



HR 1 CONTINUING RESOLUTION: OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL & STATE IMPACTS ON KEY CHILD/FAMILY PROGRAMS

Head Start/Early Head Start

Description: Head Start promotes school readiness among at-risk children up to age 5 by enhancing social and cognitive development through education, health, nutritional, and other services and by engaging families in children's learning. *Early Head Start* is a comprehensive early childhood program which serves at-risk children prenatal to age three, pregnant women, and their families. Early Head Start's mission is to support healthy prenatal outcomes and enhance the cognitive, social, and emotional development of infants and toddlers in order to promote later success in school and life.. Currently, Head Start and Early Head Start have funding to serve 965,000 children. This includes 61,000 slots that are paid for by the 2009 Recovery Act but are scheduled to expire in September 2011.

Proposed Cut: The House proposal would reduce funding for Head Start by nearly \$1.1 billion, or 15 percent, relative to the level under the current continuing resolution. This cut would be in addition to the expiration of Recovery Act funds. If these cuts were implemented by reducing enrollment, rather than cutting the amount spent per child (by cutting the services these children receive), about 157,000 children would lose Head Start. The cuts would be on top of the loss of the 61,000 expiring Head Start and Early Head Start slots paid for by the Recovery Act. 50,000 babies in Early Head Start would lose services.

State by State Impact: See Table A. Source: National Head Start Association.

Child Care and Development Block Grant

Description: The Child Care and Development Block Grant Program provides grants to states, territories, tribes, and tribal organizations for child care assistance for low-income families.

Proposed Cut: \$39 million (1.8% decrease from 2010)

State by State Impact: See Table B. Source: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Maternal and Child Health Block Grant

Description: The Maternal and Child Health (MCH) Block Grant, as authorized under Title V of the Social Security Act, aims to improve the health, safety, and well-being of all mothers and children. Through funding to the states, MCH programs strive to support community-based initiatives to address the comprehensive physical, psychological, and social needs of the maternal and child population with an end goal of ensuring that all mothers and children have access to the services and supports they need, including access to quality health care in supportive, culturally-competent, family, and community settings.

Proposed Cut: \$50 million (7.6% decrease from 2010).

State by State Impact: No state by state impact cuts have been published.

School Based Health Clinics

Description: School-based health centers blend medical care with preventive and psychosocial services as well as organize broader school-based and community-based health promotion efforts. Typically staffed with nurse practitioners and health aides, they increasingly include mental health professionals. The following resources provide both general background as well as publications that address the specific topics of access to care, clinical services, financing, reproductive health care, research and evaluation, school-based dental services, school-based health centers/school partnerships, and staffing and training.

Proposed Cut: School Based Health Centers would be cut in a number of ways, including Title V (\$61 million); Title X (\$327 million reduction) and Community Health Centers (\$1.3 billion cut). If cuts are enacted, more than half of the school based health centers across the nation would be impacted.

State by State Impact: No state by state impact cuts have been published.

Community Services Block Grant

Description: The Community Services Block Grant offers funds to states to address the causes of poverty by providing effective services in communities. Activities may include coordination and referral to other programs, as well as direct services such as child care, transportation, employment and education, and self-help projects.

Proposed Cut: \$14.2 million (45.71% decrease from 2010).

State by State Impact: No state by state impact cuts have been published.

Low Income Heating Assistance Program

Description: LIHEAP provides funding to states, tribes, and territories to provide assistance to help eligible low-income families pay their heating and cooling bills. The program consists of block grant formula funds (\$4.5 billion) and a smaller Contingency Fund (\$590 million). The Contingency Fund provides emergency funding to supplement regular LIHEAP grants and is distributed to states as needed to help households, especially those in states with particularly high home energy assistance needs.

Proposed Cut: The House proposal would eliminate the LIHEAP Contingency Fund for the rest of the year (a cut of \$390 million). The portion dedicated to children is \$148.3 million, 7.7% decrease from 2010.

State by State Impact: No state by state impact cuts have been published.

Pell Grants

Description: The Pell Grant program provides grants to low- and moderate-income undergraduate students to help pay for college. Pell Grants also help low-income working adults return to school to improve their skills.

Proposed Cut: The House proposal would reduce funding for Pell Grants by approximately \$5.7 billion, or 24 percent, and would reduce the maximum discretionary Pell Grant award by \$845 (from \$4,860 to \$4,015), or 17.4 percent. This cut would affect all 9.4 million students who receive Pell Grants. (See Appendix for state figures.)

State by State Impact: See Table C.

Workforce Investment Act Youth Service

Description: Employment and training services help match job seekers with labor-market and employer needs. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) formula grants provide funds for states to provide job training, job search, and other employment assistance for low-income adults and workers whose jobs have been eliminated. They also provide summer and year-round jobs, education, training, and employment assistance for both in-school and out-of-school youth.

Workforce Investment Act Youth Service

Description: Employment and training services help match job seekers with labor-market and employer needs. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) formula grants provide funds for states to provide job training, job search, and other employment assistance for low-income adults and workers whose jobs have been eliminated. They also provide summer and year-round jobs, training, and employment assistance for in-school out-of-school youth.

Proposed Cut: HR 1 zeroes out funding for youth jobs training and education programs operated under WIA for the remainder of 2011. Over a quarter of a million young people would not be served and would be impacted by these cuts.

State by State Impact: See Table D.

State by State Impact: See Table D.

Other State-by-State Cuts

See Table E-F.

Table A. State by State Impact of Head Start Cuts

State/Territory/ Special Population	Total Net Head Start and Early Head Start Spaces Lost from Current Levels if HR 1	Total Net Head Start and Early Head Start Jobs Lost from Current Levels if HR 1	Total Net Head Start and Early Head Start Classrooms Lost from Current Enrollment Levels if HR 1
	Passes	Passes	Passes
Alabama	3,989	871	283
Alaska	393	129	29
Arizona	3,441	674	212
Arkansas	2,546	682	187
California	24,310	5,369	1,615
Colorado	2,517	827	247
Connecticut	1,561	416	112
Delaware	496	143	38
District of Columbia	724	289	65
Florida	9,148	2,127	682
Georgia	5,693	1,352	445
Hawaii	668	144	45
Idaho	824	250	52
Illinois	9,633	2,061	730
Indiana	3,849	877	264
Iowa	1,794	510	145
Kansas	2,029	627	157
Kentucky	3,806	983	340
Louisiana	5,009	1,110	359
Maine	851	297	72
Maryland	2,372	512	170
Massachusetts	2,936	886	205
Michigan	8,106	1,596	543
Minnesota	2,533	663	182
Mississippi	5,523	1,239	373
Missouri	4,190	1,080	307
Montana	694	210	48
Nebraska	1,272	384	108
Nevada	825	193	48
New Hampshire	416	135	27
New Jersey	3,719	1,018	281
New Mexico	1,898	428	137
New York	11,882	3,523	916
North Carolina	5,298	1,394	414
North Dakota	565	164	45
Ohio	9,109	1,910	646
Oklahoma	3,417	947	266
Oregon	2,525	737	180
Pennsylvania	8,131	1,873	524
Rhode Island	663	158	44
South Carolina	3,166	640	233
South Dakota	651	237	41
Tennessee	3,957	861	284
Texas	16,907	4,148	1,345
Utah	1,435	363	110
Vermont	336	121	25
Virginia	3,340	921	246
Washington	2,989	1,009	210
West Virginia	1,795	563	160
Wisconsin	3,247	887	239
Wyoming	347	130	24
National Total	218,220	55,000	16,000

Table B. State by State Impact of the Child Care Development Block Grant

State/Territory/ Special Population	Children At-Risk of Losing Child Care Support if Cuts Go Through
Alabama	9,000
Alaska	500
Arizona	8,000
Arkansas	3,000
California	27,000
Colorado	3,000
Connecticut	1,000
Delaware	900
Florida	21,000
Georgia	20,000
Hawaii	1,000
Idaho	3,000
Illinois	14,000
Indiana	7,000
Iowa	2,000
Kansas	4,000
Kentucky	6,000
Louisiana	11,000
Maine	900
Maryland	3,000
Massachusetts	2,000
Michigan	13,000
Minnesota	3,000
Mississippi	10,000
Missouri	8,000
Montana	1,000
Nebraska	1,000
Nevada	1,000
New Hampshire	800
New Jersey	4,000
New Mexico	4,000
New York	13,000
North Carolina	13,000
North Dakota	1,000
Ohio	9,000
Oklahoma	5,000
Oregon	4,000
Pennsylvania	12,000
Rhode Island	700
South Carolina	7,000
South Dakota	1,000
Tennessee	8,000
Texas	44,000
Utah	4,000
Vermont	400
Virginia	5,000
Washington	5,000
West Virginia	2,000
Wisconsin	4,000
Wyoming	500
National Total	331,700

Table C. State by State Impact of Pell Grant Cuts

State/Territory/Special Population	Funding (\$Millions)	Students Affected
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
National Total	(\$5,667)	9,413,000

Technical Notes:

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 D. State by State Impact Youth Service Cuts to Workforce Investment Act Job Training

State/Territory/Special Population	WIA Youth Services Participants
Alabama	-2,000
Alaska	-1,300
Arizona	-4,400
Arkansas	-2,500
California	-28,900
Colorado	-3,100
Connecticut	-1,300
Delaware	-700
District of Columbia	-500
Florida	-15,100
Georgia	-7,800
Hawaii	-600
Idaho	-1,000
Illinois	-13,100
Indiana	-7,000
Iowa	-1,500
Kansas	-1,400
Kentucky	-4,400
Louisiana	-3,400
Maine	-1,100
Maryland	-2,200
Massachusetts	-3,900
Michigan	-18,500
Minnesota	-5,100
Mississippi	-6,400
Missouri	-5,800
Montana	-700
Nebraska	-1,100
Nevada	-1,100
New Hampshire	-700
New Jersey	-4,100
New Mexico	-1,500
New York	-17,900
North Carolina	-5,100
North Dakota	-900
Ohio	-14,400
Oklahoma	-1,700
Oregon	-3,600
Pennsylvania	-8,000
Rhode Island	-1,000
South Carolina	-5,800
South Dakota	-300
Tennessee	-12,700
Texas	-15,500
Utah	-1,900
Vermont	-800
Virginia	-3,300
Washington	-4,500
West Virginia	-1,400
Wisconsin	-2,700
Wyoming	-800
National Total	-254,300

Technical Notes:

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/>)

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 E. State by State Impact of Selected K-12 Programs (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities)

State/Territory/Special Population	Education for the Disadvantaged	School Improvement
Alabama	-\$17,102,454	-\$15,112,174
Alaska	-\$3,155,296	-\$4,597,290
Arizona	-\$23,859,652	-\$18,208,951
Arkansas	-\$11,930,371	-\$9,782,727
California	-\$125,247,666	-\$106,032,145
Colorado	-\$11,497,423	-\$10,684,615
Connecticut	-\$8,138,616	-\$7,637,840
Delaware	-\$3,460,632	-\$4,595,872
District of Columbia	-\$4,016,845	-\$4,587,003
Florida	-\$56,627,174	-\$45,487,971
Georgia	-\$39,921,759	-\$29,143,057
Hawaii	-\$3,873,180	-\$4,597,921
Idaho	-\$4,395,349	-\$4,628,040
Illinois	-\$48,668,303	-\$37,866,632
Indiana	-\$19,425,124	-\$16,540,583
Iowa	-\$5,966,332	-\$6,571,997
Kansas	-\$8,768,072	-\$7,189,556
Kentucky	-\$17,168,468	-\$14,588,424
Louisiana	-\$22,174,510	-\$18,938,823
Maine	-\$4,210,178	-\$4,656,648
Maryland	-\$14,004,775	-\$11,993,088
Massachusetts	-\$16,490,411	-\$14,802,269
Michigan	-\$40,580,578	-\$34,412,939
Minnesota	-\$12,177,404	-\$11,438,884
Mississippi	-\$14,471,795	-\$13,434,563
Missouri	-\$18,543,147	-\$16,358,026
Montana	-\$3,626,305	-\$4,697,299
Nebraska	-\$4,958,261	-\$4,747,282
Nevada	-\$7,545,288	-\$5,662,547
New Hampshire	-\$3,329,508	-\$4,644,928
New Jersey	-\$22,538,409	-\$19,518,831
New Mexico	-\$8,687,241	-\$7,364,125
New York	-\$87,412,381	-\$68,777,451
North Carolina	-\$29,716,578	-\$23,977,420
North Dakota	-\$2,873,456	-\$4,599,758
Ohio	-\$43,188,531	-\$34,578,131
Oklahoma	-\$11,763,725	-\$11,052,643
Oregon	-\$11,401,598	-\$9,389,601
Pennsylvania	-\$41,017,095	-\$34,394,365
Rhode Island	-\$3,959,262	-\$4,596,899
South Carolina	-\$16,813,875	-\$13,197,767
South Dakota	-\$3,560,486	-\$4,613,040
Tennessee	-\$20,768,614	-\$17,531,002
Texas	-\$103,423,552	-\$83,885,228
Utah	-\$6,248,426	-\$6,130,885
Vermont	-\$2,831,891	-\$4,588,487
Virginia	-\$18,517,037	-\$16,265,311
Washington	-\$16,485,829	-\$14,777,027
West Virginia	-\$7,090,094	-\$6,796,423
Wisconsin	-\$16,178,089	-\$14,103,030
Wyoming	-\$2,786,638	-\$4,588,667
National Total	-\$1,416,000,000	-\$979,866,239

Technical Notes:

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 F. State by State Impact of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Programs (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities)

State/Territory/Special Population	Community Mental Health Services Block Grant	Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant
Alabama	-\$379,000	-\$1,500,000
Alaska	-\$44,000	-\$311,000
Arizona	-\$597,000	-\$2,346,000
Arkansas	-\$231,000	-\$839,000
California	-\$3,352,000	-\$15,776,000
Colorado	-\$415,000	-\$1,655,000
Connecticut	-\$262,000	-\$1,070,000
Delaware	-\$46,000	-\$423,000
District of Columbia	-\$48,000	-\$423,000
Florida	-\$1,654,000	-\$6,312,000
Georgia	-\$834,000	-\$3,178,000
Hawaii	-\$123,000	-\$480,000
Idaho	-\$114,000	-\$435,000
Illinois	-\$986,000	-\$4,395,000
Indiana	-\$498,000	-\$2,095,000
Iowa	-\$212,000	-\$851,000
Kansas	-\$196,000	-\$773,000
Kentucky	-\$339,000	-\$1,300,000
Louisiana	-\$340,000	-\$1,626,000
Maine	-\$103,000	-\$423,000
Maryland	-\$458,000	-\$2,012,000
Massachusetts	-\$506,000	-\$2,160,000
Michigan	-\$802,000	-\$3,642,000
Minnesota	-\$429,000	-\$1,566,000
Mississippi	-\$248,000	-\$39,000
Missouri	-\$439,000	-\$897,000
Montana	-\$74,000	-\$1,645,000
Nebraska	-\$121,000	-\$423,000
Nevada	-\$230,000	-\$496,000
New Hampshire	-\$94,000	-\$871,000
New Jersey	-\$720,000	-\$423,000
New Mexico	-\$148,000	-\$2,953,000
New York	-\$1,472,000	-\$565,000
North Carolina	-\$709,000	-\$7,266,000
North Dakota	-\$46,000	-\$2,510,000
Ohio	-\$865,000	-\$345,000
Oklahoma	-\$273,000	-\$4,193,000
Oregon	-\$312,000	-\$1,114,000
Pennsylvania	-\$903,000	-\$1,128,000
Rhode Island	-\$86,000	-\$3,717,000
South Carolina	-\$364,000	-\$423,000
South Dakota	-\$54,000	-\$1,297,000
Tennessee	-\$486,000	-\$319,000
Texas	-\$2,022,000	-\$1,871,000
Utah	-\$195,000	-\$8,554,000
Vermont	-\$46,000	-\$1,078,000
Virginia	-\$627,000	-\$341,000
Washington	-\$532,000	-\$2,710,000
West Virginia	-\$150,000	-\$2,200,000
Wisconsin	-\$468,000	-\$548,000
Wyoming	-\$27,000	-\$1,767,000
National Total	-\$26,000,000	-\$113,000,000

Technical Notes:

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.