

Index to State-by-State Tables

Education and Job Training

Table 1	K-12 Education.....	2
Table 2	Pell Grants.....	4
Table 3	Vocational and Adult Education.....	6
Table 4	Grants to States for Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Job Training.....	8

Health

Table 5	Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grants.....	10
---------	---	----

Housing

Table 6	Selected Low-Income Housing Programs.....	12
---------	---	----

Environment and Infrastructure

Table 7	Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds.....	14
Table 8	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).....	16

Law Enforcement

Table 9	Byrne Justice Assistance Grants.....	18
---------	--------------------------------------	----

**Table 1. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
K-12 Education: Selected Programs**
(In millions of dollars)

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Education for the Disadvantaged	School Improvement	Total
U.S. Total	-\$1,416 -8.9%	-\$980 -18.7%	-\$2,396
Alabama	-\$17.1	-\$15.1	-\$32.2
Alaska	-\$3.2	-\$4.6	-\$7.8
Arizona	-\$23.9	-\$18.2	-\$42.1
Arkansas	-\$11.9	-\$9.8	-\$21.7
California	-\$125.2	-\$106.0	-\$231.3
Colorado	-\$11.5	-\$10.7	-\$22.2
Connecticut	-\$8.1	-\$7.6	-\$15.8
Delaware	-\$3.5	-\$4.6	-\$8.1
District of Columbia	-\$4.0	-\$4.6	-\$8.6
Florida	-\$56.6	-\$45.5	-\$102.1
Georgia	-\$39.9	-\$29.1	-\$69.1
Hawaii	-\$3.9	-\$4.6	-\$8.5
Idaho	-\$4.4	-\$4.6	-\$9.0
Illinois	-\$48.7	-\$37.9	-\$86.5
Indiana	-\$19.4	-\$16.5	-\$36.0
Iowa	-\$6.0	-\$6.6	-\$12.5
Kansas	-\$8.8	-\$7.2	-\$16.0
Kentucky	-\$17.2	-\$14.6	-\$31.8
Louisiana	-\$22.2	-\$18.9	-\$41.1
Maine	-\$4.2	-\$4.7	-\$8.9
Maryland	-\$14.0	-\$12.0	-\$26.0
Massachusetts	-\$16.5	-\$14.8	-\$31.3
Michigan	-\$40.6	-\$34.4	-\$75.0
Minnesota	-\$12.2	-\$11.4	-\$23.6
Mississippi	-\$14.5	-\$13.4	-\$27.9
Missouri	-\$18.5	-\$16.4	-\$34.9
Montana	-\$3.6	-\$4.7	-\$8.3
Nebraska	-\$5.0	-\$4.7	-\$9.7
Nevada	-\$7.5	-\$5.7	-\$13.2
New Hampshire	-\$3.3	-\$4.6	-\$8.0
New Jersey	-\$22.5	-\$19.5	-\$42.1
New Mexico	-\$8.7	-\$7.4	-\$16.1
New York	-\$87.4	-\$68.8	-\$156.2
North Carolina	-\$29.7	-\$24.0	-\$53.7
North Dakota	-\$2.9	-\$4.6	-\$7.5
Ohio	-\$43.2	-\$34.6	-\$77.8
Oklahoma	-\$11.8	-\$11.1	-\$22.8
Oregon	-\$11.4	-\$9.4	-\$20.8
Pennsylvania	-\$41.0	-\$34.4	-\$75.4
Rhode Island	-\$4.0	-\$4.6	-\$8.6
South Carolina	-\$16.8	-\$13.2	-\$30.0
South Dakota	-\$3.6	-\$4.6	-\$8.2
Tennessee	-\$20.8	-\$17.5	-\$38.3
Texas	-\$103.4	-\$83.9	-\$187.3
Utah	-\$6.2	-\$6.1	-\$12.4
Vermont	-\$2.8	-\$4.6	-\$7.4
Virginia	-\$18.5	-\$16.3	-\$34.8
Washington	-\$16.5	-\$14.8	-\$31.3
West Virginia	-\$7.1	-\$6.8	-\$13.9
Wisconsin	-\$16.2	-\$14.1	-\$30.3
Wyoming	-\$2.8	-\$4.6	-\$7.4

Technical Notes - Table 1 - K-12 Education

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of projected cuts in discretionary funding for K-12 formula grants that fall within two major Department of Education spending accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged (recently renamed “Accelerating Achievement and Ensuring Equity”) and School Improvement (recently renamed “Education Improvement”). The national totals include all the H.R. 1 program cuts within each account, but the state figures only include those programs for which the Department of Education provides state allocation estimates.

This table differs from Table 1 in the February 18th version of this report because it takes into account the impact of an amendment by Rep. McMorris Rodgers. This amendment restored the \$558 million cut to Special Education grants to states, but deepened the cut for the Education of the Disadvantaged account by an additional \$337 million and the cut for the School Improvement account by \$500 million. The new total cuts for these two spending accounts relative to current funding levels are \$1,416 million and \$980 million respectively. Within these accounts, H.R. 1 is not explicit about which programs would absorb these cuts. When Rep. McMorris Rodgers introduced her amendment, however, she specified that it would reduce funding to the School Improvement Grants program (found in the Education for the Disadvantaged account) and the Teacher Quality State Grant program (found in the School Improvement account). We assume that the Department of Education would interpret the amendment accordingly.

Within the Education for the Disadvantaged account, the analysis includes the proposed funding cuts for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (\$694 million) for schools in low-income communities as well as the termination of the Even Start program (\$66 million), which provides grants to support comprehensive literacy projects designed to improve the academic achievement of young children and their parents through programs incorporating early childhood education, adult literacy, parenting education, and interactive literacy activities for low-income families and teen parents with young children. In addition, the state figures include the impact of the \$337 million cut to School Improvement Grants from Rep. McMorris Rodgers' amendment. H.R. 1 also cuts \$250 million from the Striving Readers program, and eliminates all funding for the Literacy Through School Libraries program (\$19 million), and the High School Graduation Initiative (\$50 million), which we were not able to distribute by state, except for \$10 million in formula grants of the Striving Readers program.

Within the School Improvement account, the analysis includes the proposed funding cuts for 21st Century Learning Centers (\$100 million) as well as the termination of Mathematics and Science Partnerships (\$180 million) and Educational Technology State Grants (\$100 million). 21st Century Learning Centers provide academic opportunities during non-school hours for students from schools with high poverty and low performance records. Mathematics and Science Partnerships work to improve the performance of students in math and science through grants to encourage institutions of higher education to improve teacher education in those areas. Educational Technology State Grants promote student achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools. In addition, the state figures include the impact of the \$500 million cut to Improving Teacher Quality State Grants from Rep. McMorris Rodgers' amendment. H.R. 1 also terminates the \$27 million Foreign Language Assistance program, which we were not able to distribute by state.

Although a separate amendment prevented the elimination of the programs for Education for Native Hawaiians (\$34 million) and Alaska Native Education Equity (\$33 million), it did not increase the funding level in the School Improvement account. This means that other programs in the account would have to be cut in order to restore the funding of these two programs. This table assumes that this additional cut would be proportionately spread among all programs within the account for which funding levels are not otherwise specified in H.R. 1.

Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. These current funding levels do not include any funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Given that the 2010-2011 academic year will be about two-thirds over by the time that these proposed cuts are put in effect, the main impact of the cuts will be felt in the academic year starting in the fall of 2011.

Projected state funding cuts assume the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's estimated share of grant funding in 2011 according to Department of Education data. For example, if a state is expected to receive 2 percent of total funding in 2011 from the 21st Century Community Learning Centers under current law, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the national cut to this block grant. This is the same as saying that all states would experience the same percentage cut to their funding for this program. Figures in the table provide the sum of these program-by-program cuts.

National totals include cuts to U.S. territories and administrative funds, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

**Table 2. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Pell Grants**

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Funding (\$Millions)	Students Affected
U.S. Total	-\$5,667 24.5%	9,413,000
Alabama	-\$111	176,000
Alaska	-\$5	8,000
Arizona	-\$319	555,000
Arkansas	-\$60	94,000
California	-\$621	1,042,000
Colorado	-\$85	149,000
Connecticut	-\$40	72,000
Delaware	-\$9	16,000
District of Columbia	-\$24	44,000
Florida	-\$368	565,000
Georgia	-\$196	308,000
Hawaii	-\$12	19,000
Idaho	-\$30	48,000
Illinois	-\$243	392,000
Indiana	-\$115	202,000
Iowa	-\$116	203,000
Kansas	-\$45	76,000
Kentucky	-\$85	137,000
Louisiana	-\$83	129,000
Maine	-\$19	31,000
Maryland	-\$71	122,000
Massachusetts	-\$83	135,000
Michigan	-\$202	337,000
Minnesota	-\$84	147,000
Mississippi	-\$81	119,000
Missouri	-\$106	178,000
Montana	-\$15	24,000
Nebraska	-\$25	43,000
Nevada	-\$19	33,000
New Hampshire	-\$12	21,000
New Jersey	-\$115	183,000
New Mexico	-\$39	66,000
New York	-\$406	584,000
North Carolina	-\$143	250,000
North Dakota	-\$12	19,000
Ohio	-\$215	356,000
Oklahoma	-\$65	106,000
Oregon	-\$66	110,000
Pennsylvania	-\$176	313,000
Rhode Island	-\$22	36,000
South Carolina	-\$78	127,000
South Dakota	-\$16	26,000
Tennessee	-\$112	182,000
Texas	-\$391	664,000
Utah	-\$56	96,000
Vermont	-\$8	13,000
Virginia	-\$107	178,000
Washington	-\$82	138,000
West Virginia	-\$39	61,000
Wisconsin	-\$70	118,000
Wyoming	-\$7	12,000

Technical Notes - Table 2 - Pell Grants

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in discretionary spending for grants to students under the Pell Grant program, administered by the Department of Education. It also shows the number of students in each state who would be affected by the reduction in the discretionary maximum award level (from \$4,860 to \$4,015) specified in H.R. 1. Funding in this analysis includes total program costs, or the sum of aid available for Pell Grant recipients and administrative costs. FY 2011 state-by-state program costs under current law are from the Department of Education.

Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. Funding figures represent the impact of a 24.5 percent cut in total discretionary funding for the Pell Grant program. There is also a mandatory component of the program. H.R. 1 does not significantly affect the mandatory Pell Grant awards for the 2011-12 academic year, so no mandatory effects are shown here. But, as discussed in the box on page 7 of the main paper, H.R. 1 effectively eliminates the mandatory component of Pell Grants starting in 2014.

Projected state funding cuts assume the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's share of Pell Grant funding in 2011 under current law. For example, if a state is expected to receive 2 percent of total Pell Grant funding in 2011 under current law, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the national Pell Grant cut. This is the same as saying that all states would experience a 24.5 percent cut in discretionary funding. National totals include cuts to Puerto Rico and U.S. territories, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

Nationally, 9.4 million undergraduate students are expected to receive Pell Grants in 2011. Because each individual grant is based on the maximum grant, reducing the maximum grant under H.R. 1 will reduce or eliminate Pell Grant awards for every recipient. The number of students affected, therefore, is the total number of students expected to receive Pells in 2011. A small portion of students affected will become ineligible for the program and lose their Pell Grant entirely, while most students affected will receive a significantly reduced award. Projected state numbers of students affected assume that total Pell Grant recipients are distributed among the states per each state's share of Pell Grant recipients in 2008, according to the Department of Education's most recent Pell Grant end-of-year report. National totals include students in Puerto Rico and U.S. territories, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

The Senate Democratic Policy and Communications Center (DPCC) has released its own analysis of how H.R. 1 would affect Pell grants. Those estimates are somewhat different, although they show essentially similar results. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities has not yet had the opportunity to analyze the reasons for the differences between the two sets of estimates.

**Table 3. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Vocational and Adult Education
(In thousands of dollars)**

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Tech-Prep Education State Grants	Workplace and Community Transition Training Program For Incarcerated Youth	Total
U.S. Total	-\$102,900	-\$17,200	-\$120,100
	-100%	-100%	
Alabama	-\$1,990	-\$310	-\$2,300
Alaska	-\$250	-\$70	-\$320
Arizona	-\$1,880	-\$680	-\$2,560
Arkansas	-\$1,190	-\$380	-\$1,570
California	-\$11,250	-\$910	-\$12,160
Colorado	-\$1,390	-\$480	-\$1,870
Connecticut	-\$870	-\$200	-\$1,070
Delaware	-\$230	-\$70	-\$300
District of Columbia	-\$130	-\$60	-\$190
Florida	-\$4,820	-\$1,090	-\$5,910
Georgia	-\$3,070	-\$430	-\$3,500
Hawaii	-\$410	-\$60	-\$470
Idaho	-\$620	-\$150	-\$770
Illinois	-\$4,050	-\$350	-\$4,400
Indiana	-\$2,460	-\$490	-\$2,950
Iowa	-\$1,240	-\$170	-\$1,410
Kansas	-\$1,070	-\$130	-\$1,200
Kentucky	-\$1,860	-\$270	-\$2,130
Louisiana	-\$2,190	-\$760	-\$2,950
Maine	-\$530	-\$30	-\$560
Maryland	-\$1,540	-\$210	-\$1,750
Massachusetts	-\$1,650	-\$150	-\$1,800
Michigan	-\$3,640	-\$510	-\$4,150
Minnesota	-\$1,740	-\$220	-\$1,960
Mississippi	-\$1,390	-\$230	-\$1,620
Missouri	-\$2,180	-\$450	-\$2,630
Montana	-\$430		-\$430
Nebraska	-\$710	-\$60	-\$770
Nevada	-\$530	-\$170	-\$700
New Hampshire	-\$380		-\$380
New Jersey	-\$2,190	-\$380	-\$2,570
New Mexico	-\$830	-\$80	-\$910
New York	-\$5,240	-\$950	-\$6,190
North Carolina	-\$2,990	-\$600	-\$3,590
North Dakota	-\$310	-\$40	-\$350
Ohio	-\$4,450	-\$540	-\$4,990
Oklahoma	-\$1,570	-\$380	-\$1,950
Oregon	-\$1,290	-\$240	-\$1,530
Pennsylvania	-\$4,240	-\$720	-\$4,960
Rhode Island	-\$340	-\$40	-\$380
South Carolina	-\$1,730	-\$370	-\$2,100
South Dakota	-\$350	-\$90	-\$440
Tennessee	-\$2,230	-\$240	-\$2,470
Texas	-\$8,390	-\$2,110	-\$10,500
Utah	-\$1,200	-\$100	-\$1,300
Vermont	-\$240		-\$240
Virginia	-\$2,420	-\$420	-\$2,840
Washington	-\$2,040	-\$350	-\$2,390
West Virginia	-\$880	-\$140	-\$1,020
Wisconsin	-\$2,110	-\$270	-\$2,380
Wyoming	-\$230	-\$50	-\$280

Technical Notes - Table 3 - Vocational and Adult Education

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of projected cuts in discretionary funding for vocational and adult education grants within the Career, Technical, and Adult Education spending account under the Department of Education.

Specifically, the table shows cuts in Tech-Prep Education State Grants (\$103 million) and State Grants for Workplace and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Individuals (\$17 million). Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. Since H.R. 1 terminates both of these grants, each state's cut corresponds to the amount each state is estimated to receive from these grants in FY2011 under current law according to the Department of Education. Given that some of these funds will already have been used by the time that these proposed cuts are put into effect, the main impact of these cuts will be felt beyond the current academic year.

Tech-Prep grants are awarded by states to local education agencies and postsecondary institutions for the development and operation of Tech-Prep programs. Tech-Prep programs help students gain academic knowledge and technical skills over the course of at least two years of secondary and two years of postsecondary education. Participants work towards an associate's degree or certificate in a specific career field.

The Workplace and Community Transition Training program provides grants to state correctional education agencies to provide educational and vocational training to incarcerated youth. The program encourages incarcerated youths to acquire functional literacy, life, and job skills through the pursuit of postsecondary education certificates, associate of arts degrees, and bachelor's degrees. In addition, the program provides employment counseling and other related services.

H.R. 1 also includes a cut of \$88 million (85 percent) for another Vocational and Adult Education program, the Smaller Learning Communities program. This program funds local school district efforts to improve academic achievement in large public high schools by creating a more personalized learning environment. (Data for projecting this cut by state are not available.)

National totals include cuts to U.S. territories and administrative funds, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

**Table 4. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Grants to States for Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Job Training**

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Funding (\$Millions)	WIA Adult Services Participants	WIA Dislocated Workers Participants	WIA Youth Services Participants
U.S. Total	-\$1,397.4 -47.1%	-1,202,800 -17.4%	-314,500 -27.4%	-254,300 -100.0%
Alabama	-\$18.6	-1,100	-1,400	-2,000
Alaska	-\$3.8	-700	-200	-1,300
Arizona	-\$24.9	-8,500	-1,700	-4,400
Arkansas	-\$11.7	-10,300	-400	-2,500
California	-\$212.4	-22,600	-22,500	-28,900
Colorado	-\$16.8	-20,300	-500	-3,100
Connecticut	-\$13.5	-4,600	-1,000	-1,300
Delaware	-\$3.4	-6,500	-400	-700
District of Columbia	-\$4.0	-3,500	-200	-500
Florida	-\$73.7	-6,000	-5,700	-15,100
Georgia	-\$44.0	-1,600	-2,900	-7,800
Hawaii	-\$4.1	-3,800	-300	-600
Idaho	-\$4.7	-81,700	-400	-1,000
Illinois	-\$65.5	-23,800	-6,300	-13,100
Indiana	-\$30.2	-53,100	-11,200	-7,000
Iowa	-\$6.9	-4,300	-3,200	-1,500
Kansas	-\$8.7	-30,100	-1,100	-1,400
Kentucky	-\$21.8	-36,700	-3,600	-4,400
Louisiana	-\$19.1	-44,500	-4,100	-3,400
Maine	-\$5.3	-300	-400	-1,100
Maryland	-\$17.4	-32,800	-1,100	-2,200
Massachusetts	-\$26.3	-2,400	-2,600	-3,900
Michigan	-\$77.8	-139,400	-8,800	-18,500
Minnesota	-\$21.4	-700	-3,500	-5,100
Mississippi	-\$17.9	-11,300	-15,800	-6,400
Missouri	-\$26.7	-62,100	-3,800	-5,800
Montana	-\$3.3	-21,100	-600	-700
Nebraska	-\$3.6	-200	-400	-1,100
Nevada	-\$12.9	-4,900	-1,000	-1,100
New Hampshire	-\$3.5	-4,400	-400	-700
New Jersey	-\$33.7	-9,400	-3,100	-4,100
New Mexico	-\$6.2	-8,600	-200	-1,500
New York	-\$78.7	-82,700	-83,700	-17,900
North Carolina	-\$41.5	-1,800	-4,000	-5,100
North Dakota	-\$2.8	-11,600	-100	-900
Ohio	-\$59.8	-79,200	-6,300	-14,400
Oklahoma	-\$10.0	-23,300	-6,300	-1,700
Oregon	-\$21.5	-61,400	-72,000	-3,600
Pennsylvania	-\$47.7	-30,100	-6,900	-8,000
Rhode Island	-\$39.9	-2,000	-900	-1,000
South Carolina	-\$6.9	-3,700	-4,400	-5,800
South Dakota	-\$26.4	-3,100	-400	-300
Tennessee	-\$2.9	-5,800	-3,400	-12,700
Texas	-\$29.2	-98,600	-5,800	-15,500
Utah	-\$83.5	-65,200	-700	-1,900
Vermont	-\$5.3	-100	-100	-800
Virginia	-\$3.1	-33,300	-2,800	-3,300
Washington	-\$20.2	-34,800	-2,400	-4,500
West Virginia	-\$27.5	-400	-1,200	-1,400
Wisconsin	-\$5.9	-1,000	-4,200	-2,700
Wyoming	-\$21.5	-3,300	-50	-800

Technical Notes - Table 4 - Grants to States for Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Job Training

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in discretionary funding for the three formula grants in the Training and Employment Services spending account under the Department of Labor.

The formula grants are for: Adult Employment and Training Activities, Dislocated Workers Employment and Training Activities, and Youth Activities. Funding for these programs constitutes 78 percent of total funding in the Training and Employment Services account.

Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011 (the cut shown does not include the proposed \$65 million rescission from the Dislocated Worker Assistance State Grants). The total funding cut for the U.S. includes cuts to U.S. territories, and Native American tribes, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

The WIA grants are typically distributed for an entire program year (July to June). H.R. 1 does not include any funding for the portion of the 2011-12 program year (October 2011 through June 2012) that is not in the current fiscal year, which ends September 30, 2011. Unless subsequent appropriations are made, there will be no further funding for the three formula grants for the remainder of the program year. (For further discussion of this point, please see "House Republican Cuts for This Year Would Hit Job Training Next Year, Too" *Off the Charts*, February 18, 2011.) (<http://www.offthechartsblog.org/house-republican-cuts-for-this-year-would-hit-job-training-next-year-too/>)

Each state's projected funding cut is calculated in proportion to its share of funding for each of the above programs in the 2010 program year, based on Department of Labor data. However, since the formulas that allocate funding to states consider employment conditions in each state, the distribution is likely to be slightly different for 2011.

The table also shows the reduction in the number of participants that could be served in each of the three programs under the proposed funding cut, based on the assumption that that states will cope with reduced funding for the programs by reducing the number of participants. The reduction in participation in each state is calculated by applying the percentage reduction in funding for each program to the most recent state participation levels available for each program. (The most recent state participation data available from the Department of Labor are for 2009. More recent national data suggest that participation levels may have increased slightly, suggesting that the reductions in participation shown here may be slightly conservative.)

The table shows the cuts as outlined in H.R. 1; however, H.R. 1 notes that 25 percent of the funding available for Dislocated Workers Employment and Training Activities may be used to fund Youth Activities in 2011. Therefore, the total reduction of participants in the Youth Services program could be lower and the reduction in the Dislocated Worker program could be higher.

The calculations assume that program spending per participant will be maintained and all cuts will come in the form of reductions in participation. Alternatively, states could choose to implement the same funding cut by reducing spending per participant; this would result in fewer (or no) participants losing assistance outright but would greatly increase the number of participants facing some reduction in services.

**Table 5. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grants**

(In dollars)

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Community Mental Health Services Block Grant	Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant	Total
U.S. Total	\$26 million -6.3%	\$113 million -6.3%	\$139 million -6.3%
Alabama	-\$379,000	-\$1,500,000	-\$1,879,000
Alaska	-\$44,000	-\$311,000	-\$355,000
Arizona	-\$597,000	-\$2,346,000	-\$2,943,000
Arkansas	-\$231,000	-\$839,000	-\$1,070,000
California	-\$3,352,000	-\$15,776,000	-\$19,128,000
Colorado	-\$415,000	-\$1,655,000	-\$2,070,000
Connecticut	-\$262,000	-\$1,070,000	-\$1,332,000
Delaware	-\$46,000	-\$423,000	-\$469,000
District of Columbia	-\$48,000	-\$423,000	-\$471,000
Florida	-\$1,654,000	-\$6,312,000	-\$7,966,000
Georgia	-\$834,000	-\$3,178,000	-\$4,012,000
Hawaii	-\$123,000	-\$480,000	-\$603,000
Idaho	-\$114,000	-\$435,000	-\$549,000
Illinois	-\$986,000	-\$4,395,000	-\$5,381,000
Indiana	-\$498,000	-\$2,095,000	-\$2,593,000
Iowa	-\$212,000	-\$851,000	-\$1,063,000
Kansas	-\$196,000	-\$773,000	-\$969,000
Kentucky	-\$339,000	-\$1,300,000	-\$1,639,000
Louisiana	-\$340,000	-\$1,626,000	-\$1,966,000
Maine	-\$103,000	-\$423,000	-\$526,000
Maryland	-\$458,000	-\$2,012,000	-\$2,470,000
Massachusetts	-\$506,000	-\$2,160,000	-\$2,666,000
Michigan	-\$802,000	-\$3,642,000	-\$4,444,000
Minnesota	-\$429,000	-\$1,566,000	-\$1,995,000
Mississippi	-\$248,000	-\$39,000	-\$287,000
Missouri	-\$439,000	-\$897,000	-\$1,336,000
Montana	-\$74,000	-\$1,645,000	-\$1,719,000
Nebraska	-\$121,000	-\$423,000	-\$544,000
Nevada	-\$230,000	-\$496,000	-\$726,000
New Hampshire	-\$94,000	-\$871,000	-\$965,000
New Jersey	-\$720,000	-\$423,000	-\$1,143,000
New Mexico	-\$148,000	-\$2,953,000	-\$3,101,000
New York	-\$1,472,000	-\$565,000	-\$2,037,000
North Carolina	-\$709,000	-\$7,266,000	-\$7,975,000
North Dakota	-\$46,000	-\$2,510,000	-\$2,556,000
Ohio	-\$865,000	-\$345,000	-\$1,210,000
Oklahoma	-\$273,000	-\$4,193,000	-\$4,466,000
Oregon	-\$312,000	-\$1,114,000	-\$1,426,000
Pennsylvania	-\$903,000	-\$1,128,000	-\$2,031,000
Rhode Island	-\$86,000	-\$3,717,000	-\$3,803,000
South Carolina	-\$364,000	-\$423,000	-\$787,000
South Dakota	-\$54,000	-\$1,297,000	-\$1,351,000
Tennessee	-\$486,000	-\$319,000	-\$805,000
Texas	-\$2,022,000	-\$1,871,000	-\$3,893,000
Utah	-\$195,000	-\$8,554,000	-\$8,749,000
Vermont	-\$46,000	-\$1,078,000	-\$1,124,000
Virginia	-\$627,000	-\$341,000	-\$968,000
Washington	-\$532,000	-\$2,710,000	-\$3,242,000
West Virginia	-\$150,000	-\$2,200,000	-\$2,350,000
Wisconsin	-\$468,000	-\$548,000	-\$1,016,000
Wyoming	-\$27,000	-\$1,767,000	-\$1,794,000

Technical Notes - Table 5 – Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grants

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of H.R. 1's cuts in discretionary funding for the Mental Health and Substance Abuse formula grants, which together made up 65 percent of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services spending account of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Mental Health Services Block Grants are a major source of funding to help state and local government health systems serve adults and children at risk of or experiencing mental illness. In FY 2008, more than 6 million people were served by programs supported in part by these grants. Last year, the block grant totaled \$421 million.

The Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant helps state and local governments to support and expand prevention and treatment for individuals and families at risk of or affected by substance abuse and to reduce the impact of substance abuse on communities. In FY 2008, nearly 2.3 million people were served by programs partly supported by these grants. The block grant equaled \$1.8 billion last year.

H.R. 1 does not specify how much will be cut from these two funding sources. Instead, it cuts \$229.5 million from the account as a whole in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. The cut includes \$214.2 million, or 6.3 percent, from the portion of the account that includes the two block grants and a variety of other activities. H.R. 1 also eliminates funding for a number of smaller programs within the budget account. The figures here assume that the 6.3 percent cut will be spread evenly across the two block grants and the other activities in the account that are not specifically terminated in H.R. 1.

Projected state cuts shown here assume that the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's share of formula grant funding in 2010. For example, if a state received 2 percent of total national funding in 2010 from either of the grants, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the cut to that block grant. This is the same as saying that all states would experience a 6.3 percent cut in both of the block grants.

National totals include cuts in administrative funds and funds for U.S. territories, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

**Table 6. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Selected Low-Income Housing Programs**
(In millions of dollars)

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Public Housing Capital Fund	HOME Investment Partnerships Program	Native American and Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants
U.S. Total	-\$1,072 -42.9%	-\$175 -9.6%	-\$213 -29.9%
Alabama	-\$32.7	-\$2.5	-\$0.7
Alaska	-\$1.3	-\$0.4	-\$30.9
Arizona	-\$4.6	-\$2.5	-\$42.0
Arkansas	-\$10.2	-\$1.6	
California	-\$42.9	-\$25.4	-\$13.6
Colorado	-\$6.6	-\$2.1	-\$0.8
Connecticut	-\$13.0	-\$2.0	
Delaware	-\$2.4	-\$0.5	
District of Columbia	-\$9.2	-\$0.9	
Florida	-\$29.6	-\$7.8	-\$0.3
Georgia	-\$38.9	-\$4.2	
Hawaii	-\$5.7	-\$0.7	-\$13.0
Idaho	-\$0.5	-\$0.7	-\$1.2
Illinois	-\$78.3	-\$7.4	
Indiana	-\$13.0	-\$3.0	
Iowa	-\$2.7	-\$1.5	-\$0.1
Kansas	-\$6.0	-\$1.3	-\$0.3
Kentucky	-\$18.8	-\$2.4	
Louisiana	-\$24.7	-\$3.1	-\$0.2
Maine	-\$3.0	-\$0.8	-\$1.2
Maryland	-\$16.8	-\$2.5	
Massachusetts	-\$30.3	-\$4.6	-\$0.3
Michigan	-\$18.8	-\$4.9	-\$4.2
Minnesota	-\$17.0	-\$2.2	-\$5.5
Mississippi	-\$12.3	-\$1.7	-\$1.0
Missouri	-\$17.4	-\$3.0	
Montana	-\$1.6	-\$0.6	-\$8.1
Nebraska	-\$4.7	-\$0.9	-\$1.7
Nevada	-\$6.0	-\$1.2	-\$4.8
New Hampshire	-\$2.8	-\$0.6	
New Jersey	-\$37.7	-\$4.7	
New Mexico	-\$3.3	-\$1.1	-\$5.2
New York	-\$178.5	-\$19.7	-\$2.0
North Carolina	-\$30.0	-\$4.0	-\$5.4
North Dakota	-\$1.2	-\$0.3	-\$5.5
Ohio	-\$46.5	-\$6.5	
Oklahoma	-\$9.0	-\$2.0	-\$29.3
Oregon	-\$5.2	-\$2.1	-\$4.8
Pennsylvania	-\$78.1	-\$7.4	
Rhode Island	-\$6.9	-\$0.9	-\$0.2
South Carolina	-\$12.8	-\$2.0	-\$0.4
South Dakota	-\$1.0	-\$0.4	-\$9.6
Tennessee	-\$29.2	-\$3.0	
Texas	-\$44.0	-\$11.5	-\$0.7
Utah	-\$1.5	-\$0.9	-\$1.2
Vermont	-\$1.2	-\$0.4	
Virginia	-\$17.8	-\$3.4	
Washington	-\$14.9	-\$3.3	-\$11.9
West Virginia	-\$4.7	-\$1.3	
Wisconsin	-\$9.2	-\$2.8	-\$6.1
Wyoming	-\$0.5	-\$0.3	-\$0.6

Technical Notes - Table 6 – Selected Low-Income Housing Programs

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of projected cuts in discretionary funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and the Native American and Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants. These programs are all part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Public Housing Capital Fund helps local housing agencies across the country make needed repairs to public housing units, such as repairing boilers and roofs.

The HOME Investment Partnerships program provides states and local communities with block grant funding for rental assistance and the development, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable housing for low-income families.

The Native American and Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants provide block grant funding to Native American reservations, tribal areas, and home lands for the development and rehabilitation of affordable housing, the provision of housing-related services, and other community development activities.

Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. The figures for public housing do not include a total of \$398 million in funding reductions and rescissions of unobligated balances of funding from the HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhoods programs, which also support the revitalization of public housing.

Projected state funding cuts assume the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's share of formula grant funding in 2010. For example, if a state received 2 percent of total funding in 2010 from the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the national cut to this block grant. This is the same as saying that all states would experience the same percentage cut.

National totals include cuts to U.S. territories and other funds not distributed to states, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

**Table 7. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds
(In millions of dollars)**

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Clean Water	Drinking Water	Total
U.S. Total	-\$1,410	-\$557	-\$1,967
	-67.1%	-40.2%	-56.4%
Alabama	-\$15	-\$7	-\$22
Alaska	-\$8	-\$5	-\$14
Arizona	-\$9	-\$11	-\$20
Arkansas	-\$9	-\$8	-\$17
California	-\$99	-\$51	-\$150
Colorado	-\$11	-\$10	-\$21
Connecticut	-\$17	-\$5	-\$22
Delaware	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
District of Columbia	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
Florida	-\$47	-\$18	-\$64
Georgia	-\$23	-\$13	-\$36
Hawaii	-\$11	-\$5	-\$16
Idaho	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
Illinois	-\$62	-\$21	-\$83
Indiana	-\$33	-\$9	-\$42
Iowa	-\$19	-\$9	-\$28
Kansas	-\$12	-\$7	-\$19
Kentucky	-\$18	-\$8	-\$25
Louisiana	-\$15	-\$10	-\$25
Maine	-\$11	-\$5	-\$16
Maryland	-\$33	-\$8	-\$42
Massachusetts	-\$47	-\$10	-\$57
Michigan	-\$59	-\$17	-\$76
Minnesota	-\$25	-\$9	-\$35
Mississippi	-\$12	-\$6	-\$18
Missouri	-\$38	-\$11	-\$49
Montana	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
Nebraska	-\$7	-\$5	-\$13
Nevada	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
New Hampshire	-\$14	-\$5	-\$19
New Jersey	-\$56	-\$12	-\$68
New Mexico	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
New York	-\$153	-\$36	-\$188
North Carolina	-\$25	-\$14	-\$39
North Dakota	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
Ohio	-\$78	-\$18	-\$95
Oklahoma	-\$11	-\$7	-\$18
Oregon	-\$16	-\$5	-\$21
Pennsylvania	-\$55	-\$16	-\$71
Rhode Island	-\$9	-\$5	-\$15
South Carolina	-\$14	-\$5	-\$20
South Dakota	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
Tennessee	-\$20	-\$6	-\$26
Texas	-\$63	-\$35	-\$98
Utah	-\$7	-\$5	-\$13
Vermont	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12
Virginia	-\$28	-\$9	-\$38
Washington	-\$24	-\$14	-\$38
West Virginia	-\$22	-\$5	-\$27
Wisconsin	-\$37	-\$9	-\$47
Wyoming	-\$7	-\$5	-\$12

Technical Notes - Table 7 – EPA Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in federal discretionary funding for the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, two funds within the EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grants spending account.

Figures show the proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. H.R. 1 cuts \$1.41 billion in funding for Clean Water and \$557 million in funding for Drinking Water.

Projected state funding cuts assume that for each program, the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's share of funding in 2010. For example, if a state received 2 percent of Clean Water funding in 2010, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the national cut for this funding. This is the same as saying that all states would experience the same percentage cut (67.1 percent) from their funding under the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and the same percentage cut (40.2 percent) in their funding under the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. The total cut shown in this table is the sum of these two program cuts. At the national level, H.R. 1 cuts combined funding for the two programs by more than half, or 56 percent. (This combined percentage cut varies from state to state, depending on the relative size of the two programs in the state.)

National totals include cuts to U.S. territories, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

**Table 8. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
(In millions of dollars)**

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Funding
U.S. Total	-\$2,490 -62.4%
Alabama	-33.6
Alaska	-3.3
Arizona	-37.1
Arkansas	-18.8
California	-314.4
Colorado	-25.7
Connecticut	-28.5
Delaware	-4.9
District of Columbia	-12.4
Florida	-108.7
Georgia	-55.9
Hawaii	-10.3
Idaho	-8.4
Illinois	-117.7
Indiana	-47.5
Iowa	-28.0
Kansas	-19.1
Kentucky	-31.2
Louisiana	-43.2
Maine	-13.5
Maryland	-37.2
Massachusetts	-74.2
Michigan	-89.1
Minnesota	-39.1
Mississippi	-24.1
Missouri	-45.2
Montana	-6.3
Nebraska	-13.0
Nevada	-13.8
New Hampshire	-9.0
New Jersey	-68.9
New Mexico	-14.4
New York	-235.9
North Carolina	-49.0
North Dakota	-4.3
Ohio	-109.8
Oklahoma	-20.6
Oregon	-24.8
Pennsylvania	-149.4
Rhode Island	-11.8
South Carolina	-26.5
South Dakota	-5.5
Tennessee	-34.1
Texas	-174.4
Utah	-14.2
Vermont	-5.7
Virginia	-41.4
Washington	-41.6
West Virginia	-17.0
Wisconsin	-45.1
Wyoming	-2.9

Technical Notes - Table 8 – Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of projected cuts in federal discretionary funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) under the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Community Development Block Grant helps fund a broad range of community development activities, including housing development and rehabilitation, homelessness programs, improvements to public facilities such as senior and youth centers, economic development, and some social services.

Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. The figures reflect potential reductions in CDBG formula grants only and do not include \$460 million in additional funding cuts proposed to the Sustainable Communities Initiative and other grant programs funded under the CDBG account. The figures also do not include H.R. 1's rescission of \$130 million in funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative that HUD has already awarded to dozens of communities across the country.

Projected state funding cuts assume the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's share of formula grant funding in 2010. For example, if a state received 2 percent of total funding in 2010 from the Community Development Block Grant, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the national cut to this block grant. This is the same as saying that all states would experience the same percentage cut.

National totals include cuts to U.S. territories, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.

**Table 9. Projected Cuts Under H.R. 1
Byrne Justice Assistance Grants
(In millions of dollars)**

**Proposed Cut in FY2011
Relative to Current Funding Levels**

	Funding
U.S. Total	-\$152
	-29.2%
Alabama	-\$2.1
Alaska	-\$0.7
Arizona	-\$3.0
Arkansas	-\$1.6
California	-\$16.0
Colorado	-\$2.1
Connecticut	-\$1.5
Delaware	-\$0.8
District of Columbia	-\$0.8
Florida	-\$9.6
Georgia	-\$4.2
Hawaii	-\$0.8
Idaho	-\$0.8
Illinois	-\$6.0
Indiana	-\$2.5
Iowa	-\$1.3
Kansas	-\$1.4
Kentucky	-\$1.7
Louisiana	-\$2.6
Maine	-\$0.7
Maryland	-\$3.1
Massachusetts	-\$2.9
Michigan	-\$4.8
Minnesota	-\$2.1
Mississippi	-\$1.3
Missouri	-\$2.8
Montana	-\$0.4
Nebraska	-\$0.9
Nevada	-\$1.6
New Hampshire	-\$0.7
New Jersey	-\$3.4
New Mexico	-\$1.3
New York	-\$7.9
North Carolina	-\$4.0
North Dakota	-\$0.3
Ohio	-\$4.4
Oklahoma	-\$1.8
Oregon	-\$1.6
Pennsylvania	-\$5.1
Rhode Island	-\$0.7
South Carolina	-\$2.7
South Dakota	-\$0.3
Tennessee	-\$3.6
Texas	-\$10.4
Utah	-\$1.2
Vermont	-\$0.4
Virginia	-\$2.8
Washington	-\$2.6
West Virginia	-\$0.9
Wisconsin	-\$2.1
Wyoming	-\$0.3

Technical Notes - Table 9 - Byrne Justice Assistance Grants

This table shows the state-by-state distribution of the projected cut in federal discretionary spending for formula grants under the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance in the Department of Justice.

Figures represent H.R. 1's proposed cut in FY 2011 relative to current funding levels, which will expire March 4, 2011. H.R. 1 does not specify how much will be cut from JAG. Instead, it cuts \$578.5 million relative to current funding levels from a broader budget account that contains several programs, including JAG. The cut includes \$185.3 million to eliminate a specific program in the budget account. The figures here assume that the remaining \$393.2 million cut will be spread evenly across JAG and the other activities in the account that are not specifically cut in H.R. 1.

The table shows the impact of a 29.2 percent cut in funding for the JAG program, assuming that a 29.2 percent cut in the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance budget account is distributed across the board. Projected state funding cuts assume the national cut would be applied evenly to states in proportion to each state's share of JAG formula funding in 2010. For example, if a state received 2 percent of total JAG funding in 2010, this analysis assumes the state would absorb 2 percent of the national JAG cut. This is the same as saying that all states would experience a 29.2 percent cut.

National totals include cuts to Puerto Rico, U.S. territories and administrative funds, but those cuts are not reflected in the state-by-state figures.