
Virgin Islands	-66
Indian Tribes	—

Technical Notes - Table C - Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers

Under the Housing Choice Voucher Program, the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides assistance for approximately 2 million low-income families to help them to secure decent housing in the private market at rents that are affordable.

The Center estimates that the President's budget request of \$14.16 billion for the renewal of housing vouchers is \$1.3 billion less than the \$15.5 billion that would be needed to renew all vouchers in 2009. The budget assumes that an additional \$600 million in housing agency reserves will be available to supplement new renewal funding. While there are good reasons to doubt that such a large sum could be taken from reserves without harming the fiscal stability of state and local housing agencies, this analysis assumes that it will be available, thereby reducing the renewal funding shortfall to a minimum of \$732 million. (If Congress chose to lower the amount taken from funding reserves, or to reject this assumption altogether, the number of vouchers cut could exceed 100,000 by a large number, if additional renewal funding were not provided above the President's request. Over the past two years, Congress has used an efficient "recent-cost" formula to distribute voucher renewal funding to housing agencies. If the Administration's proposed block-grant formula were used instead, the number of vouchers cut would also increase significantly above 100,000.)

To calculate the number of vouchers cut in each state, the minimum shortfall amount of \$732 million was distributed among states in proportion to their share of total voucher assistance payments in 2008. Each state's shortfall amount was then divided by its estimated per-unit cost in 2009 to calculate the number of vouchers cut. The Center's estimates of per-unit costs and total renewal funding needed in 2009 are based on an analysis of data reported to HUD by housing agencies as of September 30, 2007, combined with certain assumptions. These assumptions include: HUD's Annual Adjustment Factor (AAF) for FY 2009 will be 4.1 percent (the national average AAF for FY 2008 was 4.05 percent); voucher utilization will increase to 95.6 percent in 2008, nearly 4 percent above the level in the 3rd quarter of 2007, but well below the peak of 98.5 percent in late 2003 and early 2004; and \$142 million will be required for the first-time renewal of tenant-protection and incremental vouchers authorized by Congress in FY 2008.