

**Table 1a. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to  
Elementary and Secondary Education  
Five Year Cuts, 2007-2011 (Millions of dollars)**

	<b>K-12 Total*</b>	<b>Education for the Disadvantaged</b>	<b>Special Education</b>	<b>School Improvement Programs</b>	<b>Impact Aid</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$7,663</b> <b>-3.9%</b>	<b>+\$2,418</b> <b>+3.1%</b>	<b>-\$5,471</b> <b>-8.8%</b>	<b>-\$3,997</b> <b>-14.2%</b>	<b>-\$613</b> <b>-3.9%</b>
Alabama	-\$112.9	+\$37.4	-\$84.1	-\$64.2	-\$2.0
Alaska	-\$86.5	+\$7.3	-\$16.8	-\$19.8	-\$57.2
Arizona	-\$191.4	+\$49.4	-\$83.1	-\$69.7	-\$88.0
Arkansas	-\$71.0	+\$24.2	-\$52.8	-\$42.1	-\$0.3
California	-\$729.6	+\$339.1	-\$574.5	-\$455.2	-\$38.9
Colorado	-\$99.4	+\$25.0	-\$70.1	-\$44.6	-\$9.6
Connecticut	-\$82.4	+\$18.8	-\$61.9	-\$35.8	-\$3.5
Delaware	-\$29.2	+\$6.3	-\$15.6	-\$19.8	-\$0.0
District of Columbia	-\$20.2	+\$8.8	-\$8.1	-\$19.5	-\$1.3
Florida	-\$353.7	+\$122.8	-\$291.6	-\$178.6	-\$6.3
Georgia	-\$191.7	+\$76.5	-\$145.1	-\$111.7	-\$11.4
Hawaii	-\$56.8	+\$8.6	-\$18.8	-\$20.0	-\$26.7
Idaho	-\$41.9	+\$8.7	-\$25.5	-\$20.8	-\$4.3
Illinois	-\$305.0	+\$98.7	-\$235.9	-\$156.7	-\$11.2
Indiana	-\$145.6	+\$34.7	-\$118.9	-\$61.3	-\$0.1
Iowa	-\$75.9	+\$12.3	-\$56.4	-\$31.4	-\$0.4
Kansas	-\$78.1	+\$16.9	-\$50.1	-\$32.4	-\$12.6
Kentucky	-\$102.7	+\$35.4	-\$75.6	-\$62.1	-\$0.3
Louisiana	-\$127.6	+\$52.7	-\$88.1	-\$86.4	-\$5.8
Maine	-\$41.7	+\$8.5	-\$25.9	-\$23.2	-\$1.2
Maryland	-\$120.8	+\$31.4	-\$93.4	-\$54.7	-\$4.2
Massachusetts	-\$160.8	+\$38.2	-\$131.3	-\$67.4	-\$0.4
Michigan	-\$246.4	+\$78.7	-\$185.4	-\$137.3	-\$2.4
Minnesota	-\$124.3	+\$20.3	-\$88.8	-\$48.2	-\$7.6
Mississippi	-\$84.0	+\$32.0	-\$55.5	-\$58.1	-\$2.4
Missouri	-\$150.0	+\$35.3	-\$104.7	-\$69.0	-\$11.6
Montana	-\$57.5	+\$7.7	-\$17.5	-\$24.3	-\$23.4
Nebraska	-\$62.7	+\$10.2	-\$34.6	-\$27.1	-\$11.2
Nevada	-\$42.0	+\$13.9	-\$31.3	-\$22.7	-\$2.0
New Hampshire	-\$38.0	+\$5.8	-\$22.3	-\$21.5	-\$0.0
New Jersey	-\$212.5	+\$48.5	-\$167.4	-\$85.0	-\$8.6
New Mexico	-\$103.5	+\$20.9	-\$42.2	-\$33.8	-\$48.4
New York	-\$452.0	+\$219.9	-\$356.4	-\$306.0	-\$9.5
North Carolina	-\$191.2	+\$55.2	-\$146.4	-\$90.7	-\$9.2
North Dakota	-\$42.7	+\$5.6	-\$12.7	-\$20.2	-\$15.4
Ohio	-\$259.2	+\$75.2	-\$202.2	-\$130.3	-\$1.9
Oklahoma	-\$117.8	+\$26.4	-\$68.1	-\$53.3	-\$22.9
Oregon	-\$75.2	+\$26.2	-\$59.8	-\$40.0	-\$1.6
Pennsylvania	-\$253.5	+\$89.3	-\$198.3	-\$143.7	-\$0.8
Rhode Island	-\$33.1	+\$8.6	-\$20.7	-\$19.9	-\$1.1
South Carolina	-\$103.1	+\$32.9	-\$81.8	-\$52.2	-\$2.0
South Dakota	-\$52.6	+\$6.8	-\$15.2	-\$20.5	-\$23.7
Tennessee	-\$138.3	+\$38.2	-\$107.8	-\$67.0	-\$1.7
Texas	-\$591.0	+\$227.4	-\$445.6	-\$327.9	-\$45.0
Utah	-\$69.7	+\$10.6	-\$50.1	-\$25.2	-\$5.0
Vermont	-\$26.5	+\$5.4	-\$12.3	-\$19.6	-\$0.0
Virginia	-\$184.2	+\$38.7	-\$130.9	-\$69.8	-\$22.2
Washington	-\$163.6	+\$35.2	-\$103.3	-\$62.3	-\$33.2
West Virginia	-\$52.1	+\$18.2	-\$35.5	-\$34.8	-\$0.0
Wisconsin	-\$135.1	+\$28.4	-\$97.8	-\$59.1	-\$6.7
Wyoming	-\$33.1	+\$5.6	-\$13.0	-\$19.5	-\$6.2

**Table 1b. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to  
Elementary and Secondary Education  
In 2011 (Millions of dollars)**

	<b>K-12 Total*</b>	<b>Education for the Disadvantaged</b>	<b>Special Education</b>	<b>School Improvement Programs</b>	<b>Impact Aid</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$3,266</b>	<b>-\$297</b>	<b>-\$1,704</b>	<b>-\$1,077</b>	<b>-\$188</b>
	<b>-8.5%</b>	<b>-1.8%</b>	<b>-13.2%</b>	<b>-18.3%</b>	<b>-13.8%</b>
Alabama	-\$48.7	-\$4.6	-\$26.2	-\$17.3	-\$0.6
Alaska	-\$29.0	-\$0.9	-\$5.2	-\$5.3	-\$17.5
Arizona	-\$77.7	-\$6.1	-\$25.9	-\$18.8	-\$27.0
Arkansas	-\$30.8	-\$3.0	-\$16.5	-\$11.3	-\$0.1
California	-\$355.2	-\$41.6	-\$178.9	-\$122.6	-\$11.9
Colorado	-\$39.9	-\$3.1	-\$21.8	-\$12.0	-\$3.0
Connecticut	-\$32.3	-\$2.3	-\$19.3	-\$9.6	-\$1.1
Delaware	-\$11.0	-\$0.8	-\$4.8	-\$5.3	-\$0.0
District of Columbia	-\$9.3	-\$1.1	-\$2.5	-\$5.2	-\$0.4
Florida	-\$156.0	-\$15.1	-\$90.8	-\$48.1	-\$1.9
Georgia	-\$88.2	-\$9.4	-\$45.2	-\$30.1	-\$3.5
Hawaii	-\$20.5	-\$1.1	-\$5.8	-\$5.4	-\$8.2
Idaho	-\$15.9	-\$1.1	-\$7.9	-\$5.6	-\$1.3
Illinois	-\$131.2	-\$12.1	-\$73.5	-\$42.2	-\$3.4
Indiana	-\$57.8	-\$4.3	-\$37.0	-\$16.5	-\$0.0
Iowa	-\$27.7	-\$1.5	-\$17.6	-\$8.5	-\$0.1
Kansas	-\$30.3	-\$2.1	-\$15.6	-\$8.7	-\$3.9
Kentucky	-\$44.7	-\$4.3	-\$23.6	-\$16.7	-\$0.1
Louisiana	-\$58.9	-\$6.5	-\$27.4	-\$23.3	-\$1.8
Maine	-\$15.7	-\$1.0	-\$8.1	-\$6.2	-\$0.4
Maryland	-\$48.9	-\$3.9	-\$29.1	-\$14.7	-\$1.3
Massachusetts	-\$63.9	-\$4.7	-\$40.9	-\$18.2	-\$0.1
Michigan	-\$105.1	-\$9.7	-\$57.7	-\$37.0	-\$0.7
Minnesota	-\$45.5	-\$2.5	-\$27.7	-\$13.0	-\$2.3
Mississippi	-\$37.6	-\$3.9	-\$17.3	-\$15.7	-\$0.7
Missouri	-\$59.1	-\$4.3	-\$32.6	-\$18.6	-\$3.6
Montana	-\$20.1	-\$0.9	-\$5.4	-\$6.5	-\$7.2
Nebraska	-\$22.8	-\$1.2	-\$10.8	-\$7.3	-\$3.4
Nevada	-\$18.2	-\$1.7	-\$9.8	-\$6.1	-\$0.6
New Hampshire	-\$13.4	-\$0.7	-\$6.9	-\$5.8	-\$0.0
New Jersey	-\$83.6	-\$6.0	-\$52.1	-\$22.9	-\$2.6
New Mexico	-\$39.7	-\$2.6	-\$13.1	-\$9.1	-\$14.8
New York	-\$223.4	-\$27.0	-\$111.0	-\$82.4	-\$2.9
North Carolina	-\$79.6	-\$6.8	-\$45.6	-\$24.4	-\$2.8
North Dakota	-\$14.8	-\$0.7	-\$4.0	-\$5.4	-\$4.7
Ohio	-\$107.9	-\$9.2	-\$63.0	-\$35.1	-\$0.6
Oklahoma	-\$45.8	-\$3.2	-\$21.2	-\$14.4	-\$7.0
Oregon	-\$33.1	-\$3.2	-\$18.6	-\$10.8	-\$0.5
Pennsylvania	-\$111.7	-\$11.0	-\$61.8	-\$38.7	-\$0.2
Rhode Island	-\$13.2	-\$1.1	-\$6.5	-\$5.4	-\$0.4
South Carolina	-\$44.2	-\$4.0	-\$25.5	-\$14.1	-\$0.6
South Dakota	-\$18.4	-\$0.8	-\$4.7	-\$5.5	-\$7.3
Tennessee	-\$56.8	-\$4.7	-\$33.6	-\$18.0	-\$0.5
Texas	-\$268.8	-\$27.9	-\$138.8	-\$88.3	-\$13.8
Utah	-\$25.2	-\$1.3	-\$15.6	-\$6.8	-\$1.5
Vermont	-\$9.8	-\$0.7	-\$3.8	-\$5.3	-\$0.0
Virginia	-\$71.1	-\$4.7	-\$40.8	-\$18.8	-\$6.8
Washington	-\$63.5	-\$4.3	-\$32.2	-\$16.8	-\$10.2
West Virginia	-\$22.7	-\$2.2	-\$11.1	-\$9.4	-\$0.0
Wisconsin	-\$51.9	-\$3.5	-\$30.5	-\$15.9	-\$2.1
Wyoming	-\$11.9	-\$0.7	-\$4.0	-\$5.3	-\$1.9

### **Technical Notes**

\* This table shows projected cuts in four major Department of Education accounts: Education for the Disadvantaged (account 91 0900), Special Education (91 0300), School Improvement (91 1000), and Impact Aid (91 0102). Each of these accounts is in the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education category of the budget (known technically as budget subfunction 501).

The Education for the Disadvantaged account 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, and the Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program.

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

The School Improvement account 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 low-income communities).

The Impact Aid account 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 Office of Management and Budget baseline for these accounts, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding for that account in 2006. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for an account in 2006, it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for that account. A very small share of the national total represents funding reductions, not shown separately, that this analysis assumes would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies in proportion to their current share of spending in the account.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 2. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to Vocational and Adult Education**

(Millions of dollars)

	<b>In 2007</b>	<b>In 2011</b>	<b>5 Year Cut</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$1,455</b>	<b>-\$1,657</b>	<b>-\$7,813</b>
	<b>-71.5%</b>	<b>-74.8%</b>	<b>-73.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$24.4	-\$27.8	-\$131.2
Alaska	-\$4.4	-\$5.0	-\$23.5
Arizona	-\$27.7	-\$31.6	-\$148.8
Arkansas	-\$15.1	-\$17.1	-\$80.8
California	-\$170.4	-\$194.1	-\$915.0
Colorado	-\$18.1	-\$20.6	-\$97.1
Connecticut	-\$12.9	-\$14.7	-\$69.5
Delaware	-\$5.3	-\$6.0	-\$28.4
District of Columbia	-\$4.7	-\$5.3	-\$25.0
Florida	-\$77.6	-\$88.4	-\$416.5
Georgia	-\$43.2	-\$49.2	-\$232.2
Hawaii	-\$6.8	-\$7.7	-\$36.4
Idaho	-\$7.5	-\$8.5	-\$40.1
Illinois	-\$55.4	-\$63.1	-\$297.5
Indiana	-\$30.4	-\$34.7	-\$163.4
Iowa	-\$14.2	-\$16.1	-\$76.1
Kansas	-\$13.0	-\$14.8	-\$69.7
Kentucky	-\$22.4	-\$25.5	-\$120.2
Louisiana	-\$26.0	-\$29.6	-\$139.3
Maine	-\$6.5	-\$7.4	-\$34.8
Maryland	-\$21.2	-\$24.2	-\$113.9
Massachusetts	-\$23.7	-\$27.0	-\$127.3
Michigan	-\$46.0	-\$52.4	-\$247.2
Minnesota	-\$21.1	-\$24.0	-\$113.2
Mississippi	-\$17.0	-\$19.4	-\$91.3
Missouri	-\$27.6	-\$31.5	-\$148.4
Montana	-\$5.8	-\$6.6	-\$31.0
Nebraska	-\$8.3	-\$9.4	-\$44.4
Nevada	-\$9.9	-\$11.2	-\$53.0
New Hampshire	-\$6.4	-\$7.3	-\$34.5
New Jersey	-\$33.1	-\$37.7	-\$177.9
New Mexico	-\$11.2	-\$12.8	-\$60.1
New York	-\$81.3	-\$92.6	-\$436.4
North Carolina	-\$41.7	-\$47.5	-\$223.9
North Dakota	-\$4.6	-\$5.2	-\$24.6
Ohio	-\$52.9	-\$60.2	-\$283.9
Oklahoma	-\$18.7	-\$21.2	-\$100.1
Oregon	-\$16.5	-\$18.8	-\$88.5
Pennsylvania	-\$54.7	-\$62.3	-\$293.9
Rhode Island	-\$6.8	-\$7.8	-\$36.7
South Carolina	-\$22.1	-\$25.2	-\$118.7
South Dakota	-\$4.8	-\$5.5	-\$25.7
Tennessee	-\$29.3	-\$33.3	-\$157.2
Texas	-\$115.2	-\$131.2	-\$618.3
Utah	-\$14.2	-\$16.2	-\$76.2
Vermont	-\$4.4	-\$5.0	-\$23.6
Virginia	-\$31.9	-\$36.3	-\$171.3
Washington	-\$26.1	-\$29.7	-\$140.0
West Virginia	-\$10.4	-\$11.9	-\$56.1
Wisconsin	-\$25.1	-\$28.5	-\$134.6
Wyoming	-\$4.2	-\$4.8	-\$22.6

### **Technical Notes**

Vocational and Adult Education is Department of Education account 91 0400 in the Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education category of the budget (known technically as budget subfunction 501). This account includes funding for four major funding streams: vocational education, adult education, English literacy and civics education, and Technical Preparation State Grants.

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding of the four major funding streams included in this account. (In 2006, these funding streams represented 93 percent of all funding for this account.) For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for these funding streams in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. A very small share of the national total represents funding reductions, not shown separately, that this analysis assumes would be borne by U.S. territories, tribes, or federal agencies in proportion to their current share of spending in the account.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 3. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to  
WIC**

**The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children**

	<b>Cut in 2007 (\$millions)</b>	<b>Cut in 2011 (\$millions)</b>	<b>Cut in 2011 (participants)</b>	<b>5 Year Cut (\$millions)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$86 -1.6%</b>	<b>-\$765 -13.3%</b>	<b>-474,000</b>	<b>-\$2,454 -8.9%</b>
Alabama	-\$1.40	-\$12.49	-7,000	-\$40.1
Alaska	-\$0.37	-\$3.32	-1,600	-\$10.6
Arizona	-\$2.00	-\$17.81	-10,500	-\$57.1
Arkansas	-\$0.95	-\$8.41	-5,200	-\$27.0
California	-\$14.56	-\$129.48	-77,300	-\$415.4
Colorado	-\$0.88	-\$7.80	-5,000	-\$25.0
Connecticut	-\$0.60	-\$5.36	-3,100	-\$17.2
Delaware	-\$0.19	-\$1.70	-1,100	-\$5.4
District of Columbia	-\$0.24	-\$2.15	-900	-\$6.9
Florida	-\$4.03	-\$35.82	-21,900	-\$114.9
Georgia	-\$2.66	-\$23.63	-15,800	-\$75.8
Hawaii	-\$0.50	-\$4.43	-1,900	-\$14.2
Idaho	-\$0.36	-\$3.17	-2,200	-\$10.2
Illinois	-\$3.08	-\$27.40	-16,200	-\$87.9
Indiana	-\$1.30	-\$11.58	-8,000	-\$37.1
Iowa	-\$0.69	-\$6.12	-4,000	-\$19.6
Kansas	-\$0.64	-\$5.66	-4,000	-\$18.1
Kentucky	-\$1.30	-\$11.56	-7,200	-\$37.1
Louisiana	-\$1.78	-\$15.81	-8,500	-\$50.7
Maine	-\$0.21	-\$1.84	-1,400	-\$5.9
Maryland	-\$1.02	-\$9.09	-6,400	-\$29.2
Massachusetts	-\$1.15	-\$10.24	-6,700	-\$32.8
Michigan	-\$2.26	-\$20.12	-13,400	-\$64.5
Minnesota	-\$1.21	-\$10.79	-7,300	-\$34.6
Mississippi	-\$1.12	-\$9.92	-6,000	-\$31.8
Missouri	-\$1.26	-\$11.24	-7,800	-\$36.1
Montana	-\$0.24	-\$2.13	-1,200	-\$6.8
Nebraska	-\$0.42	-\$3.76	-2,400	-\$12.1
Nevada	-\$0.49	-\$4.40	-2,900	-\$14.1
New Hampshire	-\$0.17	-\$1.52	-1,000	-\$4.9
New Jersey	-\$1.57	-\$13.99	-8,700	-\$44.9
New Mexico	-\$0.68	-\$6.07	-3,800	-\$19.5
New York	-\$5.80	-\$51.57	-28,500	-\$165.4
North Carolina	-\$2.41	-\$21.47	-13,300	-\$68.9
North Dakota	-\$0.19	-\$1.71	-800	-\$5.5
Ohio	-\$2.69	-\$23.89	-16,100	-\$76.6
Oklahoma	-\$1.18	-\$10.48	-7,100	-\$33.6
Oregon	-\$1.08	-\$9.60	-6,100	-\$30.8
Pennsylvania	-\$2.35	-\$20.88	-14,200	-\$67.0
Rhode Island	-\$0.24	-\$2.17	-1,300	-\$7.0
South Carolina	-\$1.12	-\$10.00	-6,400	-\$32.1
South Dakota	-\$0.24	-\$2.16	-1,300	-\$6.9
Tennessee	-\$1.74	-\$15.49	-9,200	-\$49.7
Texas	-\$8.25	-\$73.36	-52,700	-\$235.3
Utah	-\$0.59	-\$5.22	-4,000	-\$16.7
Vermont	-\$0.19	-\$1.72	-1,000	-\$5.5
Virginia	-\$1.36	-\$12.08	-8,200	-\$38.8
Washington	-\$1.86	-\$16.58	-9,500	-\$53.2
West Virginia	-\$0.55	-\$4.90	-2,900	-\$15.7
Wisconsin	-\$1.13	-\$10.02	-6,700	-\$32.1
Wyoming	-\$0.12	-\$1.10	-700	-\$3.5

## Technical Notes

This table shows projected cuts to the WIC program, which is Department of Agriculture account 12 3510 in the Food and Nutrition Assistance category of the budget (known technically as subfunction 605).

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding in 2005. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for these funding streams in 2005, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account.

The table also illustrates the loss in the number of women, infants, and children who could receive WIC benefits if the cut in 2011 were achieved in part by reducing the number of households receiving assistance. This analysis assumes that the participation cuts would be apportioned to each state in proportion to its share of the total number of WIC participants in 2005. The analysis assumes the adoption of proposals in the President's budget to reduce the portion of federal WIC funds that are devoted to the costs of administering the program in the states and providing various nutrition services. Those proposals would cap federal funds for WIC nutrition services and administration (NSA) and impose a state match on NSA funds beginning in fiscal year 2008. (NSA funds are used to provide services for WIC participants such as counseling in nutrition and breast feeding for new mothers and health care referrals for young children, as well as paying for eligibility determinations and other administrative expenses for WIC clinics.)

If we did not make the assumption that these proposals would be adopted, the projected numbers of participants losing WIC would be higher than is shown here.

National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 4. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to the  
Child Care and Development Block Grant (discretionary funding)**

(Millions of dollars)

	<b>Cut in 2007</b>	<b>Cut in 2011</b>	<b>5 Year Cut</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$45</b>	<b>-\$315</b>	<b>-\$1,029</b>
	<b>-2.1%</b>	<b>-13.7%</b>	<b>-9.4%</b>
Alabama	-\$0.89	-\$6.20	-\$20.2
Alaska	-\$0.09	-\$0.62	-\$2.0
Arizona	-\$1.09	-\$7.63	-\$24.9
Arkansas	-\$0.54	-\$3.77	-\$12.3
California	-\$5.00	-\$34.99	-\$114.3
Colorado	-\$0.52	-\$3.63	-\$11.8
Connecticut	-\$0.31	-\$2.19	-\$7.1
Delaware	-\$0.10	-\$0.69	-\$2.3
District of Columbia	-\$0.07	-\$0.47	-\$1.5
Florida	-\$2.51	-\$17.55	-\$57.3
Georgia	-\$1.65	-\$11.56	-\$37.8
Hawaii	-\$0.18	-\$1.24	-\$4.0
Idaho	-\$0.25	-\$1.77	-\$5.8
Illinois	-\$1.66	-\$11.61	-\$37.9
Indiana	-\$0.90	-\$6.33	-\$20.7
Iowa	-\$0.40	-\$2.78	-\$9.1
Kansas	-\$0.41	-\$2.88	-\$9.4
Kentucky	-\$0.77	-\$5.41	-\$17.7
Louisiana	-\$1.03	-\$7.18	-\$23.5
Maine	-\$0.15	-\$1.05	-\$3.4
Maryland	-\$0.57	-\$4.01	-\$13.1
Massachusetts	-\$0.56	-\$3.91	-\$12.8
Michigan	-\$1.28	-\$8.97	-\$29.3
Minnesota	-\$0.56	-\$3.94	-\$12.9
Mississippi	-\$0.70	-\$4.93	-\$16.1
Missouri	-\$0.85	-\$5.94	-\$19.4
Montana	-\$0.12	-\$0.87	-\$2.8
Nebraska	-\$0.26	-\$1.82	-\$5.9
Nevada	-\$0.30	-\$2.07	-\$6.8
New Hampshire	-\$0.10	-\$0.72	-\$2.4
New Jersey	-\$0.80	-\$5.63	-\$18.4
New Mexico	-\$0.40	-\$2.83	-\$9.2
New York	-\$2.35	-\$16.42	-\$53.6
North Carolina	-\$1.42	-\$9.94	-\$32.5
North Dakota	-\$0.08	-\$0.59	-\$1.9
Ohio	-\$1.48	-\$10.34	-\$33.8
Oklahoma	-\$0.68	-\$4.77	-\$15.6
Oregon	-\$0.49	-\$3.41	-\$11.1
Pennsylvania	-\$1.37	-\$9.59	-\$31.3
Rhode Island	-\$0.13	-\$0.89	-\$2.9
South Carolina	-\$0.81	-\$5.66	-\$18.5
South Dakota	-\$0.12	-\$0.87	-\$2.9
Tennessee	-\$0.98	-\$6.89	-\$22.5
Texas	-\$4.60	-\$32.23	-\$105.3
Utah	-\$0.49	-\$3.42	-\$11.2
Vermont	-\$0.06	-\$0.45	-\$1.5
Virginia	-\$0.87	-\$6.08	-\$19.9
Washington	-\$0.72	-\$5.04	-\$16.5
West Virginia	-\$0.30	-\$2.09	-\$6.8
Wisconsin	-\$0.65	-\$4.55	-\$14.9
Wyoming	-\$0.06	-\$0.43	-\$1.4



### **Technical Notes**

This table shows projected cuts in federal discretionary child care assistance grants under the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which is Department of Health and Human Services account 75 1515 in the "Other Income Security" category of the budget (known technically as subfunction 609). This account does not include two other major sources of federal child care funding, known as "Mandatory" and "Matching" funds.

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding in 2006. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for these funding streams in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 5. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to  
Children and Families Services**

(Includes the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), Head Start,  
and Services for Abused and Neglected Children) (Millions of dollars)

U.S. Total	Total			CSBG Only		
	Cut in 2007	Cut in 2011	5 Year Cut	Cut in 2007	Cut in 2011	5 Year Cut
	<b>-\$784</b>	<b>-\$1,928</b>	<b>-\$7,293</b>	<b>-\$643</b>	<b>-\$701</b>	<b>-\$3,359</b>
	<b>-8.7%</b>	<b>-19.6%</b>	<b>-15.5%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$14.0	-\$31.0	-\$120.2	-\$12.0	-\$13.0	-\$62.5
Alaska	-\$2.6	-\$4.6	-\$18.7	-\$2.3	-\$2.5	-\$12.1
Arizona	-\$7.4	-\$23.4	-\$84.2	-\$5.3	-\$5.8	-\$27.9
Arkansas	-\$10.1	-\$20.6	-\$81.4	-\$8.9	-\$9.7	-\$46.4
California	-\$74.2	-\$202.7	-\$750.2	-\$58.2	-\$63.4	-\$304.1
Colorado	-\$7.0	-\$17.8	-\$67.0	-\$5.7	-\$6.2	-\$29.6
Connecticut	-\$8.9	-\$17.3	-\$68.9	-\$7.9	-\$8.6	-\$41.1
Delaware	-\$3.5	-\$5.8	-\$24.3	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.1
District of Columbia	-\$11.2	-\$15.8	-\$69.2	-\$10.7	-\$11.7	-\$56.0
Florida	-\$24.1	-\$65.6	-\$243.0	-\$19.0	-\$20.7	-\$99.1
Georgia	-\$20.9	-\$47.8	-\$183.4	-\$17.6	-\$19.1	-\$91.7
Hawaii	-\$3.7	-\$7.5	-\$29.5	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.1
Idaho	-\$3.7	-\$7.5	-\$29.5	-\$3.2	-\$3.5	-\$16.8
Illinois	-\$36.1	-\$79.0	-\$306.6	-\$30.8	-\$33.6	-\$161.1
Indiana	-\$11.4	-\$26.9	-\$102.7	-\$9.5	-\$10.4	-\$49.7
Iowa	-\$8.1	-\$16.5	-\$65.1	-\$7.1	-\$7.7	-\$36.9
Kansas	-\$6.3	-\$14.5	-\$55.6	-\$5.3	-\$5.8	-\$27.8
Kentucky	-\$13.1	-\$30.1	-\$115.5	-\$11.0	-\$12.0	-\$57.5
Louisiana	-\$18.1	-\$41.1	-\$158.2	-\$15.3	-\$16.7	-\$80.1
Maine	-\$4.0	-\$8.4	-\$32.8	-\$3.4	-\$3.7	-\$17.9
Maryland	-\$10.5	-\$23.1	-\$89.4	-\$9.0	-\$9.8	-\$46.8
Massachusetts	-\$18.4	-\$35.9	-\$143.1	-\$16.3	-\$17.7	-\$85.0
Michigan	-\$28.6	-\$65.6	-\$252.0	-\$24.1	-\$26.3	-\$126.0
Minnesota	-\$9.3	-\$20.9	-\$80.5	-\$7.9	-\$8.6	-\$41.0
Mississippi	-\$13.4	-\$38.0	-\$139.6	-\$10.4	-\$11.3	-\$54.2
Missouri	-\$20.4	-\$39.8	-\$158.8	-\$18.1	-\$19.7	-\$94.4
Montana	-\$3.4	-\$6.7	-\$26.6	-\$2.9	-\$3.2	-\$15.4
Nebraska	-\$5.3	-\$11.1	-\$43.3	-\$4.6	-\$5.0	-\$23.8
Nevada	-\$3.8	-\$7.8	-\$30.8	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.1
New Hampshire	-\$3.5	-\$5.9	-\$24.5	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.1
New Jersey	-\$20.4	-\$41.2	-\$163.0	-\$17.9	-\$19.5	-\$93.3
New Mexico	-\$4.7	-\$12.8	-\$47.3	-\$3.7	-\$4.0	-\$19.3
New York	-\$64.9	-\$133.8	-\$526.8	-\$56.7	-\$61.7	-\$295.9
North Carolina	-\$19.9	-\$42.8	-\$166.9	-\$17.1	-\$18.7	-\$89.5
North Dakota	-\$3.3	-\$6.1	-\$24.8	-\$3.0	-\$3.3	-\$15.6
Ohio	-\$30.2	-\$69.3	-\$266.2	-\$25.5	-\$27.7	-\$132.9
Oklahoma	-\$9.3	-\$21.8	-\$83.3	-\$7.7	-\$8.4	-\$40.4
Oregon	-\$6.4	-\$15.8	-\$59.7	-\$5.2	-\$5.7	-\$27.2
Pennsylvania	-\$32.1	-\$68.6	-\$267.7	-\$27.6	-\$30.1	-\$144.4
Rhode Island	-\$4.0	-\$7.6	-\$30.7	-\$3.6	-\$3.9	-\$18.9
South Carolina	-\$11.7	-\$25.0	-\$97.4	-\$10.0	-\$10.9	-\$52.5
South Dakota	-\$3.0	-\$6.0	-\$23.8	-\$2.6	-\$2.9	-\$13.8
Tennessee	-\$15.2	-\$34.2	-\$131.8	-\$12.9	-\$14.0	-\$67.2
Texas	-\$40.8	-\$115.4	-\$424.2	-\$31.4	-\$34.3	-\$164.2
Utah	-\$4.0	-\$10.1	-\$37.9	-\$3.2	-\$3.5	-\$16.7
Vermont	-\$3.5	-\$5.8	-\$24.4	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.1
Virginia	-\$12.4	-\$28.4	-\$109.1	-\$10.5	-\$11.4	-\$54.6
Washington	-\$9.7	-\$25.4	-\$94.8	-\$7.7	-\$8.4	-\$40.3
West Virginia	-\$8.3	-\$16.4	-\$65.3	-\$7.3	-\$8.0	-\$38.2
Wisconsin	-\$9.7	-\$24.1	-\$91.1	-\$7.9	-\$8.7	-\$41.5
Wyoming	-\$3.5	-\$5.6	-\$23.7	-\$3.3	-\$3.6	-\$17.1

## Technical Notes

Children and Families Services is Department of Health and Human Services account 75 1536 in the Social Services category of the budget (known technically as subfunction 506). It includes funding for the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) -- which the President's budget proposes to eliminate starting in 2007 -- as well as for Head Start, services for abused and neglected children or children at risk for abuse or neglect, and several smaller funding streams.

CSBG enables states (along with Community Action Agencies and other designated entities) to address needs related to employment (such as child care, job training, or transportation assistance), education, better use of available income, housing, nutrition, emergency services, and health.

Nationwide cuts in the account are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) baseline for the account. That baseline reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. Because OMB does not publish a separate baseline for CSBG, we calculate the CSBG baseline by starting with the CSBG funding level in 2006 and increasing it for inflation using the same rate of inflation as for the account overall.

This analysis assumes that the cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding in 2006 for the major funding streams included in this account. These funding streams -- namely, Head Start, the CSBG, and child welfare services -- represent about 88 percent of funding under this account. Each state's loss in funding from the elimination of CSBG is calculated separately from each state's share of cuts in the remainder of the account. CSBG cuts were distributed in proportion to each state's share of CSBG funding in 2006; cuts in the remainder of the account were distributed in proportion to each state's share of Head Start funds (in 2006) and child welfare funding under Title IV-B subpart I of the Social Security Act (in 2005).

National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, and an additional share (about 5 percent of the total) that this analysis assumes would not be borne by states. This five percent represents the share of federal spending in the account the account in 2006 that was not distributed in the form of grants to states, territories, or tribes.

**Table 6. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to the  
Number of Children in Head Start  
Number of Head Start Slots in 2011**

	<b>Low Estimate</b>	<b>High Estimate</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-88,800</b> <b>-10.2%</b>	<b>-116,800</b> <b>-13.4%</b>
Alabama	-1,700	-2,200
Alaska	-200	-200
Arizona	-1,400	-1,800
Arkansas	-1,100	-1,500
California	-10,100	-13,200
Colorado	-1,000	-1,300
Connecticut	-700	-1,000
Delaware	-200	-300
District of Columbia	-300	-500
Florida	-3,600	-4,800
Georgia	-2,400	-3,200
Hawaii	-300	-400
Idaho	-300	-400
Illinois	-4,100	-5,300
Indiana	-1,500	-1,900
Iowa	-800	-1,000
Kansas	-800	-1,100
Kentucky	-1,600	-2,200
Louisiana	-2,200	-3,000
Maine	-400	-500
Maryland	-1,100	-1,400
Massachusetts	-1,300	-1,700
Michigan	-3,600	-4,700
Minnesota	-1,100	-1,400
Mississippi	-2,700	-3,600
Missouri	-1,800	-2,300
Montana	-300	-400
Nebraska	-500	-700
Nevada	-300	-400
New Hampshire	-200	-200
New Jersey	-1,500	-2,000
New Mexico	-800	-1,000
New York	-5,000	-6,600
North Carolina	-1,900	-2,600
North Dakota	-200	-300
Ohio	-3,900	-5,100
Oklahoma	-1,400	-1,900
Oregon	-900	-1,200
Pennsylvania	-3,300	-4,300
Rhode Island	-300	-400
South Carolina	-1,300	-1,600
South Dakota	-300	-400
Tennessee	-1,700	-2,200
Texas	-6,900	-9,000
Utah	-600	-700
Vermont	-200	-200
Virginia	-1,400	-1,800
Washington	-1,100	-1,500
West Virginia	-800	-1,000
Wisconsin	-1,400	-1,800
Wyoming	-200	-200

## Technical Notes

This table shows potential losses in the number of children served by Head Start. Head Start is part of the Department of Health and Human Services' Children and Families Services account, which is account number 75 1536 in the Social Services category of the budget (budget subfunction 506).

For each state, and for the nation as a whole, projected losses in the number of Head Start participants in 2011 are calculated by multiplying the number of children enrolled in Head Start in that state in 2005 (the most recent year available) by the percentage reduction in nationwide Head Start funding projected for 2011. Because the President's budget does not specify the exact cut in Head Start funds in 2011, but only shows funding cuts for the account as a whole, this analysis projects a "low estimate" and "high estimate." The low estimate assumes Head Start funding will remain frozen at the level requested by the President's budget for 2007 -- resulting in a 10.2 percent erosion in value from inflation. (Inflation here is measured by the increase in the Office of Management and Budget baseline for Children and Families Services programs, excluding the Community Services Block Grant, from 2006 to 2011.) The 10.2 percent inflation-adjusted funding cut is assumed to result in a 10.2 percent reduction in Head Start enrollment, a reduction of nearly 89,000 children served.

The high estimate assumes that, after 2007, Head Start funding will be reduced each year at the same rate, relative to the baseline, as the Children and Families Services account overall (excluding the Community Services Block Grant, which the President's budget would eliminate). This is a particularly believable scenario because Head Start represents a large majority of non-CSBG spending in the account. Head Start accounted for 82 percent of proposed non-CSBG spending in this account. Under this scenario, Head Start funding would be cut 13.4 percent in program year 2011, relative to inflation as measured by the baseline. The result is a projected decline in Head Start participation of 13.4 percent, or approximately 116,800 children.

National totals include U.S. territories and tribes.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 7. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to the  
Commodity Supplemental Food Program**

	<b>Elderly Recipients Losing CSFP Food Assistance in 2007</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-420,000</b>
Alabama	—
Alaska	-1,900
Arizona	-13,400
Arkansas	—
California	-44,100
Colorado	-10,300
Connecticut	—
Delaware	—
District of Columbi	-6,900
Florida	—
Georgia	—
Hawaii	—
Idaho	—
Illinois	-12,900
Indiana	-4,300
Iowa	-3,400
Kansas	-5,100
Kentucky	-14,800
Louisiana	-71,400
Maine	—
Maryland	—
Massachusetts	—
Michigan	-65,700
Minnesota*	-11,900
Mississippi	-6,300
Missouri	-9,000
Montana	-6,100
Nebraska	-11,600
Nevada	-4,900
New Hampshire	-5,400
New Jersey	—
New Mexico	-14,700
New York	-24,700
North Carolina	-1,200
North Dakota	-2,700
Ohio	-11,900
Oklahoma	—
Oregon	-1,000
Pennsylvania	-13,500
Rhode Island	—
South Carolina	-3,500
South Dakota*	-3,200
Tennessee	-12,400
Texas	-11,600
Utah	—
Vermont	-4,000
Virginia	—
Washington	-1,800
West Virginia	—
Wisconsin	-4,400
Wyoming	—

**Technical Notes**

— State has no program.

This table shows projected cuts in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), which is Department of Agriculture account 12 3507 of the Food and Nutrition category of the federal budget (budget subfunction 605). CSFP provides monthly nutritious food packages primarily to low-income seniors aged 60 and older in parts of 32 states, the District of Columbia, and two Indian reservations.

The President's budget proposes to eliminate funding for CSFP. This step would terminate CSFP food assistance for the 420,000 low-income seniors who USDA estimates receive CSFP in 2006. (CSFP also provides food packages to low-income pregnant and post-partum women, infants, and children up to age 6. The President's budget assumes that some of these families will continue to receive food assistance from WIC.)

To project the number of seniors receiving CSFP assistance by state -- and hence the number losing assistance if the program is eliminated -- this analysis assumed that each state contains the same percentage of participants as it had in 2005. Figures for two states (Minnesota and South Dakota) include cuts to Indian reservations in those states.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 8. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to the  
Public Housing Capital Fund  
For Repair of Public Housing (Millions of dollars)**

	<b>Cut in 2007</b>	<b>Cut in 2011</b>	<b>5 Year Cut</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$314</b> <b>-12.6%</b>	<b>-\$622</b> <b>-22.9%</b>	<b>-\$2,481</b> <b>-19.1%</b>
Alabama	-\$9.0	-\$17.9	-\$71.5
Alaska	-\$0.4	-\$0.7	-\$2.9
Arizona	-\$2.8	-\$5.6	-\$22.2
Arkansas	-\$1.4	-\$2.7	-\$10.9
California	-\$12.7	-\$25.1	-\$100.2
Colorado	-\$1.8	-\$3.6	-\$14.4
Connecticut	-\$4.1	-\$8.1	-\$32.3
Delaware	-\$0.7	-\$1.4	-\$5.4
District of Columbia	-\$4.2	-\$8.3	-\$33.1
Florida	-\$12.8	-\$25.4	-\$101.1
Georgia	-\$11.4	-\$22.7	-\$90.5
Hawaii	-\$1.7	-\$3.3	-\$13.2
Idaho	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$1.1
Illinois	-\$22.9	-\$45.4	-\$180.9
Indiana	-\$4.0	-\$7.9	-\$31.7
Iowa	-\$0.8	-\$1.5	-\$6.1
Kansas	-\$1.6	-\$3.2	-\$12.8
Kentucky	-\$5.5	-\$10.9	-\$43.5
Louisiana	-\$6.8	-\$13.5	-\$53.8
Maine	-\$0.9	-\$1.7	-\$6.9
Maryland	-\$6.4	-\$12.6	-\$50.3
Massachusetts	-\$8.3	-\$16.4	-\$65.5
Michigan	-\$6.0	-\$12.0	-\$47.7
Minnesota	-\$4.6	-\$9.0	-\$36.0
Mississippi	-\$3.0	-\$6.0	-\$24.0
Missouri	-\$4.4	-\$8.7	-\$34.7
Montana	-\$0.5	-\$0.9	-\$3.7
Nebraska	-\$1.3	-\$2.5	-\$10.0
Nevada	-\$1.0	-\$1.9	-\$7.6
New Hampshire	-\$0.8	-\$1.5	-\$6.0
New Jersey	-\$11.2	-\$22.1	-\$88.1
New Mexico	-\$1.0	-\$2.0	-\$7.9
New York	-\$53.4	-\$105.9	-\$422.2
North Carolina	-\$7.8	-\$15.5	-\$61.8
North Dakota	-\$1.0	-\$2.0	-\$8.1
Ohio	-\$12.8	-\$25.5	-\$101.5
Oklahoma	-\$2.5	-\$5.0	-\$19.9
Oregon	-\$1.5	-\$2.9	-\$11.5
Pennsylvania	-\$22.1	-\$43.9	-\$174.9
Rhode Island	-\$2.0	-\$4.0	-\$15.9
South Carolina	-\$3.5	-\$7.0	-\$27.9
South Dakota	-\$0.3	-\$0.5	-\$2.1
Tennessee	-\$7.9	-\$15.6	-\$62.3
Texas	-\$12.3	-\$24.4	-\$97.2
Utah	-\$0.4	-\$0.8	-\$3.3
Vermont	-\$0.3	-\$0.6	-\$2.5
Virginia	-\$5.3	-\$10.4	-\$41.5
Washington	-\$4.1	-\$8.2	-\$32.7
West Virginia	-\$1.3	-\$2.6	-\$10.4
Wisconsin	-\$2.7	-\$5.3	-\$21.0
Wyoming	-\$0.1	-\$0.3	-\$1.1



**Technical Notes**

This table shows projected cuts in the Public Housing Capital Fund, which is Department of Housing and Urban Development account 86 0304 in the Housing Assistance category of the federal budget (known technically as subfunction 604).

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding in 2006. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for these funding streams in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. National totals include U.S. territories and tribes, not shown separately.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 9. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to the  
Community Development Block Grant  
Formula Grants Only (Millions of dollars)**

	<b>Cut in 2007</b>	<b>Cut in 2011</b>	<b>5 Year Cut</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$818</b>	<b>-\$1,273</b>	<b>-\$5,411</b>
	<b>-21.6%</b>	<b>-30.9%</b>	<b>-27.3%</b>
Alabama	-\$10.9	-\$17.0	-\$72
Alaska	-\$1.0	-\$1.6	-\$7
Arizona	-\$12.0	-\$18.7	-\$80
Arkansas	-\$6.1	-\$9.5	-\$40
California	-\$104.2	-\$162.2	-\$690
Colorado	-\$8.5	-\$13.2	-\$56
Connecticut	-\$9.3	-\$14.4	-\$61
Delaware	-\$1.6	-\$2.5	-\$11
District of Columbia	-\$4.2	-\$6.6	-\$28
Florida	-\$35.7	-\$55.7	-\$237
Georgia	-\$18.4	-\$28.7	-\$122
Hawaii	-\$3.4	-\$5.3	-\$22
Idaho	-\$2.7	-\$4.2	-\$18
Illinois	-\$39.0	-\$60.7	-\$258
Indiana	-\$15.6	-\$24.2	-\$103
Iowa	-\$9.1	-\$14.2	-\$60
Kansas	-\$6.2	-\$9.6	-\$41
Kentucky	-\$10.1	-\$15.7	-\$67
Louisiana	-\$13.8	-\$21.5	-\$91
Maine	-\$4.4	-\$6.9	-\$29
Maryland	-\$12.4	-\$19.3	-\$82
Massachusetts	-\$24.5	-\$38.1	-\$162
Michigan	-\$29.3	-\$45.6	-\$194
Minnesota	-\$12.9	-\$20.1	-\$85
Mississippi	-\$7.8	-\$12.1	-\$52
Missouri	-\$15.0	-\$23.4	-\$99
Montana	-\$2.0	-\$3.2	-\$13
Nebraska	-\$4.3	-\$6.7	-\$29
Nevada	-\$4.5	-\$7.0	-\$30
New Hampshire	-\$2.9	-\$4.6	-\$19
New Jersey	-\$22.4	-\$34.9	-\$148
New Mexico	-\$4.7	-\$7.3	-\$31
New York	-\$77.8	-\$121.2	-\$515
North Carolina	-\$15.8	-\$24.6	-\$104
North Dakota	-\$1.4	-\$2.2	-\$9
Ohio	-\$36.0	-\$56.0	-\$238
Oklahoma	-\$6.7	-\$10.5	-\$44
Oregon	-\$8.1	-\$12.7	-\$54
Pennsylvania	-\$49.3	-\$76.8	-\$326
Rhode Island	-\$3.8	-\$5.9	-\$25
South Carolina	-\$8.6	-\$13.4	-\$57
South Dakota	-\$1.8	-\$2.8	-\$12
Tennessee	-\$11.1	-\$17.3	-\$74
Texas	-\$57.0	-\$88.8	-\$378
Utah	-\$4.5	-\$7.1	-\$30
Vermont	-\$1.8	-\$2.9	-\$12
Virginia	-\$13.6	-\$21.2	-\$90
Washington	-\$13.7	-\$21.3	-\$91
West Virginia	-\$5.6	-\$8.7	-\$37
Wisconsin	-\$14.8	-\$23.0	-\$98
Wyoming	-\$0.9	-\$1.5	-\$6

## Technical Notes

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is part of the Community Development Fund, which is Department of Housing and Urban Development account 86 0162 in the Community Development category of the federal budget (known as 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 Office of Management and Budget baseline, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. The table shows only the portion of the account (89 percent in 2006) used for CDBG formula grants. The analysis assumes that formula grants would experience the same percentage cuts as the account as a whole.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of CDBG funding in 2006. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for the CDBG in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. National totals include U.S. territories, tribes, and set-asides not shown separately.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

Table 10. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to

**Low Income Home Energy Assistance**

(Millions of dollars)

	<b>Cut in 2011</b>	<b>5 Year Cut</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$693</b>	<b>-\$1,911</b>
	<b>-28.9%</b>	<b>-16.6%</b>
Alabama	-\$5.92	-\$16.3
Alaska	-\$2.64	-\$7.3
Arizona	-\$2.65	-\$7.3
Arkansas	-\$4.55	-\$12.5
California	-\$31.73	-\$87.5
Colorado	-\$11.14	-\$30.7
Connecticut	-\$14.54	-\$40.1
Delaware	-\$1.93	-\$5.3
District of Columbia	-\$2.26	-\$6.2
Florida	-\$9.43	-\$26.0
Georgia	-\$7.46	-\$20.6
Hawaii	-\$0.75	-\$2.1
Idaho	-\$4.14	-\$11.4
Illinois	-\$40.25	-\$111.0
Indiana	-\$18.22	-\$50.3
Iowa	-\$12.92	-\$35.6
Kansas	-\$5.93	-\$16.3
Kentucky	-\$9.48	-\$26.2
Louisiana	-\$6.09	-\$16.8
Maine	-\$9.08	-\$25.0
Maryland	-\$11.14	-\$30.7
Massachusetts	-\$29.08	-\$80.2
Michigan	-\$37.96	-\$104.7
Minnesota	-\$27.53	-\$75.9
Mississippi	-\$5.10	-\$14.1
Missouri	-\$16.08	-\$44.3
Montana	-\$4.33	-\$11.9
Nebraska	-\$6.39	-\$17.6
Nevada	-\$1.35	-\$3.7
New Hampshire	-\$5.51	-\$15.2
New Jersey	-\$26.94	-\$74.3
New Mexico	-\$3.34	-\$9.2
New York	-\$88.14	-\$243.0
North Carolina	-\$12.91	-\$35.6
North Dakota	-\$4.33	-\$11.9
Ohio	-\$35.61	-\$98.2
Oklahoma	-\$4.98	-\$13.7
Oregon	-\$8.49	-\$23.4
Pennsylvania	-\$47.37	-\$130.6
Rhode Island	-\$4.78	-\$13.2
South Carolina	-\$4.73	-\$13.1
South Dakota	-\$3.70	-\$10.2
Tennessee	-\$9.61	-\$26.5
Texas	-\$15.69	-\$43.3
Utah	-\$5.08	-\$14.0
Vermont	-\$4.13	-\$11.4
Virginia	-\$13.56	-\$37.4
Washington	-\$13.64	-\$37.6
West Virginia	-\$6.28	-\$17.3
Wisconsin	-\$24.78	-\$68.3
Wyoming	-\$2.00	-\$5.5

## Technical Notes

This table shows projected cuts in the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which is Department of Health and Human Services account 75 1502 in the "Other Income Security" category of the federal budget (known technically as subfunction 609).

The nationwide cuts were measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account. That baseline reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation.

The 2007 cuts are not listed for this program due to an unusual circumstance that is creating substantial uncertainty about the 2007 funding level. The budget reconciliation bill signed into law in early February 2006 provides an extra \$1 billion for LIHEAP in 2007, and the President's budget assumes that money will be available in 2007. But active consideration is being given in Congress to shifting that money to 2006 to help pay for unusually high home heating costs. It is presently unclear in which year this money will be spent. The five-year figures shown here assume this money will stay in 2007. If Congress does move it to 2006, the five-year cut shown here will be larger than the \$1.9 billion shown in this table.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of formula-grant funding in 2006. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for LIHEAP in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. National totals include U.S. territories, tribes, and set-asides not shown separately.

**Table 11. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to  
EPA Clean Water/Drinking Water Revolving Funds**

(Millions of dollars)

	<b>In 2007</b>	<b>In 2011</b>	<b>5 Year Cut</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$241</b>	<b>-\$459</b>	<b>-\$1,847</b>
	<b>-13.6%</b>	<b>-23.8%</b>	<b>-20.0%</b>
Alabama	-\$2.8	-\$5.3	-\$21.2
Alaska	-\$1.5	-\$2.8	-\$11.4
Arizona	-\$1.7	-\$3.2	-\$12.8
Arkansas	-\$1.6	-\$3.1	-\$12.4
California	-\$17.8	-\$33.8	-\$135.9
Colorado	-\$2.0	-\$3.8	-\$15.2
Connecticut	-\$3.0	-\$5.8	-\$23.3
Delaware	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
District of Columbia	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
Florida	-\$8.4	-\$15.9	-\$64.1
Georgia	-\$4.2	-\$8.0	-\$32.1
Hawaii	-\$1.9	-\$3.7	-\$14.7
Idaho	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
Illinois	-\$11.2	-\$21.4	-\$85.9
Indiana	-\$6.0	-\$11.4	-\$45.8
Iowa	-\$3.4	-\$6.4	-\$25.7
Kansas	-\$2.2	-\$4.3	-\$17.1
Kentucky	-\$3.2	-\$6.0	-\$24.2
Louisiana	-\$2.7	-\$5.2	-\$20.9
Maine	-\$1.9	-\$3.7	-\$14.7
Maryland	-\$6.0	-\$11.4	-\$45.9
Massachusetts	-\$8.4	-\$16.0	-\$64.5
Michigan	-\$10.7	-\$20.3	-\$81.7
Minnesota	-\$4.6	-\$8.7	-\$34.9
Mississippi	-\$2.2	-\$4.3	-\$17.1
Missouri	-\$6.9	-\$13.1	-\$52.7
Montana	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
Nebraska	-\$1.3	-\$2.4	-\$9.7
Nevada	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
New Hampshire	-\$2.5	-\$4.7	-\$19.0
New Jersey	-\$10.1	-\$19.3	-\$77.6
New Mexico	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
New York	-\$27.4	-\$52.1	-\$209.7
North Carolina	-\$4.5	-\$8.5	-\$34.3
North Dakota	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
Ohio	-\$14.0	-\$26.6	-\$107.0
Oklahoma	-\$2.0	-\$3.8	-\$15.3
Oregon	-\$2.8	-\$5.3	-\$21.5
Pennsylvania	-\$9.8	-\$18.7	-\$75.3
Rhode Island	-\$1.7	-\$3.2	-\$12.8
South Carolina	-\$2.6	-\$4.8	-\$19.5
South Dakota	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
Tennessee	-\$3.6	-\$6.9	-\$27.6
Texas	-\$11.4	-\$21.6	-\$86.8
Utah	-\$1.3	-\$2.5	-\$10.0
Vermont	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3
Virginia	-\$5.1	-\$9.7	-\$38.9
Washington	-\$4.3	-\$8.2	-\$33.0
West Virginia	-\$3.9	-\$7.4	-\$29.6
Wisconsin	-\$6.7	-\$12.8	-\$51.4
Wyoming	-\$1.2	-\$2.3	-\$9.3

## Technical Notes

The Environmental Protection Agency's clean water and drinking water state revolving funds are part of EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grants (account 68 0103) in the Pollution Control and Abatement category of the budget (known technically as subfunction 304). The state revolving funds provide federal funding to states to construct wastewater treatment facilities, improve drinking water infrastructure, and enhance water quality.

Because the President's budget does not provide details on program-by-program cuts after 2007, this analysis assumes that these revolving funds will be cut by the same percentage in each year from 2008 through 2011 as the account overall. (The revolving funds account for 55 percent of the total account in 2006.) Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation.

This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of total funding for these revolving funds in 2001. (Each state's share of these funds is fixed by law and has not changed in several years.) For example, if a given state received 3 percent of the total funding for the revolving funds in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for these funds.

**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**

**2/23/2006**

**Table 12. Projected Cuts Under the President's FY07 Budget Plan to the  
Social Services Block Grant**

	<b>Cut in 2007 (\$millions)</b>
<b>U.S. Total</b>	<b>-\$500</b>
	<b>-29%</b>
Alabama	-\$7.7
Alaska	-\$1.1
Arizona	-\$9.5
Arkansas	-\$4.7
California	-\$60.7
Colorado	-\$7.8
Connecticut	-\$6.0
Delaware	-\$1.4
District of Columbia	-\$1.0
Florida	-\$29.1
Georgia	-\$14.8
Hawaii	-\$2.2
Idaho	-\$2.3
Illinois	-\$21.6
Indiana	-\$10.6
Iowa	-\$5.0
Kansas	-\$4.7
Kentucky	-\$7.0
Louisiana	-\$7.7
Maine	-\$2.2
Maryland	-\$9.4
Massachusetts	-\$10.8
Michigan	-\$17.2
Minnesota	-\$8.7
Mississippi	-\$4.9
Missouri	-\$9.8
Montana	-\$1.6
Nebraska	-\$3.0
Nevada	-\$3.8
New Hampshire	-\$2.2
New Jersey	-\$14.8
New Mexico	-\$3.2
New York	-\$32.8
North Carolina	-\$14.4
North Dakota	-\$1.1
Ohio	-\$19.6
Oklahoma	-\$6.0
Oregon	-\$6.1
Pennsylvania	-\$21.1
Rhode Island	-\$1.8
South Carolina	-\$7.1
South Dakota	-\$1.3
Tennessee	-\$10.0
Texas	-\$37.8
Utah	-\$4.0
Vermont	-\$1.1
Virginia	-\$12.6
Washington	-\$10.5
West Virginia	-\$3.1
Wisconsin	-\$9.4
Wyoming	-\$0.9



### Technical Notes

This table shows the President's proposed one-year cut in the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), which is Department of Health and Human Services account 75 1534 in the Social Services category of the federal budget (known technically as subfunction 506). SSBG provides funding to states to help promote economic self-support or self-sufficiency, prevent or remedy neglect, abuse, or the exploitation of children and adults, prevent or reduce inappropriate institutionalization, and secure referral for institutional care.

Unlike most programs in this analysis of the President's federal discretionary spending proposals, the Social Services Block Grant is generally considered a mandatory program (that is, it does not to be funded annually by congressional appropriations committees). Nonetheless, the President's budget proposes to have the House and Senate appropriations committees make this one-year SSBG reduction; so, under congressional budgeting rules, the change would count as a discretionary cut.

Nationwide cuts are measured relative to the Office of Management and Budget baseline for this account, which reflects the 2006 funding level adjusted only for inflation. This analysis assumes that the proposed cuts would be apportioned among states on the basis of each state's share of funding in 2006. For example, if a given state received 3 percent of total SSBG funding in 2006, the analysis assumes it would absorb 3 percent of the proposed funding cut for the account. U.S. total figures include cuts attributed to U.S. territories and tribes.