

## Table 1. Elementary and Secondary Education

**President's Proposed Funding Level is \$1.3 Billion Below Labor-HHS Conference Report Level**

(Millions of dollars)

	Difference in Funding, 2008
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$1,305</b> <b>-3.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$23.9
Alaska	-\$9.2
Arizona	-\$24.6
Arkansas	-\$13.9
California	-\$146.4
Colorado	-\$15.6
Connecticut	-\$14.1
Delaware	-\$5.4
District of Columbia	-\$4.3
Florida	-\$68.7
Georgia	-\$43.1
Hawaii	-\$8.0
Idaho	-\$6.1
Illinois	-\$54.5
Indiana	-\$27.2
Iowa	-\$7.7
Kansas	-\$8.5
Kentucky	-\$22.7
Louisiana	-\$27.2
Maine	-\$7.6
Maryland	-\$23.8
Massachusetts	-\$29.3
Michigan	-\$46.3
Minnesota	-\$18.0
Mississippi	-\$19.6
Missouri	-\$21.1
Montana	-\$2.2
Nebraska	-\$5.1
Nevada	-\$7.9
New Hampshire	-\$6.1
New Jersey	-\$38.0
New Mexico	-\$14.1
New York	-\$101.8
North Carolina	-\$35.9
North Dakota	-\$5.0
Ohio	-\$48.8
Oklahoma	-\$14.6
Oregon	-\$13.4
Pennsylvania	-\$52.8
Rhode Island	-\$6.0
South Carolina	-\$21.3
South Dakota	-\$5.8
Tennessee	-\$25.3
Texas	-\$106.1
Utah	-\$10.9
Vermont	-\$4.6
Virginia	-\$31.6
Washington	-\$24.5
West Virginia	-\$12.0
Wisconsin	-\$20.7
Wyoming	-\$5.0

## **Technical Notes - Table 1 - Elementary and Secondary Education**

The figures in this table show the state-by-state distribution of the \$1.305 billion difference between the President's proposed 2008 funding level for K-12 formula grants to states — \$35.214 billion — and the funding level included in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education conference report — \$36.519 billion.

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 levels 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 — \$250 million for Promise Scholarships and \$300 million for new competitive grant programs. The analysis includes the Promise Scholarships, but does not include the competitive grants program 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, education for homeless children and youth, 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 educational 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, while the conference report provides \$34 million for each of these programs. Both programs are in the School Improvement account.

To calculate the total difference in K-12 formula grants funding each state would receive under the President's budget as compared to the conference report, 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 2008 (as calculated by the Department of Education) multiplied by the difference in funding between the President's budget and the conference report 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 \$401 million — the national difference in funding under the two proposals 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 2007, 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 percentage difference between the President's proposed funding levels and the levels in the conference report for 2008 K-12 formula grant funding may differ somewhat from the national figure of 3.6 percent.

National total includes U.S. territories, tribes, and federal expenditures not shown separately.

**Table 2. Child Care and Development Block Grant****President's Proposed Funding Level is \$33 Million Below Labor-HHS Conference Report Level**

	<b>Difference in Funding, 2008</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$32,600,000</b>
	<b>-1.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$630,000
Alaska	-\$60,000
Arizona	-\$790,000
Arkansas	-\$400,000
California	-\$3,650,000
Colorado	-\$380,000
Connecticut	-\$230,000
Delaware	-\$70,000
District of Columbia	-\$50,000
Florida	-\$1,800,000
Georgia	-\$1,230,000
Hawaii	-\$120,000
Idaho	-\$180,000
Illinois	-\$1,210,000
Indiana	-\$660,000
Iowa	-\$280,000
Kansas	-\$290,000
Kentucky	-\$560,000
Louisiana	-\$730,000
Maine	-\$110,000
Maryland	-\$400,000
Massachusetts	-\$400,000
Michigan	-\$920,000
Minnesota	-\$400,000
Mississippi	-\$500,000
Missouri	-\$610,000
Montana	-\$90,000
Nebraska	-\$180,000
Nevada	-\$220,000
New Hampshire	-\$70,000
New Jersey	-\$580,000
New Mexico	-\$290,000
New York	-\$1,700,000
North Carolina	-\$1,050,000
North Dakota	-\$60,000
Ohio	-\$1,060,000
Oklahoma	-\$490,000
Oregon	-\$360,000
Pennsylvania	-\$990,000
Rhode Island	-\$90,000
South Carolina	-\$580,000
South Dakota	-\$90,000
Tennessee	-\$700,000
Texas	-\$3,420,000
Utah	-\$350,000
Vermont	-\$50,000
Virginia	-\$620,000
Washington	-\$520,000
West Virginia	-\$210,000
Wisconsin	-\$470,000
Wyoming	-\$40,000

**Technical Notes - Table 2 - Child Care Development Block Grant**

The figures in this table show the state-by-state distribution of the \$32.6 million difference between the President's proposed 2008 discretionary funding level for the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) — \$2.062 billion — and the discretionary funding level included in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education conference report — \$2.095 billion. This analysis does not include the non-discretionary federal funding for CCDBG.

The difference in CCDBG funding each state would receive under the President's funding request as compared to the conference report level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of discretionary CCDBG funding in 2008, 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 2008, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to the level in the conference report would equal 3 percent of \$32.6 million (the national funding difference). National total includes U.S. territories, tribes, and federal expenditures not shown separately.

**Table 3. Head Start**

**President's Proposed Funding Level is \$254 Million Below Labor-HHS Conference Report Level**

(Millions of dollars)

	<b>Difference in Funding, 2008</b>	<b>Potential Difference in Slots, 2008</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$254</b> <b>-3.6%</b>	<b>-33,800</b>
Alabama	-\$3.9	-600
Alaska	-\$0.5	-50
Arizona	-\$3.8	-500
Arkansas	-\$2.4	-400
California	-\$30.7	-3,650
Colorado	-\$2.5	-350
Connecticut	-\$1.9	-250
Delaware	-\$0.5	-100
District of Columbia	-\$0.9	-150
Florida	-\$9.7	-1,300
Georgia	-\$6.2	-900
Hawaii	-\$0.8	-100
Idaho	-\$0.8	-100
Illinois	-\$10.0	-1,500
Indiana	-\$3.6	-550
Iowa	-\$1.9	-300
Kansas	-\$1.9	-300
Kentucky	-\$4.0	-600
Louisiana	-\$5.4	-800
Maine	-\$1.0	-150
Maryland	-\$2.9	-400
Massachusetts	-\$4.0	-500
Michigan	-\$8.7	-1,300
Minnesota	-\$2.7	-400
Mississippi	-\$6.0	-1,000
Missouri	-\$4.4	-650
Montana	-\$0.8	-100
Nebraska	-\$1.3	-200
Nevada	-\$0.9	-100
New Hampshire	-\$0.5	-50
New Jersey	-\$4.8	-550
New Mexico	-\$1.9	-300
New York	-\$16.0	-1,850
North Carolina	-\$5.2	-700
North Dakota	-\$0.6	-100
Ohio	-\$9.1	-1,400
Oklahoma	-\$3.0	-500
Oregon	-\$2.2	-350
Pennsylvania	-\$8.4	-1,200
Rhode Island	-\$0.8	-100
South Carolina	-\$3.0	-450
South Dakota	-\$0.7	-100
Tennessee	-\$4.4	-600
Texas	-\$17.7	-2,500
Utah	-\$1.4	-200
Vermont	-\$0.5	-50
Virginia	-\$3.7	-500
Washington	-\$3.7	-400
West Virginia	-\$1.9	-300
Wisconsin	-\$3.4	-500
Wyoming	-\$0.5	-50

### **Technical Notes - Table 3 - Head Start**

The figures in this table illustrate the state-by-state distribution of the \$254 million difference between the President's proposed 2008 funding level for Head Start — \$6.789 billion — and the funding level included in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education conference report — \$7.042 billion.

The difference in Head Start funding each state would receive under the President's proposal as compared to the conference report funding level is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of Head Start funding in 2008, as calculated by the Office of Management and Budget. For example, if a state is projected to receive 3 percent of total Head Start funding in 2008, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to the level in the conference report would equal 3 percent of \$254 million (the national funding difference). National totals include U.S. territories, tribes, and federal expenditures not shown separately.

The table also shows the difference in the number of children that could be served in Head Start programs under the President's proposed funding level and the level in the conference report as estimated by the National Head Start Association. These National Head Start Association estimates illustrate the difference in the number of children who could be served if Head Start programs cope with the lower level of funding provided by the President's budget by reducing the number of children served rather than making other kinds of adjustments in their programs such as reducing teacher salaries, funding for classroom materials, or developmental, health and nutrition services.

**Table 4. Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program**

**President's Proposed Funding Level is \$630 Million Below Labor-HHS Conference Report Level**

(Millions of dollars)

	Difference In Funding, 2008	Potential Difference in Participants, 2008
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$630</b> <b>-26.1%</b>	<b>-1,380,000</b>
Alabama	-\$5.1	-12,900
Alaska	-\$3.8	-2,700
Arizona	-\$2.3	-4,800
Arkansas	-\$3.9	-15,500
California	-\$27.6	-43,700
Colorado	-\$9.7	-26,400
Connecticut	-\$18.3	-22,400
Delaware	-\$1.7	-3,200
District of Columbia	-\$2.0	-6,100
Florida	-\$8.2	-12,200
Georgia	-\$6.5	-23,000
Hawaii	-\$0.7	-1,800
Idaho	-\$3.6	-8,400
Illinois	-\$34.9	-85,000
Indiana	-\$15.8	-35,900
Iowa	-\$11.2	-22,700
Kansas	-\$5.1	-11,500
Kentucky	-\$8.2	-28,700
Louisiana	-\$5.3	-9,800
Maine	-\$14.5	-18,900
Maryland	-\$9.7	-21,600
Massachusetts	-\$33.8	-45,700
Michigan	-\$33.0	-118,300
Minnesota	-\$23.9	-30,800
Mississippi	-\$4.4	-16,100
Missouri	-\$13.9	-30,200
Montana	-\$3.9	-4,900
Nebraska	-\$5.5	-8,700
Nevada	-\$1.2	-4,800
New Hampshire	-\$7.5	-11,500
New Jersey	-\$23.4	-39,900
New Mexico	-\$2.9	-14,100
New York	-\$76.4	-207,900
North Carolina	-\$11.2	-53,000
North Dakota	-\$4.0	-3,300
Ohio	-\$30.9	-82,800
Oklahoma	-\$4.4	-23,400
Oregon	-\$7.4	-15,600
Pennsylvania	-\$41.1	-85,100
Rhode Island	-\$5.6	-9,000
South Carolina	-\$4.1	-5,500
South Dakota	-\$3.3	-4,000
Tennessee	-\$8.3	-16,200
Texas	-\$13.6	-12,100
Utah	-\$4.4	-9,400
Vermont	-\$5.8	-7,500
Virginia	-\$11.8	-26,400
Washington	-\$11.9	-19,000
West Virginia	-\$5.4	-19,600
Wisconsin	-\$21.5	-36,200
Wyoming	-\$1.7	-2,500

#### **Technical Notes - Table 4 - Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program**

The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (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.

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the \$630 million difference between the President's proposed 2008 funding level for LIHEAP — \$1.782 billion — and the funding level included in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education conference report — \$2.412 billion.

To calculate the difference in LIHEAP funding each state would receive under the President's budget request and the conference report 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 \$480 million less in funding for the formula grants and \$150 million less for the contingency fund as compared to the conference report levels, for a total difference in funding of \$630 million.

To calculate the total difference in funding each state would receive under the President's budget as compared to the conference report, we determine the state-specific differences in funding for 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 used by the Department of Health and Human Services. For the contingency funds, each state's share of funding is based on its share of contingency funding in 2007.) 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 \$480 million (the national difference in funding for the formula grant). National funding total includes U.S. territories, tribes and federal expenditures 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 and the level provided in the conference report. 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 difference in the number of households served, we first estimate the number of households that would be served under both proposals. To do this, we divided the projected funding level in each state under the President's proposal and under the conference report by the 2005 average benefit per participant, adjusted for inflation. We then compared the two participant estimates. To compute the average LIHEAP benefit amount in 2005, we divide the total assistance provided in 2005 in each state by the largest single category of LIHEAP participants. (Unfortunately, there are no data showing the unduplicated number of LIHEAP participants by state — available data show the number receiving different types of assistance, such as the number receiving heating assistance and the number receiving cooling assistance. Since many participants receive both, adding these participant numbers together would significantly overstate the number of LIHEAP beneficiaries.)

The latest available LIHEAP participation estimates are for 2006; however, we use participant data for 2005 because of the large effects of Hurricane Katrina on the distribution of LIHEAP assistance in 2006.



**Table 5. Home-Delivered Nutrition Services Program**

**President's Proposed Funding Level is \$16 Million Below Labor-HHS Conference Report Level**

	Difference in Funding, 2008
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$16,300,000</b> <b>-8.3%</b>
Alabama	-\$250,000
Alaska	-\$80,000
Arizona	-\$470,000
Arkansas	-\$150,000
California	-\$1,570,000
Colorado	-\$300,000
Connecticut	-\$130,000
Delaware	-\$80,000
District of Columbia	-\$80,000
Florida	-\$1,340,000
Georgia	-\$650,000
Hawaii	-\$80,000
Idaho	-\$80,000
Illinois	-\$490,000
Indiana	-\$290,000
Iowa	-\$130,000
Kansas	-\$120,000
Kentucky	-\$230,000
Louisiana	-\$110,000
Maine	-\$80,000
Maryland	-\$260,000
Massachusetts	-\$280,000
Michigan	-\$450,000
Minnesota	-\$240,000
Mississippi	-\$140,000
Missouri	-\$280,000
Montana	-\$80,000
Nebraska	-\$80,000
Nevada	-\$170,000
New Hampshire	-\$80,000
New Jersey	-\$350,000
New Mexico	-\$130,000
New York	-\$830,000
North Carolina	-\$600,000
North Dakota	-\$80,000
Ohio	-\$440,000
Oklahoma	-\$170,000
Oregon	-\$260,000
Pennsylvania	-\$470,000
Rhode Island	-\$80,000
South Carolina	-\$330,000
South Dakota	-\$80,000
Tennessee	-\$370,000
Texas	-\$1,280,000
Utah	-\$160,000
Vermont	-\$80,000
Virginia	-\$440,000
Washington	-\$420,000
West Virginia	-\$80,000
Wisconsin	-\$250,000
Wyoming	-\$80,000

**Technical Notes - Table 5 - Home-Delivered Nutrition Services Program**

The home-delivered nutrition services program is administered by the Administration on Aging (AoA) at the Department of Health and Human Services. The program provides grants to states to support services (like Meals on Wheels) that provide home-delivered meals to elderly individuals.

The figures in this table show the state-by-state distribution of the \$16.3 million difference between the President's proposed 2008 funding level for home-delivered nutrition services — \$181 million — and the funding level included in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education conference report — \$197 million.

The difference in home-delivered nutrition services funding each state would receive under the President's budget request and the conference report is calculated by multiplying the national funding difference by each state's projected share of home-delivered nutrition services funding in 2008 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 home-delivered nutrition services funding in 2008, this analysis assumes the difference in funding the state would receive under the President's budget as compared to the conference report would equal 3 percent of \$16.3 million (the national funding difference). The statutory formula determines state allotments based on two factors: each state's share of the over-60 population and historical appropriations patterns.

National total includes U.S. territories, tribes and federal expenditures not shown separately.