

Table 1
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Elementary and Secondary Education
Projected Cuts in 2006
(In millions)

State	Total*	Education for the Disadvantaged	Special Education	School Improvement Programs
U.S. Total	-\$1,177 -3.5%	-\$520 -3.5%	-\$164 -1.4%	-\$452 -7.9%
Alabama	-\$17.7	-\$7.9	-\$2.6	-\$7.2
Alaska	-\$8.2	-\$1.6	-\$0.5	-\$2.2
Arizona	-\$26.2	-\$10.2	-\$2.5	-\$7.7
Arkansas	-\$11.5	-\$5.1	-\$1.6	-\$4.7
California	-\$147.4	-\$74.7	-\$17.5	-\$52.5
Colorado	-\$12.9	-\$5.2	-\$2.1	-\$5.0
Connecticut	-\$10.6	-\$4.3	-\$1.9	-\$4.1
Delaware	-\$4.1	-\$1.4	-\$0.5	-\$2.3
District of Columbia	-\$4.5	-\$1.9	-\$0.2	-\$2.2
Florida	-\$54.3	-\$25.0	-\$8.9	-\$20.0
Georgia	-\$33.9	-\$16.1	-\$4.4	-\$12.6
Hawaii	-\$6.6	-\$1.9	-\$0.6	-\$2.3
Idaho	-\$5.3	-\$1.9	-\$0.8	-\$2.4
Illinois	-\$46.9	-\$21.1	-\$7.2	-\$17.8
Indiana	-\$17.5	-\$7.0	-\$3.6	-\$6.8
Iowa	-\$7.9	-\$2.6	-\$1.7	-\$3.5
Kansas	-\$9.5	-\$3.6	-\$1.5	-\$3.6
Kentucky	-\$16.9	-\$7.6	-\$2.3	-\$6.9
Louisiana	-\$24.0	-\$11.1	-\$2.7	-\$9.8
Maine	-\$5.5	-\$2.0	-\$0.8	-\$2.6
Maryland	-\$16.0	-\$6.7	-\$2.8	-\$6.2
Massachusetts	-\$20.8	-\$9.0	-\$4.0	-\$7.7
Michigan	-\$38.3	-\$17.2	-\$5.7	-\$15.4
Minnesota	-\$12.9	-\$4.4	-\$2.7	-\$5.3
Mississippi	-\$15.2	-\$6.7	-\$1.7	-\$6.6
Missouri	-\$19.6	-\$7.9	-\$3.2	-\$7.8
Montana	-\$6.5	-\$1.7	-\$0.5	-\$2.8
Nebraska	-\$7.0	-\$2.2	-\$1.1	-\$3.0
Nevada	-\$6.3	-\$2.7	-\$1.0	-\$2.5
New Hampshire	-\$4.4	-\$1.3	-\$0.7	-\$2.4
New Jersey	-\$26.1	-\$10.7	-\$5.1	-\$9.6
New Mexico	-\$12.9	-\$4.4	-\$1.3	-\$3.9
New York	-\$94.8	-\$47.9	-\$10.9	-\$35.4

1. Elementary and Secondary Education (cont'd)

(in millions)

State	Total*	Education for the Disadvantaged	Special Education	School Improvement Programs
North Carolina	-\$26.9	-\$11.7	-\$4.5	-\$10.1
North Dakota	-\$5.0	-\$1.3	-\$0.4	-\$2.3
Ohio	-\$36.4	-\$15.3	-\$6.2	-\$14.8
Oklahoma	-\$15.5	-\$5.7	-\$2.1	-\$6.1
Oregon	-\$11.9	-\$5.4	-\$1.8	-\$4.6
Pennsylvania	-\$41.0	-\$18.9	-\$6.0	-\$16.0
Rhode Island	-\$4.9	-\$1.9	-\$0.6	-\$2.3
South Carolina	-\$15.6	-\$7.1	-\$2.5	-\$5.9
South Dakota	-\$5.8	-\$1.5	-\$0.5	-\$2.3
Tennessee	-\$19.1	-\$8.1	-\$3.3	-\$7.6
Texas	-\$102.1	-\$48.4	-\$13.6	-\$37.2
Utah	-\$7.1	-\$2.3	-\$1.5	-\$2.8
Vermont	-\$3.8	-\$1.2	-\$0.4	-\$2.2
Virginia	-\$22.0	-\$8.6	-\$4.0	-\$7.8
Washington	-\$19.9	-\$7.6	-\$3.2	-\$7.0
West Virginia	-\$8.9	-\$4.0	-\$1.1	-\$3.8
Wisconsin	-\$16.6	-\$6.4	-\$3.0	-\$6.7
Wyoming	-\$4.2	-\$1.2	-\$0.4	-\$2.2

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), and Impact Aid (91 9102). Each of these accounts is in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education subfunction (501).

* Impact Aid is included in the total but is not shown separately because it is smaller.

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).

Impact Aid helps school districts that lose property tax revenue because the children they serve live on federal property, which is exempt from local property taxes.

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
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Vocational and Adult Education
(In dollars)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
U.S. Total	-\$45 million -2.2%
Alabama	-\$761,000
Alaska	-\$135,000
Arizona	-\$865,000
Arkansas	-\$469,000
California	-\$5,308,000
Colorado	-\$563,000
Connecticut	-\$403,000
Delaware	-\$165,000
District of Columbia	-\$145,000
Florida	-\$2,454,000
Georgia	-\$1,329,000
Hawaii	-\$208,000
Idaho	-\$231,000
Illinois	-\$1,740,000
Indiana	-\$934,000
Iowa	-\$440,000
Kansas	-\$404,000
Kentucky	-\$697,000
Louisiana	-\$808,000
Maine	-\$201,000
Maryland	-\$666,000
Massachusetts	-\$740,000
Michigan	-\$1,430,000
Minnesota	-\$653,000
Mississippi	-\$526,000
Missouri	-\$862,000
Montana	-\$179,000
Nebraska	-\$258,000
Nevada	-\$310,000
New Hampshire	-\$198,000

2. Vocational and Adult Education (cont'd)

(In dollars)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$1,049,000
New Mexico	-\$333,000
New York	-\$2,574,000
North Carolina	-\$1,269,000
North Dakota	-\$138,000
Ohio	-\$1,650,000
Oklahoma	-\$578,000
Oregon	-\$515,000
Pennsylvania	-\$1,708,000
Rhode Island	-\$208,000
South Carolina	-\$688,000
South Dakota	-\$149,000
Tennessee	-\$913,000
Texas	-\$3,610,000
Utah	-\$412,000
Vermont	-\$135,000
Virginia	-\$1,001,000
Washington	-\$811,000
West Virginia	-\$317,000
Wisconsin	-\$783,000
Wyoming	-\$129,000

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
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Children and Family 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
U.S. Total	-\$350 -3.8%	-25,000 -2.8%
Alabama	-\$5.4	-500
Alaska	-\$0.6	*
Arizona	-\$5.2	-400
Arkansas	-\$3.3	-300
California	-\$41.7	-2,800
Colorado	-\$3.5	-300
Connecticut	-\$2.6	-200
Delaware	-\$0.7	-100
District of Columbia	-\$1.2	-100
Florida	-\$13.4	-1,000
Georgia	-\$8.6	-700
Hawaii	-\$1.2	-100
Idaho	-\$1.2	-100
Illinois	-\$13.6	-1,100
Indiana	-\$5.0	-400
Iowa	-\$2.6	-200
Kansas	-\$2.6	-200
Kentucky	-\$5.4	-500
Louisiana	-\$7.3	-600
Maine	-\$1.4	-100
Maryland	-\$4.0	-300
Massachusetts	-\$5.4	-400
Michigan	-\$11.8	-1,000
Minnesota	-\$3.7	-300
Mississippi	-\$8.0	-700
Missouri	-\$6.0	-500
Montana	-\$1.1	-100
Nebraska	-\$1.8	-100
Nevada	-\$1.3	-100
New Hampshire	-\$0.7	*

3. Children and Family 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	-\$6.5	-400
New Mexico	-\$2.6	-200
New York	-\$21.6	-1,400
North Carolina	-\$7.2	-500
North Dakota	-\$0.9	-100
Ohio	-\$12.4	-1,100
Oklahoma	-\$4.0	-400
Oregon	-\$3.0	-200
Pennsylvania	-\$11.5	-900
Rhode Island	-\$1.1	-100
South Carolina	-\$4.2	-300
South Dakota	-\$0.9	-100
Tennessee	-\$6.0	-500
Texas	-\$24.3	-1,900
Utah	-\$2.0	-200
Vermont	-\$0.7	*
Virginia	-\$5.1	-400
Washington	-\$5.1	-300
West Virginia	-\$2.5	-200
Wisconsin	-\$4.6	-400
Wyoming	-\$0.6	-100

* indicates a loss of fewer than 50 children.

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 funding levels in the December 2006 conference agreement are reduced by an additional one percent, which would bring the combined nationwide Head Start funding reduction to 2.8 percent compared with the 2006 CBO baseline. State estimates were computed by multiplying 2.8 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 4
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Child Care Assistance
(In dollars)

State	Projected Loss in Funds, 2006
U.S. Total	-\$65 million -3.0%
Alabama	-\$1,290,000
Alaska	-\$130,000
Arizona	-\$1,530,000
Arkansas	-\$780,000
California	-\$7,140,000
Colorado	-\$730,000
Connecticut	-\$450,000
Delaware	-\$140,000
District of Columbia	-\$100,000
Florida	-\$3,540,000
Georgia	-\$2,330,000
Hawaii	-\$260,000
Idaho	-\$360,000
Illinois	-\$2,440,000
Indiana	-\$1,300,000
Iowa	-\$570,000
Kansas	-\$590,000
Kentucky	-\$1,120,000
Louisiana	-\$1,500,000
Maine	-\$220,000
Maryland	-\$840,000
Massachusetts	-\$820,000
Michigan	-\$1,850,000
Minnesota	-\$810,000
Mississippi	-\$1,030,000
Missouri	-\$1,230,000
Montana	-\$180,000
Nebraska	-\$370,000
Nevada	-\$410,000
New Hampshire	-\$150,000

4. Child Care Assistance (cont'd) (In dollars)

State	Projected Loss in Funds, 2006
New Jersey	-\$1,160,000
New Mexico	-\$590,000
New York	-\$3,410,000
North Carolina	-\$2,020,000
North Dakota	-\$130,000
Ohio	-\$2,140,000
Oklahoma	-\$990,000
Oregon	-\$700,000
Pennsylvania	-\$1,960,000
Rhode Island	-\$190,000
South Carolina	-\$1,170,000
South Dakota	-\$180,000
Tennessee	-\$1,420,000
Texas	-\$6,570,000
Utah	-\$700,000
Vermont	-\$90,000
Virginia	-\$1,250,000
Washington	-\$1,040,000
West Virginia	-\$440,000
Wisconsin	-\$950,000
Wyoming	-\$90,000

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 5
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Section 8 Housing Vouchers

State	Projected Loss in Housing Vouchers in 2006
U.S. Total	-65,000
Alabama	-1,500
Alaska	-300
Arizona	-600
Arkansas	-800
California	-4,900
Colorado	-1,100
Connecticut	-1,100
Delaware	*
District of Columbia	-600
Florida	-2,600
Georgia	-2,500
Hawaii	-700
Idaho	-500
Illinois	-3,300
Indiana	-1,000
Iowa	-700
Kansas	-300
Kentucky	-1,600
Louisiana	-1,000
Maine	-300
Maryland	-1,600
Massachusetts	-1,800
Michigan	-800
Minnesota	-300
Mississippi	-400
Missouri	-1,300
Montana	-200
Nebraska	-200
Nevada	-300
New Hampshire	-100

5. Section 8 Housing Vouchers (cont'd)

State	Projected Loss in Housing Vouchers in 2006
New Jersey	-3,200
New Mexico	-800
New York	-6,000
North Carolina	-1,700
North Dakota	-200
Ohio	-1,700
Oklahoma	-1,100
Oregon	-1,200
Pennsylvania	-3,600
Rhode Island	-600
South Carolina	-600
South Dakota	-300
Tennessee	-800
Texas	-3,500
Utah	-300
Vermont	-100
Virginia	-1,200
Washington	-1,800
West Virginia	-600
Wisconsin	-1,100
Wyoming	-100

* Indicates a loss of fewer than 50 households.

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 formula in the FY 2006 appropriations bill signed into law in November sets agency funding levels in part based on the 2005 funding level before the proration was applied. The funding formula also includes an adjustment fund to compensate agencies for certain anomalies in the 2005 voucher funding formula.

This analysis therefore measures the cuts against a baseline that reflects the number of vouchers that would be funded based on an agency's 2005 funding level *before* the proration, plus such adjustments. In addition, the baseline includes an estimated number of "tenant protection vouchers" replacing other forms of federal housing assistance that were first issued in 2005 and will need renewal funds for the first time in 2006. (These vouchers were funded through separate tenant protection voucher funds in 2005.) State totals do not sum to the national totals because the national totals include some vouchers that we cannot allocate to a particular state or that are administered by US territories.

Table 6
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Ryan White HIV/AIDS Funding
(Titles I and II only)
(In dollars)

State	Projected Cuts 2006
U.S. Total	-\$43 million -2.5%
Alabama	-\$317,000
Alaska	-\$25,000
Arizona	-\$483,000
Arkansas	-\$129,000
California	-\$5,846,000
Colorado	-\$339,000
Connecticut	-\$701,000
Delaware	-\$140,000
District of Columbia	-\$1,184,000
Florida	-\$4,779,000
Georgia	-\$1,424,000
Hawaii	-\$86,000
Idaho	-\$27,000
Illinois	-\$1,577,000
Indiana	-\$298,000
Iowa	-\$54,000
Kansas	-\$80,000
Kentucky	-\$187,000
Louisiana	-\$778,000
Maine	-\$35,000
Maryland	-\$1,418,000
Massachusetts	-\$916,000
Michigan	-\$629,000
Minnesota	-\$187,000
Mississippi	-\$247,000
Missouri	-\$467,000
Montana	-\$22,000
Nebraska	-\$49,000
Nevada	-\$286,000
New Hampshire	-\$33,000

6. Ryan White HIV/AIDS Funding
(Titles I and II only) (cont'd)
(In dollars)

State	Projected Cuts 2006
New Jersey	-\$2,019,000
New Mexico	-\$87,000
New York	-\$7,806,000
North Carolina	-\$592,000
North Dakota	-\$8,000
Ohio	-\$529,000
Oklahoma	-\$166,000
Oregon	-\$248,000
Pennsylvania	-\$1,641,000
Rhode Island	-\$83,000
South Carolina	-\$541,000
South Dakota	-\$18,000
Tennessee	-\$554,000
Texas	-\$3,110,000
Utah	-\$85,000
Vermont	-\$23,000
Virginia	-\$715,000
Washington	-\$444,000
West Virginia	-\$57,000
Wisconsin	-\$146,000
Wyoming	-\$9,000

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 \$52 million overall, this table looks at 83 percent of those cuts or \$43 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 funding provided to communities within states.

Table 7
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on the
Maternal & Child Health Block Grant (Title V)
(In dollars)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
U.S. Total	-\$47 million
	-6.4%
Core formula grants	-\$36 million
Alabama	-\$784,000
Alaska	-\$75,000
Arizona	-\$493,000
Arkansas	-\$475,000
California	-\$3,045,000
Colorado	-\$481,000
Connecticut	-\$316,000
Delaware	-\$129,000
District of Columbia	-\$455,000
Florida	-\$1,322,000
Georgia	-\$1,095,000
Hawaii	-\$151,000
Idaho	-\$214,000
Illinois	-\$1,454,000
Indiana	-\$779,000
Iowa	-\$428,000
Kansas	-\$314,000
Kentucky	-\$755,000
Louisiana	-\$902,000
Maine	-\$223,000
Maryland	-\$783,000
Massachusetts	-\$757,000
Michigan	-\$1,258,000
Minnesota	-\$597,000
Mississippi	-\$653,000
Missouri	-\$824,000
Montana	-\$162,000
Nebraska	-\$265,000
Nevada	-\$126,000
New Hampshire	-\$131,000

7. Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (cont'd)

(In dollars)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$780,000
New Mexico	-\$298,000
New York	-\$2,760,000
North Carolina	-\$1,107,000
North Dakota	-\$119,000
Ohio	-\$1,473,000
Oklahoma	-\$492,000
Oregon	-\$416,000
Pennsylvania	-\$1,620,000
Rhode Island	-\$119,000
South Carolina	-\$756,000
South Dakota	-\$149,000
Tennessee	-\$784,000
Texas	-\$2,386,000
Utah	-\$394,000
Vermont	-\$110,000
Virginia	-\$822,000
Washington	-\$607,000
West Virginia	-\$425,000
Wisconsin	-\$713,000
Wyoming	-\$83,000

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 specialpurpose 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 \$47 million overall, this table looks at 78 percent of those cuts or \$36 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 8
The Effect of an Additional One Percent Cut on
Community Development block grants
(In millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
Account total	-\$777
	-15.7%
State formula grants	-\$492
	-11.7%
Alabama	-\$6.4
Alaska	-\$0.5
Arizona	-\$7.4
Arkansas	-\$3.4
California	-\$63.0
Colorado	-\$4.9
Connecticut	-\$5.4
Delaware	-\$1.0
District of Columbia	-\$2.5
Florida	-\$21.7
Georgia	-\$10.8
Hawaii	-\$3.0
Idaho	-\$1.5
Illinois	-\$23.6
Indiana	-\$9.4
Iowa	-\$5.4
Kansas	-\$3.9
Kentucky	-\$5.9
Louisiana	-\$8.4
Maine	-\$2.5
Maryland	-\$7.4
Massachusetts	-\$14.8
Michigan	-\$17.7
Minnesota	-\$7.9
Mississippi	-\$4.4
Missouri	-\$8.9
Montana	-\$1.0
Nebraska	-\$2.5
Nevada	-\$2.5
New Hampshire	-\$2.0

8. Community Development Block Grant (cont'd)

(In millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$13.3
New Mexico	-\$3.0
New York	-\$46.8
North Carolina	-\$9.4
North Dakota	-\$1.0
Ohio	-\$21.7
Oklahoma	-\$3.9
Oregon	-\$4.9
Pennsylvania	-\$29.5
Rhode Island	-\$2.5
South Carolina	-\$5.4
South Dakota	-\$1.0
Tennessee	-\$6.9
Texas	-\$34.0
Utah	-\$3.0
Vermont	-\$1.0
Virginia	-\$8.4
Washington	-\$8.4
West Virginia	-\$3.4
Wisconsin	-\$8.9
Wyoming	-\$0.5

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. The Community Development Fund account would be cut \$777 million in 2006. The state-by-state cuts shown here are for the CDBG state formula grants portion of the account, which would be cut by \$492 million.

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 9
EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water State
Revolving Funds
(In millions)

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
U.S. Total	-\$243 -13.2%
Alabama	-\$2.8
Alaska	-\$1.5
Arizona	-\$1.7
Arkansas	-\$1.6
California	-\$17.8
Colorado	-\$2.0
Connecticut	-\$3.1
Delaware	-\$1.2
District of Columbia	-\$1.2
Florida	-\$8.4
Georgia	-\$4.2
Hawaii	-\$1.9
Idaho	-\$1.2
Illinois	-\$11.3
Indiana	-\$6.0
Iowa	-\$3.4
Kansas	-\$2.3
Kentucky	-\$3.2
Louisiana	-\$2.7
Maine	-\$1.9
Maryland	-\$6.0
Massachusetts	-\$8.5
Michigan	-\$10.7
Minnesota	-\$4.6
Mississippi	-\$2.2
Missouri	-\$6.9
Montana	-\$1.2
Nebraska	-\$1.3
Nevada	-\$1.2
New Hampshire	-\$2.5

**9. EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water State
Revolving Funds (cont'd)
(In millions)**

State	Projected Cuts in 2006
New Jersey	-\$10.2
New Mexico	-\$1.2
New York	-\$27.5
North Carolina	-\$4.5
North Dakota	-\$1.2
Ohio	-\$14.0
Oklahoma	-\$2.0
Oregon	-\$2.8
Pennsylvania	-\$9.9
Rhode Island	-\$1.7
South Carolina	-\$2.6
South Dakota	-\$1.2
Tennessee	-\$3.6
Texas	-\$11.4
Utah	-\$1.3
Vermont	-\$1.2
Virginia	-\$5.1
Washington	-\$4.3
West Virginia	-\$3.9
Wisconsin	-\$6.7
Wyoming	-\$1.2

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.)